

GZL
AUG 1 1968



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. III

FEBRUARY, 1919

No. I

The Day of the People

By EUGENE V. DEBS

The State and Revolution

By NICOLAI LENIN

Problems of American Socialism

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

Karl Marx

By FRANZ MEHRING

Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg

By LUDWIG LORE

Price, 25 Cents

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

243 55th STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. III FEBRUARY, 1919 No. 1

CONTENTS

	Page
The Day of the People.—By Eugene V. Debs	1—4
The State and Revolution.—By Nikolai Lenin.....	5—22
Lenin versus Wilson.—By Karl Island.....	23—26
Problems of American Socialism.—By Louis C. Fraina	26—47
Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.—By Ludwig Lore	47—64
The Labor Party.—By A. Dreifuss.....	64—67
Karl Marx.—By Franz Mehring.....	68—75
Economic and Menshevik Determinism.—By Maurice Blumlein	76—87
The Principles of Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship.—By Leon Trotsky	88—91
The National Constituent Assembly.—By Karl Kautsky	91—94
Editorials	95—110
A World Safe for Democracy.—The Crime of Crimes.—Mexico and American Imperialism.—Franz Mehring.—The Constitutional National Assembly.....	111—115
Party Discussion	116—127
Documents	116—127
A Swedish Party Correspondence.—The German Revolution and Russia.—The Appeal of the "Spartacus" Group to the Berlin Workmen.—An Appeal of the "Spartacus" Group.....	

The Co-Operative Press  15 Spruce St., New York

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

PUBLISHED BY

The Socialist Publication Society, 243 55th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Issued Every Two Months—25¢ a Copy; \$1.50 a Year

Editors: EUGENE V. DEBS, LOUIS C. FRAINA and LUDWIG LORE

Vol. III FEBRUARY, 1919 No. 1

The Day of the People

By EUGENE V. DEBS

Upon his release from the Kaiser's bastille—the doors of which were torn from their hinges by the proletarian revolution—Karl Liebknecht, heroic leader of the rising hosts, exclaimed: "The Day of the People has arrived!" It was a magnificent challenge to the Junkers and an inspiring battle-cry to the aroused workers.

From that day to this Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and other true leaders of the German proletariat have stood bravely at the front, appealing to the workers to join the revolution and make it complete by destroying what remained of the criminal and corrupt old regime and ushering in the day of the people. Then arose the cry that the people were not yet ready for their day, and Ebert and Scheidemann and their crowd of white-livered reactionaries, with the sanction and support of the fugitive Kaiser, the infamous Junkers and all the allied powers, now in beautiful alliance, proceeded to prove that the people were not yet ready to rule themselves by setting up a bourgeois government under which the working class should remain in substantially the same state of slavish subjection they were in at the beginning of the war.

And now upon that issue—as to whether the terrible war has brought the people their day or whether its appalling sacrifices have all been in vain—the battle is raging in Germany as in Rus-

sia, and the near future will determine whether revolution has for once been really triumphant or whether sudden reaction has again won the day.

In the struggle in Russia the revolution has thus far triumphed for the reason that it has not compromised. The career of Kerensky was cut short when he attempted to turn the revolutionary tide into reactionary bourgeois channels.

Lenine and Trotzky were the men of the hour and under their fearless, incorruptible and uncompromising leadership the Russian proletariat has held the fort against the combined assaults of all the ruling class powers of earth. It is a magnificent spectacle. It stirs the blood and warms the heart of every revolutionist, and it challenges the admiration of all the world.

So far as the Russian proletariat is concerned, the day of the people has arrived, and they are fighting and dying as only heroes and martyrs can fight and die to usher in the day of the people not only in Russia but in all the nations on the globe.

In every revolution of the past the false and cowardly plea that the people were "not yet ready" has prevailed. Some intermediate class invariably supplanted the class that was overthrown and "the people" remained at the bottom where they have been since the beginning of history. They have never been "ready" to rid themselves of their despots, robbers and parasites. All they have ever been ready for has been to exchange one brood of vampires for another to drain their veins and fatten in their misery.

That was Kerensky's doctrine in Russia and it is Scheidemann's doctrine in Germany. They are both false prophets of the people and traitors to the working class, and woe be to their deluded followers if their vicious reaction triumphs, for then indeed will the yokes be fastened afresh upon their scarred and bleeding necks for another generation.

When Kerensky attempted to side-track the revolution in Russia by joining forces with the bourgeoisie he was lauded by the capitalist press of the whole world. When Scheidemann patriotically rushed to the support of the Kaiser and the Junkers at the beginning of the war, the same press denounced him as the be-

trayer of socialism and the enemy of the people. And now this very press lauds him to the heavens as the savior of the German nation! Think of it! Scheidemann the traitor has become Scheidemann the hero of the bourgeoisie. Could it be for any other reason on earth than that Scheidemann is doing the dirty work of the capitalist class?

And all this time the prostitute press of the robber regime of the whole world is shrieking hideously against Bolshevism. "It is worse than Kaiserism" is the burden of their cry. Certainly it is. They would a thousand times rather have the Kaiser restored to his throne than to see the working class rise to power. In the latter event they cease to rule, their graft is gone and their class disappears, and well do they know it. That is what we said from the beginning and for which we have been sentenced as disloyalists and traitors.

Scheidemann and his breed do not believe that the day of the people has arrived. According to them the war and the revolution have brought the day of the bourgeoisie. Mr. Bourgeois is now to take the place of Mr. Junker—to evolve into another Junker himself by and by—while Mr. Wage-Slave remains where he was before, under the heels of his master, and all he gets out of the carnage in which his blood dyed the whole earth is a new set of heels to grind into his exploited bones and a fresh and lusty vampire to drain his life-blood.

Away with all such perfidious doctrines; forever away with such a vicious subterfuge and treacherous betrayal!

The people *are* ready for their day. *THE PEOPLE*, I say. Yes, *the people*!

Who are the people? The people are the working class, the lower class, the robbed, the oppressed, the impoverished, the great majority of the earth. They and those who sympathize with them are *THE PEOPLE*, and they who exploit the working class, and the mercenaries and menials who aid and abet the exploiters, are the enemies of the people.

That is the attitude of Lenine and Trotzky in Russia and was of Liebknecht und Rosa Luxemburg in Germany, and this ac-

counts for the flood of falsehood and calumny which poured upon the heads of the brave leaders and their revolutionary movement from the filthy mouthpieces of the robber regime of criminal capitalism throughout the world.

The rise of the working-class is the red spectre in the bourgeois horizon. The red cock shall never crow. Anything but that! The Kaiser himself will be pitied and forgiven if he will but roll his eyes heavenward, proclaim the menace of Bolshevism, and appeal to humanity to rise in its wrath and stamp out this curse to civilization.

And still the "curse" continues to spread—like a raging conflagration it leaps from shore to shore. The reign of capitalism and militarism has made of all peoples inflammable material. They are ripe and ready for the change, the great change which means the rise and triumph of the workers, the end of exploitation, of war and plunder, and the emancipation of the race. Let it come! Let us all help its coming and pave the way for it by organizing the workers industrially and politically to conquer capitalism and usher in the day of the people.

In Russia and Germany our valiant comrades are leading the proletarian revolution, which knows no race, no color, no sex, and no boundary lines. They are setting the heroic example for world-wide emulation. Let us, like them, scorn and repudiate the cowardly compromisers within our own ranks, challenge and defy the robber-class power, and fight it out on that line to victory or death!

From the crown of my head to the soles of my feet I am Bolshevik, and proud of it.

"The Day of the People has arrived!"

The State and Revolution

By NIKOLAI LENIN

1. The State is the Product of the Irreconcilability of Class Contradictions

The teachings of Marx are faring now as have fared more than once in the course of History, the teachings of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of the oppressed classes in their struggle for freedom. During their lifetimes, the great revolutionists have met, at the hands of the oppressing classes, only with constant persecutions, and their teachings have encountered the most savage hostility, the most insane hatred, the most irresponsible flood of lies and slanders. After their death the effort is always made to transform them into harmless ikons, to canonize them, as it were, and to surround their names with a certain halo, so that they may be used for the "consolation" of the oppressed classes and for their stupefaction, by emasculating the *content* of the revolutionary doctrine, removing its revolutionary edge, and vulgarizing it. At present the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the workers' movement are united in the performance of this "operation" on Marxism. They forget, gloss over, pervert the revolutionary side of the doctrine, they steal its revolutionary soul. They place in the foreground and magnify whatever is acceptable or appears acceptable to the bourgeoisie. And don't forget that all Social-Chauvinists are now "Marxists"! More and more the German bourgeois scholars, who but yesterday were specialists in the extermination of Marxism, talk of our "national-German" Marx, as if he had originated the workers' unions, so magnificently organized for the waging of a war of conquest!

In view of this situation, in view of the wide currency of Marxist distortions, our task becomes, first of all, to reveal once more the true teaching of Marx concerning the state. For this purpose we shall have to reprint a large number of long selections from the works of Marx and Engels them-

selves. Of course, it is true that long extracts make a presentation somewhat heavy, and will in no way contribute to its popularity. But it is impossible to dispense with them. All, or at least all the important, passages from the works of Marx and Engels with regard to the state must absolutely be quoted in the fullest possible form, so that the reader may form an independent idea of the whole system of the views of the founders of scientific socialism, and of the development of these ideas, and also, so that the distortion of them at the hand of the now dominant "Kautskianism" may be proved by means of documents and made evident to every eye.

Let us begin with the most widely known work of Friedrich Engels: *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, of which the sixth edition appeared at Stuttgart in 1894. We are obliged to translate the quotations from the German original, as the Russian translations, although they are very numerous, are for the most part either incomplete, or executed in an extremely unsatisfactory manner.

"The state,"—says Engels, drawing the final conclusions of his historical analysis,—“does not represent in any way a power that is imposed upon society from without. Nor is the state the ‘realization of the moral idea,’ ‘the form and reality of reason,’ as Hegel affirms. The state is a product of society at a certain stage of its development, the state is the recognition of the fact that society has become lost in a maze of unsolvable self-contradictions, has been split by irreconcilable oppositions, which it is powerless to escape from. And in order that these oppositions, these classes with contradictory economic interests, should not consume each other and the state in fruitless conflict, for this purpose there was needed a power, standing, apparently, over society, a power which should moderate their collisions, and maintain it within the bounds of ‘order.’ And this power arising out of society, but placing itself over society, and estranging itself more and more from it, is the state.” Sixth German edition, pp. 177-178.

Here we have with absolute clearness the fundamental Marxist thought on the state, its historic role and its significance. The state is a product and an expression of the *irreconcilability* of class contradictions. The state comes into being wherever, whenever, and insofar as the class contradictions, as an objective fact, can *no longer* be reconciled. And,

conversely, the existence of the state is a proof of the fact that the class contradictions are irreconcilable.

And it is at this most important and fundamental stage of the discussion that the distortion of Marxism sets in, proceeding along two principal directions.

On the one hand, the bourgeois and particularly the petit bourgeois ideologists, under the pressure of indisputable historical facts, recognize that the state exists only where there are class contradictions and class struggle, and “correct” Marx in such manner as to make the state appear as the organ of the *reconciliation* of classes. But Marx said that the state could never arise or maintain itself if any reconciliation of classes were still possible. But the petit bourgeois and philistine professors and publicists would have it appear—and often with condescending use of Marx as an authority!—that it is precisely the state that reconciles the classes. But according to Marx the state is the organ of class *rule*, the organ of the *oppression* of one class by another, the creation of “order”, which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression, by moderating the clashes between the classes. But in the opinion of the petit bourgeois politicians, order is precisely the reconciliation of classes, and not the oppression of one class by another; to regulate the clashes means to conciliate and not to deprive the oppressed classes of certain ways and means in the struggle for the overthrow of the oppressors.

For example, the S. R.s (Social-Revolutionaries) and Mensheviks in the 1917 Revolution, when the question of the function and significance of the state arose in all its magnitude, as a practical question requiring immediate action and furthermore, action on a mass scale,—all accepted, suddenly and completely, the petit bourgeois theory of the “conciliation” of the classes by the “state”. Countless resolutions and articles by the politicians of these two parties are permeated absolutely with this philistine, petit bourgeois doctrine of “conciliation”. The fact that the state is the organ of the rule of a certain class, which *cannot* be reconciled with its oppo-

site (the class opposed to it), is altogether beyond the comprehension of the petit bourgeois democracy. Their relation to the state is one of the most striking indications that our S. R.s and Mensheviki are not socialists at all (we Bolsheviki have repeatedly pointed this out), but petit bourgeois democrats with an almost socialistic phraseology.

On the other hand, the¹ Kautskian distortion of Marxism is even thinner. "Theoretically" it does not deny that the state is the organ of class rule, nor that class contradictions are irreconcilable. But it loses sight of, or obscures this fact: if the state is the product of the irreconcilability of class contradictions, if it is a power standing over society, and "*more and more estranging* itself from society," then it is clear that the liberation of the oppressed class is not possible unless there is not only a revolution by force, *but also an annihilation* of the mechanism of state power created by the ruling class, in which this "estrangement" is incorporated. This inference, which is theoretically clear enough to stand on its own bottom, was drawn by Marx with the utmost definiteness, on the basis of a concrete historical analysis of the tasks of revolution. And just this conclusion, as we shall clearly show in our further exposition, is "forgotten" and distorted by Kautsky.

2. Special Bodies of Armed Men, Prisons, etc.

"As compared with the ancient gens (family or clan) organization," Engels continues, "the state is distinguished, in the first place, by a division of the subjects of the state according to territorial sections."

To us this division seems "natural," but it required a long struggle with the old organization in tribes and clans before it was realized.

"The second distinguishing feature is the institution of a social power, no longer completely coinciding with the population, which organizes itself as an armed force. This special social power is necessary in order

to make impossible any independent armed organizations of the population at the time of the cleavage of society into classes. . . This social power is present in all states, and consists not only of armed persons, but of physical accessories, prisons, and institutions exercising every manner of constraint, which were unknown under the family (clan) structure of society."

Engels displays a profound understanding of that "power" which is called the state,—a power arising out of society, but placing itself over society and estranging itself more and more from it. And in what does this power, generally speaking, consist? In special bodies of armed men, having at their disposal prisons and so forth.

We have a right to speak of special bodies of armed men because it is a characteristic of every state that the social power does not coincide with the armed population, with its independent armed organizations.

Like every great revolutionary thinker, Engels attempts to direct the attention of the class-conscious workers to the fact that the dominant philistinism considers such state powers to be all the less deserving of special attention, in that it is sanctified by custom, and made permanent if not petrified in the prejudices of men: The police and the standing army are the chief weapons of force used by the state power—but could this be otherwise?

From the standpoint of the great majority of Europeans at the end of the 19th century, to whom Engels was speaking, and who had never lived through or even witnessed a great revolution, it could not be otherwise. It was completely inconceivable to them what was meant by "independent armed organization of the population." To the question of whence arose the necessity of special bodies of armed men (police, standing army), placed above society and estranging themselves from it, the Western European and also the Russian philistine would have been inclined to answer with a few trivial phrases, borrowed from Spencer or from Mikhailovsky, or references

to the complex texture of social life, the differentiation of functions, etc.

Such references look "scientific"; they lull the philistine to intellectual repose and softly obliterate the main point: the separation of society into irreconcilably hostile classes.

If it were not for this division, "independent armed organizations of the population" might differ by their greater complexity, by the advanced stage of their technique, from the primitive organization of the ape stage, which bore sticks, or from the aborigines, or from people united in the clan society; but organizations of this kind would still be possible.

Such organization is at present impossible, because civilized society is divided into hostile—irreconcilably hostile—classes, whose independent armaments would lead to armed conflict between them.

The state has been built up; a special force is created, special bodies of armed men, and as each revolution destroys the state mechanism, it presents us with the interesting spectacle of the governing class attempting to recreate the special bodies of armed men useful *to it*, while the oppressed class aims to create a new organization of this kind, adapted to the use, not of the exploiters, but of the exploited.

In the passage quoted, Engels puts theoretically the question which is practically and visibly put, and on a mass-action scale, by each great revolution, namely, the question of the mutual relations of the "special" bodies of armed men and the "independent armed organizations of the population." We shall see how this question was concretely illustrated by the experience of European and Russian revolutions.

But let us return to Engels' exposition.

He points out that sometimes, such as, for example, in North America, this social power is weak (he is here discussing a rather rare exception in capitalist society, as applied to certain parts of North America in their pre-capitalistic stage,

when the free colonist was still the most common figure), but in general he emphasizes that:

"The social power becomes stronger in proportion as the class contradictions within the state are aggravated, and in proportion as the states which have mutual contact become larger and more densely populated. Consider for a moment present-day Europe, in which the class struggle and the competition for conquests have developed to a state power of such high degree, that it threatens to swallow up all society, including even the state itself."

This was written not later than the early nineties of the last century; Engels' last foreword was dated June 16, 1891. At that time the trend toward imperialism—in the sense of a complete domination by trusts, as well as the absolute power of the great banks, a large-scale colonial policy, etc.—was only beginning in France, and was very weak in North America and in Germany. From that time on the "competition in conquests" made all the more gigantic strides, since the whole earth seemed at the beginning of the second decade of the 20th century to be definitely divided among these "competing conquerors," i. e., the predatory great powers. Military and naval armaments increased incredibly from that time on, and the war of conquest of 1914-17, fought to determine whether England or Germany should rule the world, for a division of the booty, brought this "swallowing up" of all the forces of society by the rapacious state power to a full catastrophic stop.

Engels was able as early as 1891 to point out this "competition for conquest," as one of the chief distinguishing marks of the external policy of the great powers, but the wretched social-chauvinists of 1914-1917, at the very moment when this competition, having been raised to the *n*th power, had given birth to the imperialistic war,—proceeded to conceal the defense of the interests of "their" bourgeoisie, with such phrases as "the defense of the fatherland," "the defense of the republic and the revolution," etc., etc.!

3. The State is the Instrument of the Exploitation of the Oppressed Class

For the maintenance of a special social power standing above society, there is necessary the imposition of taxes and obligations toward the state.

"Ruling by social power and by the right of imposing obligations," writes Engels, "the office-holders, as organs of society, rise above society. The voluntary, unaffected respect which was felt toward the organs of family (clan) society, is no longer sufficient for them—as if they could attain even that." Special laws are created, providing for the sanctity and inviolability of the official class. "The pettiest policeman" has more "authority" than the representatives of the clan, yet even the head of the military power of the civilized state might envy the elders of the clan, who enjoy the respect of their society "without enforcing it with clubs."

The question of the privileged position as organs of state power of the official class is here clearly put. It is pointed out as fundamental. What puts them over society? We shall see later how this theoretical question was answered in practice by the Paris Commune of 1871, and squashed in a reactionary spirit by Kautsky in 1912.

"As the state arose from the necessity of holding in check the opposition of the classes, and as it arose at the same time from the very collisions between these classes, it will naturally become, as a general rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which with the aid of the state established itself as the politically dominant class and thus creates new modes for suppressing and exploiting the downtrodden classes" . . . Not only the ancient and feudal societies were organs for the suppression of the slaves and serfs, respectively, but "our present-day representative govern-

ment" is an instrument for the exploitation of wage labor by capital. Exceptional periods may occur, in which the struggling classes attain a certain equilibrium of forces, so that the state power for a time has a certain independence with respect to both of them: it is then apparently a "mediator between them." Such was the absolute monarchy of the 17th and 18th centuries, the Bonapartism of the 1st and 3rd empires in France, and Bismarck in Germany.

And such, we may add for ourselves, was the Kerensky-Government in republican Russia, after it began to persecute the revolutionary proletariat at the moment when the Soviets, owing to the fact that they were led by petit bourgeois democrats, were still powerless, while the bourgeoisie was *not* yet strong enough to disperse them.

"In a democratic republic," Engels continues, "wealth exercises its power indirectly, but all the more truly;" in the first place, simply as in America, by "the outright purchase of officials"; in the second place, by "a union between the government and the moneyed interests" (France and America).

In our day imperialism and the domination of the banks "has developed" both these means of defending and putting into force the universal power of wealth, in any democratic republic, to an unprecedented degree. If, for example, in the earlier months of the democratic republic in Russia, during the honeymoon, as it were, of the union of the S. R. and Menshevik "socialists" with the bourgeoisie in one coalition government—Mr. Palchinsky sabotaged all methods of checking the capitalists and their marauding agents, their seizures of public moneys for war supplies; and if, after Mr. Palchinsky leaves the ministry (to be succeeded, of course, by another man exactly like him), he is "recompensed," by the capitalists, with a little job and an annual salary of 120,000 rubles attached,—what would you call that? Is that a direct or an indirect purchase of officials? Is that an alliance of the govern-

ment with the industrialists, or "merely" a friendly understanding? What is the role played by the Chernovs, Tseretellis, Avksentyeffs and Skobeleffs?—Are they direct aids of the millionaire-grafters, or only indirect aids?

The complete domination of "wealth" is *more real* in democratic republics for the reason that it is no longer dependent on the awkward political robe of capitalism. The democratic republic is the best possible garment for capitalism, and capital therefore, once having acquired this splendid cloak (through the Palchinskys, Chernovs, Tseretellis, and associates), proceeds with all the greater hopefulness to lay the foundations of its power, since it is assured that *no change whatever*, in personnel, or institutions, or parties, can, in the bourgeois democratic republic, cause that power to tremble.

We must also observe that Engels, with great definiteness, calls the general suffrage right an instrument of bourgeois rule. This right, he says, evidently with the long experience of the German Social Democracy in mind, is:

"An indicator of the degree of maturity of the working-class. It cannot give, and never will give more than this with the state organized as it is now."

Petit-bourgeois democrats of the stamp of our S. R.'s and mensheviks, as well as their true brothers, the social-chauvinists and opportunists of Western Europe, hope for "great things" from the general suffrage right. They thus disseminate and put into the minds of the people the false idea that the general right of suffrage is calculated, "*with the state as it now is*," to secure an actual reflection of the will of the majority of the toilers as well as its enforcement.

For the present we may only call attention to this false idea and point out that the perfectly clear, precise, concrete declaration of Engels is distorted at every step in the propaganda and agitation of the "official" (i. e. opportunistic) socialist parties. A complete exposition of the falsity of this teaching, which Engels merely touches upon, will be found in our fur-

ther presentation of the views of Marx and Engels on "*the state as it now is*."

The final summing up of his views is given by Engels in his most popular work, as follows:

"Thus the state has not existed forever. There were societies which got along without it, which had not the slightest conception of the meaning of the state or of state power. At a certain stage in the economic development, which coincided with the splitting up of society into classes, the state became a necessity by virtue of this split. We are now rapidly approaching that stage in the development of production, when the existence of these classes will not only cease to be a necessity, but will become an outright hindrance to production. The classes will disappear as inevitably as, in the past, they have appeared. And with the passing away of the classes will inevitably be associated the passing away of the state. The society which reorganizes production on the basis of a free and equal association of the producers, will send all its state machinery to the place where it really belongs, namely, the museum of antiquities, by the side of the spinning-wheel and the bronze hatchet."

We do not often come upon this quotation in the propagandist and agitational literature of our present-day Social-Democracy. But even where this extract is found, it is most usually quoted, as it were, as an act of ceremonial piety, as a genuflexion before an ikon, an official expression of respect for Engels, without for a moment considering what a broad and deep revolutionary thought is contained in this "sending the whole state machinery to the museum of antiquities." Nor do we meet, for the most part, with any understanding of what Engels calls the state machinery.

4. The "Dying Out" of the State and Revolution By Force

Engels' words concerning the "dying out" of the state have now such wide circulation, they are so frequently quoted, and they so sharply indicate the nature of the customary misrepresentation of Marxism by opportunism that it is necessary to dwell on them somewhat in detail. The whole passage from which they are taken follows:

"The proletariat will seize the state power and will, as a first step, transform all the means of production into a state possession. By this act, however, it will destroy itself as a proletariat, it will abolish all class distinctions and class antagonisms, and with them also the state. Society as it existed in the past and still exists today, moving as it does within the confines of class hostilities, needed the state, that is, an organization of the exploiting class for maintaining the external conditions of production, that is, a special power for keeping the exploited class by force in the conditions of oppression defined by the given circumstances of production (slavery, serfdom, wage labor). The state was the official representative of the society as a whole, its concentration, as it were, into a corporate personality, but it attained this dignity only insofar as it was the state of that class which, at the given epoch, stood for the entire social system; in ancient times, it was the state of the slave-holders, the citizens of the state; in the middle ages, the feudal nobility; in our day, the bourgeoisie. When the state shall finally become the representative, really, of all society, it will then, by that fact, make itself superfluous. As soon as there shall remain not a single social class that requires to be held in subjection, as soon as there shall disappear, together with class domination, together with the struggle for individual existence, resulting from the present anarchy in production, those collisions and excesses which arise from this

struggle—from that time on, no one will need to be suppressed, and there will be no further necessity for a special power of oppression, for the state. The first act undertaken by a government that will be acting in its capacity of representative of society, will be the seizure as its property of all the means of production in the name of society, and will simultaneously be its last independent act as a state. The interference of state power in social relations will then, in one field after another, become superfluous, and will pass away of its own accord. In place of a government over persons there will arise a control over things and a guidance of the processes of production. The state will not be abolished; it will die. It is from this standpoint that we must evaluate the phrase: "free popular government, a phrase which has, in its day, a certain right to existence as a means of agitation, but which in the last analysis is completely without any scientific foundation. And this enables us also to understand at its proper value, the demand of the so-called anarchists, that the state be abolished between today and tomorrow."

"Anti-Duehring, a Refutation of the Science of Herr Eugen Duehring," 3rd German edition, pp. 302-3.

It may be said without fear of error, that of this whole passage of Engels, so rich in ideas, only one point has really become a staple of socialist thought in the present-day socialist parties, namely, that according to Marx the state will "die," while anarchistic theory, on the other hand, speaks of "abolishing" the state. Reducing Marxism to these terms means making it opportunistic, for this "interpretation" leaves only a vague notion of slow, smooth, gradual transformation, of the absence of crises, and storms, of the absence of revolutions. "The dying out" of the state in this widespread, vulgar, and if I may say it, cheap conception is equivalent absolutely to an attempted omission, if not to a denial, of the revolution.

And yet "this interpretation" is the coarsest misrepresen-

tation of Marxism, acceptable only to the bourgeoisie, and founded in theory on a complete ignoring of the important circumstances and reflections expressed in the "summarizing" passage from Engels that is above quoted in full.

First. At the very beginning of this passage Engels says that in seizing state power, the proletariat, "will, by this very act, destroy the state as a state." What this means, it is "improper" to surmise. As a rule it is entirely ignored, or regarded as some outgrowth of Engels' "Hegelian foible." As a matter of fact, this passage is a reflection in abbreviated form of the experience of one of the greatest proletarian revolutions, the Paris Commune of 1871, which will receive fuller attention in the proper place. As a matter of fact, Engels speaks of the annihilation, by the proletarian revolution, of the bourgeois state, while the words concerning the dying out refer to the remains of the proletarian state after the social revolution. The bourgeois state will not "die out," according to Engels, but will be "annihilated" by the proletariat in revolution. After the revolution, the proletarian or semi-proletarian state will die out.

Second. The state is "a special power (organ) for suppression." This magnificent and most profound definition of Engels he here puts in all its clearness. But it follows from it that the "special power for the suppression" of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, of millions of toilers by small groups of magnates, must be supplanted by "a special power for the suppression" of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat (Dictatorship of the Proletariat). That is the essence of the "annihilation of the state as a state." That is the essence of the "act" of taking under control the means of production in the name of society. And it is self-evident that such a substitution for one (the bourgeois) "special power for suppression," of another (the proletarian) "special power," cannot in any way take the form of a "dying out."

Third. In speaking of the "dying out" and—even more emphatically and distinctly—of the "going to sleep," Engels

clearly and definitely refers to the period after "the taking control of the means of production in the name of all society," i. e., after the social revolution. We all know that the political form of the "state" at this time will be the fullest possible democracy. But not one of the opportunists, in their shameless distortions of Marxism, ever recalls the fact that Engels must consequently mean, in this passage, the "going to sleep" and the "dying out" of *democracy*. At first glance this seems very peculiar. But the thing is "incomprehensible" only to one who does not know that democracy is *also* a state, and that, consequently, democracy also will pass away, when the state passes away. Only revolution can "destroy" the bourgeois state. But the state altogether, i. e., the fullest form of democracy, can only "die out."

Fourth. Having stated his famous proposition: "the state will die out," Engels explains concretely that this proposition is aimed simultaneously against both the opportunists and the anarchists. Yet the place of honor in the attack intended by the proposition as to the "dying out of the state" is held by the opportunists.

It is a safe bet that out of ten thousand men who may have read or heard of the "dying out" of the state, 9990 absolutely do not know or understand that Engels *did not* draw the inferences from this proposition *only* against the anarchists. And of the remaining ten, nine do not know what is meant by "free popular government" and why the attack on this watchword should include an attack on the opportunists. Thus is history written! Thus operates the imperceptible distortion of a great revolutionary teaching under the prevailing philistinism. The inference has been repeated thousands of times insofar as it refers to anarchists, it has been vulgarized, stupefied and dinned into our heads, until it has attained the fixity of a tradition. But the inference as to the opportunists has been glossed over and "forgotten"!

"Free popular government" was the platform demand and the current battle-cry of the German Social-Democrats of the

seventies. Yet, beyond a pretentious *petit bourgeois* circumscription of the meaning of democracy, there is absolutely no political content in this battle-cry. Whenever it was legally used to point out the possibility of a democratic republic, Engels was ready, on occasion, to "defend" this battle-cry, from the agitatorial standpoint. Yet this slogan was opportunistic, for it reflected not only an advocacy of bourgeois democracy, but also a failure to understand the state at all, in the light of socialistic criticism. We are in favor of a democratic republic, as it is the form of state most favorable to the proletariat under capitalism, yet we have no right to forget that even in the most advanced democratic bourgeois republics, wage slavery is the people's lot. Every state is a "special organ" for the oppression of the lowest class. Consequently, *every* government is *unpopular* and *unfree*. Marx and Engels pointed this out more than once to their party comrades in the seventies.

Fifth. In the same work of Engels out of which everyone remembers what is said about the "dying out" of the state, there is a passage on the significance of revolution by force. Instead of an historical estimate of its role, we have in Engels a veritable panegyric on revolution by force. "Not a soul" remembers this; to talk or even think of the implications of this idea is considered improper in our present-day socialistic parties, and in the every-day propaganda and agitation among the masses, this thought has no place at all. And yet, it forms, together with the thought of the "dying out" of the state, a single, indissoluble whole.

Here is the passage from Engels:

"That force has a different role to play in history than that of a performer of evil) should be evident precisely from the revolutionary role which, in Marx's words, plays the mid-wife to every old system of society, when it is pregnant with the new; force is the instrument by which every social movement clears a path for itself and breaks the petrified and atrophied political forms; concerning all this Mr. Dühring says not a word. Only with sobs and

sighs does he admit the possibility that, in order to overthrow the system of the exploiters, it may be necessary,—unfortunately, mind you!—to use force; but every application of force demoralizes, as it were, him who uses it. And this is said in spite of the high moral and intellectual enthusiasm which every great revolution has always led in its train! And this is said in successful Germany, where a violent collision, even though it should be forced upon the people, would at least have the advantage of sloughing off the servile spirit that has been the heritage of their national character from the humiliation of the Thirty Years' War. And this spiritless, miserable, impotent old woman's theory is suggested as a program for the most revolutionary party that History has ever known?" (Page 193, 3rd German edition; end of 4th chapter in 2nd edition).

How is it possible to unite into a consistent whole this panegyric on revolution by force, so stubbornly maintained by Engels in his relations with the German Social-Democrats from 1878 to 1895, in other words, to his death, and the theory of the "dying out" of the state?

Usually the two are rendered compatible with the aid of eclecticism, a superficial, idealless, or sophistical arbitrary choice and emphasis now of the one, now of the other passage (as may best please the powers that be), at the same time, in 99 cases out of 100, if not in all, assigning the prominent place to the "dying out" passage. Dialectics yield ground to eclectics: this is the most common, the most widespread phenomenon in the official social-democratic literature of our day, in its relations to Marxism. And this substitution is by no means new: you will find it already in the history of classic Greek philosophy. Among the other substitutions of opportunism for Marxism, that of eclecticism for dialectics is best of all adapted to deceive the masses; it creates some false sense of satisfaction by appearing to consider all phases of the process, all the tendencies of evolution, all the opposing influences, while in reali-

ty it gives no complete or revolutionary understanding whatever of the process of social evolution.

We have already said above, and will show more in detail in our further exposition, that the teaching of Marx and Engels concerning revolution by force was written with reference to the bourgeois state. The latter cannot be succeeded by the proletarian state (the dictatorship of the proletariat) by any path of "dying out", but may as a general rule be so succeeded only by revolution by force. The panegyric pronounced by Engels on this type of revolutionary action furthermore corresponds to frequent utterances of Marx (we point out the end of "The Poverty of Philosophy", and the "Communist Manifesto", with its proud and open declaration of the inevitability of revolution by force; we recall the criticism of the Gotha Program of 1875, almost thirty years later, in which Marx mercilessly flays the opportunism of this program)—this panegyric is not merely an "infatuation", by no means a declamation, nor a polemic gesture. The necessity of training the masses in this, and only in this, view of revolution by force lies at the very foundation of the entire teaching of Marx and Engels. The betrayal of their teaching by the at present prevalent social-chauvinistic and Kautskian currents is most clearly expressed by the fact that both factions forget to carry on this kind of propaganda, this kind of agitation.

The substitution of the proletarian state for the bourgeois state cannot take place without revolution by force. The annihilation of the proletarian state, in other words, of the state altogether, is possible only by the "dying out" process.

Marx and Engels have left us a detailed and concrete presentation of these views in their studies of each separate revolutionary situation, in which they analyzed the lessons of the experience of each separate revolution. And we shall now proceed to take this up, unquestionably the most important part of their teaching.

Lenin Versus Wilson

By KARL ISLAND (STOCKHOLM)

At the present time there are, broadly speaking, only two great power divisions, namely, the money-power of the American millionaires and its opposite: the people's will to live. In shorter form: the *dollar* and *liberty*.

American capital developed at an unheard-of pace through the influence of the war, particularly because of its delivery of war supplies to the Allies, before entering the war, as well by the great war loans it advanced. At the present moment American capital controls the entire capitalist world, everything that a few months or years ago was considered to be all-powerful in national governments, economic life, industry, etc. At this moment, Mr. Wilson stands before the problem of fulfilling the wishes of the absolute power of capital, as the mighty executor of the will of those who rule the world's possessions, as perhaps the Director-to-be of the world corporation, Iron Heel & Co.

He gives us no stupid phrases about his alliance with the gods, when the interests of the system are under discussion, no embarrassed professorial wisdom and high-sounding declamations on great ancestors and the traditions of bygone ages appear in his speeches; but a judiciously calculated manipulation of the general opinion, constructed with remarkable skill and consistency, while he permits the chords of liberty to vibrate, and the phrases of liberty to resound, with astonishing virtuosity!

The war and the policy he conducts are not in the interest of war and conquest: who could believe such a thing? His policy and his war are conducted in the name of the oppressed peoples in order to create an empire of peace, in which war shall be impossible and peace enthroned forever.

And this vocabulary is taken seriously by cultured radicals, who are not intimately acquainted with the nature of capital-

ism and its subterranean alliances. And, just as the socialists in all countries, with the exception of small minorities, concluded a "Burgfrieden," and aided capital in the universal clash, so did they also in "free America."

The American socialists imagined the land of their dreams to be rising over the horizon, without the necessity of the dangerous and painful approach through the class struggle, as soon as President Wilson took over the American railways in order to give them a unified administration and thus realize a greater efficiency. "If we can," they reasoned, "in the course of the war, gain control of the railroads and pay their owners an annual income of over a billion dollars, we can surely, after the war, retain them as well as all other great industries into the bargain, without paying the aforesaid rent or annuity." But the American socialists and radicals will yet learn, perhaps too late, that they have been deceived, that after the war they will have **even less opportunity** than before to gradually penetrate and absorb **capitalist** society. Things will proceed as they did in 1914, in the state of Oklahoma, which had been so successful in the congressional elections that a capitalist paper said that all **good citizens would** do well to remove every socialist from their state. "This may seem a hard measure," the yellow sheet continued, "but **we must** remember that for every socialist so removed, there will be a place for an honest worker."

This is class war as the capitalists would desire to have it.

Well, times have changed since then. The socialists have not, in general, made any **great advances**, but the people have instead been won over for **revolutionary socialism**. At the present moment, the Central **autocracy** lies crushed, not by **American capital**, although that accelerated the process, but by the "inner enemy," i. e. the awakening popular will.

At this moment "Burgfrieden" is at the last gasp and half of Europe which did not conclude a "Burgfrieden," is engaged in building up the new realm over the smoking ruins of feudal power, of Czarism.

At the present moment are not the hordes of capitalism

sweeping over the smoking debris of medieval European Junker and Kaiser grace-of-God rulership, advancing against their only enemy, their great and glorious enemy: the Soviet Government?

But the course of these armies is like that of a comet approaching the sun. It fades away, as will also the capitalist armies when in brotherly international union they advance against the workers' states in the East. As under Engelbrekt in Sweden, as in America in the days of the Revolution, not to mention other movements for human freedom, the struggle will be waged by those who fight for liberty, with all their might, as a lion just released from captivity. And so the socialist states will defend their new-won freedom. Already we are witnessing the formation of armies of millions in revolutionary Russia, ready to meet the first onslaught of the cannons and machine-guns of capital, convinced, as they are, that the great proletarian hosts will not have the heart to fight the battle of capital against the men of the red flag, who fight for their lives and for the new day.

To the cultured radicals, who, like the "Sowers" and others consider revolution to be equivalent to a slow crucifixion of the proletariat, it will seem absurd to suppose that justice, to attain its final victory, will make use of dynamite and Maxim guns; and yet they consider it perfectly natural that the Entente should attempt to crush the Junkertum of Germany by such means.

At the present hour the battle-cries resound between *Wilson* and *Lenin*; between the *dollar* and *freedom*; between *capital* and *labor*. The struggle will certainly not be a process of peaceful penetration, whatever else it may be. Never before has the fight been so hot, the front so clearly drawn. As compared with the world war just ended, we find not a number of fronts, but one single front: the class struggle, along which the people, with weapons in their hands, must fight for their freedom, where boundaries are not designated by the red lines on the map, but by the line between all the workers of the world, as a class, and all the world's capitalists, as a class.

And in this fight, worker-proletarian, you know your place. Never before in history has the working class had an opportunity as now, but never before has its situation been so perilous. And the danger lies precisely in the fact that capital, after having concluded the world war and obtained a hold on all the world's resources, can without hesitation prescribe its conditions to the proletariat: namely, a thousand years of slavery.

To refrain from the conflict now is equivalent to treason to oneself and to the future; there are only two possible roads: *slavery or freedom*.

Problems of American Socialism

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

The ultimate decision as to whether Capitalism or Socialism shall control the world will be rendered in the United States. As American Capitalism is now the arbiter of international Imperialism, so the American proletariat will become the arbiter of international Socialism. This imposes a great responsibility upon American Socialism, determines its problems and the *international* character of its policy

Even now, after the accomplishments of the war, the enormous power of American Capitalism is not fully appreciated. It is not appreciated because of the rapid ending of the war, of America's small sacrifice in men; one must probe below the surface to understand the decisive role of the United States in the war. But facts are facts. The United States provided the men and munitions that steadied the wavering front in France, providing means for the offensive; and it provided that deceptive ideology of democracy which steadied the wavering morale of the French, British and Italians, that seduced large sections of the masses, and, in Britain, Belgium and France, seduced the dominant Social-

ism and Laborism. The threat of American Capitalism to Socialism is not alone physical, it is equally moral: moral, in the sense that its deceptive democracy is a splendid means for promoting Imperialism and seducing the masses.

The United States has become a world power. It will maintain that position—potential of evil—unless the proletariat acts for Socialism. American Capitalism is perhaps the most highly developed in the world, the most efficient, the mightiest; it controls a large section of the world's richest territory, bursting with natural wealth; it has tremendous resources of raw materials within its own borders, and it can at any moment seize upon the tremendous resources of Mexico, Central and South America, convert them into means of conquest. Imperialistic finance-capital nowhere is as aggressive, commands as much power, as in the United States. The wealth of the United States is twice as large as that of Great Britain—which is much more wealthy than its nearest rival. And this wealth is simply a symbol expressive of the enormous capacity for productivity inherent in American Capitalism,—a terrific power. The United States has a large navy, has proved that it can easily develop a large army, and is laying plans for the largest navy in the world, and will retain universal military service in one form or another. American Capitalism has all the physical reserves for aggression and is becoming the gendarme of the world.

These physical reserves are supplemented by moral ones. In no other large nation is the labor movement as reactionary as in the United States; in no other large nation is organized Socialism as loose, as purposeless, as petty bourgeois, as in the United States. Should Great Britain, France and Italy decide upon complete military intervention in Russia, the revolutionary proletariat may march into action—surely in France and Italy; but should the United States decide upon this brutal military adventure, the American proletariat on the whole will acquiesce, and its representatives will manufacture justifications for the offensive against Socialism and the coming new civilization. And all this, not because the

American proletariat is not possessed of reserves for action, but because of the organizations of this proletariat.—This is one aspect of our problems.

* * *

The American proletariat has an inspiring history of aggressive struggles. The great Homestead strike, the American Railway Union strike in 1893, the implacable industrial struggles in Colorado, at Coeur D'Alene and Goldfield, the strikes at McKees Rocks, Lawrence, Paterson, Passaic, Ludlow, the Mesaba Range—all these are expressions of an aggressive proletariat, of a proletariat capable of great things. The American radical Labor movement first clearly formulated the principles, forms and purposes of industrial unionism, yet industrial unionism has made infinitely larger strides in Great Britain, Australia and elsewhere than it has in the United States. The American Labor Union, twenty years ago, formulated the industrial union program, but it went the way of all flesh; the Western Federation of Miners adopted industrial unionism, waged inspiring struggles against Capitalism, and then was captured by the reaction; the Industrial Workers of the World started with great purposes and expectations, contributed a vital and aggressive spirit to our movement, in spite of all its faults; but the I. W. W. is incapable of rallying the revolutionary proletariat, and never builded definitely upon the basis of its achievements.

Why? There are a large number of reasons, material and ideologic; but one alone that can be considered here, and that is the *petit bourgeois* spirit that animates American Socialism—the Socialist Party, even the Socialist Labor Party. All these great instinctive revolts of the proletariat, under the impact of which new forms of industrial organization and struggle, a new ideology, were being developed, met the open hostility or lack of understanding of Socialism. Instead of accepting these forces as the initial expression of new tactics and forms of action, the dominant Socialism tried to compress

them within the stultifying limits of *petit bourgeois* and parliamentary Socialism—make them serve the ends of the middle class and petty bourgeois, “liberal” democracy. The Socialist Labor Party, which was an active force in the initial development of the new unionism, savagely attacked it and the I. W. W. when they did not pursue the road charted by an essentially petty bourgeois conception of the Revolution. To attack the unskilled proletariat rallied by the I. W. W. as a “lumpen-proletariat”—that was a characteristic expression of the fundamental defect of the S. L. P. in action, its *petit bourgeois* ideology, which, while it rejected the gradual, peaceful conquest of power by the Socialist proletariat, accepted an equally fallacious policy, the gradual, peaceful conquest of power by the proletariat through organizing the majority of the working class into industrial unions. The Socialist Party majority was even worse—it rejected the I. W. W. while serving the monstrous reaction of the American Federation of Labor,—its attitude toward the new ideas compounded of hypocrisy and animosity. American Socialism has not yet developed a realistic, revolutionary policy—a policy that is instinct in the struggles of the proletariat—a policy able to arouse, integrate and direct the revolutionary energy of the proletariat.

The *petit bourgeoisie* is the slave of the illusions of democracy, avoids the implacable industrial struggle, rejects movements and struggles that refuse to proceed within the orbit of parliamentarism; the *petit bourgeoisie* pursues an anaemic policy, a routine activity, chained to the old and rejecting or camouflaging the new,—refuses to consider the actual problems of the Revolution and the violent struggles necessary to realize the Revolution. What the American proletariat requires is a Socialism that has snapped asunder its *petit bourgeois* fetters, that issues to the proletariat the clear call to the revolutionary struggle—and which the proletariat will yet answer.

* * *

The attitude of American Socialism toward the Bolsheviks

is characteristic of its general policy, of its anaemic, petty bourgeois spirit.

The accomplishments of the Bolsheviki are epochal. They have maintained for fifteen months a revolutionary dictatorship in Russia, have accomplished the first stage of the international proletarian revolution. They have organized a new state, upon the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced. They have issued the clear, magnificent call to the international proletarian revolution; and they have been a decisive factor in the coming of the proletarian revolution in Germany. They are active in the struggle to develop the Revolution in the rest of Europe, and the world; and they are preparing to wage a revolutionary war against international Imperialism, if necessary, in co-operation with the revolutionary proletariat of Germany. The Bolsheviki have subjectively introduced the revolutionary epoch of the proletariat, objectively introduced by Imperialism and the war. *Socialism in action, Marxism become life*—that, in sum, constitutes the accomplishments of the Bolsheviki.

But while the Bolsheviki have issued the clear call to the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism, they have equally issued the clear call to the *revolutionary struggle against the dominant, petty bourgeois Socialism*.

In Russia and in Germany, the great enemy of the proletarian revolution was not Capitalism, *per se*, but moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism—that majority Socialism become part of the national liberal movement, corrupted by petty bourgeois politics, allied with the middle class and with social-Imperialism. *Before the proletarian revolution could conquer Capitalism and Imperialism, it had to conquer the dominant Socialism*. Why? Because the dominant Socialism, operating in an epoch of peaceful, national struggles, had become moderate, had become part of the governing system of things, indirectly its ally and protector, had, it is true, accomplished great things, *but which did not and could not adapt itself to the new requirements of the revolutionary epoch introduced by Imperialism and the war*. Instead of pro-

moting the proletarian revolution, the dominant Socialism was a fetter upon the Revolution and betrayed the Revolution. This is not true alone of Russia, Germany and Austria; it is true of every European nation, except Norway and Italy, where the tactics and requirements of the new revolutionary struggle are being adopted. Everywhere else, including the United States, the dominant Socialism pursues its old legalistic and corrupting policy, is the slave of petty bourgeois illusions, has its face turned to the past and not to the future, is not aware of the call to international action.

Out of life itself, and the relation of Marxian to life, the Bolsheviki and the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany have developed the new policy and tactics of revolutionary Socialism: rally the proletariat for the immediate revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism; abandon the old tactics of parliamentary conciliation and compromise; depend upon the proletarian class struggle alone; carry on this class struggle by means of revolutionary mass action and the dictatorship of the proletariat!

These are the immediate purposes and tactics imposed upon Socialism by the prevailing conditions; these are the immediate purposes and tactics of the Bolsheviki, which alone can make Socialism vital and vitalizing.

Nor are these simply the purposes and tactics required when the proletarian revolution is actually in action: they are necessary in preparing the Revolution, in preparing the forces that will direct the Revolution to the conquest of power by the proletariat. . . .

While the proletariat is revolutionizing Capitalism, it is equally revolutionizing Socialism: what is the response of American Socialism to this epochal circumstance?

The Socialist Labor Party never responded adequately to the Bolshevik call to action, in spite of its revolutionary pretensions. Shortly after the Bolsheviki conquered power, the National Secretary of the S. L. P. published an article in the "Weekly People," declaring, in substance, that a proletarian

revolution was impossible in Russia, because of its economically undeveloped condition and because the proletariat was not organized into industrial unions; that the day of the Bolshevik victory was the day of their defeat; that the Bolsheviks should not have seized power, but should have labored hard and waited—precisely the policy proposed by the counter-revolutionary Mensheviks. The S. L. P. did not act upon the Soviet proposal for an armistice; and in this, the S. L. P., together with the N. E. C. of the Socialist Party, missed a great revolutionary opportunity and perpetrated a real betrayal of trust. This S. L. P. policy of partial repudiation and misunderstanding was pursued for months; now it is trying to atone, by claiming that it *was* for the Bolsheviks. But in what way? The S. L. P. does not understand the Bolsheviks; its attitude is something like this: what is good in the Bolsheviks is implicit in the S. L. P. program; what is not in the S. L. P. program, is not worth anything. They have forgotten nothing and learned nothing; they do not realize the infinite broadening of tactics made necessary by the new conditions and the experience of the proletarian revolution in action; they do not understand the functions of revolutionary mass action and dictatorship of the proletariat: we have the truth, have always had and always will have the truth: three cheers for the S. L. P.!

The official majority in the Socialist Party adopted a disgraceful policy toward the Bolsheviks. It never answered the call to agitate for the armistice proposal; it was silent about the great proletarian revolution in Russia, until the up-surg-ing feelings of the membership compelled them to speak—and then they spoke in the terms of the politician, in the terms of camouflage. They cheer for the Socialist Republic in Russia, and simultaneously they cheer for—the Socialist Republic in Germany, the bourgeois, counter-revolutionary republic of Ebert, Scheidemann & Co., which is betraying the Revolution!

The representatives and officials of the party refuse to penetrate beneath the surface of events, refuse to “take

sides.” They deny, as did Morris Hillquit, and still deny, I believe, that the International collapsed during the war; they speak much about the “revival of Socialism”—but *which* Socialism? They do not admit the fact that this Socialism is in relentless hostility to the old Socialism, that the implacable struggle against the old petty bourgeois Socialism is a phase of the “revival of Socialism.” They adopt this attitude, because their “Socialism” in fundamentals is identical with that of the Mensheviks in Russia, with that of Ebert, David, Scheidemann & Co. in Germany, with petty bourgeois “majority” Socialism everywhere. They do not want to accept the new, and so they pervert, disguise, and distort events.

Where do you see, in the official Socialist Party press, appreciation and analysis of the problems of the Revolution? Of mass action and proletarian dictatorship? Of the decisive struggle in Russia, of the decisive struggle in Germany—the struggle between “minority” revolutionary Socialism and “majority” petty bourgeois Socialism? Socialism is split asunder by the Revolution—but this fact is carefully concealed; it is concealed because the struggle in Germany and Russia against petty bourgeois Socialism and majority Socialism is a fundamental struggle developing implacably in international Socialism, of universal necessity and significance.

The “representatives” of the party cannot completely avoid the Bolshevik issue, so they adopt the policy of words, of camouflage. The Bolsheviks are acclaimed—miserably, in words; not daringly, in deeds. There is no clear call to the reconstruction of Socialism, no clear call to accept the new purposes and tactics of the revolutionary Third International, no clear call to the revolutionary struggle. Indeed, the N. E. C. of the Party has definitely aligned itself with moderate Socialism in Europe, with the betrayers of Socialism, by delegating, with Oneal and Work, who do not represent revolutionary Socialism, Algernon Lee to the International Congress. Lee is a typical petty bourgeois Socialist; he has been as silent as the proverbial clam concerning the revolutionary events in

Russia and Germany, concerning the Bolsheviks (although he, too, has "jubilated" over the Socialist Republics in Germany and Russia, in the approved style); he accepted the war for democracy (indeed, much worse, declared in April this year, that the war should be supported as it was a war to save the Russian Revolution!); he has, in the New York City Board of Aldermen, voted in favor of the Liberty Loan campaign, adopted the disgraceful policy of the petty bourgeois reformer and bureaucrat;—Algernon Lee, in short, is a typical representative of that "Socialism" which collapsed during the war, and which is directly counter-revolutionary in Europe. According to the policy promulgated in the St. Louis declaration against the war, our party should align itself with the Italian Socialist Party, with the Bolshevik Communist Party of Russia and the Bolshevik Communist Labor Party of Germany; but Lee will align the party with Haase and even Ebert, with the Mensheviks, with the "majority" party in France, which greets Woodrow Wilson enthusiastically, with the British Labor Party. This is the reactionary, official policy of the Socialist party; considering this, how much value is there in accepting the Bolsheviks in words?

Action is necessary. Emphasizing the *implications* of accepting the Bolsheviks is necessary—the necessity for the revolutionary reconstruction of Socialism.

* * *

The international situation, at this moment, is characterized by the developing revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism, and for a Socialist peace.

Peace with revolution—that is the tactic of the revolutionary proletariat, in Russia and in Germany, and developing in the other European nations. But the official majority in the party still prates of a "democratic" peace, of a peace without annexations and indemnities, of a "liberal" peace on the basis of Capitalism. This is sheer petty bourgeois ineptitude—as if there could be any real peace without the overthrow of Capitalism! The Socialist Party cannot determine a revo-

lutionary peace? But it can at least maintain its Socialist, proletarian integrity, in theory and practice, develop reserves for action in the days to come. . . .

The proletarian revolution is in action: that is a definite fact. And equally definite should be our relation to this fact.

The immediate requirement imposed upon us is the struggle to prevent intervention in Russia and in Germany. The party officially is pledged against intervention; but an infinitely larger and more aggressive campaign could be carried on against intervention. The party will spend thousands of dollars, will use tremendous energy, to elect Socialist incompetents such as Algernon Lee and Meyer London; but apparently, in most cases, it is satisfied with a gesture concerning intervention. Resolutions and declarations are not enough: they should become life in intensive agitation, developing the ideology of action, at least, as a preliminary to action itself.

Moreover, our agitation against intervention pursues, largely, a petty bourgeois policy. Faith in President Wilson, demands upon Congress, the attempt to create "understanding" with the "liberals," the policy of petty bourgeois democracy—all this characterizes the campaign against intervention. This is a clear abandonment of Socialism and the class struggle. The campaign against intervention should in all its aspects assume the character of Socialism and the class struggle—that alone develops power. The campaign should become a campaign to *move the masses*, to set them in motion; the campaign should center in the large industrial plants. Get the workers to march out of the plants, go to other plants and pull out other workers, broaden the scope of this industrial action into mass action—that is the policy of the militant proletariat and revolutionary Socialism: only the aggressive action of the industrial proletariat can prevent the government from "putting over" its reactionary plans.

The workers won't move? But where is that written? And, moreover, is particular agitation justified only if immediate

success is assured? That is hopelessly petty bourgeois and reactionary; that is the contemptible attitude of "majority" Socialism everywhere. When war was declared, "majority" Socialism justified its acceptance and justification of the war upon the miserable plea that, since the proletariat had not answered the declaration of war with an immediate revolution, the only other course was acceptance of the war. But the revolutionary Socialist declared: no one counted upon an immediate revolution; the war creates a revolutionary crisis, which compels us to carry on an uncompromising propaganda for the revolution; the proletariat may not immediately answer this call to revolutionary action, but the Socialist must persist; sooner or later, the answer will come, and we must prepare by means of an intensive agitation for the revolution. The moderate Socialist, who is corrupted by the mercantile ideals of the *petite bourgeoisie*, justifies a policy only if it is capable of immediate success. That is not the policy of Socialism. The question is: is particular agitation in accord with Socialism, with the prevailing situation and the tendency of the revolutionary proletariat? If it is, do not fear; success must come.

Our campaign against intervention, which is our immediate revolutionary task, must proceed together with the emphasizing of the revolutionary implications of the policy of intervention: that it is an expression of the international class struggle, a struggle between Imperialism and Socialism, and that the struggle against intervention is simultaneously a struggle for Socialism. Equally, the revolutionary implications of Bolshevism must be emphasized: that is a necessary part of our task, a necessary aspect of awakening the proletariat and preparing it for action.

The policy of revolutionary Socialism is a policy applicable to immediate and ultimate problems; the revolutionary struggle is not alone a phase of the Revolution, it precedes and prepares the Revolution. Revolutionary agitation is itself an act of revolution.

The revolutionary crisis in Europe is spreading, becoming

contagious. It is admitted that if Germany becomes definitely Bolshevik, all Europe will become Bolshevik. And then? Inevitably, this will develop revolutionary currents in the United States, will develop other revolutions, will accelerate and energize the proletarian struggle. The United States will then become the center of reaction: and imperative will become our own revolutionary struggle. Is American Socialism prepared for the struggle? It is not; and it is necessary that we prepare ideologically and theoretically for the final revolutionary struggle in our own country—which may come in six months, or in six years, but which will come; prepare for that final struggle which alone can make the world safe for Socialism.

* * *

Revolutionary Socialism does not mean the abandonment of the immediate struggle; it engages aggressively in this struggle. But revolutionary Socialism accepts that struggle, or phase of the immediate struggle, which is fundamental; and pursues this struggle by means in accord with revolutionary Socialism,—promoting the final struggle, and developing reserves for the revolutionary conquest of power.

While the moderate Socialist nobly wages the class struggle by conciliating the *petite bourgeoisie*, by introducing in legislative bodies bureaucratic reform measures, by ascribing to parliamentarism a creative and revolutionary significance which it does not possess, the revolutionary Socialist accepts a proletarian ideology, engages in the aggressive mass and industrial struggles of the proletariat, awakens in the proletariat a consciousness of its control of industry,—out of the mass strikes of the proletariat the revolutionary Socialist tries to develop more effective forms of organization and means of struggle. Socialism is *the class struggle*—this is decisive in our policy. The moderate Socialist depends upon the petty bourgeois parliamentary struggles, and degrades politics; the revolutionary Socialist depends upon the proletarian mass struggle, and makes politics one phase, and an auxiliary phase, of the proletarian struggle. Vary as the

immediate conditions may, revolutionary Socialism always expresses its fundamental policy in theory and *in action* . . .

The necessity of revolutionary Socialism in the United States does not depend upon the immediate coming of the final revolutionary struggle; but revolutionary Socialism develops the coming of the final struggle by adapting itself to the prevailing conditions: out of these conditions emerge revolutionary consciousness and the final struggle.

The revolutionary crisis in Europe is surely influencing the consciousness of the American proletariat, which it is our task to express and bring to a focus; and this influence will become stronger as events sweep on. But certain objective conditions are developing which, in proportion as Socialism appreciates the opportunity, will accelerate the development of class consciousness and revolutionary action.

Capitalism in the United States has profited enormously from the war. But, precisely because of this fact, Capitalism must aggressively and consciously accept Imperialism. The new industrial efficiency developed by American Capitalism, the lower costs, the increasing volumes of profits, and surplus capital and goods,—all this implies the necessity for new markets, for undeveloped territory, for investment and markets. American Capitalism must pursue the practice of Imperialism. An understanding of Imperialism, as marking a new and final stage of Capitalism and introducing the revolutionary epoch, is necessary; and equally necessary is the adoption of revolutionary tactics to fight Imperialism. Yet American Socialism to these *problems* of revolutionary theory and practice. . . .

Simultaneously, American Capitalism will itself provide the objective conditions out of which can be developed the spirit for the revolutionary struggle. The war has sharpened imperialistic appetites and antagonisms. Capitalism has been shaken. Capitalism must "reconstruct" itself. In this reconstruction, new and more acute problems will develop, new forms for the exploitation of the proletariat, coincidentally

with the development in the proletariat of a more conscious and aggressive spirit.

But Capitalism cannot reconstruct itself. Capitalism cannot solve the multiplying antagonisms of a system of production that is decaying, that is becoming international while its forms and control are still national. Demobilization will offer enormous problems of providing employment. Adapting industry again to peace conditions means new complications. The sharpening of imperialistic competition and the new industrial efficiency, each will contribute in a measure to unemployment, to the necessity of still more oppression of the proletariat. Crises and antagonisms, industrial dislocation, will characterize Capitalism in the days to come.

Without considering the influence of the developing international revolutionary crisis, the coming period will be characterized by giant industrial revolts, by strikes larger and more numerous than in the past, by an intense unrest of the industrial proletariat. These strikes, which will assume the form of mass revolts, will particularly affect the larger, basic industry, where the industrial proletariat is concentrated. Conciliation, reconstruction, "understanding" between employer and employe, will not prevent the coming of this period of great strikes, of mass industrial revolts, of potential revolutionary mass action.

This situation will offer a great opportunity to Socialism. But if, as in the past, the Socialist Party uses these great strikes to make political capital, to prove to the workers the futility of strikes, and the power of the vote, — then a great opportunity will be wasted. That is the petty bourgeois policy, which tries to compress the elemental action of the proletariat within the stultifying limits of parliamentary action, as such.

The Socialist Party, revolutionary Socialism, should use these strikes and mass industrial revolts to develop in the proletariat the consciousness of revolutionary mass action, to

develop the conception and practice of political strikes, to make it realize that its action should centre in the large plants, that when it wants to act, its action should develop out of the mill, mine and factory. Our political action should become part and parcel of this mass action, should promote the aggressive industrial struggle. To broaden a strike into a demonstration, to develop, out of these, revolutionary mass action against Capitalism and the state — that is the policy of revolutionary Socialism, that is the policy which will transform the coming period of strikes definitely into a period of revolutionary action, preparing the mass action of the Revolution.

The proletariat must be made to realize that the futility of industrial action lies not in its being industrial action, as such, but in that it is incomplete, does not broaden and deepen itself into class action, is not sufficiently general and aggressive. The proletariat must be made to realize that its great strength lies in its control of industry; and it is necessary to develop the *consciousness* and *forms* of workers' control of industry. The proletariat must be made to realize that its characteristic tactics consist of industrial mass action developing into revolutionary mass-action, and that through this *class struggle of the industrial masses* alone can the Socialist proletariat conquer.

And Socialism must be made to realize that the value of parliamentary action lies not in "constructive legislation" and bureaucratic, petty bourgeois reform measures, but in *revolutionary criticism*, in developing the industrial action of the masses, in awakening their revolutionary consciousness; and that when the class struggle turns into a test of power, it is the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat that will conquer, parliaments and parliamentary activity will disappear: politics may assist in developing the Revolution, but can never become the instrument of Revolution, unceasing practice of Socialism must be revolutionary mass action; the unceasing object of Socialism must be the revolutionary conquest of power, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

An important problem is the movement developing among the unions of the American Federation of Labor to organize a Labor Party; in some cities this has been done, in others the proposal has been approved.

This may, in a measure, be a reflex of similar action among the Canadian unions. It is, in still larger measure, an expression of the new currents that the war and events in Europe are developing in the world's working class — expressed in immature and conservative form. It is, accordingly, a move that, while it should not meet enthusiastic and uncritical acceptance, merits the serious study of the Socialist who does not flee from reality by means of phrases, nor accepts every "reality" as real, but who studies the social alignment, its development and peculiar forms, as the basis for appropriate Socialist tactics.

The organization of an American Labor Party may prove a step forward for the A. F. of L., but not necessarily a step forward for the American proletariat. The A. F. of L., which has insisted all along upon "no politics in the unions" while dickering and compromising with Republican and Democratic politicians, may develop a cleaner sense of independence by means of independent politics, in spite of the petty bourgeois forms these politics will necessarily assume. It may, moreover, by showing the futility of A. F. of L. politics, impress upon the proletariat the necessity of revolutionary Socialist action.

The New York *Call* wails that there is no necessity for a Labor Party, since the Socialist Party has been in the field for twenty years. This is either an admission that the Socialist Party in practice is no more than a Labor Party, or a characteristic Menshevik refusal to admit the fundamental differences between a Labor Party and a Socialist Party. In either case, it is counter-Socialism.

What is a Labor Party? The Labor Party, in England and Australia, has been, from the standpoint of revolutionary Socialism, hopelessly reactionary, consistently un-prole-

tarian. The British Labor Party's policy is a petty bourgeois policy, a counter-revolutionary policy, as has been clearly apparent from its unity with imperialistic Capitalism in the British Cabinet, its declaration that the war was a war of democracy, its accepting petty bourgeois liberalism instead of proletarian Socialism, its nationalistic proposals concerning Ireland, its virtual acquiescence in the expulsion of Maxim Litvinoff from England, its accepting the resolution of the Inter-Allied Labor and "Socialist" Conference favoring "democratic" intervention in Russia, its bureaucracy through Arthur Henderson acting against every development of revolutionary energy in the British proletariat. The British Labor Party has been a typical party of laborism, in that it struggles for a place in the governing system of things, for petty advantages to the upper layers of the working class, instead of struggling for the overthrow of the governing bourgeois system. The British Labor Party has been and is a party of social-Imperialism: a policy characteristic of laborism and petty bourgeois Socialism.

A characteristic of laborism is that it acts against the broad masses of the industrial proletariat, against the unorganized proletariat of unskilled labor. The "labor" government of Australia, once in power, used armed force to break the strikes of unorganized, unskilled workers. Moreover, the "labor" government, instead of introducing Socialism, as was expected by the gullible Socialist, strengthened Capitalism, became the unifying centre of bourgeois reaction camouflaged in "labor" and "liberal" colors. When the war broke out, "labor" Australia was even more patriotic and imperialistic than bourgeois Canada, "labor" Premier William Morris Hughes becoming the particular pet of the ultra-imperialistic forces of British Capitalism. There has been a revolt in the Labor Party against the "excesses" of Hughes, and more radical currents are developing under pressure of the industrial proletariat and revolutionary Socialism, but the tendency still remains characteristic of a party of laborism.

An American Labor Party would be an expression of the

A. F. of L. The policy of the A. F. of L. is clearly reactionary. It acts against the great masses of the unorganized and the unskilled, as is proven by its attitude during I. W. W. strikes. The A. F. of L. is an organization of craft unions, that splits the working class; an organization, moreover, that represents only a very small part of the working class, being largely an organized system of "job trusts." The A. F. of L. during the war has pursued a policy of the utmost reaction, even more reactionary than many circles of Capitalism; it united with Capitalism against Socialism in the United States, and in Europe through its "Labor Missions"; and a Labor Party would pursue an identical reactionary, petty bourgeois policy.

There are elements in the Socialist Party, whose policy is not at all Socialist but the policy of reactionary trade unionism and laborism, who would welcome a Labor Party, and urge merging with it. That would be suicidal; there must be an independent Socialist Party: to merge with a Labor Party would promote confusion, compromise and disaster.

But it must be admitted that the official majority policy of the Socialist Party in action is, in substance, the policy of Laborism disguised with "Socialist" phraseology. Should our party retain this policy, it would become the fifth wheel of the wagon, serve no necessary mission, and would either decay or become absorbed in the Labor Party. The Socialist Party would have to irrevocably separate itself from a Labor Party and wage war upon it by means of revolutionary Socialism.

The movement to organize a Labor Party, all the developments now transforming the world, are a call to Socialist reconstruction, to the annihilation of moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism. The Socialist Party must re-organize in accord with the new conditions, must adopt the policy of revolutionary Socialism, of the Bolsheviki—accept the ideas now developing a new pulse in international Socialism, and which alone represent Socialism and Marxism.

The way to wage war upon a Labor Party, should it eventuate, is not to promise more reforms than the Labor Party, is not to plead and placate, but to develop the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat, to awaken to action the great, unorganized industrial proletariat, which is the dominant force in industry, and which will determine the destiny of the Revolution. This would mean a broadening of the conception and practice of politics—a broadening fully in accord with Marxism and fundamental Socialism. The A. F. of L. does not represent the elements of the real proletariat—the industrial proletariat massed in the basic larger industry. The A. F. of L., except in the case of anachronisms such as the miners, represents the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor, men who have skill and consider this skill “property.” Their ideology is a petty bourgeois ideology, and their domination of Socialism and the industrial proletariat would prove a calamity. The answer to the A. F. of L. compromise and petty bourgeois policy is to awaken the industrial proletariat, and pull out of the A. F. of L. unions, such as the Miners, which belong with the industrial proletariat.

As against the Labor Party, a *Socialist* Party; as against the aristocracy of Labor, the masses of the industrial proletariat; as against A. F. of L. unionism, industrial unionism; as against conciliation with Capitalism, the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism.

There is no magic in “labor”—it depends upon what labor represents, its tendency and action. There is no magic in “Socialism” either; both may be reactionary and counter-revolutionary. The great task of Socialism is its own reconstruction—this animates its policy on all problems.

* * *

Socialism must have an economic basis—industrial power. That is one argument made in favor of a union Labor Party. But does conservative unionism use its industrial power for large purposes? Is it using it for the release of Tom Mooney?

Did the British Labor Party use its industrial power to secure for its delegates access to Conferences held in other nations?

Socialism must possess industrial power. But industrial power emerges only out of the class consciousness and revolutionary activity of the proletariat. Socialism must have industrial power, but this will develop not out of parliamentarism, not out of unity with a reactionary Labor Party, but out of the aggressive mass action of the industrial proletariat, out of awakening the masses to independent revolutionary activity, out of industrial unionism.

The moderate Socialist has never concerned himself with the struggles of the revolutionary Socialist to develop industrial power by means of industrial unionism; the moderate Socialist thinks of this only when it may promote reactionary purposes, never when it may promote the Revolution.

But the task of developing this industrial power is important. The coming period of strikes will provide an excellent opportunity for the development of more effective forms of organization, for the construction of industrial unionism, for the building up of a revolutionary labor movement. This is a task that Socialism cannot shirk. The argument that the Socialist Party is a political party, and therefore cannot concern itself with problems of union organization, is a miserable subterfuge; a *Socialist* Party is a party of Socialism, of the proletarian class struggle, of the Revolution; and it must concern itself with every problem that affects the revolutionary struggle and the coming of Socialism. The problem of unionism, of revolutionary industrial unionism, is fundamental,—all the more, since in its theoretical phase, the construction of an industrial state, the abolition of the political state, contains within itself the norms of the new proletarian state and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A revolutionary union movement—that must be an integral phase of our activity. Life itself will determine the

most appropriate means of accomplishing this task; but a general revolutionary attitude and activity are indispensable. The constituent elements for a revolutionary union movement are here: unions of unskilled workers in the A. F. of L., who do not belong there and who are betrayed by the aristocracy of labor; a large number of independent unions, the radical character of which might develop into more revolutionary consciousness; the I. W. W. and the masses of the unorganized industrial proletariat.

This is an important problem. But it is not the decisive problem. The Revolution will not develop out of industrial unionism, but out of a crisis developing into *revolutionary mass action* and *proletarian* dictatorship. Not organizations, but *revolutionary class-consciousness*—that is the instrument of the Revolution. Industrial unionism must not become an end in itself; even the I. W. W. is becoming conservative. The proletarian revolution annihilates the old bourgeois order and the old organizations. The Revolution is the act of the organized producers; but the producers are not organized *before* but *during* the Revolution—by means of Soviets.

The revolutionary struggle by means of mass action—that constitutes the process of the Revolution and the Revolution itself in action.

* * *

I am simply *projecting* some of the problems of American Socialism—there are others, but these are fundamental. My purpose is to arouse *discussion* of these problems. The fatal defect of our party is that there is no discussion of fundamentals, no controversy on tactics. The bureaucracy and representatives of the party discourage discussion and controversy: where the spirit of inquiry prevails, there is potential opposition. Let us, together and in fraternal spirit, discuss our problems and build the new Socialism of the final struggle, and victory!

Let us reconstruct the party. As a preliminary, let us integrate the revolutionary elements in the party, *an organ-*

ization for the revolutionary conquest of the party by the party! The American Socialist Party needs a definite, organized, vocal left wing, a unified expression of revolutionary Socialism in theory and practice. Thus alone shall we prepare for the coming struggles; thus alone shall we become a decisive factor in the new the third International—the international of revolutionary Socialism and the final struggle.

Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg

By LUDWIG LORE

We are all of us prone to judge men and women by their individual deeds and actions, without examining the motives and principles that stand behind them. The hero of to-day is to-morrow's lunatic. We acclaim the man or the woman whose momentary attitude happens to agree with the position we ourselves have taken, only too often without investigating the causes that prompted their position, only to rail at them with equal enthusiasm when the same causes lead them to adopt a position of which we do not approve.

It was to be expected that the American capitalist press, with its extravagant praises of the German radical Socialist wing, would experience an immediate change of heart with the cessation of hostilities between the two nations. For there never was, nor could there be, the slightest bond of sympathy between the revolutionary Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg and the servants of American imperialism, beyond a momentary opposition to the German government.

But the same holds true, though, of course, to a lesser degree, of some of our comrades in the Socialist movement. Here, too, we found enthusiastic admiration for the courageous stand taken by the minority group, which has changed, in many individual cases, to bewilderment and opposition to the course this group has adopted since the revolution has put an end to the war. And yet, did these comrades know

the history of this movement within the German party, and the position taken by its leaders, not only during the war but for two decades in the past, they would be forced to admit that Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht did not act "madly" and "rashly," but consistently, in absolute agreement with standards that they have always upheld in the past.

Karl Liebknecht Born a Revolutionist

Karl Liebknecht was born to a revolutionary heritage. He was the son of Wilhelm Liebknecht, one of the founders of the Socialist movement of Germany, who, side by side with August Bebel, led the young and undeveloped party through a period of the stormiest struggles against public sentiment and governmental autocracy. He was one of a family of five children, three sons and two daughters, all of whom have faithfully carried on the great work that their splendid father began.

One of the daughters became the wife of Bruno Geiser, a Socialist deputy to the Reichstag, who was expelled from the Social-Democratic Party of Germany together with Viereck, the father of the gentleman who has won for himself a rather undesirable reputation in this country, for cowardice, because they refused to sign an appeal for the forbidden party convention to be held at St. Gallen, under the notorious anti-Socialist laws of 1878-1890. Geiser was later readmitted to the party, upon a motion by Bebel, Liebknecht's most intimate friend, against the vehement protests of Wilhelm Liebknecht himself.

Recently it was reported in the American press that the sisters of Karl Liebknecht were arrested in connection with the Spartacus uprising. Whether they were actually directly connected with the revolutionary movement, or were simply arrested because of their relationship to the troublesome revolutionist, did not appear from the news that was received in this country.

In their early youth, the three sons of Wilhelm Liebknecht completely vanished from the public eye. It was a common

thing in the editorial rooms of Socialist papers to receive letters from comrades far and wide asking to know what had become of the three sons of the staunch old fighter, whether they had deserted the cause for which their father had made such enormous sacrifices. These questions invariably remained unanswered, for a public avowal of allegiance to the Socialist cause in Germany at that time would have made it impossible for the three young students, (two of whom were studying law, while the youngest had chosen the medical profession) to complete their university courses or to obtain their degrees. It is true, Karl Liebknecht founded a "Social-Wissenschaftlicher Verein" among the students of his Alma Mater. But this organization remained always simply a medium for more or less radical discussion of social political topics without a definite party allegiance.

Liebknecht Becomes a Public Figure

When Karl Liebknecht was admitted to the bar, however, he immediately threw off all restraint and threw himself whole-heartedly into the movement. His appearance was greeted everywhere with open delight, and the welcome that was accorded to the son of the beloved old fighter was enough to have turned the head of many an older and wiser man. But the young Liebknecht at once won the sympathy of the masses for himself as well. His fearless radicalism, his untiring zeal and devotion to the cause and his undoubted gift of public speaking and his great personal magnetism captured his audiences wherever he went.

His first efforts were directed toward the building up of a radical and militant Young People's Movement, which at that time was just beginning to gain a foothold in Germany. At this period in his career Liebknecht already evidenced the intense anti-militaristic spirit that runs, like a red thread, through his whole life in the Socialist movement. He foresaw that militarism in Germany was fast becoming the dominant factor in German political life. He insisted that the struggle against capitalism in Germany must go hand in hand with an intense, determined agitation against armaments, against

military service, against war. He was among the first to recognize that militarism in Germany was more than the tool of the capitalist class, that it was becoming the spirit that dominated and controlled the very destinies of the nation.

"Since we are not in a position," he said at the National Party Convention at Bremen, in 1904, "to carry on our agitation in the barracks, as is being done in other countries, let us then carry on our agitation while we can still do so within the law. . . . Let us systematically spread our ideas among the young people of the proletariat, laying particular emphasis upon the character of militarism; social-democratic recruits will know what to do when once they are drafted into military service. . . . But we must see to it that the powers that be, when once they come into actual conflict with the organized proletariat, cannot feel itself as invincible as it does at the present time, that it will no longer be able to rely absolutely upon the obedience of its army, even for illegal purposes."

The persistent anti-militaristic propaganda that was carried on under the direction and influence of Liebknecht and his followers was not without its effect. It is a fact that at the outbreak of the war the Young People's Organizations in many parts of Germany were in open revolt against the position adopted by the party, and that in Hamburg and other localities, their organizations were summarily dissolved by the official party organization. The same radical anti-war position was adopted by the Young People's International, which was founded chiefly by Liebknecht's efforts, and which, in the early part of the war, actually furnished the only channel for international communication at the disposal of the radical anti-war minorities in the belligerent countries.

Liebknecht Becomes More and More Unpopular with the Official Party Leaders

Karl Liebknecht soon enjoyed the whole-hearted dislike of the party officials of the German Socialist Party movement. They attributed his radical speeches and actions to a natural desire to be something more than simply the son of a famous father and refused to take him seriously. Their bureaucratic souls were completely out of sympathy with the whole-hearted disregard for petty considerations that characterized his every action, and regarded him with ill-concealed con-

tempt. Even in later years, after he had served a four-year sentence in a military prison for his anti-militarist agitation, even after he had won international fame in 1913-1914 by his celebrated Krupp revelations, he was looked upon as an irresponsible troublemaker by the more "solid" elements in the party.

"He makes himself absolutely ridiculous," said Scheide-mann of Liebknecht during his American visit. "Whenever you see him he is in a tremendous hurry, with a package of books and notes under his arm. He rushes from one meeting to another; in the morning he speaks in the Landtag, in the afternoon he has an important commission meeting. Then he runs into the Reichstag to deliver a speech there before the session closes. It is impossible to get him to attend to his law business. If it were not for his brother William, he would not earn the salt for his bread."

The first Russian Revolution in 1905 and the period of black reaction that followed made a deep impression on the intense personality of Karl Liebknecht. He threw himself heart and soul into the propagation of revolutionary tactics in Germany, and, together with Rosa Luxemburg, launched a campaign against the pacific, purely political tendency that was taking root in the Social-Democracy. At the National Convention of Magdeburg (1910) he bitterly assailed the party authorities for failing to arouse the whole country to a determined protest against the visit of the Bloody Czar to Germany.

"The Czar has dared to appear openly, as if he were a citizen, before the public in a number of German cities. He is moving through Germany at the present time more freely than he has ever dared to move in Russia. The thought is unbearable that he may dare to do in Germany what he could not think of doing in Italy or in France, or anywhere else, that Germany, of all nations should have been the one to give this man, who must flee from place to place in his own country, who must hide everywhere, like a robber, can appear before the German people like one who has a right to command the respect of his fellow-men."

Rosa Luxemburg

Liebknecht was by no means alone in his demands for a spiritual and revolutionary revival in the party. For years he fought for the realization of these ideas side by side with some of the finest men and women that the International has produced. Klara Zetkin, Franz Mehring and the heroic Rosa

Luxemburg were chief among the supporters of this more radical trend in the movement, and every party conference, every great party movement found them at their post, staunchly braving the ridicule and the misunderstanding of the party leaders. Among them all, none was braver and more courageous, none more ready to carry out her ideas to the last bitter consequence, none more far-seeing and theoretically sound in her opinions than Rosa Luxemburg.

Rosa Luxemburg was born fifty-four years ago in Warsaw, Russian Poland. As a very young girl she came to Germany as a student, and immediately became so active in the revolutionary movement that she was forced to flee to Switzerland in order to escape deportation into the land of the Czar. She continued her studies in Switzerland, but remained in constant communication with her German comrades. In order to be able to return to Germany she entered upon one of those political marriages that were very common in those days among young Russian women who had been driven from Russia and desired to acquire German citizenship. She married a young German student, thus, as his legal wife, acquiring German citizenship, and returned to Germany where she immediately became one of the most promising agitators and writers the movement had at that time.

Her personal appearance was exceedingly unprepossessing; she was slightly humpbacked and her features unattractive. But nature had compensated her with a personality and a mental brilliancy that led even her most apathetic listeners to forget her outward appearance after the first five minutes. She was one of the most profound students of Marxian philosophy in a movement that was rich of theoreticians. She possessed a remarkable memory for facts, and her speeches were full of references, quotations and examples from the most diversified sources. In repartee she was unexcelled, she gave no quarter, and her attacks were feared by her opponents as much for their merciless clearness, as for the logical brilliancy with which they were presented. An accomplished linguist, she was equally at home in Russian or

German, in Polish as in French, and was well known in most countries of Europe as a fascinating and thoroughly learned speaker.

In Poland she became a member of the Polish Social-Democratic Party, the strictly Socialist, anti-national wing of the Polish Socialist movement, and led the fight against the nationalistic P. P. S. (Polish Party Socialista). Although always at variance with the majority of the German party, she was unalterably opposed to all separatist tendencies, opposed to all outside organizations and propaganda to such a degree that she refused steadfastly to countenance any kind of separate organization or agitation even for propaganda among women.

The Fight in the Party for Revolutionary Methods

During the last two decades, every Party Congress, every important discussion of party tactics found Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht together in the radical minority. Political conditions in Germany, the unparalleled success of the party on the political field, the enormous membership, the power and strength of the trade union and co-operative movements, the extraordinary development of its educational institutions,—all of these factors encouraged the growth of a distinctly conservative spirit in its membership, but especially in its leaders. Strikes and labor struggles in Germany had become the exception rather than the rule, because the labor organizations, backed up by the Social-Democracy, were too formidable an opponent to be lightly alienated, even by a powerful capitalist class. Success on the political field had made it possible for the Socialist movement to achieve the passage of important reforms and social legislation, achievements that were naturally stressed and pushed into the foreground in the propaganda work of the party, thus acquiring undue importance and influence upon the tactical program of the party. In consequence the party bureaucracy met every suggestion in favor of more radical measures with active resentment, because they honestly feared that such measures

might alienate its voters, that the failure of such revolutionary demonstrations might shake the confidence of the masses in the party and strengthen the power of the capitalist class. Years of success had bred in the bureaucrats of the party a holy horror of failure. They were desperately opposed to any action that did not, at the outset, bear assurance of a successful outcome.

The radical minority waged constant war upon this deadening conservatism. In Prussia it demanded the adoption of a policy of active opposition to the three-class election system, against which the party had used its political weapons in vain. In 1904, at Bremen, Karl Liebknecht moved that the question of the general political strike against the unequal suffrage laws of Prussia be discussed. At the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart, in 1907, Rosa Luxemburg called out to the delegates who had adopted a resolution celebrating the martyrs of the Russian counter-revolution: "If they could speak they would cry out to you, 'We do not need your praises. Learn, rather, from our example.'" In 1913, at the celebrated Party Convention of Jena, the unceasing agitation of this small group of revolutionists had so far borne fruit that they succeeded in securing the adoption of the following resolution, against the vehement opposition of David, Bernstein, Scheidemann, and others:

"The Party Congress of Jena, 1913, sees in the general application of mass cessation of labor, under certain circumstances, one of the most effective methods, not only against proposed attacks upon existing political rights, but also for the conquest of new political reforms and rights.

"The achievement of general, equal, direct and secret suffrage for all public offices is a necessary condition for the liberation of the proletariat. The existing three-class suffrage system not only deprives the propertyless class of its political liberties, but hampers them in every movement for the improvement of their standard of life; it makes the worst enemies of labor-union activity and social progress, the Junker caste, the controllers of all legislation.

"The Party Congress, therefore, calls upon the politically enslaved masses to use all their powers in the fight against the three-class election system, realizing that this struggle cannot be carried out without great sacrifices to a victorious conclusion.

"While the Party Congress opposes the use of the general strike as an unfailing weapon that may be used at all times for

the abolition of social wrongs in the anarchistic sense, it is of the conviction that the proletariat must be prepared to use its whole power for the achievement of political equality. The political mass strike can be successful only with the united effort of all organs of the labor movement, by class-conscious masses, inspired by the ultimate aims of Socialism, prepared for all sacrifices. The Congress pledges every comrade, therefore, to work tirelessly for the political and labor union organizations of the working class."

On this occasion Rosa Luxemburg delivered a half hour speech that has become famous in the annals of the Socialist movement of Germany:

..... "We declare that in Germany, as in all other countries, it is not necessary to wait with the eventual application of the general-strike weapon until the last man and the last woman have paid their dues as organized members of a Socialist local, when we call attention to the fact that where a revolutionary situation has arisen, when we face great historical tasks, the organization of the party will exert a moral and spiritual influence that will sweep the unorganized masses into our movement, when we declare that the policies and tactics of the party must be such that will awaken enthusiasm and the self-sacrificing spirit outside of the organization, for only in this way can we carry the masses with us,—then the Executive Committee protests, and says that we are preparing to disrupt the organization. That means lack of discipline, that is sowing suspicion against the party functionaries! They have spoken of our lack of responsibility, of our unscrupulousness. I will not use such expressions, but allow me to say that such methods in the discussion of party questions border on demagoguery..... We have been accused of being direct actionists, and conspirators. We here declare that they are the conspirators who would apply the typical tactics of the conspirators to the strike because they believe that the outbreak of a mass strike must be a surprise, that it must be worked out and prepared secretly, behind closed doors, by a handful of officials..... Can you not understand that the masses themselves must become familiar with this new weapon? After all, we here are not speaking to the masses, we are merely formulating propositions that must be thought out, digested and accepted by the comrades outside..... The mass strike in Germany, as in all countries, to be sure, must come from the masses, and that is the reason why we say in our resolution that the mass strike cannot be ordered, from one day to another, by party and union leaders, as our party authorities seem to assume. Nor can it be stopped once it has reached the historic stage of ripeness. But this does not, by any means take from us the responsibility for the conduct of the mass strike if it is to be successful, if it is to bring us the maximum of positive results and advantages, in the political and socialist awakening of the masses. The party must stand at the head of the movement, but in order to be at its head when it comes, it must not wait patiently until the revolutionary situation has become a fact, to be dragged along by the masses, no, it must prepare the masses, by a complete re-orientation of its tactics and methods toward a revolutionary tendency,

to take the offensive, that the masses may follow us with full confidence in our powers."

In this connection, and because both Rosa Luxemburg and Liebknecht, and in fact all supporters of a more general adoption of mass action in Germany, and other countries, have been accused of anarchistic and syndicalistic ideas and aspirations, it is of interest to know that both at all times fought against anarchistic and syndicalistic tactics. They consistently opposed the anarchic syndicalist movement in Germany that was organized in the so-called "Lokale Gewerkschaften." In 1910, at Magdeburg, Comrade Luxemburg expressed this in a speech on the same subject:

"A political mass strike can only arise out of historic conditions, out of the ripeness of the political and industrial situation.

"If anything could prove that one may talk indefinitely of mass strikes without the slightest practical result, so long as the initial conditions for its outbreak are not given, it is the history of the idea of the mass strike itself. You know that anarchists, of the type of Nieuwenhuis, propagated the idea of the mass strike for decades, as a panacea against all evils in society and against war as a means of bringing about the social revolution within 24 hours. And today, who talks more of the general strike than the French Syndicalists of the anarchistic school? . . . And yet the country where the general strike has been least put into practice is France, where the Syndicalists are forever mouthing its phrases."

During the War

The position taken by Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg from the beginning of the outbreak of the war, their struggle not only against the power of a war-mad government, but, what was far harder to bear, against a deluded people, need not be repeated here. Only those who understand what party discipline means in Germany, only those who know what the Social Democratic Party as the expression of the political and social aspirations of the working class meant to Karl Liebknecht can appreciate the inner struggle that he and his comrades that later formed the Independent Social Democratic Party had to undergo before they took the step that separated them irrevocably from the movement that had been the end and aim of their very existence. In the caucus that preceded the vote in the Reichstag on the first war loan, Liebknecht, Haase, Ruehle and a few others stood alone against

an overwhelming opposition. And so strong was the hold of the party upon them that not even Liebknecht voted against the first loan in the Reichstag, that Hugo Haase, the chairman of the Socialist Reichstag group, delivered the declaration explaining the action of the majority, although every word he uttered seared his very soul.

When the second war loan vote was taken, Liebknecht alone voted against it, and was condemned by the Executive Committee of the party, by a vote of 65 to 26.

On Christmas, 1914, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg sent letters of greeting to their comrades in England:

"Confusion reigns in the ranks of the Socialist movement," writes Liebknecht. "Many Socialists make our principles responsible for our present failure. The failure is due, not to our principles, but to the representatives of our principles.

"All such phrases as 'national defence' and 'freedom of the people,' with which imperialism decorates its instruments of murder, are lying pretense. The emancipation of each nation must be the result of its own efforts. Only blindness can demand the continuation of murder until its opponents are crushed.

"The welfare of all nations are inseparably interwoven. The world war that destroyed the International will surely teach the world a mighty lesson. It will bring a new International, an International with a power greater and more unshaking than that which fell last August before the blows of the capitalist powers. In the cooperation of the working classes of all nations alone in war and in peace, lies the salvation of mankind."

The greeting sent by Rosa Luxemburg breathes this same confidence in the victory of the Socialist ideal, in spite of the downfall of the Socialist movement:

"It is necessary that we express the bitter truth, not to encourage futile despair and resignation, but, on the contrary, to learn from the mistakes we have committed in the past and the facts of the existing situation, valuable lessons for the future."

In the second year of the war Liebknecht was sent to the front as a non-combatant soldier, where he was shortly afterward seriously hurt by a falling tree trunk. In March of the same year Rosa Luxemburg was sentenced to a year in prison for alleged libels of officers' corps and the Crown Prince, in a speech in which she protested against the ill-treatment of the soldiery.

During 1916 Liebknecht was sentenced to 30 months in prison for a speech delivered in a soldier's uniform, at a peace demonstration held on the Potsdamer Platz, Berlin. This sentence was increased to four years on an appeal to a higher court. Various after that there came to this country reports of Liebknecht's illness and death in prison, until he was released, a few weeks before the German revolution broke out, by the Coalition-Socialist-Liberal-Ministry that had been created in Germany as a last desperate attempt to pacify a nation already in the throes of revolution.

The German Revolution

In the few weeks that preceded the German revolutionary uprising Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were in the forefront of events. They addressed gigantic demonstrations. Liebknecht was met with tremendous ovations whenever he appeared in public. The memory of the meetings he addressed from the portico of the Embassy of the revolutionary Russian government will be unforgettable in the memory of those who witnessed them.

And yet, by the strange irony of fate, the very men who had always vehemently opposed revolutionary tactics in the German proletariat, the very men who, up to the last day of the coming of the revolution tried with all means to stem the rising tide that threatened the overthrow of the German military autocracy, assumed the reigns of government upon the Emperor's abdication. Ebert and Scheidemann became the rulers of the new German Republic. But even though majority Socialists stood at the head of the government, the spirit that filled the masses was undeniably revolutionary. Soldiers'

and Workmen's Councils everywhere took over the reigns of government in the cities, and proclamations and orders were usually signed in the name of the "Socialist Republic of Germany." Even the "Vorwärts," the organ of the majority group, spoke of "the social revolution."

The control of the government was placed in the hands of a council made up of three supporters of the Social Democratic Party and three Independents. But at the outset there were radical differences of opinion between the two groups, that were only with difficulty overcome. True to their old theory that Germany would grow into the Socialist state by a process of gradual evolution, the Social Democratic Party remained, as it has always been, opposed to any action that might precipitate the working class of Germany into an active conflict, either within the nation or without. To a proposal made by the Executive Committee of the Independent Social Democratic Party, on November 8th, as a basis for united action, that "in this Republic the entire executive, legislative and judicial power shall rest exclusively in the hands of representatives of the entire laboring population and the soldiers," the Executive of the Social Democratic Party replied: "If this demand means the dictatorship of a part of a class that has not the support of the majority of the people, we must decline it, because it is not in accord with our democratic principles." Street demonstrations everywhere breathed the most revolutionary spirit. The decisions and decrees of the different Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils showed a radicalism and firmness toward the Socialist goal that was refreshing and promising.

And yet, prompted probably by the fear of renewed warfare of the Allies against Germany should the spirit of unrest grow, the leaders of the Independents in the end acquiesced and abandoned their opposition to the National Assembly. For a time even closer affiliation with the Social Democratic Party was under consideration. But the lengths to which the Ebert-Scheidemann group went in their concessions to the capitalists and militaristic clique of Germany, the boldness with which military leaders like Hindenburg and officers of

all ranks came out with counter-revolutionary sentiments and proposals under the spiritual protection of the government that retained them in power in spite of all protests, showed the hopelessness of such an alliance, and finally led the representatives of the Independents to resign from the Socialist Cabinet.

During the entire period of indecision and concessions Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, and with them the Spartacus group, remained in the Independent Social Democratic Party. On the Sunday before Christmas the Independents held a convention at Berlin in response to a demand made by the Spartacus group for a clarification of its position. At this conference Haase defended the action taken by the Independent leaders in trying to come to some kind of an understanding with the majority Socialists. The position of the Spartacus group was defended by Rosa Luxemburg, who attacked the government (at that time the Independents were still in office) and maintained that the present rulers of Germany were doing nothing to prevent the growth of a counter-revolutionary movement. The Spartacus group then presented a resolution containing the following demands:

1. The immediate resignation of the Independent representatives from the government.
2. That the conference repudiate the calling of a National Assembly which can only strengthen the counter-revolution and cheat the revolution of its Socialist aims.
3. The immediate assumption of all political power by the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils, disarmament of the social revolution, armament of the working-class population, the creation of a Red Guard for the protection of the revolution, dissolution of the Ebert Council of People's Plenipotentiaries and the placing of full political control into the hands of an Executive Council of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils.

A resolution by Hilferding was finally adopted with 485 against 195 votes.

The most important task of the I. S. P. at the present time is the organization of the campaign for the National Assembly. We must now muster the supreme power of the proletariat to assure the victory of Socialism over the bourgeoisie.

On the 30th of December a National Conference of the Spartacus group was then held that finally severed all connection with the Independents and organized its forces into the "Revolutionary Communist Labor Party" by an unanimous vote.

From this we see that Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and the Spartacus group by no means rushed rashly and madly into the revolutionary uprising that followed. They left no stone unturned to secure the support of their comrades of the Independents, and far from being prompted by motives of self-aggrandizement, actually remained in the background of events until the situation showed that only by independent action could they hope to prevent the overthrow of the proletarian revolution that threatened. Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg made one mistake. But they erred, not on the side of rashness, but, on the contrary, on the side of the great hopefulness, to create confidence in the steadfastness of principle of the Independent Social Democracy. Had they struck at once, while the whole country was still aglow with the excitement of the first revolutionary uprising, had they taken advantage of the socialistic spirit that dominated the first days and weeks of the revolution to firmly establish the power of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils, the German proletariat would not be facing to-day a National Assembly in which the combined bourgeoisie can and will wrest from the hands of the Socialist movement the power to control the destinies of the new Republic.

The Martyrdom of Liebknecht and Luxemburg

When the Spartacus revolt set in, the proletariat of Germany had already accepted the new conditions, and resented the reawakening of the revolutionary excitement that, in the

first days of the revolution, had driven everything before it. The Majority Socialists left nothing untried to fan this resentment into an open flame. Not only did the government make use of notoriously monarchistic regiments to quell the uprising, its press was filled with scurrilous attacks against the Spartacus followers. In one of its articles the "Vorwärts" declared that it would henceforward refuse to take Liebknecht seriously until he had been examined and declared sane by at least three reputable alienists. But their attacks reached the climax of virulence in the whole-page appeal to the working class that appeared in the "Vorwärts" of December 23, that we have reproduced on the opposite page.

BOLSHEVISM, THE MILITARISM OF THE LAZY

Hunger has forced the Russian people under the yoke of militarism. Labor in Russia struck, and by premature socialization of Russian industries, robbed itself of its means of existence for the sake of demands that cannot possibly be realized, sacrificed its freedom to militarism. Bolshevik militarism is the autocratic rule of force by a clique, is the dictatorship of those who refuse to work, of the lazy. To-day the Russian army, the great mass of its unemployed labor, is again engaged in a bloody war.

Let the example of Russia be a warning to us.

Do we want another war? Do we want terror or the bloody rule of a caste? NO!

We want no more bloodshed, no more militarism. We want peace through labor. We want peace, that we may not fall under the rule of militarism, under the dictatorship of the unemployed. Bolshevik loafers are calling the masses to arms into the streets. Armed masses, prepared to use force are militarism incarnate. But we want no militarism, neither from the right nor from the left.

Bolshevism, the militarism of the lazy, knows neither freedom nor equality. It is vandalism, terror at the hands of a small mob that has arrogated itself to power. Therefore, refuse to follow the Spartacides, the Bolsheviki of Germany, lest you destroy our industries and our commerce.

For the downfall of German industries and commerce means

The Ruin of the German People.

Therefore, no terror, no militarist rule, no loafers and deserters.

Not Militarism, but Freedom!

Not Bolshevism, but Labor!

General Secretariat, Antibol.

Bolschewismus, der Militarismus der Faulenzer

Der Hunger hat das russische Volk ins Joch des Militarismus gezwungen. Russlands Arbeiter streikten, zerstörten durch überhastete Vergesellschaftung das Wirtschaftsleben, beraubten sich selbst durch unerfüllbare Forderungen der Existenzmöglichkeit, und opferten ihre Freiheit dadurch dem Militarismus. Der bolschewistische Militarismus ist die willkürliche Gewaltherrschaft einer Clique, ist die Diktatur der Arbeitsunwilligen, der Faulenzer. Heute führt Russlands Armee (die Masse der arbeitslosen Arbeiter) bereits wieder blutigen Krieg.

Das russische Beispiel diene als Warnung.

Wollen wir auch wieder Krieg? Wollen wir Terror oder Blutherrschaft einer Kaste? **Nein!**

Wir wollen kein neues Blutvergießen und keinen Militarismus. Wir wollen durch Arbeit zum Frieden kommen. Wir wollen Frieden, um nicht, wie Russland, dem von den Arbeitslosen diktierten Militarismus zu verfallen. Bolschewistische Faulenzer fordern die Massen bewaffnet auf die Strassen, bewaffnete zur Gewalt entschlossene Massen verkörpern den Militarismus. Wir aber wollen keinen Militarismus, weder von rechts noch von links.

Bolschewismus, der Militarismus der Faulenzer, kennt keine Freiheit und Gleichheit. Er ist der Vandalismus, der Terror einer kleinen Menge, die sich Gewalt angemast hat. Drum folgt nicht Spartakus, den deutschen Bolschewisten, wenn ihr nicht unser Wirtschaftsleben, unseren Handel vernichten wollt.

Der Zusammenbruch von Deutschlands Industrie und Handel aber bedeutet des

Deutschen Volkes Untergang

Drum keinen Terror, keine militaristische Herrschaft der Faulenzer und Deserteure.

Nicht Militarismus, sondern Freiheit!
Nicht Bolschewismus, sondern Arbeit!

Generalsekretariat Antibol.

Truly, the Socialist majority leaders bear upon their souls not a little of the responsibility for the dastardly murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

The Proletarian Revolution of Germany

The immediate future of Germany lies shrouded in darkness. But the discouraging result of the elections to the National Assembly and the increasing boldness with which the counter-revolutionary and militaristic elements are raising their heads seem to indicate that the people of Germany are still far from the peaceful era of "development into the Socialist state" that this National Assembly was to usher in. There will be no peace in Germany, there can be no peace until the revolutionary proletariat, realizing the futility of "democratic" government, hand in hand with the capitalist class, will arise once more to overthrow the uncrowned kings that are preparing to take control of the nation.

Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht are dead. But the spirit they and their comrades have awakened will live on in the hearts and minds of the German proletariat, in the hearts and minds of the revolutionary working class of the world.

Out of their ranks new leaders will come, new leaders, who, like those honored dead, have confidence and faith in the destiny and in the power of the working class.

The Labor Party

By A. DREIFUSS (Chicago)

So the founding of the so-called Independent Labor Party for Chicago has become an actual fact.

The remarkable feature of its formation is the fact that the first impetus came not from the workers, but from among the highest officials of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

Hitherto these officials have always been democratic politicians, who used the slogan "No politics in the union" for the sole

purpose of placing difficulties in the way of Socialist propaganda, while they themselves conducted all sorts of wire pulling for their own party.

In local politics, Mayor Thompson has gradually lost his following in the Board of Aldermen, the Republicans of his own party as well as the Democrats.

That led him to seek for support in the Chicago Federation of Labor, and a consequent fraternization between him and the Federation officials ensued.

It was agreed to force the Board of Education—with whose members the Mayor had been engaged in an active and lengthy controversy—into submission by appointing five labor leaders from the Federation of Labor to office. They were convinced that the Board of Aldermen would not dare to oppose the nomination of these men for fear of losing the labor vote at the next election.

But, contrary to all expectations, the Board of Aldermen took up the challenge and refused to sanction the appointment of the labor leaders to the Board of Education.

This was the immediate cause for the founding of the "Independent Labor Party."

Circulars were sent out to all parts of the country, calling upon organized labor to follow the example of Chicago. The Illinois Federation of Labor Convention greeted this new departure, in New York the Chicago example found immediate imitation.

The above shows clearly that the new-born political party owes its origin, not to an increasing clearness of understanding among the rank and file of organized labor of the class lines of our social structure, but simply to an accidental, factional fight among politicians in the course of which organized labor happened to receive a slap in the face.

Without this purely factional fight in Chicago, Fitzpatrick and his ilk would have been perfectly content to remain Democratic politicians to the end of their days, and the creation of a "Labor Party" might still rest in the lap of the future.

Undoubtedly, however, it would have come, sooner or later. It was inevitable that, at some time or another, the ruling class would be forced to tell organized labor openly: "So far and no

further." For even non-Socialist workers must live, must make new and more far-reaching demands in order to keep step with the constantly increasing cost of living, to offset the increasing intensity and the ravages of modern industry.

The organized capitalist appreciates this conflict even more keenly than his opponent of the laboring class. He realizes that time will hurt rather than improve his chances, and so takes the bull by the horns in the Board of Aldermen even at the risk of losing labor votes and provoking the founding of a labor party.

It is still too early to philosophize as to the future of the new party and to prophecy as to its fate. Let us rather look at the present, in order that we may determine upon our position as Socialists toward this new political expression of organized labor and its demands.

More than one of us has lost his bearings with the appearance of this new labor party.

It must be understood, at the outset, that we still regard the Socialist Party as the *only* party whose program and aims are in accord with the interests of the working class. The fact that prejudice, ignorance and persecution has to the present time prevented a large portion of the working class from realizing the truth of this statement, is no reason why we ourselves should doubt its actuality.

On the contrary, it should spur us on to more intensive agitation among ever widening circles of the working class.

Nevertheless, it must not be overlooked that a labor party, even though it is in no sense socialistic, may be successful in catching the votes and the active support of a large part of the working class, and still be organically very different from the Democratic or Republican Parties.

The Labor Party that wishes to win the support of a considerable portion of labor must put up specific working-class demands. In so doing it will be forced into a class position against Capitalism, even though it may vigorously deny its own class character.

As a matter of fact, the demands adopted at the Convention of the new party, though some of them are utopian under a capi-

talist system, are, to a great extent, taken from the program of the Socialist Party. It is interesting, too, that the eight-hour day, minimum wage and old-age pension demands, that have been so consistently opposed by Gompers and the official American Federation of Labor, have found a prominent plan in the program of this new political party, while several of the other, more general demands are directly in line with the ultimate aims of the Socialist movement.

That does not signify, by any means, that the leaders of the I. L. P. are Socialists. It need not even mean that they are all honest radicals, although in general it is advisable to be somewhat sparing in the use of the term dishonest.

In short, an honest, consistent and determined political program of action in accordance with the fourteen points recently adopted would inevitably lead to the ultimate adoption of the Socialist political program.

Our position, therefore, must be one of "watchful waiting." The new party is not our creation. We could not prevent its coming, nor have we encouraged its formation.

But in the end we will profit by its coming, be the future of the party what it may.

Either it will eventually come to us as a whole, or we will win for our movement the more intelligent and far-seeing of its members who will shortly see the ineffectiveness of a spineless, half socialistic and yet anti-socialistic labor policy.

It is to be expected that the formation of the new party will encourage the discussion of political and social questions in labor circles. Probably the division between fundamentally sound, radical Socialists and revisionistic opportunists in our own ranks will become more marked, both eventualities much to be desired in the interests of the political education of American labor.

There will be differences between us and the Labor Party. For we are already Socialists, while they, for the first, will still be our active opponents. But we need not create these differences, we must use them, when they come, to teach from the example of a class-conscious, international Socialism, of a world labor movement, the charlatanism of a Jack-of-all-trades labor party.

Karl Marx

By FRANZ MEHRING

Translator's Note.

The following two chapters are from a new book by Franz Mehring entitled "Karl Marx, Geschichte seines Lebens," intended as a contribution to the hundredth anniversary of Marx's birthday (May 5, 1918). These two chapters are from the advance sheets, and are the only chapters that have thus far reached us. The publisher is the Leipziger Buchdruckerei A. G. (Verlag der Leipziger Volkszeitung) and the price is 8 marks paper and 10 marks bound. Pp. 544 plus XII. From the publisher's prospectus we take the following:

The book is written with both admiration and criticism for the great subject, and both qualities are needed in a good biography, as Mehring points out in his foreword. Comrade Rosa Luxemburg has contributed a masterly bit from her pen: the portion dealing with the second and third volumes of "Capital," which forms the third section of Chapter XII. Another brave woman who has fought in the front ranks of the proletariat, Comrade Clara Zetkin, "the heiress of the Marxian spirit," is she to whom the book is dedicated.

1. Genius and Society

Although it may be said that Marx found a second home in England, the term "home" must not here be understood with too wide a connotation. He was never in any way molested in England because of his revolutionary activity, and yet England was often the object of his attacks. The government of the "greedy and envious nation of shopkeepers" was inspired by a greater degree of self-respect and self-consciousness than those continental governments, which, terrified by their evil consciences, send the darts and javelins of the police after their opponents even when the latter are active only in the fields of discussion and propaganda.

In another, profounder sense, however, Marx found it impossible to regard any country as his home, once he had learnt to read in the very soul of bourgeois society, with his divining eyes. The lot of genius in that social system is a long story, and it has given rise to the most varied opinions: from the innocent faith in God, which is the Philistine's and which prom-

ises final victory to all true genius, to Faust's melancholy reflection:

Those few who ever had a trace of it,
And in their folly hid it not;
Revealed their souls, their visions to the rabble:
The cross, the stake, have been their certain lot.

The historical method that owes its development to Marx permits us to see more deeply in this field too. The Philistine promises every genius a final victory, simply because he is a Philistine; but whenever a real genius has not been crucified or burnt at the stake, it has simply been because the genius finally consented to become a Philistine. Had they not been attached by their bourgeois wigs to the social system of their time, Goethe and Hegel would never have become recognized "great men" of bourgeois society.

Whatever may be the merits of bourgeois society, which, in this connection, must be regarded only as the most developed form of class system, and however numerous these merits may be, it certainly cannot be said that this society ever afforded a safe refuge for genius. And it would be impossible for bourgeois society to play this part, for the very nature of genius implies the opposition of the creative impulse of an unfettered human spirit, to established tradition, and colliding with the barriers that are necessary to the existence of class society. There is a little lonely churchyard on the island of Sylt, in the North Sea, and it harbors the unknown dead washed ashore by the waves, and the cross standing in the churchyard bears the inscription: "The cross of Golgatha is a home to the homeless." To be sure it was not intended in this inscription to indicate the lot of genius in a class-ruled society, yet the fact has been well-stated in these words: Genius is homeless in the class system; in such a system its home is only on the cross of Golgatha.

Of course, the case is altered if genius can come to some agreement with class society. Whenever it has placed its

services at the disposal of the bourgeois, in order to overthrow feudal society, genius has acquired an immense power, which has always disappeared, however, as soon as genius has undertaken to act on its own authority: the rock of St. Helena has then been its asylum. Or, if genius consents to don the frock coat of the Philistine, it may rise to the position of a Grand-Ducal Saxon Minister of State at Weimar, or a Professor at the Royal Prussian University of Berlin. But unhappy is the lot of the genius who, in proud independence and inaccessibility, opposes bourgeois society, prophesying its downfall on the basis of its own inner structure, forging the weapons which are to inflict a death-blow on this society. For such a genius, bourgeois society has only racks and tortures, which may, to be sure, seem less savage to the external eye than the crucifixion of the ancient world and the *auto da fè* of medieval society, but are in reality much more cruel.

Of all the geniuses of the 19th century, none suffered so cruelly under the tortures of this lot than Karl Marx, the most inspired of them all. He was obliged to struggle with the sordid cares of daily life even in the very first decade of his public activity, and when he settled in London he entered upon the life of an exile with its worst burdens, but his truly Promethean lot cannot be said to have begun until, after a painful ascent to his prime, in the full flourish of his manly energy, he was daily assailed by the petty troubles of life, by the depressing worries as to his daily bread: and this lasted for years and for decades! Up to the day of his death he did not succeed in establishing himself in the domain of bourgeois society, even in the most rudimentary sense.

And yet, his mode of life was far removed from what a Philistine may be inclined to term, in the generally accepted disreputable sense of the word, "the life of a genius." His diligence was as tremendous as his strength: early in life his iron constitution began to be undermined by the excessive labors of his days and nights. Incapacity for labor he considered to be the death-sentence of any man that was more than an animal, and he meant these words in dead earnest: once, having

been seriously ill for several weeks, he wrote to Engels: "These days, being completely unfit for work, I have read the following: Carpenter's Physiology, Lord's ditto, Kölliker's Theory of Tissues, Spurzheim's Anatomy of the Brain and Nervous System, and Schwann and Schleiden's *Zellenschmiere*." And in spite of all his eagerness for study, Marx remained ever mindful of his own statement, made when he was still a young man, that a writer must never work in order to make money, but that he must make money in order to be able to work; Marx never underestimated the "imperative necessity of earning one's living."

But all his exertions were of no avail against the suspicions, the hatred, or, in the most favorable case, the fears, of a hostile world. Even those German publishers who wished to emphasize their independence were afraid of the name of this disreputable demagogue. All German parties alike slandered him, and whenever the clear outlines of his position forced their way through the mists of deception, it was killed by the malicious treachery of systematic silence. Never has a nation been so completely and for so long a period deprived of a knowledge of its greatest thinker.

The only connection that might have enabled Marx to secure a comparatively firm footing in London was his work as a contributor to the New York Tribune, which covered a full decade, beginning in 1851. The Tribune, with its 200,000 readers, was then the wealthiest and most widely circulated newspaper of the United States, and, through its agitation in favor of American Fourierism, it had at least raised itself above the level of mere capitalistic money-making. And the conditions under which Marx was to work for the Tribune were not exactly unfavorable; he was to write two articles a week and to get ten dollars for each article. This would have meant an annual income of \$1000, which would just about have enabled Marx to keep his head above water in London. Freiligrath, who went so far as to boast that he was eating the "beefsteak of exile" in London, was not at first better paid for his business activity.

And of course, no difficulty was raised as to the question whether the fee received by Marx from the American paper corresponded to the literary and scientific value of his contributions. A capitalist newspaper calculates on market prices, and in bourgeois society it has every right to do so. Marx never required more than this, but he might reasonably have asked, even in bourgeois society, a fulfilment of the terms of the contract once made, and perhaps also some degree of deference for his work. But the Tribune and its publisher showed not a trace of these qualities. Theoretically, to be sure, Dana was a Fourierist, but practically he was a hardheaded Yankee; his socialism, according to an angry declaration of Engels, amounted simply to the lousiest petty bourgeois cheating. Although Dana knew very well how valuable a contributor Marx was and made liberal use of Marx's name to his subscribers, whenever he did not print Marx's letters as the products of his own editorial activity—and this occurred rather often and never failed to arouse Marx's righteous indignation—he made use of every manner of brutality to which a capitalist can resort in his relations with a source of labor-power that he is exploiting.

He not only reduced Marx to half pay whenever business was low, but actually only paid for those articles which he really printed, and had the effrontery to throw into his waste-paper basket everything that did not suit his momentary purpose. For three weeks, for six weeks, in succession, Marx's compositions would take this course. To be sure, the few German newspapers in whose columns Marx's contributions found temporary asylum, such as the Wiener Presse, did not treat him better. He was therefore absolutely correct in his statement that in newspaper work he fared worse than any space-writer.

Already in 1853 he longed for a few months of solitude, to devote to learned investigation. "It seems as if I cannot have it. All this newspaper scribbling bores me. It takes away much of my time, distracts me, and what does it amount to, after all? Be as independent as you like: you are bound to

your paper and to its readers, especially if you are paid in cash, as I am. Purely scientific studies are quite a different matter." And how much more savage were Marx's exclamations after he had worked for several additional years under Dana's gentle sway: "It is in truth disgusting to be condemned to regard it as a piece of good fortune to be printed in such a rotten sheet. Breaking bones, grinding them, and making soup of them, like the paupers in the workhouse, that is all that your political work, of which you get more than you want in such a business, amounts to." Not only in his scanty sustenance, but particularly in the absolute insecurity of his entire existence, Marx fully shared the lot of the modern proletariat.

Things of which we formerly had only the most general notions are shown with the most heartrending clearness in his letters to Engels; he once had to remain indoors because he had neither shoes nor a coat suitable for street wear; another time, he lacked the few pence necessary to buy writing-paper or a newspaper to read; on a third occasion he describes his hunt for a few postage-stamps to mail a manuscript to a publisher. And then, the eternal quarrels with the tradesmen, whom he could not pay for the most necessary foodstuffs, not to mention the landlord, who was threatening at any moment to send the sheriff into his quarters, and his constant recourse to the pawnshops, whose usurious interest rates would destroy the last remnants of cash that might have banished the phantom of care from his threshold.

Dame Care not only sat on his threshold, but had even come in to share his board. His highminded wife, who had been accustomed from early childhood to a life that was free from care, could not but waver under the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, and wish that she and her children might be in their graves. In his letters there is no lack of traces of domestic scenes, and occasionally he says that there is no greater folly possible for people of social tendencies than to get married and thus hand themselves over to the petty cares of private life. But whenever her complaints would make him impatient, he had words of excuse and justification for

her; her sufferings from the indescribable humiliations, tortures, and terrors, which were connected with their position, must be much greater than his, especially since she has not the possibility of seeking refuge in the realm of science, which often serves him as an asylum. It was very hard for both parents to see their children deprived of the innocent joys of youth.

Sad as this lot of a great spirit may seem, it rises to truly tragic eminence by reason of the fact that Marx voluntarily assumed these decade-long torturing burdens, and rejected every temptation to seek refuge in the haven of some bourgeois calling, which he might have sought with every justification. All that was to be said on this matter, he said simply and plainly, without any high-sounding words: "I must pursue my purpose through thick and thin, and dare not permit bourgeois society to transform me into a money-making machine." This Prometheus was not fettered to the rock by the bolts of Hephæstos, but by his own iron will, which was directed toward the highest goals of humanity with the certainty of a magnetic needle. His whole character is that of tempered steel. There is nothing more marvelous than to find him, in the same letter in which he seems depressed by the most sordid wretchedness, suddenly rebounding with magnificent elasticity and turning with the detached calm of a sage to a discussion of the most difficult problems, with not a furrow on his brow.

But we must not forget that Marx felt the blows inflicted on him by bourgeois society. It would be a stupid stoicism to declare: What are such tortures as Marx suffered, to a genius who must wait for the approval of posterity? Silly as is the vanity of the literateur who is not happy unless he finds his name in the papers at least once a day, it is nevertheless a necessity to a man of really creative force to find a field large enough for the unfolding of his energy, and to draw new strength for further labors, from the echo that responds to his efforts. Marx was no mewling and puking ascetic, such as may be found in cheap plays and novels, but a lover of the world, like Lessing, and he was quite familiar with the mood

expressed by the dying Lessing when he wrote to the oldest friend of his youth: "I do not believe you have the impression that I am a man in any way hungry for praise. But the coldness which the world shows to certain people, in order to teach them that nothing they do is acceptable to it, is at least numbing, if not destructive." Just before he reached the age of fifty, Marx wrote, with the same bitterness: "Half a century on my back, and still a pauper!" Once he wished himself to lie a hundred fathoms under the ground rather than continue to vegetate in this manner. Once, a desperate cry bursts from his heart: he would not desire his worst enemy to wade through the swamp in which he has been stuck for eight months, infuriated by watching his intellect being neutralized and his power for work undermined by all sorts of bagatelles.

Marx did not, to be sure, become "a cursed dog of sadness" through all this, as he occasionally remarks, with irony, and Engels speaks the truth when he says that his friend never gave up the ship. But, although Marx loved to call himself a hard man, there is no doubt that in the furnace of misfortune he was hammered harder and harder. The clear sky that was spread over the labors of his youth became overcast with heavy thunderclouds as time went on, and from these his ideas sprang forth like lightning, his verdicts on his enemies, frequently also on his friends, assumed an incisive sharpness, which injured even those whose spirits were not weak.

Those who would therefore call him a cold and icy demagogue are no less—but we must admit, no more—mistaken than those nice subaltern spirits who behold in this mighty champion only the shining puppet of the parade-ground.

Economic and Menshevik Determinism

By MAURICE BLUMLEIN

II.

Historic Inevitability

All the conditions and changes that have been referred to are reducible to two factors: the material conditions on the one hand and the mental attitude, understanding and interpretation corresponding to them and growing out of them, or as Marx has put it, "the material world transformed by mental assimilation."

Human action is *governed by two limitations*:

1. Objectively, by the inherent nature of things and physical conditions and their laws;
2. Subjectively, by those of the possibilities in nature which we are able to perceive, or of whose presence we are aware. The mere fact that a possibility exists does not make it available until we awaken to a realization of its existence.

The former is absolute, it is the limitation of human development not at a given time and place, but for any and all times. It belongs to the sphere of philosophy and metaphysics which treats of human activity according to its potential possibilities, and seeks to define the abstract theoretical boundary of human possibilities. The fact, for instance, that we cannot conceive of anything that is infinite but can deal only with things that are finite, is a case of this character.

But while the principles underlying human development can be dealt with in this abstract form, the development itself is a concrete historical process. "Man makes his own history but he does not make it out of whole cloth; he does not make it out of conditions chosen by himself, but out of such as he finds close at hand." His progress is based on conditions that

are *given* and his understanding of them; his action is determined and guided accordingly.

Furthermore, where the material conditions are the same in one case as in another, it does not imply of necessity that the history of the one must be the same as that of the other. For if this identity of conditions does not meet with a similar identity of mental interpretation, the course of action will be different, just as different individuals under the same set of conditions may do entirely different things.

The change from feudalism to capitalism in Japan for instance, was an entirely different process than in the case of England or France, and took an incomparably shorter time, for Japan was in a position to borrow and incorporate the industrial development of the western nations. "Had the Japanese been compelled to develop the stage of western civilization independently it would have taken surely hundreds of years, not to mention thousands, whereas they have done this in a few decades, just as they assimilated the civilization of China previously."

On the other hand, England was a pioneer in capitalist development, and under such conditions the rate of progress is necessarily slower. It is necessary to experiment, to try many ways before finding the best one, to make errors in order to know that they are errors, thus doing often the wrong thing in order to find the right way in the end; in short, it is the method of progress from the known to the unknown.

Japan was in a position to borrow the mental equipment of the western nations whereas the latter had to solve a similar situation with inferior knowledge. Under such circumstances, History is not a duplication of processes, it is evolution by a different path, and a shorter one. The changes which were historically inevitable in the case of the western nations, did not have to be adopted in Japan by repetition; she was in position to meet the same situation materially, with a superior capacity mentally.

Historic inevitability does not mean therefore that similar material conditions must lead to identical views, or must be

dealt with in the same manner. It does mean this, however,—that whatever the possibilities of a situation may be objectively the choice of action is limited to those of the possibilities which a society is in a position to grasp according to its mental capacity and development, and that what it does not perceive is as good as non-existent for the time being. That is the real significance of historic inevitability as distinct from fatalism which pre-determines a single unalterable course of action irrespective of all subjective possibilities; the fatalist point of view is hopelessly inadequate, in consequence, to explain why the same conditions do not always lead to the same results.

ECONOMIC DETERMINISM

All that has been stated under the heading of historic inevitability is just as true of economic determinism, but with this addition: the latter not only accepts and regards the mental development and understanding as an essential cause contributing to social results and conditions but goes still further by explaining that the mental stage is itself the result of previous material conditions of which it was the outgrowth. Thus we conceive of each mental stage not only as the cause of what follows, but as the result of what preceded. For each one is born in an environment, not of his own choosing, to which he must react and in which he must reach a certain maturity; he may then as the product of one environment, influence another. In short, economic determinism treats not alone of causes, but of the causes for causes in a continuous chain, which then constitutes a connected interpretation covering the entire sphere of history.

In this sense, therefore, the class struggle is a necessary result and a necessary cause; not as an eternal condition, however, but *only so long as society saw no other path of progress than by class struggles*, in other words, only just so long as our mental development did not enable us to diagnose the presence and nature of classes and class-antagonisms, and by finding their causes, remove them.

This diagnosis was made possible not alone by the mate-

rial of history, but also by the discovery of mental methods and processes in the field of philosophy and science. Class struggles have made up the entire period of known history, yet it was only in the nineteenth century that the class diagnosis was made. History presented the symptoms and indications, and continued to do so with ever greater emphasis and incisiveness, until the "pressure and more pressure penetrated to the consciousness" just as the continued presence and recurrence of disease in the human body led to medical science and its cures.

This development of the human understanding to the point where it could grasp the nature of social factors and entities, so as to be able ultimately to control them, is the accumulated result of many centuries and many minds. First it was necessary to make human reason a perfect instrument of observation; this made possible the accumulation of natural and historical material of perfect accuracy and universal reliability, i. e., scientific material. This took up to the time of the French Revolution and reached a practical result in the exact and natural sciences.

"But this method has left us as a legacy the habit of observing objects and processes . . . in repose not in motion, as constants not as essentially variables, in their death not in their life." The addition of the dialectic method of reasoning discovered by Hegel, and perfected and applied by Marx made possible not only the perfect observation of things in repose, but of things in motion, of forces and their underlying principles, and consequently of social evolution. This mental development was accomplished simultaneously with the rise in human society of a permanent industrial proletariat, and resulted in a diagnosis of permanent causes and permanent remedies of social classes and class struggles.

Ever since the time of the Communist Manifesto the mental impediments to the abolition of the class system has tended to disappear, in proportion as the working mass learnt the message of final social liberation. When to the power of the worker is added the knowledge or consciousness of his

class relation, this combination of knowledge and power in the hands of the mass means the vanishing point of progress by class control and class interests.

Had this knowledge been possible a thousand years ago there is no reason why the class system could not have been permanently dispensed with at the time of such realization. In other words whenever the producing class is able to analyze its class condition and social evolution, when society can thereby really master the forces of production so as to fully control them and no longer to be driven by them, it means that production will be operated and society's affairs conducted by one class, i. e., there will be no classes. This realization might have been possible (so far as the objective factors are concerned) at any period of history from the time of the first class system.

However, the abolition of classes is not absolutely necessary at any and all stages of the class system. Under ancient slavery, under feudalism, and under early bourgeois capitalism, there were periods of general well-being, and not until each stage led to a condition of oppression did the material conditions indicate the inevitable necessity of a change. The producing mass then rebels against the conditions of ownership *as it sees them*, and the new system then corresponds to this understanding of cause and remedy. But each time such a change is made, it is accomplished under the impression that the oppression of ownership has been disposed of, not in favor of a new oppression, but permanently. In other words, the world has all along been seeking the freedom of a one-class society, only to find that it is deceiving itself each time that it thinks that it has found it. The aspiration has remained unfulfilled because the mentally indispensable factors were not yet present.

The final acute indication of the need of removing class production is the presence of a permanent proletariat. Just as fever in the human body means that there is something radically wrong, so the existence of a proletariat is a specific indication that there is a dangerously unhealthy condition of

society which cannot last. Where the proletariat is transient, that is to say, where it disappears by a change of class relations, the class system is again made tolerable for a time instead of being abolished. The first two proletarian situations, that of the Roman proletariat and the agricultural proletariat, were solved in this manner. But no class system can be made healthy by merely trying to maintain and perpetuate proletarian conditions. It is doomed the moment that the necessary mental equipment is placed in the hands of society.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

That the Russian people are ready mentally for a system without class-rule can hardly be questioned; that is the message of the Revolution.

Therefore we come to the final point of our problem: Why do the Mensheviks say that the material conditions are not yet ripe for the Social Revolution?

They contend that Russia has a big agricultural proletariat but a proportionately small industrial proletariat, that further industrialization under the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is still necessary so as to reach the stage arrived at in the advanced nations, such as England, Germany, etc.

But why must a big or preponderating portion of the country be industrialized? Because it brings the workers together, makes them a homogeneous unit, and enables them to become conscious of their relation to each other as members of a class. In other words, it is the instrumentality by which the mental equipment and message of Marx and Engels is conveyed to the masses. The average individual cannot acquire a knowledge of socialist philosophy by analysis and abstract thought, and if that were the only way in which the emancipation could take place, it might never occur.

But the worker learns these things very concretely. "Pressure and more pressure until the cause penetrates to the consciousness."

Nevertheless, if industrialization heretofore has served the

purpose of developing mental consciousness by exerting pressure intensively and extensively, it is also true that the Russians have arrived at that condition of mind already, so that the Bourgeoisie could only give them what they had attained previously, besides handing them a number of other things which the workers would rather not have.

Moreover, there is a very good reason why Russia does not need the same degree of industrial development as the western nations in order to become a revolutionary mass. The industry that has been introduced came at a late stage, is on a big scale, and did not have to be built up from small beginnings. In other words, the Russians, just as in the case of the Japanese, adopted the completed result that it took the other nations a much longer time to find by experimentation and pioneer work, and together with it they similarly adopted the philosophy and economics of Socialism.

Therefore a much smaller proportion of industry in Russia was able to furnish a much larger proportion of revolutionary understanding than in the nations where these processes first occurred. Russia, consequently, does not have to run through the whole gamut of class relations. What was historically inevitable in the pioneer nations, namely a high degree of industrialization and pressure by concentration, does not mean that similar prolongation of agony must be duplicated in Russia. For while history is a repetition of the application of certain principles and laws, the manner in which this takes place is not a duplication, but varies with our mental capacity.

No wonder, therefore, that the Russian people could not accept the dictum of the Mensheviks to continue to crucify themselves until some later, more suitable time. What on earth the Bourgeoisie was to do for them under such circumstances had better be left to a bourgeois social scientist to explain rather than to a revolutionary socialist.

At the time of the French Revolution the Bourgeoisie at least did a real service to society. It was not only a basic factor in abolishing feudal privilege, but it also had a constructive program

and gave to society a one-class arrangement with relative freedom; moreover, it must be borne in mind that an industrial proletariat did not yet exist, that there was only an agricultural proletariat. Marx said as late as 1848: "It is quite evident and equally borne out by the history of all modern countries, that the agricultural population, in consequence of its dispersion over a great space, and of the difficulty of bringing about an agreement among any considerable portion of it, can never attempt a successful independent movement; they require the initiatory impulse of the more concentrated, more enlightened, more easily moved people of the towns." Thus the motive force of the French Revolution was furnished by the physical power of the exploited peasantry under the leadership of the bourgeoisie of the cities.

The fact that the middle-class ideal proved eventually to be a transient makeshift, does not affect its validity in the case of the pioneer nations. Nor does it seem possible to deny that the middle-class form is better suited than any other to small-scale production; had production not progressed beyond that stage, the personal union of earning and owning in each individual might have remained the best solution.

As the Russian Bourgeoisie can no longer fulfill any such useful functions today, the only thing that it could accomplish would be to develop a revolutionary consciousness where it already existed, and at the same time try its best to preserve the class system as long as possible, a task which it will at all times take up without requiring any special encouragement.

It is contended, also, that we cannot abolish class control until it shall have reached a stage where it is no longer able to fulfill the function of production; in other words when the stage is reached that the forces of production become so great that the maintenance of class relations can be preserved only by limiting production. When such a condition has been reached it is then conceded by the Menshevik scientist that the overthrow of class rule becomes necessary, that this is economically sound because

the one-class system will then be more productive since it does away with a system of production based on artificial curtailment.

This interpretation sins in overlooking the fact that when the capitalist class is forced to limit production, it does not see the error of its ways and abdicates; it is then in a situation where the world is too small for all the bourgeois groups or nations; this ends the international harmony of the Bourgeoisie and splits it into two contending forces. Each of these will attempt to avoid the need of limiting production at home by expanding the outlet abroad; each will aim to maintain the condition of its further existence at the expense of the other, by the defeat of the competing group so as to attain world domination, i. e., the largest possible sphere for the distribution of its products and its capital. And after that they would have nothing better to offer than to play the same game over again from the beginning, by another splitting up and another era of military glory.

Besides in this process of self-preservation, by splitting the Bourgeois world into two camps, the forces of society are employed destructively on a maximum scale, so that during the contest itself the forces of production are engaged to their fullest capacity. Thus instead of abdication on account of limitation of the forces of production, we get war and the fullest expansion of production.

Furthermore, Socialism, when it is installed, will not be automatically more productive than capitalism, but will have to use its forces for protection in order to defend itself against capitalism invading from without, with its forces of production fully employed and organized to destroy the Socialist state. In the course of this struggle, too, the capitalist state will not be undermined by compulsory limitation of production.

Another contention to be dealt with is that as Russia still consists of many small units of production and few large ones, the conditions for social ownership and operation are not yet present. This means that there is still a good-sized middle class in Russia and a small-sized big-capitalist class. But here as elsewhere the middle class has been ground into impotence between the upper

millstone of modern big capital and the nether millstone of an industrial proletariat with a constructive program. No middle class anywhere can offer even a temporary solution at this late date; for it is a declining class, and cannot perform a socially useful function, as it did in days gone by before production on a large scale by big capital had taken the lead, and also before a permanent industrial proletariat was fully developed and had become conscious of its destiny of social emancipation. The middle-class principle and middle-class ideals are utterly unsocial and useless to-day, quite irrespective of the industrial stage or degree of development.

Presumably, the Menshevik position, therefore, is that the proletariat should perform the role of watchful waiting while the big capitalist class wipes out small capitalist production; for only after this has taken place in the emancipation of society by the proletariat indicated according to the inevitable laws of economic science. Apparently that means that the highest form of production must be introduced by the Bourgeoisie and cannot be installed by any other agency. If that is the inference, nothing could be further from the truth. The biggest enterprises of late have grown altogether beyond the capacity of privately owned capital and have been undertaken by the political state, with the backing not of individual capitalists but of the nation as a whole. The Panama Canal is a shining example, but since then, in the course of the war period, cases of this kind are sufficiently frequent not to require detailed enumeration.

It is not clear, therefore, why the Russian proletariat should lengthen the time of its industrial slavery *as a means of social emancipation*. The abolition of private ownership of social property, the abolition of the class control of industry and production *should be the means of* installing the biggest and best forms of production and distribution by the industrial state. And this will then be done by a one-class government instead of by mass agony. The state will have to perform the work that was done elsewhere by the big capitalist class, and it will do this much more quickly and thoroughly

by borrowing the equipment of the other advanced nations, if not betrayed previously by the world proletariat.

This same new application of an old principle is equally true for all backward nations and colonies. They must abolish class rule as a means of installing big-scale production and distribution, and not attempt to wait for the introduction of big-scale industry as a means of abolishing class rule. Even Lenin goes too far when he says that a revolutionary government can support national movements in backward countries, and in colonies against the mother country. If these movements are in favor of bourgeois supremacy they ought not to be supported by the Social Revolution because it would be strengthening the forces and institutions in those same spheres, that will then fight the Revolution itself. The backward countries and the colonies need the most improved form of production, but they do not need a bourgeois form of exploitation for that purpose. Marx, in 1852, writing about the Revolution of 1848, urged the proletariat to support the Bourgeoisie as a means of overthrowing the feudal government of Germany. But with the uncanny keenness that he possessed to such a rare degree, he adds, "the preparation of such a movement otherwise than by spreading of Communist opinions by the masses, could not be the object, etc."

Incidentally the most extreme Menshevik must admit that should the Social Revolution come in the way that he himself claims to be indispensable, production will not cease to improve from that point on, but an ever growing productivity will be the basis of social progress the same as before. And unless this be denied, it amounts to a concession that progress by a one-class system ought to be just as feasible as under class rule. Russia of course must develop fully the stage of industrial production as it represents a superior development, but it is a "consummation devoutly to be wished" that this will be accomplished not through a bourgeois nightmare but by the one-class state.

Finally there is also an international objection to the wisdom of a social revolution in Russia at this time, and again

based on the economic factor. It is feared that Russia with her inferior productive capacity, at least at the beginning of the Revolution if not later, must easily succumb to the counter-revolutionary power of the international Bourgeoisie. It is perfectly true that a united Bourgeoisie can crush the Russian Revolution, not because of its inferior productive capacity, but entirely irrespective of it.

It is not a question of insufficient productivity and productive capacity, for that does not decrease through Revolution, but is plainly the consequence of former conditions of reaction. Therefore, if we are not to deceive ourselves by sophisticated economics we must realize that an isolated proletariat cannot withstand the counter-revolution indefinitely; the isolation must be broken or the Revolution will break down. The Revolution isn't asking the outside world to perform its production, it only wants a chance to do its own producing in its own way without interference, not to mention the most venomous sort of interference at that.

Thus we must find that the Menshevik diagnosis, in spite of the profound scientific standard that it claims, sins

(1) in transferring historic inevitability intact from one place to another,

(2) and thereby incorporating in economic determinism not only the stage of production, but also the human agency, the Bourgeoisie. It thus also makes of history and historical necessity, a duplication instead of an evolution. That Russia must undergo the same progress in production as the Bourgeoisie has accomplished in the economically advanced nations is perfectly true, but that this must be done by duplication so far as the agency is concerned, is not true. For this does not come under economic determinism but is merely the subjective determination of the individual Menshevik.

The Principles of Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship

By LEON TROTSKY

As Marxists, we have never been idol-worshippers of formal democracy. In a society of classes, democratic institutions not only do not eliminate class struggle, but also give to class interests an utterly imperfect expression. The propertied classes always have at their disposal tens and hundreds of means for falsifying, subverting and violating the will of the toilers. And democratic institutions become a still less perfect medium for the expression of the class struggle under revolutionary circumstances. Marx called revolutions "the locomotives of history." Owing to the open and direct struggle for power, the working people acquire much political experience in a short time and pass rapidly from one stage to the next in their development. The ponderous machinery of democratic institutions lags behind this evolution all the more, the bigger the country and the less perfect its technical apparatus.

The majority in the Constituent Assembly proved to be Social Revolutionists, and, according to parliamentary rules of procedure, the control of the government belonged to them. But the party of Right Social Revolutionists had a chance to acquire control during the entire pre-October period of the revolution. Yet, they avoided the responsibilities of government, leaving the lion's share of it to the liberal bourgeoisie. By this very course the Right Social Revolutionists lost the last vestiges of their influence with the revolutionary elements by the time the numerical composition of the Constituent Assembly formally obliged them to form a government. The working class, as well as the Red Guards, were very hostile to the party of Right Social Revolutionists. The vast majority of soldiers supported the Bolsheviks. The revolutionary element in the provinces divided their sympathies between the Left Social Revolutionists and the Bolsheviks. The

sailors, who had played such an important role in revolutionary events, were almost unanimously on our side. The Right Social Revolutionists, moreover, had to leave the Soviets, which in October—that is, before the convocation of the Constituent Assembly—had taken the government into their own hands. On whom, then, could a ministry formed by the Constituent Assembly's majority depend for support? It would be backed by the upper classes in the provinces, the intellectuals, the government officials, and temporarily by the bourgeoisie on the Right. But such a government would lack all the material means of administration. At such a political center as Petrograd, it would encounter irresistible opposition from the very start. If under these circumstances the Soviets, submitting to the formal logic of democratic conventions, had turned the government over to the party of Kerensky and Chernov, such a government, compromised and debilitated as it was, would only introduce temporary confusion into the political life of the country, and would be overthrown by a new uprising in a few weeks. The Soviets decided to reduce this belated historical experiment to its lowest terms, and dissolved the Constituent Assembly the very first day it met.

For this, our party has been most severely censured. The dispersal of the Constituent Assembly has also created a decidedly unfavorable impression among the leading circles of the European Socialist parties. Kautsky has explained, in a series of articles written with his characteristic pedantry, the interrelation existing between the Social-Revolutionary problems of the proletariat and the regime of political democracy. He tries to prove that for the working class it is always expedient, in the long run, to preserve the essential elements of the democratic order. This is, of course, true as a general rule. But Kautsky has reduced this historical truth to professorial banality. If, in the final analysis, it is to the advantage of the proletariat to introduce its class struggle and even its dictatorship, through the channels of democratic institutions, it does not at all follow that history always affords it the opportunity for attaining this happy consummation. There is noth-

ing in the Marxian theory to warrant the deduction that history always creates such conditions as are most "favorable" to the proletariat.

It is difficult to tell now how the course of the Revolution would have run if the Constituent Assembly had been convoked in its second or third month. It is quite probable that the then dominant Social Revolutionary and Menshevik parties would have compromised themselves, together with the Constituent Assembly, in the eyes of not only the more active elements supporting the Soviets, but also of the more backward democratic masses, who might have been attached, through their expectations not to the side of the Soviets, but to that of the Constituent Assembly. Under such circumstances the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly might have led to new elections, in which the party of the Left could have secured a majority. But the course of events has been different. The elections for the Constituent Assembly occurred in the ninth month of the Revolution. By that time the class struggle had assumed such intensity that it broke the formal frames of democracy by sheer internal force.

The proletariat drew the army and the peasantry after it. These classes were in a state of direct and bitter war with the Right Social Revolutionists. This party, owing to the clumsy electoral democratic machinery, received a majority in the Constituent Assembly, reflecting the pre-October epoch of the revolution. The result was a contradiction which was absolutely irreducible within the limits of formal democracy. And only political pedants who do not take into account the revolutionary logic of class relations, can, in the face of the post-October situation, deliver futile lectures to the proletariat on the benefits and advantages of democracy for the cause of the class struggle.

The question was put by history far more concretely and sharply. The Constituent Assembly, owing to the character of its majority, was bound to turn over the government to the Chernov, Kerensky and Tseretelli group. Could this group have guided the destinies of the Revolution? Could it

have found support in that class which constitutes the backbone of the Revolution? No. The real kernel of the class revolution has come into irreconcilable conflict with its democratic shell. By this situation the fate of the Constituent Assembly had been sealed. Its dissolution became the only possible surgical remedy for the contradiction, which had been created, not by us, but by all the preceding course of events.

The National Constituent Assembly*

By KARL KAUTSKY

Four great problems confront the government brought in by the revolution. The first is the conclusion of peace and bringing about of normal intercourse with the other countries. Second, making certain of the supply of food. Third, the rebuilding of the government machinery so as to make it suitable for a Socialist method of production. And lastly, the controlling of the steps of reconstruction, which is subdivided into the change from a war to a peace basis, and the transition from a capitalist to a socialist society.

This formulation of our problems is rejected by many revolutionists as being "philistine" and even "bourgeois." They demand that the revolution be carried still further.

It is not quite clear what is meant by this very loose expression. Do they imply by the word "Revolution" that the present government must be overthrown? Who is to overthrow it, what is to replace it? The present government is composed of both the great Socialist parties of Germany. We will not here investigate as to who is to bear the blame for the split.

That this weakens the German proletariat at this very crucial movement, at a time when it needs all its strength to hold its own, will not be denied by the intelligent of either party. The

* See: Editorial "The National Constituent Assembly."

co-operation of the two parties, while not an ideal state, is the only condition that makes a Socialist government possible under the given circumstances. Every attempt to overthrow this compromise government only sets one part of the proletariat in opposition to the other, thus making the strength of the entire proletariat impotent, and making sure the victory of the counter-revolutionists; just as in 1794, when the quarrels between Hebert, Danton and Robespierre sealed the downfall of the party of the Mountain and the victory of the bourgeoisie.

However, the demand to carry the revolution still further may, in another sense, be interpreted as not being altogether inimical to the present government. It would certainly be disastrous should the working-class masses begin to believe that now everything is as it should be and the government will provide all necessities of life. But there need be no fear that they will go to sleep again. Even if there should be such a danger, it would be counter-acted by our opponents. Their first shock is over, they are beginning to rally and use the new freedom for their own advantage. By no means should any one hinder them in this. The urgent need rests upon us, however, of meeting their activity, their work of agitation and organization with ours, to use the general awakening of the masses so as to win them over to our aims. The mass of the proletariat and also groups of the petty-bourgeoisie and intellectuals had a close interest in Socialism. Why many of them did not join us, was merely because they doubted our power. They voted for the Centrists, Liberals, National-Liberals and Conservatives not because their programme appealed to them more, but because they believed in their power. Now that we have gotten the power into our hands many of these blind ones have begun to see clearly. They will now believe in us, and work with us, if we give them an opportunity to join us in our activity.

And because the belief in our power means so much to so many unenlightened members of the lower strata, I do not see such an advantage, as many of my friends do, in postponing the gathering of the Constituent Assembly. Their belief in our power cannot increase with further delay. It may rather de-

crease, as soon as the shock, caused by the unheard of cataclysm begins to abate. The champions of the delay count upon the lesson to the masses from the practical application of Socialism. But we cannot work by magic. We may speed the work of nationalizing production, but a decided improvement in the welfare of the masses will first be possible when we succeed by advanced nationalization to increase the productivity of society's work. This may require one or two years. But it is just these unenlightened masses, whose support is most important, that expect Socialism to make a paradise of this earth tomorrow. Not to call the National Assembly together until Socialism has by its accomplishments won over the doubtful ones, we cannot.

On the other hand, it is a lack of faith, absolutely beyond my comprehension, to fear that we are lost as soon as we place our programme before the public. I have complete confidence in its conquering power after the frightful sufferings of the past four years. Waiting will not enhance this power, but weaken it. It gives an impression of insincerity, of hesitation and lack of faith in one's own strength. And that is particularly bad where it is necessary to convert doubting, undecided elements. They wish to convene the National Assembly only after Socialist measures have been executed. How can they be carried out, however, with the present government machinery? And how will they bring this change uniformly and thoroughly throughout the country without a Constituent National Assembly?

For instance, one of the first measures will be the nationalization of coal mines. But how can this be done while the relation between Prussia and the rest of the country is not settled? Things cannot remain the way they are now. The coal mines must come under the ownership of the federal government, but the Prussian state must not be allowed to dispose of that question alone. On the other hand, can Lippe-Detmold nationalize anything? And how about the nationalization of the water power? Shall they come into the control of the states or the nation?

It is clear that the foundation of the new state must first be laid, before nationalization can be attempted in practice, not merely in decrees. First to establish government ownership and

control, and then the government, would mean to begin building the house at the roof. We were prevented from establishing a modern uniform government under capitalist rule, because of the maintenance of our two dozen kings and princes and the slavish servility of our bourgeoisie toward them. To build up the state, we must first clear away this mass of feudal rubbish, which hinders us from immediately undertaking the socialization of society with all our strength before calling together the National Constituent Assembly.

Naturally, much can be done and must be done immediately. But for the speedy establishment of truly thoroughgoing measures, the machinery of state must first be changed. The transformation of Germany into a democratic republic must not be confined to the disappearance of a few dynasties. It must penetrate the entire spirit of the government in all its details. And only a National Constituent Assembly can do this.

EDITORIALS

The name of Eugene V. Debs appears for the first time this month as one of our Editors.

Comrade Debs has accepted the invitation of *The Socialist Publication Society* to serve in this capacity, as he feels that he is in full accord with the policy of *The Class Struggle*.

"A World Safe for Democracy"

It is characteristic of the thoughtless carelessness with which political catchwords are accepted in this country that a people that went war-mad for democracy finds nothing to cavil in the fact that the issues of the war, and the peace terms that will decide the future history of the world, are being decided by three men, Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau. Aside from the fact that not one of these gentlemen can even pretend to represent the people of the nation that sent them.

Woodrow Wilson was elected "because he kept us out of war," against a Republican "Preparedness" candidate. In the recent Congressional elections the Democratic candidates for election and re-election to Congress met with unqualified defeat, in spite of the fact that the President pleaded for the return of a Democratic majority to Congress as a vote of confidence before the eyes of the world. The peace commission was appointed by the President without advice or ratification from any legally constituted body in the government of the country. The President left the United States with the peace commission without consulting with either of the two legislative bodies in Washington as to the peace terms to be demanded in the name of the people of the United States, aye, without even indicating the position that he, the representative of the great American democracy, would take at the Peace Conference.

To be sure, the Constitution provides that all terms of peace must receive the ratification of the Senate before they can be finally adopted. But not even the wildest flight of imagination

can conceive of a United States Senate, any considerable portion of which would refuse to sanction a treaty of peace, once it has been adopted by the peace plenipotentiaries of the great powers.

In France, there have been no national elections since before the beginning of the war, and its people have had no opportunity to give expression, either to the aims for which they were fighting or to their opinions on the terms of peace. Clemenceau represents France at the Peace Conference, not at the direction of the French people, but at the behest of a Cabinet that he himself has appointed, whose continued existence in power depends entirely upon his good will.

If by public opinion we mean the desires and demands of the ruling, capitalist class, then indeed Clemenceau may truly be said to represent the people of his nation. He outspokenly supports their lust for increased territory and power, and demands openly an opportunity for industrial rehabilitation by increased possibilities for exploitation.

Lloyd George, alone of the three, speaks with some semblance of authority for his nation: the people of England have just returned him to power with a big vote. But the official leader of Liberalism in England has long ago lost the support of all honestly liberal and progressive elements in England, and retained himself in power only by an affiliation with the reactionary Tory elements of the country against the most progressive spirits of his own party. Lloyd George sits at the Peace Table as the official spokesman of the ultra-capitalistic, ultra-jingoistic elements of the British nation.

He was chosen by a Cabinet that, with two exceptions, is made up of bred-in-the-bone Conservative Unionists. His co-delegates he chose from the same party.

The delegations from the other powers, from Japan and Italy, not to mention those smaller nations and national fragments whose fate hangs in the balance at Paris, have been definitely and openly relegated into the background. Their opinions carry no weight, their demands are completely ignored. The ideals of former days, "open diplomacy," "peace by negotiations," "self-

determination of small nations," and "international labor legislation," have given way for the struggle for world-domination.

To the superficial reader of the capitalist press of this country, it may seem as if the democratic ideas of the President were dominating the negotiations of the Peace Conference. As a matter of fact, Wilson appears in this role only because he has been willing to compromise on every issue, from the secret sessions of the Conference to the colonial question. *L'Humanité*, the French Majority Socialist newspaper, which has always belonged to the most ardent admirers of President Wilson and his policies, openly deplores his compromise, saying that the result justifies all the contentions of those who say that a war of capitalist states cannot end in a peace of the people. On the other hand, the French capitalistic press is equally dissatisfied. The *Echo de Paris* attacks Lloyd George for breaking with France, and accuses him of flirting with radical opinion in England. And herein lies the secret of Wilson's apparent domination of the Peace Conference. He who has succeeded in making his name the symbol of progressivism and radicalism in the countries of Europe, is being used to hide from the eyes of the restive masses of Europe the sordid motives, the capitalist interests, that are dominating every decision of the Conference.

And so, after all, not President Wilson, not the American people, but the revolutionary European proletariat holds in its hands the future of the world. The capitalist Peace Conference at Paris is laying the cornerstone for new national conflicts, new wars. The revolution of the proletariat of the world alone can achieve universal peace and international brotherhood.

L.

The Crime of Crimes

I was in the detention "coop" waiting for bail, after being arrested for agitation against conscription. In the room were a number of other criminals, their appearance a mixture of dejection, swagger and trembling apprehension. Two men—one was only a boy—had been convicted of selling cocaine;

the boy was himself a victim, and was in a terrible state, not because of being deprived of his liberty as such, but because that meant being deprived of his opportunity to use cocaine—unless he could secure it surreptitiously in prison. Another had been convicted of selling liquor to soldiers; still another for the crime of burglary. . . . An Assistant District Attorney had come in, and a friend of my co-criminal, Ralph Cheney, tried to make him see our crime in its true light as a political offense. But the D. A. wouldn't; he told us: "I sympathize with these other men here, they are ignorant and the victims of circumstances; but you—your crime is unforgiveable, since it is a conscious and wilful assault upon law and order." . . .

The crime of crimes is an assault upon the prevailing ideology, upon the prevailing social order, upon the supremacy of Capitalism. Ordinary crimes are considered normal, natural; they are not a menace to the prevailing system: on the contrary, they are a necessary phase of this system, a means for its preservation. The criminal against law and order is the ally of the criminal of law and order—a holy alliance characteristic of a society based on class divisions. But the political criminal is dangerous; and the loftier his purposes are, the greater becomes his danger to Capitalism.

It is natural, accordingly, that the political criminal should find no sympathy among the defenders of law and order. The ordinary criminal, naturally, is treated brutally, since brutality is inherent in the beast of Capital; but the political criminal is treated even more brutally, with a conscious and purposeful brutality—the brutality of the slave owner toward slaves in revolt. This is emphasized all the more, as the American Government recognizes no such thing as political crimes—a tactical necessity to prevent the development of class consciousness. The political criminal must endure all the ignominy of the ordinary criminal, plus. This refusal to recognize political crimes is a consequence of the illusions of democracy and strengthens these illusions.

Perhaps no belligerent government has been as savage

toward its political criminals as has the American Government—a fact blisteringly characterizing our democracy. All the evidence indicates that the Conscientious Objectors in this country have had infinitely more suffering and ignominy inflicted upon them than the Conscientious Objectors in England. Karl Liebknecht and William Dittmann urge the people in Berlin to open revolt, and are given sentences of four and a half and three and a half years; in New York City, four Russian men are given twenty years each, and one Russian girl fifteen years in prison, for issuing a leaflet declaring that President Wilson was a hypocrite in his policy on Russia. Fritz Adler in Austria assassinates Premier Sturgkh, and is given thirteen years in prison; Eugene V. Debs makes a speech, and is sentenced to ten years. Our political criminals are treated miserably, denied opportunity for free communication with their comrades; a revolutionary Socialist in Italy is convicted of treason, receives four years in prison, and while in prison edits the Socialist daily newspaper, *L'Avanti!*

All this is a consequence of the vicious and unparalleled repressive character of the Espionage Laws. Nowhere, not even in Germany, were the laws against freedom of expression as severe as in our Espionage Acts. These measures were passed to punish enemy espionage; but instead of being used against the enemy, they were most frequently and severely used against the Socialist and the radical. Is Germany or Socialism the real enemy of Capitalism and Imperialism? The crime of crimes was not espionage, but awakening the consciousness of the masses; and the Department of Justice acted accordingly.

The class character of political crimes is still more apparent in the cases of industrial agitation. The I. W. W. trial, with its savage verdict, clearly indicates that the assault upon the industrial supremacy of Capitalism is considered more dangerous than the assault upon morals. All the testimony proved that the I. W. W. defendants had been engaged in industrial agitation, in organizing strikes for

better conditions, in trying to use the conditions of the war precisely as they used the conditions of peace—to organize the struggle against Capitalism. Men and women in Italy are arrested for insurrectionary fighting in the streets of Milan and other cities, and are not punished as severely as these I. W. W.'s for organizing strikes to secure better conditions.

And all this savage repression, all this repudiation of democracy, proceeded simultaneously with the representatives of American Capitalism speaking of democracy in the loftiest strains of eloquence and poetry. A good part of the world was hypnotized—the United States are the great exemplars of democracy! And they are, since this democracy means bourgeois democracy, which is the authority of one class over another, the instrument for the repression of the proletariat. The more Capitalism develops, the more necessary becomes a deceptive development of the **forms** and **words** of democracy, that cloak the sinister interests of reaction.

Reparation is being demanded of Germany for its crimes against the world: the Socialist proletariat demands reparation of the real criminal—international Imperialism. The Socialist proletariat, moreover, demands reparation for the political criminals imprisoned or about to be imprisoned for their struggle to make America safe for democracy. The problem of the political criminals is an important one, since it means a hampering of the aggressive proletarian movement if our active and militant comrades are to be imprisoned and kept in prison. Socialism must adopt new forms of struggle, new means of agitation, as reaction conquers . . .

Immediately upon the conclusion of the armistice, there developed a movement to secure amnesty for political prisoners; there was even a rumor that amnesty would be granted political criminals by the President on New Year's day. But Woodrow Wilson is apparently too occupied with making Europe safe for democracy to devote any time to democracy in our own country. And, while political amnesty

was being agitated, it developed that the American Government had determined upon the policy of deporting every single agitator who was born in a foreign country, regardless of whether a citizen or how long he had been in this country, if this agitator was convicted of a political crime. This is a serious issue. The policy of deportation would enormously weaken our movement—it is the most important issue in our campaign for political prisoners.

The problem of political criminals is part and parcel of the general problems of the proletarian movement. Political amnesty must be secured, not by grace of the master class, but through the militant action of the proletarian movement. If, in Europe, political criminals are not dealt with as savagely as in this country, it is because the proletariat and Socialism are more conscious and aggressive—more revolutionary.

The issue must be made a working class issue, it must be used to develop the class action of the proletariat. The struggle in the courts is necessary, but not enough; the propaganda must be one of developing the industrial action of the working class, of using the industrial might of the workers to secure our demands. In this sense, the struggle for our imprisoned comrades becomes one phase of the larger struggle—the struggle for the Social Revolution.

Open the prison gates! On to Socialism! F.

Mexico and American Imperialism

While President Wilson in Europe indulges his favorite sport of promoting democracy *in words*—while preparing to accept fundamental Imperialism *in fact*—the sinister interests that skulked behind the ideology of the war are actively preparing to make the world safe for American Imperialism.

The war has ended America's "splendid isolation"—ended it, not because of democracy and for purposes of democracy, but because of Imperialism and for purposes of Imperialism.

The Capitalism of no belligerent nation—with the incidental exception of Japan—has profited the way American Capitalism has. Capitalism in Russia has been annihilated; Capitalism in Germany is on the verge of being annihilated; the Capitalism of Great Britain, France and Italy is staggering under a disastrous national debt, apprehensive of the approach of proletarian revolution, overwhelmed by the problems of resuming industrial and trade relations. American Capitalism alone is bloated, aggrandized, supreme. From a debtor nation, the United States has become a creditor nation, France and Italy being virtually its financial vassals; its Capitalism has monopolized the foreign markets of its beloved allies, while industry has been given a tremendous impetus, finance acquired a new vision, and Imperialism developed more savage appetites.

There was much criticism of President Wilson's "democratic" program; but it is now being made apparent to the critics that this "democracy" is the characteristic expression and necessity of American Imperialism. This, of course, alters the case; and while the peoples of Europe, who have been captivated by the words of democracy, are being prepared for a great deception, American Imperialism is preparing to satiate its appetites and acquire supremacy. . .

Mexico, which is considered by the imperialist as "our Balkans," is again appearing as the immediate objective of American Imperialism. The New York *Evening Sun* says editorially, in its issue of December 26:

"With his usual acumen and his familiar directness of speech, Colonel Roosevelt goes right to the point when he says that 'Mexico is our Balkan Peninsula. Some day we shall have to deal with it.'

"The letter of our correspondent, Mr. Gardner, gives one concrete reason why Colonel Roosevelt is right. The American owned company which he represents has over 2000 stockholders. Their money was invested in good faith in a legitimate industry. But, says Mr. Gardner, the property 'has been non-productive for the past five years,' owing to the lawlessness, banditry and Governmental incompetence, to use no harsher word, in Mexico. The rubber company's experience is but a small item among many, but it means an injury to thousands of our own people, as well as dangerous economic anarchy to the Mexican himself. Some day, as Colonel Roosevelt says, 'we shall have to deal with it.'"

The correspondent is D. H. Gardner, Vice-President of the Obispo Plantation Company, and the gist of his appeal is this:

"Lives have been sacrificed, property has been destroyed, industries abandoned and foreign capital appropriated or rendered unproductive, all to no purpose whatever, for Mexico appears to be utterly incompetent to establish for herself a stable Government or afford protection to life and property worth while. Is it not time for the peoples of other nations to take a hand for the good of Mexico herself, and is it not the plain duty of other Governments to see to it that money invested there by their subjects be properly protected and safeguarded in accordance with international law?"

Strange—international law has during the war been invoked against Germany for its invasion of Belgium; now it is invoked to justify an invasion of Mexico and its conquest—for that is precisely what the gentleman proposes. . .

Memory informs one that intervention in Mexico was proposed some years ago because that "unhappy country" was being "ravaged by revolution," and that revolution was a menace to all. But now the revolution is no more—revolutionary ideals have decayed and become maggots. The regime of Carranza, according to all reports, is a brutal one, using the utmost in violence against the workers and the peons, the methods of suppression used by American Capital at Ludlow, at McKees Rocks, at Passaic. The Mexican Government is a typical government of Capitalism, of bourgeois law and order. Accordingly, the American press, church and capital should praise, bless and encourage this government after their own heart. Why do they not? Because the Carranza Government insists that the larger share of the profits sweated out of the Mexican workers and peons should go into the pockets of the Mexican exploiters. The Carranza Government is trying to make Mexican Capitalism national and independent, instead of being a satrapy of international Imperialism. But this, clearly, means that foreign investors, particularly the innocent, religious and meek American investor, does not squeeze profits out of his investments as easily and plentifully as one squeezes juice out of an orange. "We shall have to deal with" Mexico!

The American Government, in April 1918, through Ambassador Fletcher, threatened the Mexican Government with action should it continue to impose control upon foreign capital. This apparently was unsuccessful—and armed intervention is being proposed in place of diplomatic intervention. Why—to protect capital, to insure profits, to make Mexico safe for American Imperialism, and then the world! All this, of course, is in the approved style of German Imperialism; but instead of stigmatizing “our” imperialists as being “pro-German,” they stigmatize Mexico. As a fact, all Imperialism, in one way or another, pursues the policy of the former predatory Germany.

The organizations of American Imperialism are making elaborate plans for imperialistic conquests, and using the government as an instrument of Imperialism—which means, ultimately, the blood of the American proletariat in new wars to make the world safe for —? In a recent issue of *The Nation*, William S. Kies, vice-president of the American International Corporation, a characteristic instrument of American Imperialism, says that “our” bankers should be free to make both political and non-political loans, and describes political loans as “loans carrying with them port or harbor concessions with powers of administration and the collection of charges; the granting of large areas of land for purposes of exploitation with complete power of control and government; the giving of franchises for the construction of important and strategic railways, conferring upon the lender complete control in the management and administration; and the granting of monopolistic privileges of various kinds.” This is Imperialism; this is precisely the policy pursued by the European nations that provoked the recent war; this is the policy characteristic of American Capitalism, and not the words of democracy perfervidly uttered by President Wilson. Thus is the policy each imperialistic nation will pursue, provoking new antagonisms and new wars.

But this is not all. While “our” peace delegates—Woodrow Wilson and his secretarial staff—speak beautifully about

self-determination of peoples in Europe, there is not even a murmur concerning self-determination for the peoples of Central America and the Caribbeans, prostrate under the iron heel of American Imperialism; instead, there is an aggressive campaign to impose “American determination” upon Mexico. Colombia, Nicaragua, Haiti, Santa Domingo—to say nothing of the Philippines—are all vassals of American Capital, their policy and destiny determined at Washington, D. C., U. S. A. These are the deeds of Imperialism that mock the words of democracy.

They speak much of the League of Nations of “free peoples”—but why not free the peoples of Central America, the Caribbeans and the Philippines? They speak much of a League of Nations, merging the national interest into the international—but has it been proposed that the United States shall abandon the Monroe Doctrine?

The Monroe Doctrine is the assertion of the supremacy of the national interests of the United States on the American continents; it is an implied and often actual threat to the independence of the American republics; it is the characteristic continental expression of “our” Imperialism. Its abandonment is a necessary requirement of any real League of Nations; but its abandonment would mean the abandonment of Imperialism—and that would mean the end of Capitalism and the coming of Socialism. But then, the League of Nations is not what it pretends to be: words do not always mean what they appear to mean; and the function of a League of Nations would be to preserve Capitalism, and to “clean out” such “plague spots” as revolutionary Russia and Germany, or, in a different sense, Mexico.

No, the Golden Age is not here: it may be an age of golden words, but that is all. It is an age of Imperialism ascendant and Socialism conquering. . . Mexico, Central America and the Caribbeans will be the American skeleton at the “feast of peace.” . . . The intervention of the Socialist proletariat is necessary.

F.

Franz Mehring

Ill-fortune seems to dog the footsteps of the Spartacus movement in Germany. Still bleeding from the fearful wound that it received when Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg died a martyr's death at the hands of the mob, it has received another blow with the news of the death of Franz Mehring. Klara Zetkin, mortally ill since her release from prison, alone is left of that brilliant galaxy of stars that, for the last four years, led the revolutionary minority of the German Social-Democracy.

When the German Social-Democratic movement, shortly before the outbreak of the war, celebrated his birthday, it honored in him the great historian, the gifted literat, the remarkable journalist. But the services that the writer rendered to the international movement of the proletariat sink into insignificance before the work that Mehring, the tactician and the revolutionist, accomplished during the last five years of his fruitful life. It was left to these last few years to produce the best that Mehring had to give to the cause of the social revolution.

After a checkered political career Mehring joined the Social-Democratic Party of Germany in 1890. He came from a bourgeois family in Pomerania, and as a young student in Berlin became actively connected with the bourgeois liberal movement. At that time there were still honest bourgeois liberals in German political life. Mehring received his first journalistic training in the fearless democratic newspaper "Zukunft," which was suppressed in 1871 because it opposed the forcible annexation of Alsace-Lorraine. In 1873 his first Socialist brochure, "Herr von Treitschke, the Socialist Killer, and the Aims of Liberalism," a Socialist reply, was published by the Co-operative Press of Leipzig. But Mehring continued to work as Berlin correspondent to the "Frankfurter Zeitung," and continued to contribute regular articles to the "Wage," the weekly edition of the suppressed "Zukunft." Although not a member, Mehring stood in close touch with the Social-Democratic Party that was organized at Gotha in 1875. But a personal conflict that arose between Mehring and the owner of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" at that time drove him further than ever away from the Socialist movement.

Then followed a period in Mehring's political career that for years blackened his name in the eyes of the German comrades. In the first edition of his famous "History of the German Social-Democracy" that appeared at this time, and in a series of articles in the "Gartenlaube," he bitterly attacked, not only the leaders of the movement, but the Social-Democracy itself. This was at a time when the party was writhing under a series of shameful persecutions that culminated in the adoption of the infamous anti-Socialist laws. Later, when Mehring's opponents in the party used his anti-Socialist activity at this time as a basis for their attacks upon him, Mehring explained his position in a pamphlet entitled "Meine Rechtfertigung" (My Justification), saying that at that time he still believed that a monarchistic government could, with honest intentions, inaugurate a policy of real reform, and could therefore accomplish more in the interests of the working class than the revolutionary movement of the Social-Democracy. The way in which the anti-Socialist laws were carried out, however, quickly disillusioned him, and in a very short time, Mehring became the sharpest and most relentless opponent of all who fought the Socialist movement, trying with all his power to undo the harm he had done. Bebel later asserted that Mehring was worth more to the Socialist movement at this time than a whole regiment of Socialist agitators. "Without him we could not have made use of one-tenth of our weapons."

Mehring's defection at that time was not, after all, a betrayal of his own principles. He simply had failed as yet to understand the full import of the Socialist movement. He was not yet a Socialist, and sympathized with the Social-Democracy only inasmuch as it seemed to him to be the expression of the longing of the people for democracy. Even after his change of front, he did not join the party, but tried to found a great democratic party. At this time he became the editor of the progressive "Berliner Volkszeitung," and in its columns fought the battles of the Social-Democracy, which had been deprived of the possibility of voicing its protest in organs of its own. The bold language of the "Berliner Volkszeitung" made it possible, in time, for the Socialist press to write a little more freely in its own behalf. A heated conflict with the influential author, Paul Lindau, in 1890, finally

brought Mehring out of the "Berliner Volkszeitung" into the ranks of the Socialist movement.

He became a regular contributor to the scientific Socialist organ, "Neue Zeit," and in this capacity he has for many years done some of his most valuable work for the German and the International Socialist movement.

Mehring's literary works, his famous "Lessing Legende," and later his books on Schiller and Heine are an application of the materialistic conception of history of Marx and Engels to the works and views of Germany's most famous poets. His greatest political economic works are an enlarged and thoroughly revised edition of the "History of the German Social-Democracy" and the major portion of the work of editing and publishing the correspondence between Marx and Engels, as well as the letters written by Lassalle to Marx. He wrote, too, numberless smaller brochures and pamphlets on the most diversified political and literary subjects. Mehring was not only one of the most brilliant, but also one of the most thorough and most productive writers of the Socialist movement.

Like most thinkers in the Socialist movement, Mehring's position underwent a series of changes and reorientations during his membership in the party. At first an enthusiastic follower of Karl Kautsky, he later became his sharpest critic and opponent. With the typical virility and energy that characterized his every action, Mehring was unsparing in his criticism of those with whom he disagreed. His attacks were masterpieces of argumentation, his philippicas always hit the mark, the arrows of his satire always afforded intense amusement to those who understood the personal references that so often stood behind them, but they left a deep hurt in those against whom they were directed.

It is now about nine years ago since the Socialist movement of Germany broke definitely with the revisionism of Bernstein only to adopt a policy of opportunism that so completely dominated the activity of the German Socialist movement before and during the years of the war. This was the origin of the division between Kautsky and Haase, on one side, and Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Zetkin and Mehring on the other. Kautsky pursued

a policy of concessions and compromises. He was unwilling to alienate the sympathies of the Davids, Suedekums and Kolbs, who were steering a direct course toward governmental participation and governmental responsibility of the Socialist movement. In their attempts to bridge over the growing conflict between revolutionary Marxism and government reform-socialist, Kautsky and Haase were forced further and further to the right while Rosa Luxemburg, Klara Zetkin and Mehring, who had still been looked upon as regulars, became more and more firmly allied with the "irresponsible" Karl Liebknecht. In short, the division between the Majority, Independent and Spartacus groups existed within the German Social-Democratic Party years before the war made it an actual fact.

We need not here describe the work done by Mehring since the war began. It is too well known to the readers of the "Class Struggle" to need repetition. Franz Mehring has fought a splendid fight. He, who by birth, training and personal preference would have chosen the path of the literary man who stands aloof from great political conflicts, took his place with the small rebellious group of staunch revolutionists. Franz Mehring's last fight was well fought, was the crowning achievement of a fruitful life.

L.

The Constitutional National Assembly

Elsewhere in this issue we have published an article by Karl Kautsky that is interesting for the arguments it leaves out as well as for those that are presented in favor of the speedy convocation of a Constituent National Assembly in Germany. It is worthy of note that not even Karl Kautsky, by far the most conservative of all the Independent supporters of a National Assembly, regards the calling of a National Assembly as a "democratic" necessity. As a matter of fact his article is a frank admission of the fact that Kautsky's support of the Assembly is not based upon principle, but that he has adopted the position he holds for purely tactical reasons of the most opportunistic character.

Kautsky's strongest argument is based upon his conviction that the combined Socialist parties have gained such a strong hold

upon the people of Germany, that the last four years of war have taught them such a bitter lesson, that the Independent and the Majority Socialist Parties will, unquestionably, be returned by a huge majority of votes, as the controlling parties, to the National Assembly. The recent elections, however, have shown the utter fallacy of this assumption, and it is more than likely that the Constituent Assembly, in its present make-up, will be content with the adoption of a few political and some more social reforms that will establish a German Republic after the pattern of that of the United States.

Similarly recent events have proven the baselessness of the fear that it would be impossible to come to terms with the Allied nations if Germany proceeded immediately to carry out a program of actual proletarian socialization. For reasons best known to themselves the statesmen that dominate the Peace Conference have seen fit to abandon their former attitude of indignant aloofness in Russian affairs in favor of a distinctly conciliatory proposal to the Bolshevik government of Russia. Had the rulers of Germany, instead of anxiously drawing away their skirts from the Russian Socialist Republic, openly entered upon an alliance with the proletarian government of the Russian people, they would have formed a League of Nations so powerful that the Allied governments, in the face of an increasingly revolutionary sentiment at home, would have been forced to come to terms.

These arguments were, until very recently, it must be admitted, of no mean importance. His contention, on the other hand, that Germany must have a Constituent Assembly in order to establish a new state that shall actually possess the power to carry out a Socialist program is hardly worthy of a man of Kautsky's political sagacity and understanding. He shows the impossibility of nationalizing Germany's industries under present conditions, while the country is divided up into a number of more or less autonomous states under the domination of Prussia. But he fails to show why the process of political nationalization, which admittedly must precede that on the industrial field, cannot be equally well accomplished, and with far less danger to the realization of our ideals, under the direction of an All-German Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils.

L.

Party Discussion

What is the "Left Wing" Movement and Its Purpose?

By EDWARD LINDGREN

This question is agitating hundreds of members of the Socialist Party at this time.

Since the memorable night when the Central Committees of the various locals of New York City held a conference, at which half of the delegates bolted and adjourned to another hall and there organized themselves into a "Left Wing" group of the party, it has been a perplexing question, and the party machinery, held in control by reactionary officials, paid organizers and speakers and other parasites who cling like leeches to the Socialist pie-counter, have endeavored to squelch this exhibition of indignation and anger of the rank and file by holding private meetings of "good," "loyal" comrades, for the purpose of saving the party from "I. W. W.ism," "anarchy," and the devil knows what. Indeed, going to the extent of using their influence with the party press to have them deny their columns for notices of meetings or statements of principles and tactics as long as the name "Left Wing" is used.

Apparently the bolt was brought about by the chairman refusing to grant the floor to a number of delegates, who wanted to question Algernon Lee, leader of the Socialist group in the Board of Aldermen, on the question of voting an \$80,000 appropriation for a "Victory Arch"; and the attitude of the Socialist leader, "that it had been a mistake in squandering so much of the people's money, but that there were no Socialist principles involved."

However, these were but contributory causes. Its origin has a more fundamental basis. While for years there have been factions in the party no real line-up was taken until 1912, when half of the party membership was read out of the party, by the infamous clause known as the "sabotage" section of the Socialist party constitution. At that time the reactionaries were left in control, as they believed for good. But the question was one of principles and could not be killed by official proclamations or by expelling members who refused to accept it. Logically, one reactionary step must be followed by others, and the party plunged deeper and deeper into the mire of vacillating policies, of opportunism and reforms; compromising the revolutionary position it should have occupied as a Socialist party, for a vote-catching policy, based on social reform issues, aimed exclusively at electing candidates to office, no matter who the candidates were or their stand on the class struggle.

When the test came in 1914, for a showdown as to the quality and quantity of Socialist idealism and principles in the party, that happened what any Socialist could have predicted who was familiar

with opportunism and its result: The leaders of the party vied with each other in finding excuses for their co-patriots in Europe—who were voting appropriations to their various governments for carrying on the war—pleading with the party membership that internationalism in war time must give way to nationalism; that the worker's immediate concern was "his job, his home and country." It left the rank and file aghast and bewildered. The leaders in whom they had had implicit faith, whom they had cheered and acknowledged as the true exponents of internationalism, had failed miserably when the time came to uphold that which they had expounded to be the true philosophy of the proletariat.

A convention was demanded by the rank and file of the party. It was held and in no uncertain manner declared its position. The result was the now world-famous St. Louis Resolution. It was sent for a referendum vote and adopted by an overwhelming majority.

Was the question settled? No!

The party machinery was still in the hands of the opportunist apologists for the European parliamentarians, and, of course, it would interfere with their program of social reforms should they insist upon elected officials carrying out the spirit of this resolution. The result was that throughout the entire country, with a few exceptions, the elected officials voted and worked for war appropriations and other measures pertaining to the war.

To many members of the party, as well as the people in general, it meant the death of the Socialist movement. They were mistaken, it was not the death of the Socialist movement, but the death of that slimy, treacherous creature, known in the world of politics as the parliamentarian, who in the guise of practical politics had misled the workers the world over to believe that Socialists in a capitalist legislature can, by working for social reforms, introduce a Socialist industrial state.

It has taken the party membership a long time to realize the fallacy of such action. Russia with its Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, Germany with its Majority Socialists and Spartacus groups have clarified the atmosphere. Where a few years ago only those who remained close to Socialist principles could see it, today, almost anyone who understands the theory of the class struggle, has no trouble in comprehending the reason why comrades are fighting and slaying each other and that opportunism must necessarily create a division in the ranks of the Socialist movement,—for that which should be a means to an end is made the end itself.

The "Left Wing" group is the logical outcome of a dissatisfied membership—a membership that has been taught by the revolutionary activities of the European movements "to compromise is to lose." And hold, with the founders of modern Socialism, that there are two classes in society; that between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class seizes the instruments of production and distribution, abolishes the capitalist state and establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat. They will not wait until the vast majority of the people will vote them into power. But—if the proletariat during its struggle with the bourgeoisie is compelled by the force of circumstances to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by

force the old conditions of production—then it will, with these methods, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class-antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

The Socialist Party has been too flexible where it ought to have been firm, and too rigid where it ought to have been flexible. Just as capitalism is inflexible in its class attitude, but flexible towards new problems, so must the Socialist Party as "the most resolute and advanced section of the working class parties," be inflexible in its class attitude, but by all means be flexible towards the new problems as they arise.

The degree of flexibility will be the test of its revolutionary character. The Soviet government of Russia is very flexible and therefore it succeeds. It is inflexible only on the fundamental class question; the dictatorship of the proletariat is the basis of its flexibility. And so with our own Socialist movement. The class struggle and the class struggle alone must be the basis of its flexibility.

On the basis of the class struggle must it reorganize itself, must prepare to come to grips with the master class during the difficult period of capitalist reconstruction now going on. It can do so only by teaching the working class the position it faces,—it must preach revolutionary industrial unionism and political action and urge the workers to develop their craft unions into industrial unions. It must carry on its political campaigns not as a means of electing officials to the legislature (as they have done in the past), but as year-around educational campaigns for the enlightenment of the working-class to class-conscious economic and political action and keeping the revolutionary fervor alive as a flaming ideal in the hearts of the people.

The "Left Wing" group therefore believes "that the time has come for the Socialist Party of America to throw off its parliamentary shackles and stand squarely behind the Soviet Republic of Russia and the revolutionary movements of Europe. That it will thus be enabled, when here the time comes—and it is soon coming—to take the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat in its struggle with the capitalist class. Instead of standing in its path dangling the bait of parliamentary reforms, push them forward towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, the final phase of the class struggle, transient and necessary to the ushering in of the Co-operative Commonwealth."

TENTATIVE PROGRAM

That we stand for the abolition of the social reform planks of the Socialist Party, together with all present municipal, state and congressional platforms.

That we teach, propagate and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of the capitalist state.

That the Socialist candidates elected shall adhere strictly to the above two provisions.

Realizing that the Socialist Party of itself cannot reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organization of the working class; that that is the task of the economic organizations of the working class themselves, we demand that the party must assist this process of reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary industrial unionism as a

part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist a proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

That the press be party-owned and controlled.

That all the educational institutions be party-owned and controlled.

That the party scrap its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above mentioned.

IMMEDIATE DEMANDS

We demand that the N. E. C. of the party call an immediate emergency national convention.

We demand that the N. E. C. shall not issue credentials to the three delegates selected to go to the International conference at Lausanne, Switzerland.

We demand that the S. P. of A. issue a call for an international congress of those groups of the Socialist movement who participated in the Zimmerwald conference in September, 1915, and the Kienthal conference in 1916 and those groups that are in sympathy with them to-day.

We demand the unequivocal endorsement of the Revolutionary Government of Russia.

We demand the unequivocal endorsement of the Spartacus group in Germany.

We demand the unequivocal endorsement of the Left Wing movements in Europe.

We demand that the Socialist Party come out for the release of all political and industrial prisoners.

Apply to Edward Lindgren, 350 Halsey Street, Brooklyn, New York, for further information.

The Communist Propaganda League of Chicago

"The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

"The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer.

"They merely express, in general terms, actual rela-

tions springing from an existing class struggle, from an historical movement going on under our very eyes."

From the Communist Manifesto, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Realizing that the Socialist movement in the United States cannot hope to attain its ends by carrying on a propaganda within the narrow limits of political action determined by our ruling class under existing property relations;

That a social revolution must proceed by every expression of mass sentiment, and of the mass industrial and economic power of the working class, which challenges the fundamentals of capitalism;

That the Socialist Party in functioning within the limits of customary political methods, when it is seen that even the few personal rights guaranteed in our Constitution mean absolutely nothing to the working class, is simply bound to convert itself into an agency of imperialism, as did the German, French and English socialist organizations under the leadership of social patriots; and as every party must do which accepts parliamentarism under so-called representative democracy as its basis of action;

Realizing that the propaganda and tactics of the Socialist Party must swing away from opportunistic labor liberalism to clear adherence to the revolutionary class struggle;

That the present form of organization of the Socialist Party makes impossible quick and certain response to current events;

That the personnel of our party officialdom and of our candidates for public office, and of our corps of speakers and educators must be brought into harmony with the revolutionary character of our movement;

And that the class struggle must be brought into unity in all its aspects, political, industrial and economic; leading to a universal proletarian dictatorship;

We organize ourselves into a unit of propaganda with the purpose of serving the Socialist Party by affecting its policies, platforms, form of organization and personnel of management and representation along the lines of clear revolutionary proletarian action.

* * *

The foregoing preamble was adopted December 6th, 1918, by a committee on organization of the Chicago branch of the Communist Propaganda League, consisting of Comrades Barney Berlyn, N. Juel Christensen, Adolph Dreifuss, J. Louis Engdahl, Isaac Edw. Ferguson (Secretary), Chris. Freiman, Robert H. Howe, S. A. Koppnagle, Andrew Lafin, William Bross Lloyd, Otto Purin, Joseph Stilson, Alexander Stoklitsky, Charles Walters.

Documents

A Swedish Party Correspondence

We print below all the documents in the negotiations that were conducted by the extended Representation of the Social-Democratic Party of the Left (P. L.) with the management of the Right Socialist Party, with regard to the requirements for carrying out the great democratic and socialistic demands of the working class. It is clear from these documents where the blame for the failure of these negotiations must be laid, namely, with the management of the Right Socialists, who, in order to continue their shameful alliance with the enemies of the working class, are inventing all sorts of imaginary obstructions of a "democratic" character, in the way of a co-operation with their class comrades of the Left.

I. The Offer of the Social-Democratic Party of the Left (P. L.)

In this revolutionary era, which is now raising one nation after the other into a full political and social democracy, the working class of Sweden also demands that our country shall take its place among the democratic nations of the world. If this is to be realized, the working class must, as far as is feasible, advance on a common front against all the reactionary enemies of society. The necessity of removing all obstructions in the path of this realization impels the Swedish S. D. P. L. to do all in its power to arrange a common action by a united working class. With this object, the S.-D. P. L. asks the S.-D. P. whether it will recognize a socialistic plan of action for the impending struggles, of the following general content:

1. General political and communal suffrage, without restriction, for all men and women over twenty years old.
2. Abolition of the Upper House of the Riksdag.
3. A Republican Constitution.
4. A maximum of eight hours' work a day.
5. Complete liquidation of the military system.
6. Socialization of banks and the most important branches of industry, as well as workers' control of industry.
7. Substantial reductions in the land holdings of corporations and estates, and transfer of the land, with assured title, to the propertyless workers of the soil.
8. Complete right of public assembly and demonstration.

In order to secure the realization of these aims the S.D. P. L. is ready and willing to support a Socialist government that will accept this plan of action. Should the program not be realizable without the use of force, the S.-D. P. L. invites the cooperation of the S.-D. Workers' P. in a mass action to be inaugurated in the form of a general strike.

As the representatives of the S.-D. P. L. are at present gathered in Stockholm, an answer is requested in the course of the day.

II. The Old Party is Afraid of "Bolshevism"

To the S.-D. P. L.

In answer to your communication the S.-D. P. Executive states the following:

That the Party Executive is always ready to offer its cooperation to secure the national or international solidarity of the working class in accordance with the general fundamental principles of democratic Socialism; but that, since the Party Executive has had more and more occasion to observe the contradiction existing between a democratic solution of the problems of society, and a Bolshevik minority dictatorship, it would appear to behoove the S.-D. P. L. to create the prerequisites for a practical political cooperation, by making a definite statement of its position with regard to the principles of democracy.

The Party Executive, in order to secure the introduction of democracy into the Swedish body politic, would greet with satisfaction a complete union of all the elements in our social system that are in principle and without reserve based on the foundations of democracy.

Yet the P. L.'s program of action contains points which in our opinion are manifestly of such nature as to require a reference of these questions, either in an election or a referendum, to the people. For this reason alone the Party Executive cannot recognize it as a basis for a common action to realize the reforms that should be immediately introduced.

Should the S.-D. P. L. feel able to accept without reserve the already indicated democratic principles, and to adopt the Minimum Program set up by the S. D. Party Executive as a basis for cooperation, the Party Executive would have not the slightest objection to working together with the S.-D. P. L.

The S.-D. Party Executive.

Hj. Branting.

Gustaf Möller.

III. The Left Answers: Not Minority Dictatorship, But Complete Democracy

To the S.-D. Party Executive.

In connection with your answer to our request of yesterday, touching the possibility of a common action by a united working class in the present situation, we have the honor to state the following:

Let us first emphasize that our party has never come out in favor of a minority dictatorship. The question of a dictatorship of the proletariat, already indicated in Karl Marx's "Communist Manifesto," the basic document of modern Socialism, is for the present not a burning one in our country, at least not to the extent of allowing a difference of opinion on this question to preventing a cooperation when on all other matters there would be a possibility of such co-operation. We have clearly and distinctly, through our demand for

a National Constituent Assembly, placed ourselves on the **broadest democratic basis**. We have surely in this way answered your objection with regard to what you call a "first requirement for a practical political cooperation."

Touching the Minimum Program you propose, we must make the general observation that it concerns itself almost exclusively with purely political reforms, neglecting the great social and economic demands which cannot or ought not to be postponed to an indefinite future in the present situation. Such proposals as were made by us in our minimum program—the socialization of the money system and of big industry, workers' control of industry, and the provisional solution of the land question—have not been considered at all in your program.

But even in connection with your political demands we must deplore that they provide no guarantees whatever for a speedy and thorough solution. We find, among other things, that such old democratic demands as a republic and a single legislative chamber, which have long since been accepted by the bourgeois circles of the country, have not seemed to you to be capable of immediate realization.

Instead, you point out that "binding assurances" should be given in advance by the state powers, regarding the removal of all disabilities in voting (but you seem to have forgotten the age restriction), while the question of a one-chamber system or of a republic should be decided either by a Riksdag constituted under the new election laws, or by a new popular election in accordance with those laws.

We believe, however, that Sweden's workers have learnt through long and bitter experience how much "assurances" and "promises" from the ruling classes are worth, and they would, in our opinion, be guilty of a serious mistake politically, if not of a crime against themselves and their future, if they should permit an opportunity for action to slip by, that might solve these questions at a single stroke.

As far as the only social demand in your program is concerned—that of the eight-hour day—we note that even its realization has been postponed without so much as a suggestion of a **provisional** solution. Particularly this omission must cause great discouragement among the entire Swedish working class.

To accept the minimum program you set up, as suggested by you in your communication, as a basis for our cooperation, would be impossible for us, for the reasons above-named. The Program, which limits itself entirely to a bourgeois-democratic action, seems to be adapted rather for a continued cooperation with the liberal party than for a common basis for the entire Swedish working class, which would have been more natural.

Nevertheless, we hope, in spite of the form of your communication, that you may again consider whether there is no possibility for a common action between us, along lines that may lead more clearly and speedily to the democratic and social transformation that is desired by both the S.-D. parties.

Should you find that a continued discussion is advisable, we suggest that it is desirable for both parties to appoint special representatives for the continuance of the negotiations.

The question as to the resources of power which the working class must, in those demands which it advances, mobilize in their

support—even if they should be of the limited nature proposed by you—would in such meetings require detailed examination.

We suggest the desirability of an early answer to this communication.

Stockholm, Nov. 16, 1918.

For the S.-D. P. L.

Executive Committee.

IV. The Old Party Answers One Question When You Ask Them Another

To the S.-D. P. L.

In answer to your last communication we beg leave to say: To our plain question whether "you can without reserve accept the principles of democracy" you have replied that "our party has never been for a minority dictatorship," and that the question of a dictatorship of the proletariat "is not a burning one in our country at present." These are subterfuges that would be more in place in the notes of the old diplomacy than in a declaration of a party which, in accordance with its loudly proclaimed principles, should place a certain value upon straightforwardness. We must, therefore, again emphasize that the necessary prerequisite for a cooperation on our part is the unconditional renunciation of Bolshevism by your party. The Social-Democratic Party's Executive feels that it has the support of an overwhelming opinion among the Swedish working class, in declaring that it will not enter into any cooperation with Bolsheviks.

You have answered our question with regard to your attitude on our program of action, by saying that it is impossible for you "to accept it as a basis for cooperation as it stands." We herewith point out that this minimum program was adopted after a careful scrutiny by the political and craft leaders, with the specific purpose of bringing about the strongest possible rally of all the democratic forces in our country around it. Your Sunday resolution is a blow in the face to this unity thought and asks, on the contrary, a split in the front of democracy.

We, therefore, point out that in both the points we have drawn up the answers made by your Executive have been either evasive or negative.

Stockholm, Nov. 18, 1918.

For the Executive Committee of the S.-D. P.

Hj. Branting.

Gust. Möller.

V. Final Reply from the Left: You Prefer Unity with the Liberal Party to Unity within the Working Class

To the S.-D. P. Executive.

At a meeting held yesterday, of the S.-D. P. L. Committee and the Y. P. S. L. Committee, as well as the Riksdag members and the representatives in Stockholm, as well as other representatives, it was unanimously decided to send the following communication to the

S.-D. P. Executive concerning the question of unity in the workers' movement:

As a prerequisite for your cooperation you demand in your last communication of Nov. 18, that the S.-D. P. L. "should unreservedly renounce Bolshevism." The answer of the S.-D. P. L. is a categorical negative, if by this means you seek to secure the party's moral or practical support for the policy of intervention and isolation inaugurated by Entente capitalism against Soviet Russia. The latter is a brutal denial both of the right of national self-determination as well as of the solidarity of the international proletariat, and, if it should prove successful, would be equivalent to a triumph for Russian and European reaction. Our party, furthermore, declines to set itself up in judgment over the fighting methods used by the November Revolution in Russia, which are the result partly of the counter-revolution and its methods, and partly of the general conditions of the country.

As regards our goal and tactics in the people's struggle that has begun in Sweden, the S.-D. P. L. refers you to its former declaration, that the party has never declared itself in favor of a minority dictatorship, and that it takes its stand on the broadest democratic foundation. Any other interpretation of our answer we must definitely reject.

Our party offered its cooperation on the basis of a pure socialistic-democratic program, calculated to gather the entire working class in a common front. The S.-D. Workers' Party passed a program of action that was chiefly bourgeois-democratic in character, which, on the one hand, postponed to an indefinite future certain important democratic constitutional demands, and, on the other hand, overlooked entirely the weighty economic and social demands of the working class. As you refuse any radicalizing of your program of action in the direction of the program of action of the S.-D. P. L., it must be admitted that the **Executive** of your party prefers a unity with the liberal party to a unity within the working class. Under these circumstances, the S.-D. P. L. is obliged to note with regret that its attempt to create a united S.-D. front on a socialistic platform has for this time met with failure. But the party simultaneously expresses its confident hope and certainty that the **workers** of Sweden, under the pressure of the world's revolutionary events, will succeed in forcing a socialistic unity of action, which is necessary if the present situation is to be the introduction to a completely democratic and socialistic Sweden.

The German Revolution and Russia

The Russian legation at Stockholm has received (October 4th) the following dispatch from the Russian Ambassador at Berlin:

"I have been notified that the meeting, recently held by the Central Executive Committee, the Moscow Soviet and other organizations of Moscow, adopted the following resolution, which later was approved by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

"The All-Russian Central Executive Committee considers it necessary that the working classes of all nations should state their

position on the latest events. The imperialists of the Central Powers are rapidly approaching a great catastrophe. Bulgaria and Turkey have bolted the alliance, and Austria will soon follow suit. The internal front of Germany is tottering. The policy of the ruling classes is wavering between military dictatorship and a parliamentary cabinet composed of representatives of liberals, Catholics and Social-ist traitors. The British-French, American and Japanese imperial-istic exploiters now seem to be almighty, just as Germany half a year ago, during the Brest-Litovsk parleys, seemed to be almighty. Encouraged by their newest victories, the allied exploiters appear as more dangerous and merciless enemies of the Soviet Republic than the Germans. But just as we during the period of the greatest triumph of the German military power foresaw its inevitable catastrophe and the impossibility of its annexation plans, likewise we now express our unshakable conviction of the approaching downfall of the Entente Powers. The deep-going inner conflicts among the partners of the world's exploitation and the deepfelt bitterness among the deceived masses of the people, are driving the capitalistic world toward social revolution. Now, as in October last year, and as during the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, the Soviet Government bases its whole policy on the conviction of the oncoming social revolution in both imperialistic camps. The firmness of this conviction allowed us to accept the vile terms of the Brest-Litovsk peace, which terms we did not for a moment believe to be the last word of history.

'As we now againn are joining the fate of Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, Baltic Provinces and Finland to the fate of the Russian workers' reolution, we do not contemplate any kind of an alliance with the allied imperialists for the purpose of obtaining modifications of the Brest-Litovsk treaty. Those chains wherewith the British-French and Japanese-American exploiters are burdening the peoples of the world are not the least better than those of the German-Austrian exploiters. The German military dictatorship is no more able than a parliamentary coalition between bourgeois agents and socialistic compromisers to change the course of the events. These events are relentlessly leading the working classes of Germany to power.

'The war between the British-American and Austrian-German exploiters may at any moment develop into a war between imperialism and the German working class. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee declares before the whole world that in this struggle the whole Soviet Russia with all its power and with all possible means will support the German workers. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee is convinced that the revolutionary working class of France, England, Italy, America and Japan will come to the same camp together with Russia and revolutionary Germany.

'Awaiting the coming reolutionary eents, it is the duty of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee to fight with double strength against the brigands who are invading our territory, and at the same time to prepare effective aid for the working class of Germany and Austria, military aid as well as in respect to the food situation.

'Te All-Russian Central Executive Committee, therefore, orders the reolutionary military council immediately to outline a broad program for the organization of the Red Army based on the conditions of the new International situation. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee orders the food commission immediately to outline a program for sending food reserves to the working masses in Germany

and Austria, in order to strengthen their struggle against the internal as well as external brigands and violators of their rights. All Russian Soviet institutions, central as well as the local, all trade unions, factory committees, the committees of the poor peasants and the co-operative societies are ordered to partake in a most effective manner in the mobilization of a powerful Red Army and in the organization of the food reserves of the social revolution.'

"Joffe."

Berlin, October 4, 2 A. M.

(From the Moscow "Izvestia" of October 19th)

The Appeal of the "Spartacus" Group to the Berlin Workmen

(Appeared in the "Novy Mir," Dec. 18th)

Workers, Awake!

The dreams of the German imperialists of world domination, which they sought to rear on heaps of corpses, in a sea of blood, has gone up in smoke. Vain are their efforts! The sword cannot forever rule the world. In one night everything has tumbled down with a crash. The shameless commerce with peoples in the East over the corpse of the strangled revolution has brought its fruits: it forced the peoples of the West to unite for a desperate war of self-defense. Everything goes down. In the battlefields of Flanders, the Balkans and Palestine defeat after defeat. The alliance of the Central Powers, that was to serve as a foundation for world domination by Germany has failed completely. Hardly had the robbers terminated their quarrels about the booty: Poland for Germany and Austria, Rumania for Bulgaria and Turkey, Dobrudja for Germany, Austria and Bulgaria—when Bulgaria left the coalition and concluded a separate peace with France and England. The German people do not any longer want a German protectorate and war, the people desire peace. And already the German soldiers are being driven from the West in order to force Bulgaria to continue the war. The German proletarian, who has nothing to eat—whose wife and children pine away for their husband and father—this proletarian must now take by the throat the Bulgarian proletarian and force him to go on fighting.

Thus the ruling clique in Germany tries to remain in power. It feels that the ground is slipping away beneath it. It is bankrupt: bankrupt in the battlefields, bankrupt in its internal and external policies. And now it stands aghast before the consequences of its criminal military adventure. It is appalled at the very thought of the

awakening of the tortured, misled proletariat, at the thought of the coming judgment of the people.

And at this very moment the government socialists—the Scheidemanns—offer their services in order to sustain the tottering power of the German bourgeoisie. At this hour of a possible world revolution they are busy with petty bargaining, attempting to get a few ministerial seats; and to get them they stand ready to save the situation for the imperialistic bourgeoisie, ready to force the people to a further waiting for the war's end, and to prolong the slaughter among the peoples. They want merely to put up a few patches and blur the class rule of the capitalists and Prussian reaction, so that their rule may be more acceptable to the people. What were the conditions for which they consented to do these lackey's services?—The solemn promise of the German government to abandon the idea of annexations and indemnities in the sense of the famous July resolution of the Reichstag. Yes, right now, when the English and French field-guns are exerting their efforts not to give any indemnities and contributions. More: the franchise reform in Prussia. Yes, right now, after the universal franchise, thanks to the shameless and piteous role which the Reichstag has played during the war, has become an empty mockery. And these arm-bearers of the bourgeoisie dared not even demand an immediate revocation of the martial laws, did not demand even that the Reichstag should sit intermittently. Thus they declare their readiness, in return for a few contemptible ministerial seats, to play the comedy of "reformed" Germany, and thus defend the rule of the capitalist class against the outburst of the people's wrath. This is the meaning of all this talk about the "reforms." Our task consists precisely in that we must destroy this agreement at the expense of the proletariat and the future of socialism. Now everything is at stake. Down with the whole refuge of Prussian reaction and the rule of the capitalists! The thing now is to obtain an immediate and a permanent peace! But to attain a stable peace these things are required:—destruction of militarism, rule of the people, and a republic. Thus, the German proletariat must become the master of the whole situation. Forward with the banner of Socialism! Long live the revolution of the international proletariat!

We must not look forward to a victory of Anglo-French imperialism. If arms dictate peace, then the cause of freedom and socialism will be lost. No matter which guns be victorious—whether German or English, the working class everywhere will have to pay the bill. The international reaction and militarism, in case they are victorious, will put on the working-class chains ten times heavier than before.

The proletariat of all countries must stop the slaughter by rising. They are called to dictate peace in the interests of freedom and socialism.

Now the hour has come to act. At this moment the English and French workmen may follow the signal given by the German workers. This signal must be given. Forward, German workers, soldiers, male and female! Forward to the battle for freedom, for an immediate peace and socialism! Forward towards the brotherhood of all peoples under the banner of free labor! Down with the class rule of the bourgeoisie! All power to the proletariat! Long live the German republic! Long live the international revolution of the proletariat!

An Appeal of the "Spartacus" Group

To the Workers of All Countries!

"Christmas, 1918.

"Proletarians! Men and Women of Labor! Comrades!

"The revolution in Germany has come! The masses of the soldiers who for four years were driven to slaughter for the sake of capitalistic profits; the masses of workers, who for four years were exploited, crushed, and starved, have revolted. Prussian militarism, that fearful tool of oppression, that scourge of humanity—lies broken on the ground. It most noticeable representatives, and therewith the most noticeable of those guilty of this war, the Kaiser and the Crown Prince, have fled from the country. Workers' and Soldiers' Councils have been formed everywhere.

"Workers of all countries, we do not say that in Germany all power actually lies in the hands of the working people, that the complete triumph of the proletarian revolution has already been attained. There still sit in the government all those Socialists who in August, 1914, abandoned our most precious possession, the International, who for four years betrayed the German working class and the International.

"But, workers of all countries, now the German proletarian himself speaks to you. We believe we have the right to appear before your forum in his name. From the first day of this war we endeavored to do our international duty by fighting that criminal government with all our power and branding it as the one really guilty of the war.

"Now at this moment we are justified before history, before the International and before the German proletariat. The masses agree with us enthusiastically, constantly widening circles of the proletariat

share the conviction that the hour has struck for a settlement with capitalistic class rule.

"But this great task cannot be accomplished by the German proletariat alone; it can only fight and triumph by appealing to the solidarity of the proletarians of the whole world.

"Comrades of the belligerent countries, we are aware of your situation. We know full well that your governments, now that they have won the victory, are dazzling the eyes of many strata of the people with the external brilliancy of their triumph. We know that they thus succeed through the success of the murdering in making its causes and aims forgotten.

"But we also know that in your countries the proletariat made the most fearful sacrifices of flesh and blood, that it is weary of the dreadful butchery, that the proletarian is now returning to his home, and is finding want and misery there, while fortunes amounting to billions are heaped up in the hands of a few capitalists. He has recognized, and will continue to recognize, that your governments, too, have carried on the war for the sake of the big money bags. And he will further perceive that your governments, when they spoke of 'justice and civilization' and of the 'protection of small nations,' meant capitalist profits as surely as did ours when it talked about the 'defence of home'; and that the peace of 'justice' and of the 'League of Nations' are but a part of the same base brigandage that produced the peace of Brest-Litovsk. Here as well as there the same shameless lust for booty, the same desire for oppression, the same determination to exploit to the limit the brutal preponderance of murderous steel.

"The imperialism of all countries knows no 'understanding,' it knows only one right—capital's profits; it knows only one language—the sword; it knows only one method—violence. And if it is now talking in all countries, in yours as well as ours, about the 'League of Nations,' 'disarmament,' 'rights of small nations,' 'self-determination of the peoples,' it is merely using the customary lying phrases of the rulers for the purpose of lulling to sleep the watchfulness of the proletariat.

"Proletarians of all countries! This must be the last war! We owe that to the twelve million murdered victims, we owe that to our children, we owe that to humanity.

"Europe has been ruined by this damnable slaughter. Twelve million bodies cover the grewsome scenes of this imperialistic crime. The flower of youth and the best man power of the peoples have been mowed down. Uncounted productive forces have been annihilated. Humanity is almost ready to bleed to death from the unexampled blood-letting of history. Victors and vanquished stand at the edge of the abyss. Humanity is threatened with famine, a stoppage of the entire mechanism of production, plagues, and degeneration.

"The great criminals of this fearful anarchy, of this unchained

chaos—the ruling classes—are not able to control their own creation. The beast of capital that conjured up the hell of the world war is incapable of banishing it, of restoring real order, of insuring bread and work, peace and civilization, justice and liberty, to tortured humanity.

“What is being prepared by the ruling classes as peace and justice is only a new work of brutal force from which the hydra of oppression, hatred and fresh, bloody wars raises its thousand heads.

“Socialism alone is in a position to complete the great work of permanent peace, to heal the thousand wounds from which humanity is bleeding, to transform the plains of Europe, trampled down by the passage of the apocryphal horseman of war, into blossoming gardens, to conjure up ten productive forces for every one destroyed, to awaken all the physical and moral energies of humanity, and to replace hatred and dissension and fraternal solidarity, harmony, and respect for every human being.

“If representatives of the proletarians of all countries could but clasp hands under the banner of Socialism for the purpose of making peace, then peace would be concluded in a few hours. Then there will be no disputed questions about the left bank of the Rhine, Mesopotamia, Egypt or colonies. Then there will be only one people: the toiling human beings of all races and tongues. Then there will be only one right: the equality of all men. Then there will be only one aim: prosperity and progress for everybody.

“Humanity is facing the alternative: Dissolution and downfall in capitalist anarchy, or regeneration through the social revolution. The hour of fate has struck. If you believe in Socialism, it is now time to show it by deeds. If you are Socialists, now is the time to act.

“Proletarians of all countries, if we now summon you for a common struggle it is not done for the sake of the German capitalists who, under the label of ‘German nation,’ are trying to escape the consequences of their own crimes; it is being done for our sake as well as for yours. Remember that your victorious capitalists stand ready to suppress in blood our revolution, which they fear as they do their own. You yourselves have not become any freer through the ‘victory,’ you have only become still more enslaved. If your ruling classes succeed in throttling the proletarian revolution in Germany, and in Russia, then they will turn against you with redoubled violence. Your capitalists hope that victory over us and over revolutionary Russia will give them the power to scourge you with a whip of scorpions and to erect the thousand-year empire of exploitation upon the grave of Socialism.

“Therefore the proletariat of Germany looks toward you in this hour. Germany is pregnant with the social revolution, but Socialism can only be realized by the proletariat of the world.

“And, therefore, we call to you: ‘Arise for the struggle! Arise for action! The time for empty manifestos, platonic resolutions, and

high-sounding words is gone! The hour of action has struck for the International!’ We ask you to elect Workers’ and Soldiers’ Councils everywhere that will seize political power, and, together with us, will restore peace.

“Not Lloyd George and Poincaré, not Sonnino, Wilson, and Erzberger or Scheidemann, must be allowed to make peace. Peace must be concluded under the waving banner of the Socialist world revolution.

“Proletarians of all countries! We call upon you to complete the work of Socialist liberation, to give a human aspect to the disfigured world and to make true those words with which we often greeted each other in the old days and which we sang as we parted: ‘And the Internationale shall be the human race!’

“KLARA ZETKIN,

“ROSA LUXEMBURG,

“KARL LIEBKNECHT,

“FRANZ MEHRING.”

. . . To give to the movement its character

"While the revolutionary period itself commands the creation and the computation and payment of the cost of a mass strike, the leaders of the Social-Democracy have an entirely different mission to fulfill. Instead of concerning itself with the technical side, with the mechanism of the mass movement, it is the duty of the Social-Democracy to undertake the political leadership even in the midst of a historical crisis. To give to the movement its character, to determine the direction that the struggle must take, to so fix the tactics of the political conflict that in its every phase and movement the whole sum of existing and already soluble active forces of the proletariat is realized, and finds expression in the attitude of the party, that the determination and the rigor of the Social-Democracy shall not for an instant fall below the level of actual power, but shall rather hasten in advance of its actual power, that is the important task of our party leadership in a great historical crisis.

"In a sense this leadership will then become the technical leadership. A determined, consistent, progressive tactic of the Social-Democracy creates in the masses a feeling of assurance and self-confidence, a fighting spirit. A weakly, vacillating tactic, based upon a low estimate of the power of the proletariat, lames and confuses the masses. In the first case, mass actions break out 'of their own accord,' and 'at the right time'; in the second, even a direct call for mass action on the part of the leaders often remains ineffectual."—*Rosa Luxemburg* in "Mass Strike, Party and Labor Unions," Hamburg, 1907.

The Crisis in the German Social-Democracy

By Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and
Franz Mehring

The authors of this book, all of whom met death in various ways in January of this year, came together shortly after the European War began, to write a scathing indictment of the economic system of the civilized world which had made the world war inevitable. There is no better arraignment of German capitalism and its tool, German militarism, than that written by these three Germans. 128 pages.

Price 35 cents.

Special Rates to Agents and Socialist Locals.
THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
243 55th Street, Brooklyn.

A Letter to American Workingmen

By Nikolai Lenin

We published this letter in our last issue, and have reprinted it for separate distribution in this cheap form, at the request of many comrades. 16 pages.

Price 5 cents.

Special Rates to Agents and Socialist Locals.
THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
243 55th Street, Brooklyn.

J' Accuse

Fritz Adler's Speech in his own defense at his trial for the murder of Premier Stuerghk. It will be interesting to readers who wish to compare his first speech upon being liberated from prison, which is printed in this issue, with this, his last speech before being sentenced for his act.

Price 15 cents.

Special Rates to Agents and Socialist Locals.
THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
243 55th Street, Brooklyn.

First Appearance in this Country:
From October to Brest-Litovsk

By LEON TROTZKY

This book of about 100 pages covers the entire period of preparation for the October (Nov. 7), 1917, Revolution in Petrograd, the events of the November Revolution itself (exciting struggles for individual buildings, discussions of such questions of principle as the function of the middle class in the class struggle), and, finally, a brilliant exposition of the Soviet attitude on armistice and peace questions. Written in April, 1918.

PRICE, 35 CENTS

Special Rates for Agents and Socialist Locals.

About to Appear:

The State and Revolution

By NIKOLAI LENIN

There is doubt in certain circles as to the desirability of revolution as opposed to evolution in the achievement of the coming Communism. Lenin shows in this book, on the basis of innumerable passages from Marx and Engels, that the founders of scientific Socialism were never in doubt on this question. Other distortions of true Marxism are also revealed in its various chapters, which will fill about 130 pages.

PRICE, 50 CENTS

Special Rates for Agents and Socialist Locals.

Both books published by

THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

243 55th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.