

SPECIAL SERVICE

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 22 No. 5
typo: is Vol. 2 No. 52

22nd June 1922

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

The Trial of the Social Revolutionaries

Vandervelde, Rosenfeld and Liebknecht withdraw from the Trial.

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

In the June 13th evening session Vandervelde informed the Tribunal that in addition to the official stenographic minutes a special stenographer for the accused should be allowed. This report would of course be of a private character. Vandervelde based his statement on the Berlin Conference, which in his opinion, gave each International the right to an independent stenographic report.

Comrade Bukharin, defender of the second accused group, expressed no opinion on the private stenographer, but emphatically contradicted, however, Vandervelde's interpretation of the Berlin Agreement:—

“Vandervelde should know that at the present moment the Berlin Agreement no longer holds good. It is impossible so to put the case that one side has obligations to fulfil and the other not. The main clause, which led us to make great concessions, was the calling of an all-embracing World Labor Congress to begin the fight with Capitalism on an international scale. This condition has been broken by the International to which Vandervelde belongs, and one can only wonder at the effrontery with which Vandervelde has forgotten this circumstance. An agreement does not now exist and it is quite futile to appeal to it. Of course everyone has the right, the League of Nations and the Second Yellow International as much as the Pinkerton agency, to make any proposition they choose to the Government of the Soviet Republic. Vandervelde also has that right.”

The second defender, Rosenfeld, remarked that the World Labor Congress was not cancelled and that the intention of calling it still existed.

The attitude of the defense towards the private stenographer met with strong opposition from the prosecution, which claimed that it is completely superfluous. As, according to the statement of the defense this stenogram should only be of a private nature, the Tribunal declared that the defense had not gone to the proper authorities and as the court is not concerned with private affairs, it must refuse to discuss this matter.

At the close of the evening session of the 14th, the accused Gendelman delivered to the President of the Tribunal a statement signed by Vandervelde, Liebknecht and Rosenfeld, according to which in view of the limitation of the rights of the defense, as for instance the refusal of a private stenographer for the defense, the foreign defenders consider their further participation in the trial to be useless, although this participation is dependent upon the desires of the accused.

The accused Gendelman stated in the name of the first group of the accused, that they release Vandervelde, Liebknecht and Rosenfeld from their obligations.

The President, Comrade Piatakov, declared that no obstacles had been put in the way of the defenders and the ac-

cused. They had been given far-reaching rights such as no other court of justice in the world would have given them. As to permission to take private stenographic notes the order of the Supreme Tribunal was that this question did not come within the competence of the Supreme Tribunal but within the competence of the Court Commandant. If such an order had come from him, naturally the defenders' stenographer would have been admitted into the court-room.

The statement of the defenders of the Second and 2½ Internationals had to be recognized as groundless after Comrade Piatakov's explanation, the more so as, after the session of June 13th, Kurt Rosenfeld, who urged the necessity for a private stenogram, had stated that in all other conditions with the exception of the stenogram, the rights of the defenders had been in no way limited and that the proceedings in the last few days had been conducted in a quieter manner and in a more normal atmosphere. The departure of the defenders of the Second and 2½ Internationals at the the moment when the court is occupied with the examination of the most essential part of the case, is a withdrawal from an undertaken duty. This retreat must be regarded as symptomatic.

The beginning of the morning session of the Supreme Tribunal was occupied with the statement of the foreign defenders, which was issued on June 14th in the following form:—

“In accordance with the statement made to us by the accused, that they excuse us from further appearance before the Supreme Tribunal, we wish to record many breaches of the Berlin Agreement of the three Internationals:

1—The Court refused the admission of four defenders and has not allowed the taking of a stenogram, in accordance with the Berlin Agreement.

2—The court has expressed the intention of questioning under certain circumstances the further admission of the foreign defenders.

3—The prosecutors, Krylenko and Lunatcharsky, have declared that the Berlin Agreement is not binding for the Court.

4—The representative of the Third International at the Berlin Conference, Bukharin, states that the Berlin agreement is no longer valid.

As we have been guided exclusively by the interests of the accused, we remain at their disposal in spite of these facts, so long as they themselves wish it.

(Signed): *Emile Vandervelde.*
Kurt Rosenfeld.
Theodor Liebkecht.
A. J. Wauters.

At the opening of the public session the President of the Tribunal stated: “In view of the importance to the trial and the political importance of the statement made yesterday by the foreign defenders, the Tribunal considers it necessary to issue a written statement as an elaboration of the statement made yesterday by the President.”

After about one hour's deliberation by the Tribunal, the following declaration was issued:—

"The Tribunal has repeatedly stated that the Berlin Agreement as a purely political measure cannot be a subject of discussion for the Tribunal and the claims of this or that side cannot bear upon the course of the process.

"To the four points alleged by the foreign representatives to be breaches in duty or conduct of trial, the Supreme Court declares:—

1—The Court has not admitted the four defenders in view of the fact that they do not enjoy the confidence of the court and their participation in no trial would be allowed. The Tribunal has no right and no reason to make an exception in this case as provided for by Article No. 17 of the Criminal Code.

Insofar as their admission could be granted on grounds of a political nature apart from the competence of the Court, special permission must be given by the Government itself, to which the defenders had been referred.

2—The second point is in complete contradiction to reality, as the Court never announced the intention of considering the exclusion of the defense.

3—The outcry about the statement of the two prosecutors, that the Berlin Agreement is not binding for the Court, has in view of the categorical and clear explanation of the President neither moral nor formal importance. The Court cannot and may not enter into the examination and exposition of this or that political obligation, as only the Government may take the necessary steps for carrying out any political obligations which it has assumed.

4—In relation to the statement that the defending attorney, Bukharin, made during the trial, evidently not as a representative of the Third International but as defender of the accused Ignatiev and Grigory Ratner, what has been said concerning the statements of the public prosecutors must be repeated.

Concerning the question of the permitting of a special private stenographer in the Court, which served as an excuse for their statements, such a private stenographer, according to the statement made by the defender Tager, must be provided personally by the defenders, without the character of an authentic, official and reliable protocol.

This is quite independent of whether proposals or promises have been made in Berlin in this connection, and it is completely clear that that the admission of such a private stenographer is not within the province of the Supreme Tribunal, just as the admission of press representatives is not within its province. According to the exact sense of the order of the Supreme Tribunal, the Tribunal has refused to discuss the question as it belongs to the technical rules of the court-room and lies within the province of the Commandant who acts according to the instructions of the President and not of the Supreme Tribunal. At the same time the Commandant of the court-room had received instructions from the President to admit the stenographer if the foreign defenders should ask him.

The Tribunal can from the above only come to the conclusion that from the beginning the foreign defenders have struck a false note against the Tribunal. They attempted to cast doubt upon its objectivity and neutrality by daring to compare it with the courts inimical to the proletariat in bourgeois states, in spite of the fact that the foreign defenders were really themselves convinced that this trial would be conducted with every guarantee for the defense of the accused and an examination of the individual guilt of each person. That was stated in the official stenographic report of the speech made by Rosenfeld during the evening session of the 13th inst. They did this because they were convinced that there remained less room than ever in the trial for their political manifestations. They sought a pretext to quit the trial, because their participation was for them obviously politically disadvantageous.

Independently of whether the defenders fulfil after the foregoing statement the duties they have taken upon them or leave the trial without any real motive, the Supreme Court will proceed with its work in accordance with the procedure and method which will completely preserve the interests of proletarian justice.

The President of the Supreme Tribunal: *G. Piatakov.*

Members of the Tribunal: *Galkin and Karklin.*

Session of June 16th.

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

In the further examination of Donskoi he had to admit that on the eve of the disbanding of the Preobrazhensky Regiment a session of the staff of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party took place in which it was decided to instruct the S.R. adherents who had got into the regiment to resist the disarmament of the regiment. The Semenovskiy and Volinsky regiments and the S.R. fighting organization were to be called in to support this resistance to disarmament. Donskoi declared, however, that "the S.R.'s intended no aggressive action at this moment. We were not preparing for armed struggle. We only were not opposed to Preobrazhensky Regiment's resistance to its disarming." (1)

In answer to the pointed question as to what Donskoi meant by the phrase "the Preobrazhensky Regiment resisted disarmament"—if he believed that it would have been possible to do so by any other method than armed resistance—Donskoi gave an evasive reply. In his previous testimony Donskoi had admitted that the S.R.'s were not opposed to armed resistance against the disarmament of the Preobrazhensky Regiment; on the contrary he had admitted that the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party would have welcomed armed resistance to the disbanding of the regiment. But the S.R.'s had absolutely no hope that things would take that course.

Gotz also declared that the S.R.'s had not prepared for fighting on the day of the disarmament of the Preobrazhensky Regiment. "But", said Gotz, "the Preobrazhensky Regiment was very valuable to us. And I will speak frankly: If the Petrograd proletariat had on that day arisen against the Soviet Power, we would have placed ourselves at the head of the movement, would have strengthened this movement with our armed troops and would have sat in judgement over the Bolsheviks with the greatest satisfaction. But the Petrograd proletariat did not arise"

The witness Kononov then took the stand. He stated that he had received express instructions in the name of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party to "rather the S.R. fighting organization under his command in order to take part in the resistance to the disarmament of the Preobrazhensky regiment. Kononov did not execute this order because he considered it useless and thought that it would only have meant unnecessary bloodshed. The Central Committee severely censured him for the non-execution of this order.

The attempt of the prosecuting attorney to learn the name of those who had taken direct part in the above mentioned preparations were unsuccessful. The accused continually replied, "I don't remember", "I have forgotten", or evaded the question. Gotz pathetically declared, "I request that you do not touch upon the inner affairs of our Party. We do not answer such questions."

Donskoi's further testimony revealed the connection of the S.R.'s with the Filolenko organization ("The Upper Ten Thousand") as well as with the organization of a certain Ivanov who stood in connection with the German General Staff.

The examination of Dashyevskiy and Timofyeyev, two of the accused, as well as the further testimony of Donskoi and Gotz proved that the Social Revolutionary Party, after the failure of the attack upon the Soviet Government on the day of the opening of the Constituent Assembly, endeavored to strengthen its influence in the Red Army. A special armored car division was organized. Dashyevskiy received the funds for this division from the Filolenko organization. Although the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party was informed of all this, and knew of the connections with the organizations Filolenko and Ivanov, it took no step to break off this connection. The statements of Dashyevskiy prove that the S.R. organization in the Red Army was employed to direct the troops which had left Petrograd to the Volga front. There the military operations against the Soviet Government began.

The testimony of Konopleva, one of the accused, disclosed that the Central Committee of the S.R. Party intended to utilize the moment of the disarmament of the division in connection with the strike movements which had spread through the Petrograd district in order to commence the fight against the Soviet Government. With this object in view there took place deliberations of the military commission of the S.R.'s together with the Central Committee of the Party, in which Semenov, Konopleva, Gotz, Lichatch and Leppert took part. But at the last moment the Central Committee lacked the necessary courage to issue the order for an armed uprising.

In reply to Krylenko's question whether he admitted that in his negotiations with Parsky he had attempted to persuade the latter to commit high treason, Gotz began an angry tirade against the Bolshevik "traitors" which occasioned vigorous disapproval in the audience.

June 17th, Morning Session.

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

The testimony of Semenov, whose examination took up the morning session, made a deep impression. Semenov stated that the military organizations of the S.R. were built up in order to revive the Constituent Assembly. He gave details on the connection of the S.R. military organization with the Filolenko and Ivanov organization. Although Filolenko was considered an adventurer, the S.R.'s nevertheless maintained connection with this organization. They even accepted money from Filolenko. The S.R.'s had concluded no express agreement with the Ivanov organization upon the purpose of their alliance, but the S.R.'s accepted money from Ivanov as well as from the Germanophile organization.

Semenov testified how indignant he and several Party workers were when they were asked to make connections with the Filolenko and Ivanov organizations and to accept money from them. Donskoi had given them this order and since Donskoi was acting in the name of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party Semenov and the others submitted to Party discipline. Donskoi had said. "We can take the money; it doesn't smell!"

The difference between the Central Committee and the military organization of the S.R.'s was that the Central Committee was too weak to make a decision in a critical moment. On the other hand the military organization could not act on its own initiative.

June 17th, Evening Session.

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

The court commenced with a cross examination of Semenov. Gotz, Timofeyev, Rakov and Utgov attempted to establish discrepancies in Semenov's pamphlet. They endeavored with all the means at their disposal to weaken the impression caused by Semenov's testimony. In answer to a provocative interrogation of Gendelman, Semenov indignantly replied, "I must once and for all categorically declare that I refuse to answer such questions. I believe that I had the fullest moral right to do what I have done. During those long years when I was a member of the Social Revolutionary Party, I earned this right for I never evaded danger. Since I have become a Communist I have also often been exposed to the rain of bullets. You, however, (turning to the members of the Central Committee of the S.R.'s) have no right to judge the correctness or incorrectness of my action. You lost that right long ago."

Gotz' speech in the evening session on June 16th had roused a wave of protest in the public. The President of the Court pointed out at the close of the June 17th evening session that it would in no way be worthy of the historical importance of the trial if it were made to appear that the proceedings were being influenced by the behavior of the audience. The President declared that in order to avoid this the Court would have to discipline those staging demonstrations against the accused. He further stated that in view of the heavy sentences threatening the accused and in view of their easily explainable nervousness—caused by their imprisonment—the Court was of the opinion that no disciplinary steps should be taken against a number of the accused because of their provocative attitude.

The Role of the French Military Mission in Soviet Russia.

June 19th, Morning Session.

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

The court dealt with the only accused of the fourth group, W. J. Ignatiev, member of the Central Committee of the Populist Party, (Trudoviki). The accused spoke of the role of the Social Revolutionaries in the preparation for the armed defense of the Constituent Assembly. Ignatiev said that the Social Revolutionaries incited the masses to opposition to the Soviet Power. As was already shown by the statements of those examined yesterday, Ignatiev also stated that the Social

Revolutionaries desisted from carrying out their plans at the last moment and left their deluded followers to their fate.

The witness Pascal then stated his observations of the attitude of the Allies toward Russia. The Allies had definite plans, as how they could weaken Russia politically, economically and militarily. Russia was divided into zones. It was intended to divide certain districts of Russia among the Allies, if the overthrow of the Soviet Power succeeded. According to this France was to have the Ukraine and England the Caucasus. In order to weaken Russia economically, the French supported the strike movement of the State and administrative officials. Through the banks—principally the Russo-Asiatic-Bank—they supplied the strikers with funds. The French Military Mission had decided to strangle Petrograd's industry completely and wished to utilize the threatened occupation of Petrograd by the German Army to this end. Pascal spoke further of the activities of the French Ambassador, Noulens, with whose help the rising in Yaroslav was engineered. There was a definite plan to close a ring around Moscow. The French Military Mission proceeded with this plan. Pascal was aware of all these plans as they were told him by the chief of the French Military Mission—after these plans had miscarried it adopted other weapons and busied itself with instigating acts of terrorism. Pascal declared that he himself had seen the coded telegram, which (immediately after the attack upon Lenin) treated of preparations for terrorist plots.

The Janus Head of the Social Revolutionaries.

June 19th Evening Session.

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

Moscow, June 20, 1922.

The Court examined the witness, Verkhovsky, the former Minister of War in the Provisional Government, who in 1918 joined the military organization. According to the witness there were two different groups in the military organization. One of these groups consisted of military members who in February had accepted the revolution, and into this group had entered the military divisions of the S.R.'s, the Populists and the Cadets. This was the group which organized the armed insurrection in defense of the Constituent Assembly. It was headed by a General Staff, consisting among others of Verkhovsky, Capt. Postnikov, Ignatiev, Gotz and General Suvorov. But besides this group there existed another larger organization headed by General Suvorov. To this group belonged mostly monarchistic officers who cherished the dream of an Eastern Front. They categorically refused to take part in the *coup d'état* planned by the Social Revolutionaries, and they wanted to join the army that was fighting against Germany. We thus see that the S.R. leaders considered it possible to create an organization with two faces, as it were: one face turned towards the workers, speaking of democracy and the Constituent Assembly; the other towards the officers, speaking of the resumption of the war with Germany, at the same time silently acquiescing in the monarchy.

This evidence furnished by Verkhovsky is particularly interesting because he was very careful in his statements and endeavored to explain the psychology of the members of the organization to which he belonged.

The Moscow Workers demand a Severe Verdict.

June 20th Evening Session

(Special Report of the International Press Correspondence.)

Moscow, June 21, 1922.

In yesterday's evening session the defendant Grigory Ratner took the stand. Before the court adjourned, a delegation representing the Moscow workers entered the court-room and asked permission to read the resolution passed by the workers with reference to the S.R.'s. After the permission was granted a group of workers of both sexes entered the court-room and read a series of resolutions. In every one a severe verdict was asked for. The most touching moment was when the old worker Ivanoff entered the room. Ivanoff was the chairman of the meeting at which Lenin spoke just before the attempt on his

life. Simply and concisely, Ivanoff stated the events of the meeting during which the Social Revolutionary, Fanny Kaplan, attempted to assassinate Lenin. Ivanoff's statement was greeted with long and thunderous applause by the public. The court then adjourned.

Yesterday there were many workers' demonstrations in Moscow, supplemented by many meetings, held in connection with the S.R. trial. The demonstrators marched past the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal building. The President of the Supreme Tribunal appeared and was greeted enthusiastically. He addressed the demonstrators and acquainted them with the events of the proceedings. He said, among other things:—

To Arthur Henderson and James Ramsay Mac Donald!

The undersigned have received the following telegram:

"We await with great anxiety news of the trial and beg that for the sake of the future you remain loyal in word and spirit to the pledges you made to us at Berlin."

(signed) Arthur Henderson.

James Ramsay MacDonald.

The following is our reply:—

"Your telegram has filled us with the greatest astonishment. You have the audacity to express the wish that we should remember for the sake of the future the Berlin agreement. But whose future? Of the future of the proletariat or of a clique of party and union leaders, who since the imperialistic war, have rendered up the proletariat to ever-increasing exploitation. Your actions are the answer to these questions. Have you forgotten that it was the Second International, which in the past has betrayed the working class a hundred times and which has, by its hindering the holding of the World Labor Congress in April or May upon the flimsiest pretexts, endangered the future of the working class. What was the object of this Congress? To reply to the closed ranks of the capitalist governments at Genoa by the closing of the ranks of the international proletariat in an indivisible united front. You, Henderson and Mac Donald, together with your companions of the Second International, with Wels and Vandervelde and with your accomplices of the 2½ International, have broken the united front of the proletariat in order to preserve your united front with the world bourgeoisie. And you speak of your anxiety for the future. You have the effrontery to demand that we "remain loyal to the pledges we gave in Berlin". Have you forgotten that the representatives of the Second International, protected and guarded by the representatives of the 2½ International, have not only broken our agreement in "word and spirit" but also in action, and have trampled it underfoot?

Since when has a contract been binding for one party only? The Executive of the Second International, under the protection of the ambiguous and unctuous phrases of the 2½ International, has rejected the arrangement for an early holding of the International Labor Congress, it has torn up the Berlin Agreement and made our concessions null and void. World-breakers have no right to demand from the other side the keeping of a mutual agreement.

Our position with regard to the Social Revolutionary trial will never be determined by an agreement that you and your friends have reduced to a worthless scrap of paper. Our attitude will be dictated by our revolutionary duty to the world proletariat, for whom the Russian Soviet Republic is the foremost and truest fighter, and which you and your friends hate and fear, like your own wicked conscience.

Although you and your like have broken the Berlin Agreement, the accused Social Revolutionaries will be given a freedom of defense such as neither England nor Germany nor any bourgeois state would allow to its political enemies. Kurt Rosenfeld publicly admitted that on the 13th of June during the trial. In spite of this on the next day the gray international of lawyers laid down their defense on the flimsiest of pretexts. Vandervelde and Co., had thought they would be able to deceive the proletariat in their role of political ingenueness when they transformed a political trial into a place for trickery and word-spinning. As soon as they saw at the beginning that the game was up, when the Social Revolutionaries themselves came out as politicians, as fact after fact showed the counter-revolutionary character of their actions and showed their aims, the defenders of unstained bourgeois rights broke down in the contest with revolutionary Soviet Russia.

"You may rest assured that the innocent will be freed, but that the guilty will not escape their just punishment! Our enemies claim that we are prejudiced. But the fact is that we examine the matter without prejudice and it has already been established that the Social Revolutionaries have actually led an armed fight against the first Workers' and Peasants' Republic in the world. Punishment will be meted out accordingly, but in all cases justly!"

Krylenko spoke after the President, and pointed out that the court has unequivocally established the criminal activities of the Social Revolutionaries and that the accused have already in part admitted their guilt.

It is easier to slander the Revolution far from Moscow than legally to justify the counter-revolutionaries in Moscow. You speak of your "great anxiety" for the 47 Social Revolutionaries on trial. Have you forgotten that this great anxiety did not hold fast against your greater anxiety to protect the world bourgeoisie against the united front of the world proletariat. When you rejected the calling of the World Labor Congress for a certain definite date, you unmasked your great anxiety for the lives of the 47 Social Revolutionaries as pure hypocrisy. The heads of the accused were and are to you nothing but pawns, with which you hope to blind the eyes of political children to your shameful bond with the bourgeoisie. These heads were and are nothing to you but loaded dice, which you have thrown on the board of our negotiations in order to deceive the proletarian masses.

How could it be otherwise? You, Henderson, were in the War Cabinet of the money and power-hungry imperialism of Great Britain. You, Mac Donald, suffered this shame. On your hands clots the blood of millions and millions of killed and maimed. Your friends, Vandervelde, Wels, Renaudel and Co., are as political brothers-in-arms of Joffre and Ludendorff, spattered with blood and filth.

You, Henderson and Mac Donald, remained silent in your speeches, did not advertise your great anxiety for human life by telegrams and articles, when your German comrades slaughtered Rosa Luxembourg, Karl Liebknecht, Leo Jogiches and thousands and thousands of revolutionary workers. Where was and is your great anxiety for the thousands of political prisoners who to-day under the most terrible conditions fill the prisons in Germany, Hungary, Jugoslavia, Roumania, the United States, India, South Africa and in other lands, while their wives, children and their aged parents, suffer need and deprivation? In Germany, in whose governments your nearest and dearest friends, Severing, Radbruch and Co. sit, in every country, the rule and dictatorship of owners and exploiters today would be at an end if you and your like did not stand on guard before them. Where was your great anxiety in the conduct and results of the trials, which, as Peoples' Courts in Bavaria and as Special Courts in Central Germany, sent, with the blessings of your friend Ebert, revolutionary workers in hundreds to their death, in thousands to the jails.

We say frankly: Your great anxiety for human life slept calm and undisturbed when the merciless White Terror of bourgeois class justice raged against the revolutionary workers. It awakes however, and wrings its hands, when as advocate for freed workers and peasants, a revolutionary court deals with deeds which had as their aim, the overthrow of this same workers' government, and the murder of the best leaders of the Russian Revolution and of the world proletariat. As protectors of the Social Revolutionaries, you and your friends range yourselves in the ranks of the counter-revolution, of the world bourgeoisie.

Although we had not forgotten for a moment what an abyss of theory and action separated us from you and your friends, we were ready for the greatest concessions to your hypocrisy, for the sake of the present needs of the proletariat and the urgency of the proletarian united front. Although you have broken the conditions of our agreement, against all faith and truth, we will continue to work with all our strength for the proletarian united front, without you and your friends and against you and your friends. Unity with you and your friends will be possible on that day when you and your kind cease to be the lackeys and defenders of the bourgeoisie, of the capitalist order, and when you and your kind begin to fight for and with the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

For the Delegation to the Berlin Conference of the three Executives.

(Signed) Bukharin, Frossard, Radek, Zetkin.

June, 17th 1922.

A Flight before the Truth.

The only real reason for the sudden flight of the foreign defenders of the S.R.'s from the S.R. trial, may be found in the facts that are coming to light in the course of the proceedings. These facts are so damaging to the S.R.'s that their defenders find it advisable to sneak away in time.

(Pravda, June 16, 1922.)

On Wednesday Messrs. Vandervelde, Rosenfeld and Liebknecht made themselves conspicuous by their absence from the court-room. On Wednesday evening, their absence was explained. They presented the court with a statement of protest, based on a series of formal conflicts with the Supreme Tribunal, and on the announcement made by the prosecutors, *Krylenko* and *Lunatcharsky*, that for the court there exists no such thing as the Berlin Agreement, but only the law and the formal rules of the Commissariat of Justice, etc.; they further complained that the trial was not being conducted in accordance with the stipulations agreed upon in Berlin and announced that they would nevertheless remain at the service of the S.R. defendants. The S.R. defendants followed with the announcement that they "exempt" their foreign defenders from the defense.

Anyone with a healthy mind must come to the conclusion that in this case there is only one of two possibilities to be considered: either the S.R. trial offers no possibility to get at the truth, (in that case not a single defendant would even attempt to defend himself before such a court), or, the statement made by Messrs. Vandervelde, Rosenfeld and Liebknecht merely represents a *flight before the truth*. All their references to the breach of the Berlin Agreement are absolute nonsense, not only because this agreement was broken by the Second International, but also because in spite of this most flagrant breach by the Second International, the Supreme Tribunal gave the defenders every opportunity to defend themselves. We pointed out yesterday that on Tuesday, when the question of permitting the defenders to make their own stenographic record of the trial was being debated, *Kurt Rosenfeld*, expressed his satisfaction with the fact that, after the preliminary disagreements and disputes on the question of trial arrangements, etc., the defendants and defenders enjoyed the full liberty of their defense. We may add to this that Mr. Rosenfeld was so certain of this liberty that he told some

of his friends and acquaintances that he intended to leave for Berlin for a fortnight, and that he would return to the last scenes of the trial. The attempt to explain the flight of the defenders by any breach of the Berlin Agreement is absolutely unfounded, as was already pointed out by Comrade *Piatkov*, the President of the Supreme Tribunal, in his answer to the foreign defenders' statement of protest.

If the claims made by the foreign defenders are mere fancy, then why do they leave the defendants undefended, and why do the defendants themselves approve of this? The reason is apparent. Now that they are acquainted with the S.R.'s and with their deeds of valor, Messrs. Vandervelde, Rosenfeld and Liebknecht have come to the conclusion that the S.R. trial will end in the unequivocal proof of the guilt of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party in the organization of an armed struggle against the Soviet Government, a struggle that was carried on until very recently. It will also unmistakably prove that the Central Committee of the S.R.'s organized terroristic acts which it later so hypocritically denied, and that it received money from the various Entente Missions. With this staring them in the face, Vandervelde, Rosenfeld and Liebknecht decided not to be present when these crimes are proven for, if they were to defend all these crimes, they (the Second and 2½ Internationals) would have to shoulder all responsibility for the S.R.'s, a burden that scares them. For this reason Mr. Vandervelde and his assistants from the 2½ International requested the S.R.'s to "exempt" them from the defense, a favor which they promised to return by making lots of noise in their own countries.

Such is the meaning of the flight of the foreign defenders from the S.R. trial. When they come home, they will start a new campaign against Soviet Russia. But these shouts do not disturb us. No madness in the world can destroy *Kurt Rosenfeld's* statement about the fairness of the Supreme Tribunal, made by him *immediately preceding* his flight from the court-room. The statement is in the stenographic record. The presence at the trial of the leaders of large workers' parties in Western Europe, as Clara Zetkin, Muna and Frossard, will make it possible to unmask this contemptible lie and hypocrisy of Vandervelde and Company. The Menshevik defenders ran before the truth, but the Supreme Tribunal will reveal the truth about the S.R. up to the bitter end. And this truth will be made the common property of the whole international proletariat.

Who are the Traitors?

by N. Bukharin.

Vandervelde accuses everyone in the rank and file of the militant workers who has turned his back on the S.R. Party of treachery. But this "treason" is a treason against the bourgeoisie. M. Vandervelde, on the contrary, betrays the workers, Gotz betrays the working class.

The S.R. Trial began with a very interesting episode.

Citizen Vandervelde — who has for the time forgotten his assurance that he appears in the court "solely as an advocate" and will not deal with politics — was "bold" enough to sling an insult in the faces of that group of the accused who, wholly or partly, have gone over to the revolutionary camp.

Citizen Vandervelde had "the manly courage" to tell Konopleva, and Semenov, both militant workers, Stavskaya, who can look back upon nine years at hard labor in Siberia, that they have bought the goodwill of the Communist Party through treason.

This move of Citizen Vandervelde, the "unpolitical" representative of the political Central Committee of the S.R.'s, tears the mask from his face.

What in reality is the case? The former S.R.'s who came over to the revolutionary camp stand as accused before the court.

A part of them are in custody. They require legal representatives like any other accused. Why then does Citizen Vandervelde rage against these workers and active members of the fighting organisation, who in their time risked their lives, and did not keep in safe hiding like Gotz and Donskoi? Why this hate? Quite simple. It is the hate of *political adversaries*. If one looks at it from a political standpoint it will not be difficult to lay bare the roots of this political hate. Everyone who leaves one camp for another betrays, in a certain sense, the first. When *Marx*, born of bourgeois stock, went over to the working class

forces, he betrayed the bourgeoisie. When *Engels*, the manufacturer's son, became leader of the revolutionary proletariat, he was, from the standpoint of the manufacturer, also a traitor. And thanks to such treachery, the working class received its mightiest weapon — Marxist theory.

There is, however, treachery of another sort. That is, if people, who have stood in the ranks of the working class, go over to the bourgeoisie. If, for instance, a Socialist, who has sworn in Stuttgart and Basle to use every means to fight against imperialist wars, becomes later on organizer of such a war, a Minister of the Crown, and signs that basest of all base treaties, the Versailles Treaty, that is treachery, betrayal of the working class.

This sort of treachery is utterly different from the "Marxist". It is not leaving the bourgeoisie to come to the proletariat but the deserting of the proletariat for the bourgeoisie. This variety is very well known to Citizen Vandervelde, for reasons known to all.

Between both these kinds of honest folk there is, however, a difference, not only in their class content but also in their form. If any of the intellectuals come over to the side of the workers, they openly announce their conversion. But it is quite otherwise with the traitors who go over to the camp of the bourgeoisie. They are *afraid* to answer for their conversion. They are able to become Ministers of the Crown but God forbid that they should lay their title "Socialist" aside. They have been able to cry Yea and Amen! to imperialist carnage and then utter pompous phrases on the International and international solidarity. This treachery, this going over to the bourgeoisie, is *identically* the same as the most ignoble hypocrisy.

Not only is Citizen Vandervelde acquainted with this kind of political desertion.

The Central Committee of the S.R.'s knows all too well how they, in the name of Socialism, allied themselves in the closest bonds with every capitalist state against the Russian working masses.

But this hypocrisy leads to yet another quite special kind of treachery, to cowardly calumny of one's own party comrades and those of similar opinions, to disowning one's own deeds without changing one's camp. When Messrs. Gotz and Co. gambled with the lives of the workers and militants of the S.R. by their murderous ambushes of Communists, and then

disowned them, calumiated them, and drew a "dividing line" between themselves and these fighters—that can compare only with the policy of a cowardly general who leaves his soldiers in the lurch. This sort of treachery is of a kind peculiar to the S.R. bureaucracy. And when Citizen Vandervelde loudly talks of *Socialism* and the *working class* and accuses of treachery those people who have found the way back to Socialism and the working class—we can tell him: The *whole* working class will acclaim such treason. It will not pardon but will take revenge, it will punish every one who in their years of direst, bloody affliction, betrayed and deserted the workers, and went over to the Versailles Camp, that they might strangle the mighty proletarian Commune.

Imperialism and the Russian Revolution before the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal.

by A. Alexeiev.

What is the international significance of the S.R. Trial?

This question can be answered only in the following manner: In the court-room, before the Supreme Tribunal, the struggle between the Russian Revolution and World Imperialism that has been going on for 5 years is now being continued.

The battle was fought on the various fronts. The Allies were compelled to put an end to this struggle because it had become hopeless.

The fight was carried on through the blockade and through the policy of isolation. Both the blockade and the barbed-wire fence that was built about Russia were broken down. The best proof of this was Genoa.

The fight has been and is still being carried on on the economic front. In spite of Soviet Russia's weakness and in spite of the overwhelming power of World Imperialism, the latter can win no decisive victory. All it succeeded in doing was to force Soviet Russia to take a step backwards, until it can gather its forces. But the Allies have no hope whatever of coming out victorious.

Is it not a fact that in every country of Europe the workers are now compelled to accept reductions in wages after long strikes? Unfortunately it is a fact. But who, outside of a few traitors and liars, can honestly claim that the bourgeoisie has won a final victory because it succeeded in grabbing a few pennies from the proletariat? The same applies to the concessions which Red Russia is granting to the capitalists in order to restore Russia's economic system.

Yet there is still another battle-front which is more deceptive, and for this reason also more dangerous than the others. All the other fronts are not dangerous as long as the proletariat is well organized and united, as long as it is fully conscious of the aims and methods of its struggle, and as long as it wages its fight with the same self-assurance and determination in the days of victory as in the days of defeat. The Russian proletariat has successfully overcome its numerous enemies only because of its self-assurance, its unity of organization, its faith in victory and its readiness to make sacrifices for the great cause.

At this point the efforts of World Imperialism set in. The dream of the enemies of the Revolution is to destroy the fort of the revolution from within, or at least to undermine its foundation. But how are they to accomplish this?

It would be sheer idiocy for our enemies to march up against us under their own banners.

If at a workers' meeting in Russia a man should appear and address the workers as follows: "Russian workers, you are being misled when you follow Lenin on the road to Communism; you must follow me; my name is Stinnes-Krupp-Creusot-Vickers-Morgan-Putilov-Nobel. I am the capitalist. I call upon you to follow me and to fight for the ideal of capitalism" the workers would simply give this speaker a good beating.

But the capitalists are no idiots, and they do not dare to speak so frankly. Instead of that, there appears at the meeting a man who with a sweet voice tells his audience the following story: "Comrades, I am Social Revolutionary. I suffered in Czarist prisons. I call upon you to overthrow the Communists and the Soviets. Follow me in the name of Democracy. There awaits you liberty without dictatorship and force. Down with Communists!"

This means about the same thing as in the preceding case. Here too, it is only a question of overthrowing the Soviets and getting rid of the Communists. But in this case the demand is made not by a capitalist but by a "Socialist", and it is to be fought not for capitalism, but for "Socialism" and "Democracy".

The capitalist can sit at ease in the office of his bank; but against the despised Communists he sends abler men. The Capitalist reaps the benefits of this struggle only when the agitation of the Socialist achieves the desired result, the overthrow of the Soviets.

The capitalists then tolerate their "Socialist" agents for a few days or weeks, and afterwards proceed to send the Social Revolutionaries to the devil. For they have served their purpose; they have torn a section of the working-class from the fight for Communism, subjected them to their influence and contributed to the overthrow of the Soviet Power. The rest can be done by capital itself.

In most of the European countries these facts have not as yet been fully substantiated, by the role played by the Socialists as agents of capitalism. In Russia sufficient material has been gathered during the four years of the revolution.

The S.R. Trial will furnish an unequivocal proof of the fact that wherever where the Social Revolutionaries succeeded in overthrowing the Soviet Power, a cruel capitalistic dictatorship was at once placed at the rudder. The Social Revolutionaries are the agents of imperialism. The trial will show that they are the lickspittles of the Entente, whose orders they carried out in the rear of the Red Army. All talk that the S.R. had fought against the Communists only with "spiritual weapons", and that the Communists persecuted "ideas" is not worth a brass farthing. The S.R. Trial will show that it is merely a question of a struggle of imperialism against the revolution.

As regards the methods of "spiritual struggle" employed by the Social Revolutionaries against Communism, the trial will unmask this lie in an unmistakable manner. Bombs, bullets poisoned with curare, expropriations perpetrated in food organizations, nocturnal robberies, robberies committed upon civilians, these are the spiritual weapons of the S.R.

The main task of the S.R. Trial is to show to the workers of the whole world that Imperialism has its agents in the ranks of the proletariat. These agents are to carry on the work of disorganization, but they must under all circumstances call themselves "Socialists".