

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 44

19<sup>th</sup> July 1924

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

## CONTENTS

Zinoviev: War and Leninism

Ten Years Mass Murder

Ludienne Kér: The Capitulation of the French Socialists.  
M. The Situation in Lettland.The Peasants' International to the Peasants of the whole World.  
How to celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the World War

Labour Movement

In the Colonies

Fuderle: The International Labour Conference at Geneva  
and Labour Struggles in Norway

Evelevn Roy: Mr. Gandhi's Swan Song

Union of Soviet Republics

An Appeal of the Communist Academy in Moscow to all Parties

## War and Leninism.

### Tenth Anniversary of the Imperialist War.

By G. Zinoviev.

Moscow, July 7, 1924.

The attitude towards war constitutes one of the most important aspects of the doctrine known as Leninism. In regard to the principles involved in the attitude towards war, the concrete content upon every war in particular, the view on the relation between wars and revolutions, the distinction between aggressive and defensive wars, the classification of wars according to different historical types, the view on national defence, the attitude towards pacifism, the attitude towards the defeat of one's country in the imperialist war - in all these problems, Lenin said its word. In the handling of these problems Lenin reached its highest point of perfection.

Immediately after the convening of the Zimmerwald Conference a pamphlet was published by Lenin and the writer on "War and Leninism and War". This pamphlet, inspired entirely by Lenin and mainly written by him, describes the attitude of Leninism towards war with the utmost terseness and lucidity in the following manner:

#### Socialists' Attitude towards War.

The socialists always condemn wars between nations as unjust and brutal. But our attitude towards war is different from that of the bourgeois pacifists and anarchists. It differs from the former because we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the nation; we understand the impossibility of abolishing war by abolishing classes and without establishing the socialist order; and also because we fully conceive the legitimacy, and the necessity of civil wars, i. e. of wars by the oppressed class against the oppressors, by slaves against slaveowners, by serfs against masters, and by wage labourers against the bourgeoisie.

We differ from the pacifists and anarchists because we are Marxists and we recognise the need for a historical study (from the standpoint of the dialectical materialism of Marx) of every war in particular. In history there have frequently been wars which, in spite of all the horrors, brutalities, calamities and suffering inevitable in every war, were progressive, wars i. e. which were useful to the development of mankind, by assisting in the demolition of particularly harmful and reactionary institutions (e. g. autocracy or serfdom), of the most barbarous despotism in Europe (Turkey and Russia). From this standpoint we should consider the historical features of the present imperialist war.

#### Historical Types of Wars in Modern Times

"The modern epoch in human history was opened by the Great French Revolution. Since that time until the Commune of Paris, from 1789 to 1871, one of the types of wars was the bourgeois-progressive, war of national-liberation. In other words, the principal feature and the historical meaning of these wars was the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism; the undermining and overthrowing of foreign oppression. For this reason when such wars occurred, all honest revolutionary democrats, including all socialists, invariably wished the success of that side (i. e. of that bourgeoisie) which was assisting in overthrowing or undermining the most dangerous shackles of feudalism, absolutism and the oppression of other nations. For instance, in the revolutionary wars of France, there was an element of pillage and overthrowing of foreign oppression. For this reason when so way changing the fundamental historical importance of these wars, which shook and demolished the feudalism and absolutism of old, serf-bound Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany robbed France, but this did not change the fundamental historical importance of this war, which emancipated millions

of the German race from their feudal dismemberment and oppression by the two despots, the Russian Czar and Napoleon III.

#### Difference between Aggressive and Defensive Wars.

"The epoch of 1789-1871 left deep traces and revolutionary landmarks behind it. Prior to the overthrow of feudalism, absolutism and alien yokes, there could be no talk of the development of the proletarian fight for socialism. Speaking of the legitimacy of "defensive" war in regard to the wars of such an epoch, the socialists had always in mind these very aims, which spelled revolution against mediaevalism and serfdom. By "defensive" war the socialists always understood a "just" war in this sense (this was the very expression used once by W. Liebknecht). It was only in this sense that the socialists understood, as they do now the legitimacy, progressiveness and justice of "National Defence" or of "Defensive" War. For instance, if tomorrow Morocco declared war on France, India on England, China or Persia on Russia and so on, these would be "just" and "defensive" wars, regardless as to who was the first aggressor, and every socialist would wish for a victory of the oppressed and dependent states against their oppressor, the slave-driving and predatory "great" powers.

But imagine that a slaveowner, having 100 slaves, fights against a slaveowner who has 200 slaves, for a more "equitable" distribution of the slaves. It stands to reason that in such a case the application of the terms "defensive war" or "national defence" would be a historical falsification and common deception of the ignorant elements of the bourgeoisie and of the common people on the part of the astute slaveowners. It is in this manner that the nations are now hoodwinked by the modern imperialist bourgeoisie, who use the terms of "national" ideology and of national defence for the present war between slave-drivers for the strengthening and fastening of the chains of slavery.

#### The Present War is an Imperialist War.

"Nearly everybody recognises the present war (this was written in 1915) as an imperialist war, but this conception is mostly being distorted, or adopted in a one-sided manner, or the suggestion is smuggled in that this might still be a bourgeois progressive, war of national-liberation. Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism reached in the 20th century. Capitalism began to feel crowded in the old national states, without whose formation it could not have overthrown feudalism. Capitalism has become so concentrated that entire branches of industry are captured by syndicates, trusts and billionaire corporations, and nearly the whole surface of the earth has been divided between these "kings of capital", either in the shape of colonies or by way of enmeshing other countries in a thousand threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition were substituted by monopolist aspirations, by the ambition to capture new lands for the investment of capital, for the export of raw material and so on. From a liberator of nations, which capitalism was in the fight against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations. Capitalism has become reactionary instead of progressive, it has developed the productive forces to the extent that the human race will have either to embrace socialism or to be doomed to long years of armed fighting by the "great" powers for the artificial maintenance of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges, and national oppression of every kind."

With the same classical lucidity, Leninism gave the answer to the question: what is social-chauvinism?

#### What is Social-Chauvinism?

"Social-chauvinism is the advocacy of the idea of "national defence" in the present war. The logic of this idea is the rejection of the class struggle during the war, the voting of war credits, and so on. As a matter of fact, the social-chauvinists are carrying on anti-proletarian, bourgeois politics because they are in fact advocating not "national defence" in the sense of fighting against alien yoke, but in the sense of the "right" of one or another set of the "great" powers to rob the colonies and to oppress foreign nations. The social-chauvinists repeat the bourgeois deception of the people, alleging that this is a war for the defence of liberty and existence of the nations, thus joining the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. To the social-chauvinists belong also those who justify and belaud the government and the bourgeoisie of one of the belligerent groups of powers, as well as those who, like Kautsky, recognise the equal

right of socialists in all the warring countries "to defend the fatherland". Social-chauvinism being in fact the defender of the privileges, prerogatives, deprivations and violence of "its own" (or of any) imperialist bourgeoisie, constitutes the total betrayal of all the socialist convictions and decisions of the international socialist congress of Basle."

And Leninism draws the following conclusion: social-chauvinism is the acme of opportunism. By identifying itself with opportunism, it called for a union of the workers with "their" national bourgeoisie, and a split of the international working class.

Leninism was much taken to task for its "defeatism". Even some of the internationalists, on reaching this point, would turn their backs on bolshevism and their faces to social-chauvinism. Nevertheless Leninism, remaining true unto itself, said:

"The revolutionary class, during a reactionary war, cannot but wish the defeat of its government, cannot but see the connection between its military defeats and the facilities of overthrowing it. Only the bourgeois who thinks that the war is throwing it. Only the governments will doubtlessly be ended by a war between governments, and wishes it to be so, in a war "preposterous" or "absurd" that the socialists of the warring countries should wish for the defeat of all "their" respective governments. On the contrary, just such an attitude would correspond to the innermost thoughts of every class-conscious worker, and would coincide with the line of our activity which is directed towards the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war. The socialists must explain to the masses that there is no salvation for them outside of the overthrow of "their" governments, and that they should take advantage of this purpose of the very difficulties of these governments in present war."

#### Transformation of Imperialist War into Civil War

Such was the fundamental slogan of Leninism in the period of the first world-wide imperialist war. This slogan would be advocated consistently and to the end by standing with feet on the ground of so-called defeatism.

Leninism, while hating the imperialist war with its heart, saw at the same time that this war was putting the earth into the hands of millions and millions of toilers. While denouncing the maudlin pacifism, Lenin appealed to the people to take advantage of the fact that the arms were placed in the hands of the toilers, urging them to turn these arms against the bourgeoisie and to proclaim the revolution.

At the very height of the imperialist war, Leninism at the same time, emphasised that the communists do not denounce national defence at a time when the country has become a socialist, proletarian country. In his theses of 1915, i. e. two years before the passing of power into the hands of the bolsheviks, a moment when bolshevism was still a persecuted political movement and no one believed that the bolsheviks would be in power, Leninism presented to the world an example of dialectical reasoning on the question of national defence. National defence for the capitalists - No! National defence for the workers who have overthrown capitalism and taken power into their own hands - Yes!

This dialectical reasoning was endowed with flesh and blood after the October of 1917, when under the banner of Leninism was born the Red Army, which defended and is defending the world's first socialist state.

Leninism does not tolerate revolutionary phrase-mongering. It particularly detests this kind of phraseology in the question of war. No one was more merciless in ridiculing and withering anti-militarist phraseology of the anarcho-syndicalist spouters and the high-falutin promises of the Social Democratic leaders arranging a general strike against war, and so on. The internationalist position of the Russian delegation to the Hague International Conference against war, which Lenin wrote and which was recently published, give us a sample of the sober reason of the great revolutionary on the question of fighting against war.

"You want to fight against war, then you must first organise illegal revolutionary nuclei in the army in time of peace. Learn in times of peace to set up such organizations among the railwaymen as will really be able at the outbreak of war to hit the capitalists in the most vulnerable spot. You want to fight against war, fight then against the bourgeoisie in times of peace, refuse to vote military credits, enter into alliances with the bourgeoisie, build brick by brick

own independent revolutionary proletarian party. And should war break out after all, then teach the soldiers to organise fraternisation in the trenches, do not conclude a "class truce" with the bourgeoisie, carry on the revolutionary agitation, and hoist at the decisive moment the banner of rebellion against war and against the bourgeoisie."

Hence the ardent, implacable revolutionary hatred which Leninism bore the counter-revolutionary leaders of Social Democracy who aided the bourgeoisie in waging the imperialist war. Scheidemann, Vandervelde, Renaudel, Thomas, Henderson, Austerlitz and the rest of them, from the standpoint of Leninism, are not less guilty of the imperialist butchery than Ludendorff, Hindenburg, Foch, Poincaré and their like.

Ten years ago the leaders of the Second International came out openly as the drivers of the workers into the battlefields of the world butchery. The leaders of the Second International were and are therefore the executioners of the working class.

We shall shortly celebrate the first anniversary of the outbreak of the imperialist war. The leaders of the Second International continue to carry on the same murderous policy of the imperialist war, only with different means. When the French Socialists, who play the part of lackeys of Herriot the "pacifist", vote military credits for the Ruhr occupation; when the head of the Second International, MacDonald, builds new dreadnoughts and gives his benediction to the wholesale shooting of Hindoos; when the whole Second International, by praising the notorious Experts' Plan, are again carrying out the grand deception of the people, what does it all mean if not the continuation of the perfidious and bloody Social-Democratic policy of 1914, in a different form and under different circumstances?

In order to conquer the bourgeoisie, the international proletariat must step over the dead political body of the counter-revolutionary leaders of Social Democracy.

Get the bourgeoisie by the throat! At the same time, put your foot on the breast of the treacherous leaders of Social Democracy! We, Communists, should say this frankly and unmistakably to the advanced workers throughout the world.

## POLITICS

### The Capitulation of the French Socialists.

By Madelaine Kér (Paris).

The socialists have granted the Ruhr credits! The press of the left speaks self-complacently and in a detailed manner of that moment, full of excitement" in which Léon Blum, pale, "but determined", had to choose between the "sacred pledges", which the socialist members of the chamber had given to the workers, and a pact with politicians who are capable of any compromises when it is a question of preserving their power.

This victory was never in doubt! In the face of the right, who laughed scornfully and cynically offered the Herriot ministry an exchangeable majority, Léon Blum made a final effort to abstain from voting. But when Herriot made it a question of confidence in the cabinet there was instantly a great capitulation which resulted in the votes of all the deputies, including the left and the centre, being given to the government, with the exception of the 26 communists.

By this Herriot has realised a sacred union which calls to mind the most beautiful days of the war. The Social Democrats were always prepared to sacrifice their principle by which they gained the confidence of the working masses, upon the altar of the imperialist fatherland and of chauvinistic egoism. Now, however, they are no longer able to seek refuge in high-sounding and hollow phrases in order to conceal their treachery. Whilst in 1914 they justified the abominable slaughter in the name of "justice" and of "Civilisation", they are now compelled mournfully to admit that only the "necessity of a narrow confined policy" demanded the breaking of their promises and that their struggles with conscience" are only the feeble cloak to an all too cynical and obvious betrayal.

"Whatever may be the causes of the Ruhr problem" says Herriot, "it is now a question of finding a solution for it."

The socialists have indeed not had the least scruples in presenting themselves with this kind of justification. This infamous Machiavellism gives approval to the most dishonest operations. Of course it is understood that the block of the left still condemns the imperialist policy of the Comité de Forges. But

that does not prevent them from continuing to carry on the same policy. The earlier declarations of the plain-spoken Paul Painlevé are as characteristic as the same phrases of the chief of the government Herriot: "We cannot give up the economic occupation of the Ruhr. We need coal and the domination of the railways."

The socialist deputies will perhaps attempt to console their active party members by pointing out that the credits have been given but that the military occupation will be abandoned and that, taken all together, a more just and human policy has been instituted as was promised at the elections, as an amnesty has been granted which permits the return of those who had been exiled.

But the followers of the socialist party and the workers who seriously believed that by turning out Poincaré and the national block the danger of war has been removed, and that a new era has begun, will remember with bitterness the election promises of their parliamentary representatives regarding the Ruhr occupation. They remember the congress of the Socialist International (22nd May 1923), when Léon Blum made a protest against the occupation because it constitutes a violation of the right of a nation to self-determination, because it rouses the nationalist feelings of the masses and is a continuation of the state of war and finally because it is not true that it renders possible a solution of the reparations problem. These people can contrast the declarations which we ourselves have made with the lies and deception in that session of the chamber and they will realise how far their leaders have gone in the denial and abjuration of all socialist principles.

### The Situation in Lettland.

By S. M.

Up to seven years ago the Lettish folk were subject to the arbitrary rule of Baltic feudalism. Simultaneously with Russia, Lettland was swept with the waves of revolution. Counter-revolution, however, has for the time being borne off the victory. Five years ago there was established the free social democratic republic of Lettland, according to the present day mode. This Lettland, patronised by the Entente powers, serves the purpose of a buffer state against the Red Danger of the East. For this reason it is coddled by its guardians like the tenderest infant, for the statesmen of Lettland prove to be ready tools for the realisation of the policy of the capitalist West.

The champions for the emancipation of the Lettish people from bondage have already forgotten that they at one time were revolutionaries. Today they constitute the bourgeoisie; they have stepped into the shoes of the former ruling class and have fully taken over their traditions.

Militarism is in full bloom. Compulsory service is universal. The discipline borders on terror. Every free-born Lettish subject has to render eighteen months "service to the country".

In place of the former eight hour day there is now unemployment. But every unemployed must suffer in silence, as unemployed benefit cannot be granted on account of the "difficult economic conditions". On the other hand the masters in Lettland do not lack for anything.

As regards the trade unions and other workers' organizations, these are suppressed as much as possible at it is first and foremost necessary to keep down the workers. For this reason the organizers and the most active workers are specially subject to espionage. In this respect the "Politska Absordziba" (Political Police) render valuable service.

The political police force is formed exactly after the model of that of the old Tsarist times, as an independent institution with a perfect organization, and receives very generous grants from the Finance Minister. It is the task of this "Ochranka" to keep a continual watch over "agitators" and to remove them out of the way. As an instance: a representative of the interests of the working class - which in Lettland is paramount to high treason - was to be rendered harmless. A female agent of the "Ochranka" approached this comrade with the offer to take charge of proclamations. This offer was refused. She visited him on a second occasion at his lodgings, and this time also failed to achieve any direct success. But her purpose was accomplished: When the Police agents appeared on the same day at the house of the comrade in question with an order to search the premises, and found in his lodgings a flag, the existence of which he was quite ignorant, bearing the inscription, "Down with the Government of Trakste!" it dawned on him what was the object of the woman's visit. On the strength of this discovery

the comrade was arrested. The "Ochranka" attempted by means of torture to wring a confession from him. But as he firmly insisted that he was not the owner of the flag, he was suddenly confronted with the alleged woman communist, who stated on oath that she was present when the comrade made the flag. And this sufficed to seal the fate of a proletarian. For the Court, in the name of the free Lettish people, will sentence him to five to eight years imprisonment. And this is the lot of many thousands of free Lettish citizens in free Lettland.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The International Labour Conference at Geneva.

By A. Enderle.

On the 21st June last there commenced at Geneva the sixth international labour conference. These conferences constitute the parliament of the Labour Bureau. The present conference was given tremendous advertisement in the bourgeoisie and Social Democratic press of all countries. Every day there appeared long reports over the "arduous labours" of the conference. Great rhetorical duels were "fought" and a terrible "struggle" took place over the eight hour day. The great masses are thereby purposely deluded into believing that in Geneva the interests of the working population are actually being preserved and promoted. But those who are in the know, and especially the capitalists and the reformist wire-pullers, are chuckling to themselves, for they know that the Geneva "comedy" is only being played for "the common people"; that there, instead of the welfare of labour being promoted, there is only being conducted a collaboration policy between the trade union leaders and the capitalists on an international scale, with the sole object of diverting the proletariat from the class war and from revolution.

If any one should doubt these facts he need only examine the composition and the deliberations of the conference a little more closely. The conference is composed of three equally large categories of representatives of governments, of employers and of labour (so called). As the governments of all the participating states are purely capitalist ones, there exists already with the government and employers' representatives a two thirds capitalist majority. But even the remaining third, the "labour" representatives, are such faithful henchmen of capital that there is never seen at the conference a proletarian front opposed to a capitalist front, but in most cases there prevails the sweetest harmony among all participants, or in so far as there are any differences whatever they are of a national character.

There lay before the conference a printed report on the activity of the Labour Bureau, the numbered of affiliated states and those states which have ratified the so-called Washington Convention. One learned from this that 54 states are affiliated to the Labour Bureau. The bulk of these belong to the League of Nations; yet Germany, which is not a member of the League, is affiliated to the Labour Bureau. The report mentions that among the important states not affiliated are America, Russia, Mexico, Turkey and Egypt. It is "hoped" that Russia will soon affiliate.

The decisions (Conventions) of the Washington Conference of the year 1919 regarding the eight hour day, unemployed, sick, accident and old age benefit, as well as regarding: regulations for the prevention of accidents and sickness, night work, children's and women's labour etc. are, according to the report, only fully "recognised" by one state, Poland, while the eight hour day is only "recognised" that is, legally introduced, by Greece, Bulgaria, Czecho-Slovakia and — don't laugh — by India.

One perceives by this that in spite of the five years existence of the Labour Bureau, which, as Oudegeest declared in Vienna, is a child of the Amsterdam trade Union International, the Washington decisions have not yet been recognised by a single great capitalist state. But even if this were the case it would not alter the position of the workers in the least, for in those states which have "recognised" and "legally introduced" the eight hour day, more than eight hours a day are being worked. This swindle is revealed in the most glaring manner by the fact that on the same day on which the representative of the Polish government, Count Akrynski, solemnly delivered the official declaration of his government that Poland had recognised and legally carried through all the thirteen conventions, including

the eight hour day, the telegraph conveyed the news, that the twelve hour day had been introduced in the Polish mines and smelting industry. One after another, M. Thomas, Jouhaux, Mertens, Poulton, the "labour" representatives of the Entente, expressed their enthusiastic appreciation to the Poles for their "great act in the interest of humanity". But that at the same time the proletariat of the mining and smelting industry, besides hundred of thousands of workers in other professions in Poland, are compelled to work a twelve hour shift, was wisely not mentioned by these "labour" representatives, not to speak of raising a protest against it.

And in spite of this these arch-scoundrels have the brazenness to carry on the world-comedy in Geneva, and to devote four days of eager debate over the eight hour day alone and to exhibit great differences as if they were fighting in all seriousness in order to obtain the eight hour day for the exploited proletarians of the whole world. But in spite of all the cunning of this crowd they were unable to conceal what are the actual differences with regard to this question. The whole concern of all delegates is nothing else but the profit of the capitalists. It is true that after the conclusion of the war and as a result of the pressure of the revolutionary masses, Germany was the first country to introduce the eight hour day. On grounds of expediency, and also in response to the pressure of their workers, the employers of other countries partially followed suit with the introduction of the eight hour day. But all of these states cautiously avoided recognising the Washington decisions. With the restrengthening of the German capitalist class and the defeat of the proletariat, thanks to the German Social Democrats, the eight hour day was abolished in Germany de facto by a decree of the 23rd December 1923. "In principle" it still exists, but in practice 54.7% of all proletarians in Germany already work over eight up to 16 hours daily, these figures do not comprise the miners and agricultural labourers, all of whom are working longer hours. This fact is disturbing the Entente capitalists, especially those of France and England, in the highest degree. They stand in fear of the unfair competition of Germany. And having regard to the well known ruthlessness with which the German employers have always exploited their wage slaves in which they are backed up by the German state power with police clubs and machine guns in their attacks against the workers, the fears of the English and French capitalists are not unfounded. In this respect, the "labour" representatives and the employers' representatives of France and England are proceeding arm in arm and delivering wonderful speeches on the utility and human necessity of the eight hour day. Their sudden love for the eight hour day is based on a very real capitalist demand, i.e. upon the control of German industry. On this point cordiality ceases for all German representatives. Not only the German government representative Leymann, and the representative of the German employers, Vogel but also the German Amsterdamers under the leadership of the Social Democratic Hermann Müller protest against this control. It is well understood that this control has as its object that no longer than eight hours a day shall be worked in Germany. And the correspondent of the capitalist "Vossische Zeitung" was able triumphantly to declare:

"As a result of the efforts of the German trade union representatives, it has been possible to have the point directed against Germany deleted from the wording of the resolution."

It would hardly be possible for the international proletariat to gain a clearer glimpse into the wretched nature of the Amsterdam trade union international and the purely capitalist character of the Labour Bureau, than through the debates on the eight hour day which have taken place at Geneva. Once again have the Amsterdamers, on an occasion where the actual interests of labour were at stake, divided into national groups and instead of standing in one proletarian front against capital, have taken sides with the capitalists of "their fatherland" in the national competitive rivalry of capital. On the other hand this incident has proved to the whole international proletariat that the Geneva Labour Bureau and the labour conferences convened by it, are nothing else but councils at which plans are concocted for the better preservation of capitalist profits and for the most advantageous exploitation of the proletariat. If it were otherwise, the Amsterdamers of every country would in this case be able to do no other than stand together and to have torn the hypocritical mask from the face of the whole international capitalist class and mobilised the proletariat of all countries against the gang of capitalist exploiters. But who would expect anything of this sort from these hirelings of the employing class?

Up to the moment of writing no final decision has been come to regarding the eight hour day, but one has no need to be a prophet in order to predict that in the end a compromise resolution will be unanimously adopted and that in every country the working day will be prolonged.

It would be superfluous to go more closely into the other items of the labour conference, because here also it is the same, i.e. beautiful speeches are delivered and decisions are adopted which deceive the workers somewhat but do no harm to the capitalists. As an example, there need only be mentioned here that the question of unemployment was dealt with at great length. The conference, according to the "Vorwärts", came to a "heroic" decision in which all governments are recommended to work out "memoranda" (!!) on the problem of unemployment which shall contain proposals as to remedies. A "magnificent" help for the unemployed!

The Amsterdamers have nothing particular to boast about as to their deeds in Geneva. They therefore make the more fuss over the exclusion of the fascist trade union representative from the conference. The Amsterdamers wish by this means to give evidence of their "fight" against the fascists. Even this bit of "fame" is very doubtful, for this fascist had been allowed to take part in the sittings for ten days without being challenged and only at the moment when the shares of Mussolini and Co. had sunk to zero in Italy, did the brave heroes of Amsterdam adopt the decision to exclude this fascist labour representative from the conference. This was a great act of injustice, for even if the Amsterdamers are not fascists of the type of Mussolini, they are no less as zealous representatives of capital as the former.

Thus the 6th International Labour Conference in spite of all the puffing advertisement and attempts to deceive the working class of the whole world has shown plainly and unmistakably that the Geneva Labour Office, with all its conferences and paraphernalia, is a very profitable undertaking for capital and that the Amsterdamers are still precisely the same nationalists and traitors as they showed themselves to be in the world war, in the Ruhr crisis and on many other occasions.

### Labour Struggles in Norway.

By Nord (Christiania).

A break has occurred in the long and bitter fight for existence waged by the Norwegian workers. The conflict as is known, started in October of last year with the strike of the metal workers, ended in a compromise which represents a peace without either victors or vanquished. The terms of the compromise had to be submitted to all the organized workers. The ballot which took place at the end of May resulted in a very small majority for acceptance (10,650 votes for and 8,250 against). If we take into account that the dispute involved 55,000 workers we can appreciate the entire futility of this ballot.

As a matter of fact a considerable portion of the workers' organizations fought to the last moment against this compromise, and even that section which stood for the immediate conclusion of peace, did not make propaganda for the compromise but desired to leave with the workers the final decision. Hence, many metall workers and builders, along with workers in other branches of industry, voted against this compromise and it was only owing to the circumstance that the rather strong federation of paper workers could not decide to break off the negotiations completely, that the compromise was, although with greatest difficulty, accepted.

The grounds of this struggle seem on first glance to be purely of a legal character. The fight began with the illegal strike of the workers in the iron works in October 1923, owing to the employers taking advantage of the slight fall in the index prices to lower wages immediately.

The fight gradually extended as a result of lock-outs and sympathetic strikes so that finally 50,000 workers were affected. The Communists brought home to the minds of the Norwegian workers that in this struggle it was not a question of obtaining the best possible advantages from the trade boom, but of opposing the class war for the great aim: setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At the head of the fight of the Norwegian workers there stood the Communist Party of Norway which, under the leadership of comrade Scheflo, is affiliated to the Comintern. The fact that this group has been strengthened during the fight and that it has pushed into the background the group supporting Tranter (who did not submit to the discipline of the Comintern) and

liquidated the group of the academicians "Mot Dag", proves the fighting power and the class consciousness of the Norwegian proletariat.

On the 20th May the "Arbejderbladet" (Workers' Newspaper) in Christiania wrote, that the settlement of this fight does not mean the conclusion of peace as far as the class war is concerned. The workers' leaders declare daily at crowded workers' meetings that before a few months are over a much larger and more embittered strike will break out which, in the event of the workers gaining the upper hand, will mean the beginning of the social revolution.

## TEN YEARS MASS MURDER

### The Peasants' International to the Peasants of the whole World.

Down with war!

Brothers and Sisters! Peasants!

Ten years ago the governments of the bourgeoisie and of the big landowners drove millions of peasants and workers to the battlefields.

All the lackeys of the bourgeoisie sought to show you that the war was necessary for the defence of the fatherland, of culture, for the liberation of the small nationalities — in one word, that the war was being conducted in the interests of and for the welfare of the whole people. The parsons of every creed and denomination blessed the barbarous annihilation on the part of the workers and peasants of one country, of their own brothers of the plough and of the bench in another country.

At present each one of you knows that the late imperialist war was a war between two sets of capitalist bandits for a new repartition of the world, that it was a war between powerful capitalist groups for the right to exploit the natural resources and the masses of the people of still newer countries. The handful of parasites who have full power at their disposal sent you to the slaughter.

Millions of peasants of the colonial countries, for the right to exploit whom, the war was mainly conducted were called to arms. The capitalist criminals in pursuit of their dirty aims have not only made use of national, but also of racial hatred by despatching coloured troops to the battlefields of Europe.

Millions of toilers were torn from the ploughs and benches, and you were condemned to lead a severe and vagrant life at the fronts. You were devoured by lice in the trenches, your bodies have been torn and crippled by artillery shells, and your families, their bodies wasted by prolonged ill-nutrition, at the same time fainted away from hunger and diseases, to which they could no longer offer any resistance. During this time the capitalist speculators like a crowd of jackals went about, extorting huge wealth out of the blood and the indescribable misery of the working masses.

In the past imperialist war more than thirteen million peasants and workers have been killed and no less a number of cripples and invalids are dragging on their wretched existence. In the last war wealth which had been accumulated by the work of a whole generation was destroyed, amounting to one hundred milliard Pound Sterling, i.e. a sum which would render the whole world population free of any taxes for a period of 50 to 60 years, as this amount would cover the state expenditure of all countries for half a century. Industry and agriculture have been destroyed, and the workers of the world have fallen into the grip of indescribable misery. It was only the Bolshevik October Revolution of 1917 which, among other slogans, raised those of "Down with war" and "All power to the workers and peasants" that awakened the popular masses.

The wave of indignation of the working masses threatened to overthrow the rule of the capitalists and big landowners in all countries. The capitalist criminals, under the pressure of the masses, were compelled to end this terrible war and by various promises tried to pacify the workers and peasants. Only in Russia did the workers and peasants, under the leadership of the Bolshevik party refuse to allow themselves to be deceived, and destroyed the original cause of all wars, the capitalist Social Order, and overthrew the domination of the bourgeoisie and of the big landowners and created the first workers' and peasants' State of the world.

## How to Celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the World War.

(Secrets of the War.)

By D. Petrovsky.

In a remarkable document written by Lenin on the 4th of December 1922, which was intended as an instruction to the Soviet Delegation to the Hague Conference we read:

"We must explain to the people the great atmosphere of secrecy in which war is born and how helpless the ordinary Labour Organisation, even if it calls itself revolutionary, is in the face of an approaching war."

Without understanding the secrets of war we cannot devise methods of fighting fresh bloody butcheries. In order to reveal the secrets of war, Lenin in this document recommended that it be made as concrete and as clear as possible how the last war was brought about. Hitherto this has not been done. The first task of the campaign week therefore is concretely and if possible photographically recall the events which took place in the last days of July and the first days of August 1914.

If we refer to the newspapers of that time, we will undoubtedly find material concerning the reparations which the parties of the Second International made for the 10th Congress of that International which should have taken place in Vienna at the beginning of August 1914. The Socialist Parties intended to convert this Congress into a solemn demonstration in connection with the 50th anniversary of the First International (formed 1864) and of the 25th anniversary of the Second International which was organised on the centenary of the French Revolution, — in 1889.

The socialists of the Second International perfectly well understood the inevitability of a world-war. They spoke of it in Stuttgart and in Copenhagen, and to combat the approaching war, an extraordinary international congress was called in Basel in November 1912.

In spite of all, the war came suddenly and unexpectedly. The leaders of the Second International were arranging festive resolutions on the golden and silver wedding of the Internationals at the very moment when the devil's dance arranged by the imperialists had already commenced.

Surprise, — this is the strength of the war secretly arranged by the dominant class.

Consequently, irrespective of the good or the evil intention of the organisations who intend to "meet" war by a general strike or civil war, all measures intended to be put into operation when the war has broken out are utterly useless.

To photographically recall the main events which took place in the last week preceding the war, will concretely and convincingly demonstrate to the toiling masses that it is necessary to prepare to meet the dangers of war in peace time, and that these preparations must be made in the most careful manner. The working class does not know and cannot know at what hour the imperialists had decided to set light to the conflagration and therefore they must be always prepared.

In the light of the lesson learned at the beginning of the imperialist war, the manifesto drafted by the Fifth Congress of the Comintern assumes exceptional importance. The manifesto recommends that work be conducted in such a way that youth join the capitalist armies with the determination to use their weapons not against their brother proletarians, but against their class-enemies, the bourgeoisie.

The manifesto further proposes that the class-conscious soldiers in the army be organised into small nuclei. At the same time it is necessary to set revolutionary organisations on railways and ammunition factories.

These nuclei are of exceptional importance because the work conducted in munition factories are part of the secret of war. While the manifesto of the Fifth Congress was being drafted up the London "Daily Herald" published an interesting exposure of the manufacture of war material in Czecho-Slovakia and Austria. The munition factories in these countries were executing the orders of the French imperialists. The most piquant illustration of this exposure is that the Austrian State factories are secretly producing munitions of war without the knowledge of the military commission and conference of ambassadors.

We are unable to penetrate into the chancelleries where secrets of the preparations for the next war are kept.

The peasants and the workers of western Europe and of other countries which were still lending an ear to the Social Democrats and to other traitors of the people, instead of abolishing once for all the original source of all wars by means of the weapons which they had at their disposal at that moment — instead of destroying the capitalist social order — were satisfied with the cessation of the war and with the promises of reforms, land, freedom etc.

Now the masses of the people perceive that they have been impudently deceived. The promises have up to now remained but promises. In a period, when the wounds of the past imperialist war are still open and in addition to the industrial crises an agrarian crisis is rising, the predatory big landowners and capitalists, regardless of all this, calmly prepare for new wars. The expenditures of the states on new armaments are three times higher than in 1913, the year of mad armaments. The governments of the bourgeoisie, and of the big landowners are preparing a new mass slaughter with feverish speed. Not content with the terrible instruments of murder already existing, they proceed to produce new ones. War is transferred from the continents and the seas to the air, and in the coming war, which can break out at any moment, aeroplanes and poisonous gases will be employed on a colossal scale.

If the masses of the people remain passive, we shall witness in the not distant future a new war even more terrible than the past one.

Therefore, on the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the late world war, the millions of workers and peasants must realise the simple truth that without the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the big landowners, there can be no talk whatever of a sure peace. In order to secure the possibility of peaceful development and prosperity for working mankind, it is absolutely necessary to eliminate the chief cause of wars and of every social evil: the capitalist Social Order. This can only be achieved by means of revolutionary struggles, by means of the armed insurrection of the people. There is no other means. It does not suffice to confine oneself to mere protests, it is necessary to prepare oneself for the fight against the gang of the bourgeoisie and the big landowners who are preparing a new terrible war for the tortured popular masses of the towns and villages.

Brothers and Sisters! Peasants!

The danger of new wars is growing and you cannot wait any longer with folded arms. We, the representatives of the Peasants' International which unites already millions of poor peasants of all countries, call upon you to arrange joint demonstrations with the revolutionary working class in the week devoted to the fight against the danger of new wars.

If you wish to avoid that utmost disaster which war constitutes for the peasants you must bear in mind that the slogan "Down with War" means "Down with the power of the bourgeoisie and the big landowners".

Therefore you must prepare yourselves for the fight against them in order to overthrow their rule and take power into your own hands together with the working class at the given moment. Mere pious wishes will not help in any way. Drive from your midst those pacifists who cry "Long live peace" and who at the same time by strengthening the power of the big landowners and of the bourgeoisie, actually prepare a war.

In the week devoted to the protest against war, may the call of hundreds of millions of peasants ring forth all over the world.

Down with the expenditure on armaments!  
Long live Disarmament and the abolition of compulsory military service!

Down with War!  
Down with the power of the bourgeoisie, of the big landowners and of their lackeys!

Long live the revolutionary alliance of the workers and peasants!

The land to the peasants the factories to the workers!  
Clear out the imperialists from the colonies!  
All power to the peasants and workers!  
Long live the Peasants' International!  
Peasants and workers of all countries, unite!

The Presidium of the International Peasants' Council:

A. P. Smirnov (Soviet Russia), T. F. Dombal (Poland), Burgin (Germany), Marius Vazeille (France), M. P. Gorov (Bulgaria), Otto Rydlo (Czecho-Slovakia), Ngyuen-ai-Quac (Colonies, Indo-China), Chero (Scandinavian countries), Ursilio Galvani (Mexico), Ken Chayashi (Japan), Green (U. S. A.).

"Labour" minister MacDonald "honorably" conceals from the workers who elected him the secrets of Curzon. MacDonald's French colleague, Leon Blum is not let into the secrets of Poincaré. With closed eyes he votes the war-credits. In order to expose the military secrets of the world incendiaries we can only use the treaties which the October revolution dragged out of the Tsarist archives. But these treaties apply to the past. In the munition factories however, are concealed the secrets of the threatening future and it is precisely in these factories that the toilers must organise their basis for a successful war against war.

Let us return to the beginning of war. In the last days of June and the first of August 1914 the methods of deceiving the masses stood out in special relief. When MacDonald's under secretary for war states that the Red Army numbers 1,003,000 men when the actual figures are 562,967 he is deliberately making the "moral preparations for war". The Soviet government's repudiation does not disturb him in the least. He knows that the capitalist press will see to it that the masses will know nothing about its repudiation. In peace-time however, the lies are not palpable as they are in the last days before the outbreak of war. The newspaper communications published during the last few days before the war provide excellent material showing how both belligerent sides lied impudently in order to create the impression that the enemy was to blame. The enemy was mobilising, the enemy was threatening, the enemy is attacking. This was the essence of the military political communications in the press of those days in both countries. We must recall these communications in order to enable the masses to see through the secrets of military preparation.

All the "moral preparation for war" in essence is nothing but surrounding war in impenetrable secrecy. In this the most reliable instrument of the dominant classes was and is considered to be the pacifist decoy duck. The whole week preceding the war was devoted to pacifist demonstrations. Among the "pacifists" was the imperialist Wilhelm II, who on the 30th of August 1914 was described as the peace-lover and peace-maker. The French bourgeois government in order to demonstrate its love of peace participated in the funeral of Jean Jaures who was assassinated because he honestly fought against the war mania. Pacifism is the most reliable means of camouflaging war and its predatory aims. Before America was drawn into the war Wilson was elected president as the champion of peace. Three days before America declared its Armed neutrality Wilson addressed a passionate appeal for peace to the world. The purpose of all these pacifist demonstrations and declarations is to convince the masses of the people that the governments are compelled to enter the war against their will; bearing in mind the passionate desire of the people for peace, the imperialists managed to present the world-war as a war for peace and declared it to be the Last War.

If we concretely recall the bloody events of 1914 we shall demonstrate to the masses the service rendered by pacifism in the preparation for war. The history of the art of war teaches us that all camouflage is effective only as long as the enemy does not see through it. Consequently the exposure of bourgeois pacifism will expose the secret of war. The events which took place on the eve of the world-war imperatively dictates to the masses the need for regarding every pacifist demonstration as a threatening warning of serious preparations for war.

From this point of view we must regard not only the Hague conference at which scores of peace societies of various nomenclatures were present but also the recent pacifist demonstration organised by the Amsterdamer at their Vienna Congress. The beginning of the world-war sufficiently exposes the character of the resolutions and promises of the heroes of the Second International.

The world-war commenced when the Socialist Parties of the Second International had clear indications as to the path they must take in the event of war breaking out. In the manifesto of the Basle Congress we read: "The Congress directly and clearly indicates the path the workers must take if the crime is perpetrated, if war is declared, — the path of civil war." This was the obligation resting upon the Socialist Parties, but when war broke out, instead of declaring civil war they declared a class war and surrendered the banner of socialism and solidarity to the fratricidal war organised in the interests of the rich plunderers.

At the grave of Jaures, Jouhaux declared: "From this day we march to the war and I too will go", and now he promises to combat war in order to be able when the moment

arrives to call upon the workers to fight for their bourgeois fatherland.

If it is true that pacifism is a means of camouflaging military preparations and military action, it is not less true that the Second International represents the school and the army from which imperialism recruits its camouflageurs.

Concretely contrasting 1914—1924 will give us a wealth of material by which to penetrate the secret of the preparations for war. It will show that the danger of war is increasing every day.

During the anti-war campaign week we must not only expose the secret of new wars which the imperialists are arranging, but also calculate the real forces which may in fact and not merely in words combat the piratical plans of the imperialists.

By the force of circumstances the week's campaign against imperialism and social-treachery will be converted into a campaign week for the Comintern, for the Soviet Union and for the Red Army.

## IN THE COLONIES

### Mr. Gandhi's Swan-Song.

By Evelyn Roy.

That the leadership of the Indian nationalist movement has passed definitely out of the hands of Mr. Gandhi and the orthodox school of Non-Cooperation, was proven by the session just concluded of the All-India Congress Committee at Ahmedabad. This is the first official deliberation in which Mr. Gandhi has participated since his release from prison in January of this year, when he was operated upon for appendicitis, and has since been undergoing a slow convalescence. The two years which have intervened between his arrest and conviction to six years' rigorous imprisonment, have brought many changes in the program and tactics of the Indian National Congress. The Swaraj Party, headed by Mr. C. R. Das of Bengal, succeeded in having an amendment passed to the Non-Cooperation Program, permitting those who desired to take part in the elections to the Legislative Councils, for the purpose of carrying on obstruction to the Government. The elections of 1923 were contested by the Swaraj Party, which succeeded in capturing about half the seats in the provincial and All-India Legislatures. By an agreement arrived at with the Independent Nationalists, whose demands are not so extreme as the Swarajists but who occupy a centre position between the Liberals or Moderates and the Non-Cooperators, the Swarajists were able to command a small majority of votes in the Central Legislatures and several of the provinces; and to defeat practically all the government measures brought before those bodies for approval. Thus, the center of gravity of the national struggle has shifted, during the past six months, from the orthodox Gandhists to the Swarajists, who still claim to be a part of the Indian National Congress, formerly entirely controlled by Mr. Gandhi and his followers.

The release of the Mahatma from prison, by an act of grace of the Labour Government soon after the latter assumed office, was regarded as the dawn of a new era in Indian political life. The lost leader had returned to his followers; the Non-cooperation movement which had fallen into stagnation since his arrest, would be revived and become once more a powerful revolutionary force, which would sweep the Swaraj Party into the background of the struggle. Six months passed without any change in the situation, due to the feeble health of the Mahatmaji, and his desire to acquaint himself with the details of the situation, with which he had lost touch for two years. Private conversations with the various leaders of the National Congress, representing different schools of thought, were held at Juhu, the little sea-side resort where Mr. Gandhi was convalescing, but strict secrecy was observed as to the nature of these discussions. Thus the first official pronouncement of the Mahatma was made just a few weeks previous to the Ahmedabad session of the All-India Congress Committee — the supreme executive body of the Indian National Congress.

This official pronouncement took the form of a simultaneous statement of policy on the part of Mr. Gandhi, for the orthodox Non-Cooperators, known as the "No-Changers", and of the two chief leaders of the Swaraj faction, or "Pro-Changers", Messrs. C. R. Das and Moti Lal Nehru. This statement, which followed a series of prolonged conversations between the rival factions within the National Congress, aroused a great sensation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

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

Dear Comrades,

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

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

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

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

(signed) Henriott Deruna, Librarian.

# Special Number: Against War and Social Treachery.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

# - INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 45

21<sup>st</sup> July 1924

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

## Lenin and the Outbreak of the World War.

By G. Zinoviev.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And our Comrade Lenin kept his word.