

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 9. No. 3

15th January 1929

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliesfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

Lenin-Liebknecht-Luxemburg-Week.

Lenin on the State (From an unpublished Lecture).

Stages of the Struggle. — Lenin, Liebknecht, Luxemburg in the Fight for the Transformation of War into Civil War.

N. LENIN: On the Defeat of One's Own Government in Imperialist War.

From LENIN'S: Socialism and War.

Z. LEDER: Karl Liebknecht und Rosa Luxemburg — Leaders of the German Revolution.

G. ZINOVIEV: Karl Liebknecht and the War.

C. SMOLYANSKY: Rosa Luxemburg in the Struggle against Trade Union Bureaucracy.

J. SIGUR: The Victims of the Imperialist War 1914/1918.

SOLDAT: The Growth of Militarism.

Tatiana GLEBOVA: How Should the Lenin-Liebknecht-Luxemburg Campaign Be Carried out?

To All Organisations Affiliated to the R. I. L. U.

Lenin
Lenin on the State.

From an Unpublished Lecture.

The following is the full text of a part of a lecture delivered by Lenin on the 11th July, 1919, in the "Central School for Soviet Officials (As the Sverdlov University was formerly termed). The full text of the whole lecture will be published in the next number of the "International".

The Editorial Board.

The State is a machine for the purpose of maintaining the dominance of one class over another. When there were no classes in society, when, up to the time of slavery, humanity lived under primeval conditions of equality, when they lived their lives under the conditions of a low productivity of labour, when primeval man gradually and with great difficulties obtained the means necessary for a primitive primeval existence, no groups of people grew up, and no such groups could grow up, which occupied themselves exclusively with administration and who dominated the whole of the rest of society. Only when the first form of the division of society into classes arose, when slavery arose, when a particular group of people who concentrated upon the most primitive forms of agriculture were able to produce a surplus, and when this surplus was no longer absolutely necessary for the miserable existence of the slaves and fell into the hands of the slaveholders, and when in this way the existence of a slave-owning class was consolidated, only then did the necessity for a State arise.

And the State arose, a State of slave owners, an apparatus which gave the slave owners the power and the possibility of dominating over all the slaves. Both the society and the State were at that time much smaller than they are now and had at their disposal an incomparably inferior apparatus for maintaining communications, for they had none of the modern means of transport. Mountains, rivers and the seas were tremendously greater obstacles than they are to-day, and the formation of the State developed within geographical boundaries which were much closer than to-day. The technically weak State apparatus served a State which controlled a relatively limited territory and a limited number of functions. There was no apparatus which could have held the slaves in slavery, which could have held one section of society under the power of another. The overwhelming section of society cannot be forced to work systematically for the other section of society without the maintenance of a permanent apparatus of power. As long as no classes existed, there was no such apparatus. When classes appeared, then everywhere there appeared also simultaneously a special institution — the State, which grew together with the growth and consolidation of this social division into classes. The State forms were very varied. At the time of slavery we see very different State forms in the two countries which were at the time the most advanced, most cultured and most highly civilised, the Greece of antiquity and Rome, both of which were based upon slavery. Even then the difference

existed between monarchy and the republic, between aristocracy and democracy — the monarchy as the rule of an individual, the republic as the absence of all other than duly elected power, aristocracy as the rule of a comparatively small minority and democracy as the rule of the people. Translated literally from the Greek, democracy means the rule of the people. These differences originated in the time of slavery. Despite these differences the State in the period of slavery was a slave owners State, irrespective of whether it was a monarchy or a republic, aristocratic or democratic.

In the lectures concerning the history of antiquity you will learn of the struggles between monarchist and republican State forms. The basic principle common to both, however, was that the slaves were not regarded as human beings, not merely not regarded as citizens perhaps, but actually not regarded as human beings. Roman law regarded the slaves as chattels. The law of the State against murder, excluded the slaves from its protecting provisions, not to mention all the other laws protecting the integrity and the dignity of the person. The laws were only for the protection of the slave owners, who were alone recognised as fully-fledged citizens. If the State form were monarchistic, then it was a slave-holding monarchy. If the State form were republican, then it was a slave-holding republic. In both these cases, only the slave-holders enjoyed civil rights, whilst the slaves were considered as chattels, so that not only every form of maltreatment was permissible, but even the murder of slaves by their masters was not regarded as a crime.

Slave-holding republics were according to their internal organisation of two varieties: aristocratic or democratic republics. In an aristocratic republic only a small and select group took part in the elections, whereas in a democratic republic everyone was entitled to take part in the elections, everyone meaning all slave-holders, and by no means including the slaves. The fundamental principle must be held carefully in mind, as it is essential for the understanding of the question of the State and its essential character.

The State is a machine for the oppression of one class by another class. It is the machine with which one class holds the other subjugated classes in check. The form of this machine may vary: with the slave-holding State we saw aristocratic republics and even democratic republics, and in fact there existed many varied forms of government, but the essential principle of the State was common to them all. The slaves enjoyed no rights of any kind and remained an oppressed class, they were not even recognised as human beings. The same principle is to be met with under feudalism. The State based upon serfdom offers the same picture.

The change in the form of exploitation transformed the slave-holding State into a State based upon serfdom. This change was of the greatest importance. In the slave-holding State the slave was completely without rights and was not even recognised as a human being. In the State based upon serfdom the peasant was chained to the land on which he worked. The fundamental characteristic of law under serfdom was that the peasantry, and at that time the peasantry represented the overwhelming majority of the population, for the urban population was only rudimentary, were regarded as chained to the land upon which they worked, and the name serfdom is derived from this fact. (Lenin refers here to the Russian word for serfdom, whose root goes back to the word bond, to bind, to make fast, as in English the term bondsman, bondage etc., referring to feudal society. Ed.) The peasant was permitted to work for a certain number of days upon the land given to him by the feudal owner, on the other days he had to work upon the land of the feudal owner as the serf of the latter. The essence of class-rule remained the same, society was still based upon the exploitation of class by class. Only the feudal landowners were able to enjoy all civil rights, whilst the peasants were regarded as having no rights at all.

In practice the situation of these peasants was very little different from that of the slaves in the slave-holding State. Nevertheless, the broad way to their freedom was opened by the fact that the peasant was not considered to be the immediate property of the landowner. The peasant was permitted to spend part of his time upon his own land, could, so to speak, belong to himself and when the possibilities of exchange developed and brought commercial relations with them, then

serfdom decayed more and more and the way to the freedom of the peasantry opened wider and wider. Society based upon serfdom was always more complicated than society based upon slave-holding. In the former society there existed the great element of the development of commerce and industry, which even then led towards capitalism. In the Middle Ages serfdom was the dominant social form, and here, too, the State forms were varied. Both monarchies and republics existed, but only the landowners having serfs under them were the dominating force. As far as political rights were concerned, the peasant serfs were absolutely without rights.

Under both slavery and serfdom, the dominance of a small minority of people over the great majority of their fellows, cannot be maintained without force. History is an unbroken chain of attempts on the part of oppressed classes to shake off their chains. The history of slavery has seen wars which lasted for decades and which were carried on for or against the emancipation of the slaves. It should be pointed out here that the name Spartacus, which the German communists have adopted for their splendid party which is fighting against the yoke of capitalism, has been taken from the name of one of the most prominent heroes of one of the greatest slave insurrections which took place about 2000 years ago when the apparently all-powerful Roman Empire, which was exclusively based upon slavery, was compelled to suffer for a great number of years the shock and the blows of a tremendous rising of slaves who rallied around one named Spartacus, armed themselves and formed a great army. Finally, however, they were defeated, their leaders taken prisoners and murdered by the slave-owners. Such civil wars are to be seen throughout the history of the existence of class-society. I have just referred to the greatest example of such wars during the epoch of slavery. The whole epoch of serfdom is full of insurrections, above all of peasant revolts. In Germany for instance, this struggle of two classes, the landowners and the peasant serfs, in the Middle Ages, took on a tremendous character and became a civil war which shook the whole country. You are all acquainted with examples of similar revolts of the peasants against the feudal landowners in Russia.

In order to maintain their dominance the feudal landowners had to have an apparatus capable of holding the enormous masses in subordination and subjecting them to certain rules and regulations; and all this regulation had the same aim, i. e. to maintain the power of the feudal landowners over their peasant serfs. That was the State based upon serfdom which existed in Russia, for instance, and still exists in a number of very backward Asiatic countries. The State form of this society was varied, being sometimes republican and sometimes monarchist. If the State was monarchist, then the power of an individual was recognised. If the State was republican, then a larger or smaller number of individuals from the feudal landowning class were permitted to take a part in its administration. This society showed such a division of classes that the enormous majority of the population, the peasant serfs, were in complete dependence upon a numerically insignificant minority of feudal landowners who held the land.

The development of commerce and commodity exchange led to the crystallization of a new social class, the capitalist class. Capital originated towards the end of the Middle Ages when the discovery of America permitted world commerce to develop to an unparalleled degree and greatly increased the supplies of precious metals, which then became the objects of exchange, and the introduction of currency permitted the accumulation of tremendous wealth in the hands of the few. Gold and silver were recognised as riches all over the world. The economic strength of the old class of feudal landowners diminished and that of the new class, the capitalists, developed. The transformation of society took place and resulted in a meretricious equality of all citizens; the former division into slaves and slave-owners disappeared; all members of society were considered equal before the law irrespective of how much wealth or how little they possessed, whether they possessed land or only their two hands to labour, all were equal before the law. The law protected all in the same manner, it protected property, as far as the citizen possessed any, against the attacks of the mass of people who possessed nothing, apart from their two hands to labour, and who became more and more impoverished and who became finally proletarians. This is capitalist society.

I am not able to discuss this question in detail here, but you will be able to deal with it again when you discuss the programme of the Party — you will then learn the chief characteristics of capitalist society. This new form of society opposed the old social form of serfdom with the slogan of personal freedom as opposed to the bondage of serfdom. It meant, however, freedom for those who possessed property. When serfdom was broken up, a process which was completed at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries — in Russia the process commenced later 1861 — when the capitalist State took the place of the State based upon serfdom and adopted the slogan of personal freedom for the whole of the people, declaring that it represented the will of the whole people and denying that it represented a class-society, a new class-struggle developed between the socialists who fought in reality for the freedom of the whole of the people, and the capitalist State, a struggle which led to the formation of the socialist Soviet Republic and which embraces the whole world.

In order to understand the struggle which is being carried on against international capitalism, in order to grasp the essential character of the capitalist State, it is necessary to remember that when the capitalist State was opposing serfdom, it held aloft the standard of personal freedom. The abolition of serfdom meant freedom for the representatives of the capitalist State, and was really useful in so far as serfdom was really abolished and the peasants received the possibility of becoming the unlimited owner of the land which he had bought free. The State paid no attention to this; it protected property no matter how the said property had been established. As the State was based upon private property, the peasants in all modern civilised States were transformed into property owners. The State protected private property where the land-owner had given up a part of his land to the peasants, receiving compensation by purchase. The State declared, so to speak, for full private property and supported and encouraged private property in every possible way. The State admitted the right of private property to every industrialist, every factory owner and every tradesman. And this society, based upon private property, the power of capital and upon the complete subordination of the propertyless workers and the toiling masses of the peasantry, declares that it is ruling on the basis of freedom. In its struggle against serfdom this society declared private property to be free and was particularly proud of the fact that the capitalist State had ceased to be a class-State.

But the State continued to be a machine with which the capitalists held the poor peasants and the working class in check, whilst both workers and peasants were apparently free. Capitalist society proclaimed the general franchise and declared through its preachers, scholars, philosophers and lawyers that the State was no longer a class-State. Even now, after the struggle of the socialist soviet republics has begun against them, they accuse us of being the disturber of freedom, because we have built up a State upon coercion, upon the suppression of one section of society by the other, whereas they have a State of the whole people, a democratic State. This question, the question of the present day State in the period of the beginning socialist revolution all over the world, in the period of the victory of the revolution in a number of countries, in the period when the struggle against international capitalism is intensifying, this question of the State takes on a very great significance and becomes, so to speak, the most vital question, the focus of all political problems and struggles at the present time.

No matter what political party we may take as an example, either in Russia or in some other civilised country, almost all political differences, differences of opinion and opinions are connected with the interpretation of the character of the State. Is the State in a capitalist country, in a democratic republic, above all in countries like the U. S. A. and Switzerland, the freest of democratic republics, the expression of the will of the people, a synthesis of the decisions of the whole people, an expression of the national will, or is the State a machine with which the capitalists there maintain their power over the masses of the workers and the peasants? That is the main question in all political debates all over the world at the present time. What is being said about Bolshevism? The bourgeois press abuses the bolsheviks, it would be impossible to find a bourgeois newspaper which does not publish the wildest accusations against the Bolsheviks, and the main tenor of their attack is

that the Bolsheviks have violated the power of the people. When our mensheviks and social-revolutionaries imagine in the simplicity of their souls (the sort of simplicity about which popular adage insists that it is worse than theft) that they are the discoverers and inventors of the accusations made against the Bolsheviki according to which the latter have violated the freedom and rule of the people, they, the mensheviks and the social-revolutionaries, deceive themselves woefully. At the present time amongst the most powerful newspapers in the richest countries, newspapers which expend millions in order to spread bourgeois lies and imperialist policy in dozens of millions of copies amongst the people, there is not one single newspaper which does not use and continually repeat these fundamental arguments and accusations against the Bolsheviks: the United States, Great Britain and Switzerland are progressive States based upon the power of the people, whereas the Bolsheviki Republic is a robber State which knows no such freedom. The Bolsheviks have violated the idea of the rule of the people and have even gone so far as to break up the constitutional assembly. These horrible accusations are being repeated against the Bolsheviks all over the world. These accusations bring us once again to the question, what does the State represent? In order to understand these accusations, to become familiar with them, to take up a conscious and deliberate attitude towards them and not only to analyse these accusations upon the basis of rumours, but also to form a definite opinion about them, it is necessary to realise clearly what it is that the State represents. There are all sorts of capitalist States and many systems of doctrine which originated before the war in their defence. In order to approach the question correctly, we must take up a critical attitude to all these doctrines and opinions.

I mentioned as an auxiliary text-book, Engel's book about the origin of the State. In this book you will see that every State in which there exists private property in land and in the means of production, where capital is dominant, no matter how democratic the State may be, is a capitalist State. This State is the machine in the hands of the capitalists for holding the working class and the poor peasantry in subjection. The general franchise, the constitutional assemblies, the parliaments, all these things are only the outward form, they represent a change which alters nothing fundamental in the real situation.

The forms of the dominance of the State can be varied. Capital shows its power first in one form, and then in the other, but always, no matter what the form, power remains in the hands of capital. Whether it is a question of censorship or of a democratic republic, power is in the hands of capital, and the more democratic the republic is, the greater and the more cynical is the rule of capital. One of the most democratic republics in the world is the United States of North America, and yet it can be seen nowhere more clearly than in this country, (and those who have been there since 1905 have a very good idea of the situation) that power is in the hands of a little group of millionaires who control the whole of society brutally and with open corruption. When capital exists, it controls the whole of society, and no democratic republic and no general franchise can alter the essence of this state of affairs.

The democratic republic and the general franchise, compared with the social structure based upon serfdom, represented tremendous progress: it gave the proletariat the possibility of attaining that strong compactness, those disciplined ranks which are necessary for a systematic struggle against capitalism. The peasant serfs had nothing of the sort, not to mention the slaves. The slaves revolted, caused great unrest and commenced civil war, but they were never able to form a conscious majority which could have led the struggles of the parties. They could not understand clearly to what goal they were moving, and even the most revolutionary moments in history showed that they were only pawns in the hands of the ruling classes. The bourgeois republic, the general franchise, parliament, all these things represent tremendous progress from the point of view of the international development of society. Humanity arrived at the stage of capitalism, and capitalism then gave for the first time, thanks to urban culture, the oppressed class of proletarians a recognition of its own position in society and the incentive for the building up of the international working class movement, which organises millions of workers all over the world in their own socialist parties, which consciously carry on a mass-struggle against capitalism. Without parliamentarism, without the general franchise, this development of the working

class would have been impossible, and therefore these institutions have taken on a great significance in the eyes of the broad masses of the workers. That is the reason why the transformation seems so difficult.

It is not only the hypocrites, the capitalist ideologists and the priests who support and defend the bourgeois lies which declare the State to be free and called upon to defend the interests of the whole people. No. A great mass of people repeat in all honesty the old worn-out shibboleths, and cannot understand the transformation from the old capitalist society to socialism. Not only people who are directly dependent upon the bourgeoisie, not only those who are under the direct pressure of capitalism, or who are bribed by capitalism, not only the fact that a great number of scholars, artists and priests of all sorts are in the services of capitalism, but also a great number of people, quite simply under the influence of the prejudice of bourgeois freedom, have allied themselves all over the world against Bolshevism, because the Soviet Republic at its birth flung aside the old bourgeois lie of freedom and declared openly: What, you call your State free? The fact is that as long as private property exists, even when your State is a democratic republic, it is nothing but a machine in the hands of the capitalists for subjugating the workers and the poor peasants, and the freer your State is, the more clearly this fact is expressed. Examples of this are: in Europe, Switzerland and in America, the United States.

Capitalism is nowhere so cynical and so ruthless as in these countries and nowhere can that be seen so clearly as in these countries, although both of them are democratic republics. No matter how the facade may look and no matter how loud the phrases about a working democracy or the equality of all citizens. In reality capitalism is dominant in Switzerland and in the United States, and all the attempts of the workers to secure any serious improvement are met immediately with a threat of civil war. In both these countries there are very few soldiers and a small standing army. In Switzerland there is a militia and every citizen has a weapon at home. Not long ago there was no standing army in the United States. When a strike breaks out therefore the bourgeoisie arms itself and recruits mercenaries in order to crush the strike, and nowhere is

the suppression of the working class movement carried out with such merciless brutality as in the United States and in Switzerland nowhere is the influence of capitalism so strong in parliament as there. The power of capital is everything, the Stock Exchange is everything and parliament and the elections are marionettes, pawns in the game... But in the course of development the eyes of the workers are being opened, the idea of the Soviets is winning more and more ground, particularly as a result of the bloody slaughter through which we have just gone. The working class is realising more and more clearly the necessity of a merciless struggle against capitalism.

No matter what form a State may adopt, including the form of the democratic republic, if it maintains the institution of private property in land and in the means of production, if private capital is able to hold the greater portion of society in wage-slavery, in other words, if a State does not fulfil that which is contained in the programme of our Party and in the Soviet constitution, then such a State is a machine for the suppression of one section of society by another. And this machine is taken in hand by us, we, the class which must overthrow the power of capital. We will throw all the old prejudices overboard, according to which the State guarantees general equality. Such conceptions are deceptions. So long as exploitation continues to exist there can be no equality. The landowner cannot be equal with the landworker, the hungry man cannot be equal with the sated man. This machine of the State before which people bow with superstitious veneration and believe that it represents the power of the whole people, is uprooted by the proletariat which declares the old ideas to be bourgeois lies. We have taken this machine away from the capitalists, we have taken it for us. With this machine or with the club we will drive all exploitation out of the world, and when all possibilities of exploitation have been abolished and no single landowner and no single factory owner exists any longer, then one human being will not be overfed whilst the other is hungry. Only when the last possibility of exploitation has been abolished will we fling this machine onto the scrap heap. Then there will be no State and no exploitation. That is the standpoint of our Communist Party. I hope that in the coming lectures we shall often come back to this question.

Stages of the Struggle. - Lenin, Liebknecht, Luxemburg in the Fight for the Transformation of War into Civil War.

The proletariat must learn by its victorious as well as by its defeats. For this reason it must thoroughly study all the stages of the fight which was waged by our predecessors — Vladimir Ilyitch Ulyanov-Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, and Karl Liebknecht — against the imperialist war in 1914—19. This fight has brought glorious victory to the proletariat in Russia, but a deplorable defeat in Germany. Relying upon its Soviet State, the proletariat in the Soviet Union is now able to take up a leading role in the new struggle against the danger of a new, a hundred times more tremendous and fateful world war. It is also able to contemplate without fear the outbreak of such a war, if provoked by the imperialist plunderers! Taught by the mistakes of the past, the proletariat of the capitalist countries must make use of a new war — should it break out after all — to inaugurate the path of the Russian October of 1917. Once and for all, for the whole of eternity, Imperialism must be thrown into oblivion!

We shall now let the dates and facts tell their story.

* * *

Middle of 1914. The gunpowder magazines in the European countries became overcharged to the point of bursting; it wanted but one spark to explode them into the air. On June 30, 1913, the Government of Wilhelm II had forced its second Armament Bill to the Reichstag. Three weeks later the French Parliament extended the time of military service from two to three years.

This was followed in rapid succession by huge military preparations on land and sea by Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Great Britain, the Balkan countries, Spain, Portugal, and the Scandinavian countries. The world bourgeoisie entertained no anxiety as to the world revolution which had been threatened by the Socialist International in 1912. It knew its chained dogs: they bark aloud, but they do not bite; they threaten, but do nothing.

June 28, 1914. The Austrian heir-apparent and his wife were killed by a Serbian nationalist. The murder was utilised as a pretext by the ruling cliques of Austro-Hungary and Germany to consolidate their domination in the Balkans. Serbia was now to be crushed. This meant a world war. The prediction of the Basle Manifesto was to come true. The most fateful catastrophe — and at the same time the most shameful historic event — was to become the fact, whilst the starting point was to be one of the most trifling events.

July 29—30, 1914. The International Socialist Bureau met at Brussels to discuss the imminent danger of war. A great many words are uttered at the conference, but only two facts are registered: in the West, the anti-war agitation of the "courageous woman" — Rosa Luxemburg, who "grips the heart of the German proletariat by the flame of her thoughts", said Jaurès, "who incited the soldiers to disobedience", as declared by the Kaiser's court who tried her in Frankfurt. In the East, the heroic behaviour of the revolutionary Russian proletariat is welcomed, which erected barricades in the streets of St. Petersburg to "celebrate" the arrival of Poincaré.

Between the 1st and 5th of August the world war became an accomplished fact. The socialists of the II. International have entirely gone over to the side of "their" perspective governments. The bourgeois world becomes enshrouded in flames. At this very moment the feeble edifice of the International, which was foolishly considered by the proletariat as its stronghold against capitalism, collapses to the ground.

August 1st — November 1st. The guns are roaring. The socialist gentlemen are the captives of the imperialist governments, of the deadly enemies of the proletariat. Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, and Karl Liebknecht in Germany, and Lenin in Switzerland — cut off from the proletariat — are gathering around them the first bodies of fighters.

On November 1st, 1914 the first gathering signal was sounded: the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Labour Party of Russia, with Lenin at the head, issued its historic Manifesto. "It is the task of the Social Democrats in every country" — Lenin declared in that document — "to wage in the first and foremost place the fight against chauvinism in their respective country". The overthrow of the Tsarist monarchy, the United States of Europe erected upon the ruins of the Russian, German, and Austro-Hungarian monarchies, the socialist revolution in the advanced European countries, the democratic revolution in Russia — such were to be the political aims of the revolutionary struggle. The transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, such was to be the road.

December 2nd, 1914. The preliminary work of Rosa Luxemburg and her narrow circle of friends yields the first fruit. Karl Liebknecht raises his voice in the Reichstag against the war of plunder, as the only revolutionary spokesman of the proletariat among 110 traitors and semi-traitors! He refused to vote for war credits whilst "protesting against the war, against its promoters and managers, against the capitalist policies which provoke it, against the annexationist plans, against the violation of the neutrality of Belgium and Luxembourg, against the social and political neglect of duty on the part of the government and the ruling classes". This deed of Karl Liebknecht resounded louder than the murderous roar of the guns. This was already a beginning of the proletarian struggle against war!

The struggle went on. The guns continued to roar on all the fronts. Streams of blood flowed in the trenches, on the battle-fields, in the swamps, in the mountains of Europe, Asia and Africa, over the seas of one-half of the world. Amid untold misery and suffering, amid super-human efforts of sacrifices, the revolutionary leaders and champions were still forming their armies. Dreadfully slow was the influx of new forces, whilst the enemy was tearing away the old forces from the ranks. On February 7th, 1915, after being denounced by Scheidemann and his crowd as a "traitor to his country", Karl Liebknecht was seized by the Kaiser's generals who drafted him as a common soldier; On February 18 Rosa was thrown into jail. A similar fate overtook everyone who protested against the war. Nevertheless they had launched the slogan: "The chief enemy is in one's own country!" It was announced as the tenet of faith of Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg, and Karl Liebknecht, in the New Year's number of the "Labour Leader" in England. Across the seas, in spite of the blockade, the revolutionary socialists of the leading combatant countries had held out their hands.

In March 1915 the Socialist women who remained true to the revolution met at Berne, with Clara Zetkin at their head, in order to urge their husbands and sons to withhold their support from the murderous gang which had unleashed the dogs of war and meant to go on with the war "to the end!" for the sake of their profits. In April, thanks to the indefatigable efforts of Rosa Luxemburg, a publication was founded — the "International" — which became, like the "Social Democrat" edited by Lenin, the rallying ground for the revolutionary proletariat. After its very first issue it fell a victim to the furious persecution by Wilhelm's generals. Nevertheless in the first days of September the first International conference took place, the Zimmerwald Conference designated by Lenin as the first step towards the break between socialism and opportunism and social-chauvinism. A further impetus was lent to the cause of the struggle against the war. Thanks to the efforts of Lenin and his associates the Zimmerwald Left was organised which constituted the first nucleus of the new International that was to be. In Lenin's pamphlet "Socialism and War", distributed at the Zimmerwald Con-

ference in the German language, the principles and the programme of action of the International were formulated for the first time.

The struggle went on. The world butchery assumed even larger scope, but already the forces were emerging which were to take up the struggle against the plunderous war.

Winter and Spring of 1916. The "Spartacus" formulated its watchwords: "The class war within the bourgeois countries against the ruling classes, and the international solidarity of the proletarians of all countries, are the two inseparable living maxims of the working class in their world-historic struggle for emancipation". "The central point of the organisation of the proletariat as a class is in the International." Such were the fundamental principles of the Spartacus. In her "Junius" pamphlet Rosa Luxemburg announced her platform which, surely, could not rally the whole of the revolutionary movement, and which served rather as a source of weakness to the movement. Nevertheless "the aim was well fixed, and the relentless class struggle was announced all along the line in the spirit of the International!" Karl Liebknecht's address to the demonstration at Potsdamer Platz on May 1st, 1916 with the slogans of "Down with the government!" and "Down with the war!" showed that the Spartacus meant in real earnest to gather the masses upon these grounds.

At the same time, from the 24th to the 30th April 1916, the second Zimmerwald Conference was held at Kiental. The influence of the Lefts who were led by Lenin had grown, and the road was made even clearer for the struggle against the war, for socialism and for the Third International. Unfortunately, the German revolutionary party had no leadership capable of ensuring the further class-conscious and firm development of the struggle.

Slowly but surely the slogan of Lenin and Liebknecht, to transform the imperialist war into civil war, was spreading among the masses. The masses entered upon the arena of the struggle, and the two years of 1915 and 1916, in Russia as well as in Germany and in the other belligerent countries, were marked at first by hunger riots and disturbances, and afterwards by political demonstrations against the war. This went on until the outburst of revolution which became louder than the roar of the guns! On March 9, 1917 the Russian working masses overthrew Tsarism!

However, the first result was the seizure of power by the bourgeoisie relying upon its subservient tools, the social-chauvinists. The struggle now to be taken up against the war was to be dedicated to the following task: the taking of power by the masses of the workers, soldiers, and peasants themselves. The man who raised and carried out this task was Lenin.

Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were behind the iron bars. Yet their spirit was alive and active in the Spartacus.

On June 28, 1916 50,000 workers in Berlin struck in favour of Liebknecht; on the following day the strike was joined by Brunswick. Germany had its first political mass strike. Thousands of workers repeated the query contained in Rosa Luxemburg's appeal: "What has happened to Liebknecht?", showing that Liebknecht's cause was their very own, that they were at one with him in the watchwords: "Down with the war, down with the government!"

It was only the Russian Revolution — the first embodiment of the Leninist spirit — which gave a fresh impetus to the struggle against war in Germany that was lacking since the imprisonment of Karl and Rosa. In mid-April 1917 big strikes broke out in the munition factories of Berlin, Leipzig, Halle, Brunswick and Magdeburg. Hundreds of thousands of workers raised economic demands, whilst the Leipzig strikers raised also political demands. Behind this wave of strikes the Kaiser's generals could perceive already so clearly the advent of the revolution that General Gröner denounced the strikers as "scoundrels". Yet owing to the internal and external weakness of the revolutionary party, the movement was as yet unable to put up a resistance to the ukases issued by General Gröner, nor to the measures taken by the even more tricky and treacherous Social Democrats. There was not sufficient resistance in the shape of an effective struggle against the war, which the Russian workers had carried out under Lenin's leadership at the other end of the front.

In Russia the revolution went on rapidly through its stages, with the speed of the "locomotive of history".

On April 4—7, 1917, immediately upon his arrival in St. Petersburg, Lenin issued his famous Theses on the tasks of the proletariat in the revolution. Not the least concessions on the "point of the revolutionary defence of the country". The war can end in a democratic peace only after the overthrow of capitalism. Without the passing of the whole power into the hands of the workers' and soldiers' soviets there can be no realisation of the programme of war and peace. Hence, the transformation of the old Social Democratic into the new Communist Party, the reorganisation of the International into a revolutionary body, the organisation of the struggle against the social-chauvinists and the Centrists, such are the immediate tasks of the Party.

During the days of April 22—27 Lenin reviewed the course of history; the first stage of the revolution had been accomplished, under the pressure of the masses of workers and soldiers the reins of government had gone over from the big bourgeoisie to the "socialist" petty bourgeoisie. During the same days the All-Russian Conference of the Bolsheviks adopted the Leninist theses. From now on we find Lenin standing at the head of a revolutionary army, with its aid he will proceed to solve the great historic tasks outlined by him for the proletariat in the first days of the world revolution: The end of the imperialist war through the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism!

On November 7, 1917, the victory was complete. With "courage", efficiency, revolutionary far-sightedness, and consistency", the supreme ends were achieved by the Russian revolution for which Rosa Luxemburg had fought. And the movement would have spread on to the West, if only the workers in the European countries had kept pace with the Russian revolution.

Nevertheless the October victory of the Leninist Party led to a definite turning also in the struggle of the working masses in Germany. It wanted precisely the spirit of Lenin, next to the flame of Luxemburg and Liebknecht, to arouse the masses in Germany to go on with the struggle against the war.

On December 1st 1917 the "glad tidings" of the Russian people's message: To All! had reached the masses of the workers in Germany. They asked "the government, all the classes, all the parties and all the belligerent countries whether they agreed to the proposal of the revolutionary government of Russia to take up negotiations for the immediate armistice and the universal peace." In the first place, the masses of the workers were urged to put an end to the senseless butchery.

It was only at the end of January 1918, when the Leninist government has already been for weeks negotiating for peace with the imperialist government of Wilhelm II., Hindenburg and Ludendorff, when the whole of the "naked brutality" of German imperialism had been unmasked in the course of those negotiations, only then the masses of the workers in Germany stepped again into the foreground. Until that time Rosa Luxemburg had nothing else to do but to bemoan the tragic element in the Russian revolution, whereas there was tragedy, above all, in the situation as it existed in Germany. Eventually not Rosa Luxemburg but Lenin was vindicated by history.

On January 28—29 1918, encouraged by the example of the masses of the workers in Vienna, Budapest and in other cities of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, 500,000 workers went out on

strike in Berlin. Peace without annexation, without indemnities, on the grounds of the right of nations to self-determination, in conformity to the principles laid down by the Leninist Government, — such were the demands, "The separate peace must be transformed into universal peace at any price", was the slogan of the Spartacus.

Once again the movement was subdued. The brutal force of the "Western Kalmucks" around Hindenburg, Ludendorff and Gröner, united with the sly perfidy of the social-traitors around Ebert, Scheidemann and Dittmann, to crush the movement. Nevertheless Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg were soon to come by their own.

In the months of August-October 1918 the German soldiers began to record en masse their agreement "to the Russian terms of peace", and to declare for "peace at any cost". Some soldiers — the best among them — voted in the Russian way, by turning their arms on their commanders at the front. And when the final collapse of the front came, the masses of the workers, soldiers and sailors on November 11, 1918 put an end to the monarchy of Wilhelm II.

On November 11, 1918 the overthrow of the German and Austro-Hungarian monarchies meant also the annulment of the Brest Litovsk treaty of separate peace. Not because it became transformed into a treaty of universal peace, but because the victorious Soviet tore up the Brest Litovsk scrap of paper. Lenin's struggle for peace was crowned with victory in the East.

Yet in the West the Ebert Republic in Germany accepted an ignominious peace of coercion. There was but one salvation: the transfer of power to the real representatives of the proletariat — to the workers' and soldiers' soviets, the overthrow of the government of the social-traitors, and the struggle for the social revolution. During November-December and January, 1919, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg led the struggle for this high aim. On December 31 1918 they established the German Communist Party as the instrument towards the immediate and ultimate aims.

A life and death struggle ensued between the tools of the imperialist counter-revolution, the Scheidemann and Eberts on the one hand, and the standard bearers of the social revolution in Germany, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg on the other hand. Rosa and Karl were physically destroyed in the course of that struggle. The "brain" and the "heart" of the German revolution seized to function on January 15, 1919. Yet not in vain had Rosa written in her last article on Revolution: "I was, I am, and I shall be". Not in vain had Karl Liebknecht written in his last article: "In spite of everything and anything..."

Between the 2 and 19 March 1919 — two months after the murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, in the days when the villains of the German counter-revolution prepared for the assassination of Leo Jogiches — the Third, the Communist International was founded in Moscow under the chairmanship of Lenin.

In it the spirits of Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg are alive. Under this banner the proletariat will destroy its mortal enemy — the imperialist bourgeoisie and the worst manifestation of its mismanagement and barbarism — the imperialist war. Under this banner the human race will be emancipated, and the socialist commonwealth will be brought about in all countries.

On the Defeat of One's Own Government in Imperialist War.

By N. Lenin.

The following article was written by Lenin on the 26th of July 1915. It was published in No. 43 of the "Social Democrat", the central organ of the Bolsheviks which appeared in Switzerland. Editor.

During a reactionary war, the revolutionary class cannot but desire the defeat of its own government.

This is an axiom. And it is only contested by the deliberate adherents or helpless accomplices of the social chauvinists. Among the former must be included, for instance, Semkovsky of the Organisation Commission. Among the latter Trotzky and Bukvoyed in Russia, Kautsky in Germany. The wish for Russia's defeat, writes Trotzky, is: "an utterly uncalled for and unjustifiable concession to the political methodology of social patriotism, substituting for revolutionary struggle against war and the conditions which it causes an orientation in the direction of the lesser evil, which is extremely arbitrary under the given conditions." (No. 105 of "Nashe Slovo".)

This is a sample of the high-flown phrases with which Trotzky invariably substantiates opportunism. "Revolutionary struggle against war" is an empty and purportless exclamation, of which the heroes of the II. International are such past-masters, unless we mean by it revolutionary action against our own government and during the war. A moment's thought enables this to be realised. And revolutionary action against our own government during a war certainly and undoubtedly does not mean only the wish for its defeat, but the actual furtherance of such a defeat (for the "astute" reader: this does not by any means signify that "bridges are to be blown up", unsuccessful military strikes organised, or the revolutionists aided in any way to bring about a defeat for the government).

Trotzky confines himself to phrases, but entangles himself frightfully in them. He believes that to desire defeat for Russia means desiring victory for Germany (Bukvoyed and Semkovsky express this thought, or rather lack of thought, which they possess in common with Trotzky, more directly.) And in this Trotzky sees the "methodology of social patriotism"! In order to oblige people who are unable to think, the Berne resolution declares: "In all imperialist countries the proletariat must desire the defeat of its government!". Bukvoyed and Trotzky have preferred to pass over this truth, and Semkovsky (an opportunist who serves the working class best by a candid and naive repetition of bourgeois wisdom), Semkovsky observed "mildly": "This is nonsense, either Germany or Russia can gain the victory".

Take the Paris Commune for instance. Germany defeated France, and Bismarck with Thiers defeated the workers! If Bukvoyed and Trotzky had thought it out, they would have seen that they are adopting the standpoint of the war of the governments and of the bourgeoisie, that is, that they are grovelling before the "political methodology of social patriotism", ... to make use of Trotzky's choice language.

Revolution during time of war is civil war, and the transition of the war of the governments into civil war is facilitated on the one hand by the military failures ("the defeat") of the governments; on the other hand it is impossible really to strive for such a transition without promoting the defeat.

The Chauvinists (with the Organisation Commission and the Cheidse fraction) do not want to have anything to do with the "slogan" of defeat, because this slogan alone signifies a consistent appeal for revolutionary action by the revolutionists against their own government during the war. And without such action millions of the most revolutionary phrases on war against war, etc., are not worth a rap.

Anyone seriously intending to reject the "slogan" of the defeat of one's own government in an imperialist war would have to prove one of the three following points: either 1. that the war of 1914 was not reactionary; or 2. that revolution is impossible in connection with war; or 3. that a corresponding

and co-operating revolutionary movement in all the belligerent countries is impossible. This last argument is of special importance for Russia, for Russia is the most backward country, and immediate socialist revolution is impossible here. Precisely for this reason the Russian social democrats should be the first to come forward with the theory and practice of the "slogan" of defeat. And the Tsarist government was perfectly right in stating that the agitation carried on by the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party was the sole example in the International, not only of parliamentary opposition, but of really revolutionary mass action against the government of the country, and that this agitation weakened military Russia and conducted to its defeat. This is a fact. It would be foolish to ignore it.

The opponents of the slogan of defeat are simply afraid of themselves, and do not want to admit the obvious fact of the indubitable connection between revolutionary agitation against the government and the bringing about of defeat.

Are the correspondence and co-operation of the bourgeois democratic movement in Russia with the socialist movement in Western Europe possible? During the decade just past there was not a single socialist, among those expressing their opinion publicly, who doubted this; the movement in the Austrian proletariat after the 17th October, 1905, proved this possibility in actual fact.

Any social democrat calling himself a socialist should be asked if he sympathises with an agreement among the social democrats of various belligerent countries for the purpose of joint revolutionary action against all the governments at war. Many will reply that this is impossible, as did Kautsky ("Neue Zeit", 2nd October, 1914), thereby plainly demonstrating his social chauvinism. For in the first place it is an arrant and crass untruth, striking a blow in the face of well known facts and of the Basle manifesto. And in the second place, were it true, then the opportunists would be right on many points!

Many will reply that they sympathise with the idea. And then we shall say: If this sympathy is sincere, it would be ridiculous to suppose that in war, and for war, a "formal" agreement is requisite, dealing with the election of representatives, meeting place, signing of a treaty, fixing of appointed day and hour! It is only the Semkovskys who are capable of thinking like this. An agreement on revolutionary action even in one country, to say nothing of a number of countries, can only be realised by the force of the example of serious revolutionary actions, their initiation and further development. Such initiative action is again impossible without the wish for defeat and without the promotion of defeat. The conversion of imperialist war into civil war cannot be "made", just as a revolution cannot be "made" ... it grows out of a large number of multifarious phenomena, aspects, features, peculiarities, and consequences of imperialist war. And this growth is impossible without a number of military failures and defeats suffered by those governments whose own oppressed classes are dealing blows at them.

To renounce the slogan of defeat is to permit the spirit of revolution to degenerate into an empty phrase or mere hypocrisy.

What is proposed to us in place of the "slogan" of defeat? A slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat" (Semkovsky in No. 2 of the "Isvestia". As also the whole Organisation Commission in No. 1). But this is nothing but a paraphrase of the slogan of defence of native country! It is a transference of the question to the plane of the war between the governments (which, according to the slogan, are to remain in their original situation, to "retain their positions") and not to the plane of the struggle of the oppressed classes against their governments! It is a justification of the chauvinism of all imperialist nations, whose bourgeoisies are always ready to maintain... and to tell the people... that they are "merely" fighting "against defeat". "The purport of our vote on 4th August is: Not for war, but against defeat", writes the leader of the German opportunists, Eduard David, in his book. The Russian adherents of the "Organisation Com-

mission", join with Bukvoyed and Trotzky in entirely adopting David's standpoint, in that they defend the slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat"!

If we regard this slogan more closely, we find that its import is "civil peace" and the renunciation of the class struggle of the oppressed classes in all the warring countries; for it is impossible to carry on the class struggle in a country without injuring its bourgeoisie and its government; and to injure one's own bourgeoisie in war time is high treason, is the promotion of the defeat of one's own country. He who recognises the slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat", can only be a hypocritical representative of the class struggle, of the "breach of civil peace", for he renounces in fact an independent proletarian policy, and subjects the proletariat of all belligerent countries to an entirely bourgeois task, that of preserving from defeat the imperialist governments concerned. The sole policy of a real and not phrasological breach of the "civil peace", and of recognition of the class struggle is the policy of the utilisation by the proletariat, of the difficulties of the government and the bourgeoisie, for the purpose of overthrowing these. And this cannot be attained, this cannot be striven for, unless the proletariat desires the defeat of its own government, and furthers this defeat.

When the Italian social democrats raised the question of the mass strike before the war, the bourgeoisie replied to them — absolutely correctly from their standpoint — that will be high treason, and you will be treated as traitors. Right. Just as it is right that fraternisation in the trenches is high treason. Those who join Bukvoyed in writing against "high treason", or Semkovsky in writing against the "decline of Russia", adopt a bourgeois standpoint, and not a proletarian one. The proletarian can neither deal his government a blow, nor stretch out his hand to his brother, the proletarian of the "foreign" country which is waging war against "us", without committing "high treason", without furthering defeat, without accelerating the decline of his own imperialist great power.

He who stands for the slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat" is, consciously or unconsciously, a chauvinist, a conciliatory petty bourgeois, and thereby an enemy of proletarian policy, an adherent of the present governments and of the present ruling classes.

Let us look at the question from yet another side. War cannot but arouse the most tempestuous emotions in the masses, breaking down the customary apathetic state of mind, and no revolutionary tactics are possible without adaptation to these new tempestuous emotions.

What are the main currents of these tempestuous emotions? 1. Despair and terror. Hence — strengthening of the church. The churches begin to fill again, the reactionaries rejoice. "Where there is suffering, there is religion", says the arch-reactionary Barrès. And he is right. 2. Hate against the "enemy" is a feeling specially nurtured by the bourgeoisie, and in a lesser degree by the clergy, and useful only to the bourgeoisie, economically and politically. 3. Hate against their own government and bourgeoisie is the feeling experienced by all class conscious workers, who realise, on the one hand, that war is a continuation of the policy of imperialism, and reply to it with a "continuation" of their hate against their class enemy, but also realise, on the other hand, that "war against war" is a banal phrase unless they accompany it by revolution against their own government. One cannot generate hate against one's own government and bourgeoisie without wishing for their defeat — and one cannot be anything else but a hypocritical opponent of civil peace if one does not generate hatred of one's own government and bourgeoisie!!!

The followers of the slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat" stand in actual fact on the side of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists; they "do not believe" in the possibility of international revolutionary action on the part of the working class against its governments, and do not desire such action: an undoubtedly difficult task, but the sole socialist task worthy of the proletariat. It is precisely the proletariat of the most backward of the warring great powers which should advance, especially in view of the despicable treachery of German and French social democracy, in the form of its Party, with revolutionary tactics which would be absolutely impossible without "promoting the defeat" of their own government, the sole tactics leading to European revolution, to the secure peace of socialism, and to the emancipation of humanity from the horrors and calamities, the barbarism and brutalisation, now prevailing.

From LENIN's "Socialism and War".

The following is taken from a brochure written by Lenin in the summer of 1915, shortly before the Zimmerwald Conference. Editor.

Social Imperialism is consummated Opportunism.

During the whole history of the II. International there took place everywhere in the socialist parties the fight between the revolutionary and the opportunist wing. In a whole number of countries it came to splits (England, Italy, Holland, Bulgaria). Not a single Marxist doubted that opportunism represents bourgeois policy in the labour movement, the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, the alliance of the smallest part of the workers, who had fallen under the influence of the bourgeoisie, with "their" bourgeoisie, an alliance which was directed against the proletariat and oppressed masses.

The objective conditions at the end of the 19th century strengthened opportunism in particular, in that it converted the taking advantage of bourgeois legality into kowtowing before it, in that a narrow circle of labour bureaucracy and labour aristocracy arose and that many petty bourgeois "hangers-on" entered the ranks of the social democracy.

The war accelerated this development in that it converted opportunism into social chauvinism and the secret alliance of opportunism with the bourgeoisie into an open alliance. At the same time the military authorities everywhere introduced a state of emergency and muzzled the working class. Their old leaders, almost without exception, went over to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

The economic basis of opportunism and social chauvinism is the same: the interest of a small section of the privileged workers and the petty bourgeois, who defend their "privi-

leges", their "right" to a few crumbs from the profits which "their" national bourgeoisie, thanks to the robbery of foreign nations and thanks to their privileges as great Powers, have made.

The ideal political content of opportunism and of social chauvinism is the same: class co-operation instead of class struggle, abandonment of revolutionary means of struggle, support of one's "own" government when the latter is in a difficult situation, instead of making use of this difficult situation in the interests of the revolution. If one takes a glance at all the European countries and disregards the attitude of certain persons (no matter how influential), it will be seen that the opportunist tendency has become the most important support of social chauvinism, and from the camp of the revolutionaries one hears everywhere a more or less consistent protest against it. If one takes, for example, the grouping of tendencies at the Stuttgart International Socialist Congress in the year 1907 then it will be seen that international Marxism was against imperialism, while international opportunism, on the other hand, already at that time supported it.

Unity with opportunism is an alliance of the workers with their national bourgeoisie and means splitting the international revolutionary working class.

In the epoch before the war, opportunism, although it was regarded as a "deviation", an "exaggeration", often passed as a natural constituent part of the Socialist Party. The War revealed the impossibility of this point of view in the future. Opportunism has become "ripe"; it has played out its role of emissary of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement. Unity with opportunism is now a complete hypocrisy, an example of

which we see in the German social democracy. On all important occasions (e. g. the voting on the 4th of August) the opportunists come with their ultimatum, they carry it through thanks to their manifold relations with the bourgeoisie, to their majority in the leading positions in the trade unions etc. Unity with opportunism now means in reality the subjugation of the working class to its own national bourgeoisie, alliance with it for the purpose of suppressing foreign nations and for the fight for its privileges as a Great Power, and means **splitting the revolutionary proletariat of all countries.**

However difficult the fight with the opportunists who dominate in many organisations may be in certain cases, however varied the process of purging the Labour Parties in the various countries of the opportunists may be, this process is necessary and fruitful. Social reformism is dying; the rising socialism will be "revolutionary, irreconcilable, rebellious", as was rightly expressed by the French Socialist Paul Golay.

Pacifism and the Slogan of Peace.

The sentiment among the masses in favour of peace frequently means the beginning of protest, of indignation and of the consciousness that the war is reactionary. It is the duty of all social democrats to make use of this sentiment. The social democrats will eagerly take part in every movement, in every demonstration inspired by this sentiment; they will, however, not deceive the people by allowing them to cherish the idea that a peace without annexations, without violation of nationalities, without robbery and which does not contain the germs of new wars between the present governments and the ruling classes, is possible without a revolution. Such a deception of the people would only benefit the secret diplomacy of the belligerent governments and their counter-revolutionary plans. He who desires a lasting, democratic peace must be for civil war, against governments and against the bourgeoisie.

Karl Liebknecht and the War.

By K. Zinoviev.

Ten years have passed since the murder of Karl Liebknecht. In this decade of the proletarian revolution the name of Karl Liebknecht has not been forgotten; on the contrary, it is better known and better honoured amongst the oppressed all over the world than ever before. In victory and defeat, in attack and in defence the working class of Germany and of the whole world will take the life and activity of Karl Liebknecht, one of the greatest leaders of our class, as a glorious example.

In this article we will remind our readers briefly of the most important stages in the life of Karl Liebknecht.

Karl Liebknecht was not always the Karl Liebknecht who is known to day to the toilers all over the world. In his political activity there is a long period when the difference between him and the other leaders of the German social democracy was not very great. In this period there was nothing to show the great historical role which Karl Liebknecht was to play during the war. It is sufficient to say that during the course of the years 1905 to 1915, during the struggle of the Russian tendencies, Karl Liebknecht was more often on the side of the Mensheviks than that of the Bolsheviks.

The development of the social democrat Liebknecht into the Liebknecht of the Spartakus Bund (League) and of the armed insurrection took place during the war. The international young communist movement, which educates the communist youth in the deepest respect for Karl Liebknecht and regards him, after Lenin, with justification as its best leader, must learn to know the real Liebknecht with all his weaknesses and all his strength. This is all the more necessary because the errors of Liebknecht were not his personal errors, but the errors of a whole wing, and by no means the worst wing, of the international working class movement. This fact detracts nothing from the real greatness of Liebknecht. With regard to Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin wrote that she had made a mistake in connection with the independence of Poland; that in 1903 she made a wrong estimate of the Mensheviks; that she was wrong in connection with the accumulation of capital; that she made a mistake in 1914 when she supported the proposal for a union of the Bolsheviks with the Mensheviks (at the so-called Brussels discussion which was organised by the Second International); that she made fundamental mistakes in a number of important questions of the Russian revolution in her writings in prison in 1918, but that despite these errors she remains an eagle". Lenin then quoted the popular Russian proverb to the effect that an eagle may sometimes swoop even lower than a hen, but that it is quite impossible that a hen might ever fly higher than an eagle.

Karl Liebknecht was and remains despite all his errors, an eagle. The truth, the whole truth concerning his life, his struggles, his mistakes and his great qualities shows up still more clearly the heroism of his attitude during the first great imperialist war.

The name of Karl Liebknecht, as it will go down in world history, is indissolubly bound up with the war. The greatness of Karl Liebknecht consisted in the fact that he understood better than anyone else, except Lenin, and was able to express better than anyone else, except Lenin, the great change which came over the proletarian revolution in Germany and in the other belligerent countries in connection with the first imperialist world war.

There is no need to stress especially the fact that the working class of Europe at the end of the first imperialist world war was different from the European working class which entered this war. Every month of the world war represented a tremendous lesson for the international proletariat. Every volley fired on the imperialist battle-field destroyed the reformist illusions of a peaceful development held by those sections of the working class in Europe which entered the war with the ideology inculcated by the twenty five years of peaceful development experienced by the Second International before the war.

Blood flowed in torrents. Every week tens and even hundreds of thousands of human beings lost their lives. With every day the miseries and privations of the population grew. Even in the first months of the war hesitation and doubt made themselves felt amongst the patriotic workers who were under the influence of the social democracy. Very soon the hesitations and doubt were resolved into a definite and growing hostility towards the war which the social democratic leaders termed "Great", "Heroic" etc. And in this situation Karl Liebknecht was the man to whose lot it fell to express this change in the broad masses of the working class. Together with the masses Liebknecht developed towards revolutionary conclusions, and with the whole passion of his fiery nature he expressed the protest of the millions of workers against the fratricidal slaughter. Liebknecht was able as no other to express the fury, the suffering and the protest, and later also the growing revolutionary determination of the best sections of the European working class which had been flung into the slaughter by the bourgeoisie and the treachery of the social democracy.

In the excellent book of Barbusse "Under Fire" which gives an unequalled description of the imperialist war, the author shows us in one of the best passages in the book, how, in the middle of the war, the example of Karl Liebknecht was synonymous with the best efforts of the workers and soldiers in that terrible period.

Liebknecht's great power was that, even when the war was still in full blast, he was able to express with unparalleled strength the passionate flaming hatred of the workers against war, and at the same time the first, fresh, and even naive hopes for an immediate revolution against war.

Liebknecht's past is in many respects different from that of Lenin. Unlike Lenin, Liebknecht was neither a prominent theoretician nor the generally recognised leader of a party or even of a fraction. Lenin's past shows us a uniformity of opinion and

a system of ideas from the end of the 'nineties right down to the death of our great master. From the book "Who are the Friends of the People" down to the book "Better less, but Good", there is an uninterrupted and logical line of development. The period of the historical preparation of Bolshevism and the period of the historical action of Bolshevism are both equally embodied by Lenin. For a quarter of a century Lenin worked at the same thing. First of all he laid the theoretical and political basis of Bolshevism, and then he applied it in three revolutions. He pursued his cause to the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat.

Karl Liebknecht's past is not of the same character. In the 'nineties of the last century, Lenin was already a Bolshevik, Liebknecht became a Bolshevik only in the years 1914/18.

Even before the war Karl Liebknecht paid very much attention to the Russian revolution. The events of 1905 were of the deepest interest to him. But in this period Liebknecht did not succeed in realising with full clarity the real class-significance of the events in Russia. Liebknecht was not able to estimate correctly the two main streams of Russian revolutionary life, Bolshevism and Menshevism. Up to 1915 Liebknecht did not support the Bolsheviks.

Inside the German social democracy Liebknecht stood on the Left, Marxist wing of the party. However, he had no systematised and final attitude, no general platform in connection with the German questions. He declared himself in favour of anti-militarist propaganda when the "Fathers" of the German social democracy considered it "tactless" to refer to the matter at all. He insisted upon paying great attention to the organisation of the young workers at a time when the above-mentioned "Fathers" considered the matter to be a bad joke. It may be remarked in passing that one of the characteristic features of opportunism is the fact that it takes up a negative and unfavourable attitude towards the organisation of the youth. All these things represent great services performed by Karl Liebknecht. His insistence upon anti-militarist propaganda and upon the support of the youth organisations, so to speak, prepared him for his historic role during the imperialist war. These, however, were the only "buds" which a keen observer might have seen at the time, serving to hint at the future role which Liebknecht was to play in the working class movement.

Liebknecht stood upon the left-wing of the German social democracy, but he regarded this party as his party, and even in 1914 the unity of this party seemed to him to be inviolate. Up to the outbreak of the war and even in the first few weeks of the war Karl Liebknecht was not able to determine upon open opposition to the majority of the German social democracy, much less on a split. Even on the 4th August, 1914, when the notorious vote of the German social democracy was given for the war credits, Liebknecht, who had carried on a passionate struggle in the social democratic Reichstag fraction, of which he was a member, against voting in favour of the credits, contented himself in public with an ineffectual protest. Only on the 2nd December, 1914, when the vote was taken in the German Reichstag concerning the granting of a further war credit of 5 milliard Marks, did Karl Liebknecht openly read a statement and vote against the granting of credit as the only one out of 111 social democratic deputies in the Reichstag. Even then, the political attitude of Karl Liebknecht to the war was so uncertain that the Bolsheviks felt compelled to deal with his attitude in an article entitled "Not Heroes" ("Against the Stream" Page 40) in the following fashion:

"The declaration of Karl Liebknecht has now also been published. The declaration is excellent in its first part which deals with the robber-imperialist character of the war, but in the second part the declaration exhausts itself in the proclamation of the slogan "Peace!". The conclusion is in such contradiction to the argument that it rings like a disharmony. If what comrade Liebknecht says about the war is correct (and it undoubtedly is correct) then the only conclusion for socialists can be: the transformation and development of the imperialist war into a civil war".

In this stage of the war, however, Karl Liebknecht expressed only the elementary urge of the workers for peace and the first dawning of a realisation amongst the social democratic workers concerning the real character of the imperialist war. Only in the summer of 1915, at the time of the first Zimmerwald conference, did Liebknecht openly approve of the Leninist slogan of the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. At that time Karl Liebknecht had been conscripted for military service and was not able to attend the conference.

He sent, however, a letter to the conference which closed with the words: "Not civil peace, but civil war is now on the agenda".

This is the period in which the Spartacus Bund was formed, that league of revolutionary workers which was to play such a glorious role in the history of the German revolution. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg stood at the head of this group, the first as political leader and agitator and the second as theoretician. The first action of this group called forth the furious hatred of the bourgeoisie and of the social democracy, a hatred which did all honour to the members of the group and its leaders. The historic significance of the first actions of the Spartakists is irrefutable. However, the fact must not be concealed that in the first period of its existence the Spartakus group did not possess a united Bolshevik programme. The members who represented this group in Zimmerwald and Kienthal even allied themselves to a certain extent with Martov against Lenin. Organisationally this group was connected with the larger group of oppositional German social democrats which later formed the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany.

The theoretical attitude of Karl Liebknecht was also not thought out to a logical conclusion at this time. Nevertheless, even then the figure of Liebknecht grew not daily, but hourly. Conscripted for military service, Liebknecht continued his anti-war propaganda in the army, and neither the state of martial law nor the moral poison of the leaders of the official social democracy were able to intimidate him. His "comrades" in the social democracy even went so far as to declare him insane. His every step was dogged by the deadly hatred of Prussian militarism, but Liebknecht's determination only grew under the pressure of intimidation, his voice steeled, his revolutionary will developed and hardened. At the head of a little group of Berlin workers he demonstrated on the Potsdamer Platz in the centre of Berlin against war and openly unfurled the banner of the struggle against war. This numerically unimportant demonstration of Berlin workers under the leadership of Liebknecht will go down in the history of the world revolution as one of the most heroic episodes in the black chapters of the war years.

Karl Liebknecht flung his famous slogans amongst the workers: "The enemy is in our own country!", "Turn the bayonets against your own bourgeoisie!". These words had the effect of a bombshell. One must have experienced the war years in order to appreciate what an effect these words of Liebknecht had. For these heroic words German militarism, with the applause of the official German social democracy, sent Karl Liebknecht to prison with hard labour, and it was in prison that he developed into the standard bearer of the world revolution.

The longer the imperialist war lasted, the higher the mountains of dead bodies grew and the worse the situation of the workers became, the greater their discontent and the firmer the revolutionary determination of the proletariat in the belligerent countries. Above the bloody darkness of the imperialist war the name of Karl Liebknecht shone to the workers like a beacon. At that time the name of Liebknecht was known to far greater circles than that of Lenin, who was compelled at the time to work in illegality abroad.

* * *

The Russian revolution broke out. From prison Karl Liebknecht sent the Russian workers a message of solidarity and support. From this time on Karl Liebknecht began to be convinced of the complete correctness of the attitude of the Bolsheviks. His former "friends", the Russian Mensheviks, including even the most radical, showed themselves to be just as banal traitors as the Scheidemanns and Eberts. The Bolsheviks alone bore the programme of Karl Liebknecht, his slogans and his name into the masses of the workers, peasants and soldiers aroused and set in movement by the revolution. In the July days of 1917 Lenin and his immediate friends and comrades experienced a similar fate to that of Karl Liebknecht. They too were arrested and flung into prison, slandered, declared to be agents of the foreign enemy, "enemies of the Fatherland" and their names were covered with dirt. Their party comrades of yesterday, the Lieberdants, the Tseretellis and the Tchernovs took part in this vile and slanderous campaign against the Bolsheviks.

The news of the events in Russia penetrated through the prison walls to Liebknecht. With tremendous enthusiasm Liebknecht gathered every single item of information he could obtain from the country where the revolution had broken the fiery ring of capitalist war. The November victory of the Bolsheviks was welcomed with enthusiasm by Liebknecht from the same prison. The Bolsheviks had seized power. They were proud of the unreserved support of such fighters like Karl Liebknecht.

For a few months the proletarian revolution in Russia marched from victory to victory, as Lenin said. And then the first great international difficulties began to rear up in its path. German imperialism was still strong enough to force the revolution to sign the peace of Brest-Litovsk. During the differences of opinion inside the ranks of the Bolsheviks concerning the permissibility of signing the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the name of Liebknecht played no small role. In Germany the revolutionary tide was undoubtedly surging upwards. The victory of the German revolution was a matter of days, no longer of months. When Liebknecht is victorious he will of course release us from all our difficulties and correct all our errors, declared Lenin to the "left-wing" communists, but that does not mean that we can permit ourselves to make especially many errors, or that, in the present state of affairs, we can permit ourselves the luxury of refusing to sign the Brest-Litovsk treaty.

The Russian revolution signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty. This fact caused an explosion of fury amongst all social-patriotic elements in Russia. Petty-bourgeois patriotism rose to white heat. Everywhere in the whole world the leaders of the Second International, in Germany also, did everything in their power to slander the Bolsheviks, to make their motives suspect and to set them in the worst possible light in the eyes of the working class in Western Europe. Here again it was Karl Liebknecht who gave the signal from prison to the best sections of the German proletariat in particular and to the proletariat of Europe in general. If the first proletarian revolution is compelled to accept the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, then it is not the Bolsheviks who are responsible, above all it is the fault and at the same time the misfortune of the working class in Western Europe who have not yet been able to assist the Russian revolution in the necessary fashion.

* * *

In the meantime the forces of German imperialism diminished more and more and approached the point of complete exhaustion. The revolutionary crisis approached in Germany with increasing speed. The working masses stirred up by the war marched towards the revolution. The official German social democracy did all in its power to hold the masses under the yoke of imperialism, but it was already too late. The military defeats of Hindenburg and Ludendorff accelerated the collapse. The German working class became more revolutionary with every passing day, with every hour. Karl Liebknecht was their standard bearer, their leader. The name of Liebknecht was known to all revolutionary workers and all the oppressed all over the world.

The revolutionary movement of the German workers and soldiers released Liebknecht from prison. Immediately after his release from prison, Liebknecht marched at the head of a great demonstration of workers to the building of the Berlin Soviet Embassy in order first of all to send his greetings to the Russian proletarian revolution. He bared his head before the red flag of the Soviet Republic. His first speech in revolutionary Germany was made in honour of the Russian revolution and the Soviet Power.

From this moment on the whole work of Liebknecht was uninterrupted service to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The whole revolutionary section of the German working class was grouped around the Spartakus Bund. The name of Liebknecht was a torch which lighted the path of the swelling ranks of the revolutionary German proletariat. The influence of Spartakus grew daily, even hourly.

Nevertheless, the German bourgeoisie and the German social democracy were incomparably better organised and cleverer than the Russian bourgeoisie, the Russian social revolutionaries and the Mensheviks. Above all, they took into consideration the experiences of the Russian revolution. When Kerensky, Tseretelli, Tchernov and Lieberdan took power, they issued the slogan, "Continue the war to a victorious end", but Scheidemann, Noske and Ebert were more cunning when they had power and they

issued the slogan, "Peace at any price". Peace with the imperialist Entente, war against the revolutionary workers! Peace with Clémenceau and Lloyd George, war against Karl Liebknecht and Lenin! These were the slogans of the "Social Democratic" Government which resulted from the November revolution. Ebert and Noske exploited the fighting spirit of the German revolutionary workers who were eager for action. Cold-bloodedly they provoked a premature insurrection in order then to drown it in the blood of the workers. This criminal plan of the "Fathers" of the German Social Democracy was successfully carried out. The January insurrection of the Spartakists was drowned in the blood of Germany's best workers. The young German Communist Party was robbed of its leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, who were murdered. Only yesterday Noske and Liebknecht, Ebert and Rosa Luxemburg were members of one and the same "united" German Social Democratic Party. To-day Noske and Ebert are the murderers of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

Karl Liebknecht served the cause of the German Revolution not only with his life and his struggle, but also with his heroic death. The circumstances of the death showed the German workers the degeneration of the German Social Democratic Party, that party which down to the present day has served as the greatest bulwark for the German bourgeoisie against the proletarian revolution.

In 1921, in his "Letter to the German Communists" analysing the March rising in Germany and the causes leading to the defeat of the revolutionary insurrection, Lenin declared, "At the time of the crisis the German workers had no party, in consequence of the delayed split and in consequence of the accursed tradition of 'unity' with the treacherous and characterless lackeys of capitalism, Scheidemann, Legien, David and Co. and Kautsky, Hilferding and Co."

In consequence of the delayed split! The Bolsheviks did not make this mistake. Long before the war they split away from the Mensheviks. The tremendous advantage which the Bolsheviks had consisted in the fact that they entered the war period and the revolutionary period following the war as an independent Bolshevik Party whose hands were not bound by "unity" with the Mensheviks. That was the basic guarantee for the victory of the Bolsheviks.

The German and the whole international bourgeoisie, the leaders of the German and of the whole international Social Democracy who had learned from the "Russian experience" and who were furious with rage in face of the approaching proletarian revolution, did everything in their power to entrap the badly armed revolutionary workers and defeat them as quickly as possible. The workers, who had suffered so much during the war, were anxious for insurrection. "Hatred forced a premature insurrection". (Lenin. See above.) The Social Democracy led the bourgeoisie over the bodies of the Spartakist workers and over the bodies of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg into a "liberated" Germany, which was called by the first "Social Democratic" Government a "Socialist" Republic in order to mislead the workers. For the present the bourgeoisie has retained power. The German proletariat has paid heavily for the delayed split from the Social Democratic Party and for the absence of a firm and consolidated Bolshevik Party.

The heroic insurrection of the Spartakists was crushed, but it sowed the seeds of victory and one day these seeds will bear fruit.

The path from the official Social Democracy to "Spartakism" represented, of course, tremendous progress. The path from the Spartakus Bund to the Bolshevik Party represents a further step forward. But the path from Bolshevism to "Spartakism" would be a step backwards.

From Liebknecht forward to Lenin! If Karl Liebknecht were alive today he would be the first to say that this, and not the opposite, must be the path of the revolutionary workers. Liebknecht himself developed along this path, and only the treacherous bullets which killed him prevented him from leading the German proletariat along this path.

Karl Liebknecht is the greatest hero of the proletarian revolution. Lenin is its greatest and most capable leader, teacher, organiser and theoretician. In the history of the world revolution the names of Karl Liebknecht and Vladimir I. Lenin will not be opposed to each other but will stand side by side. Whoever wishes to honour the memory of the great proletarian revolutionary Karl Liebknecht must tread the path of Leninism.

Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg - Leaders of the German Revolution.

By Z. Leder (Moscow).

I.

On the afternoon of the 31st July 1914 Jaurès was murdered in Paris. On the evening of the following day Germany declared war on Russia. On the same evening the French government published an order for a general mobilisation and declared for the benefit of all persons who cared to believe it, that "mobilisation is not the same thing as war".

On the 2nd August a closed meeting of party members called by the Seine Federation of the Socialist Party, took place in one of the largest halls in Paris in order to listen to the report of the delegation of the International Socialist Bureau. In this meeting the speeches of the party leaders already showed very clearly that the chauvinist fever in them was already devouring their socialist conscience. Nevertheless they attempted to convince their audience that they would simultaneously perform their "duty as Frenchmen and their duty as loyal socialists towards the International". With regard to the German Social Democracy they declared that "according to confidential information the German Social Democrats would under no circumstances vote for the credits".

This "confidential information" came from a representative of the Central Committee of the German Social Democratic Party, Hermann Mueller, who was in Paris at the time with a view to coming to some agreement with the French socialists concerning a joint attitude. The information appeared therefore to be reliable. It was the last "reliable information" obtained from the "other side" and at the same time the first of the war lies which continued during the course of four and a half years slaughter. The next day Her von Schoen, the German Ambassador to France, handed the French government the German declaration of war and from that time on for four and a half years France was cut off from Germany by an impenetrable wall of military defences, heaps of corpses and streams of lies.

One of the first reports was that the German social democrats had voted for the war credits, a sad fact, a depressing fact, but obviously a fact. The Social Democrats of "His Majesty, the Kaiser", had collapsed like pricked wind bags, the opportunists had betrayed the class struggle in favour of an alliance with the bourgeoisie.

The second report was that the declaration of war by Germany had produced unrest amongst the masses. Firing had taken place, and killed and wounded had resulted. At the head of the insurrectionary movement were Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. They had been shot.

We believed this. Others believed it. It was terrible and weighed upon us depressingly. Nevertheless, the revolutionary German proletariat had showed itself to be steadfast. It had not permitted itself to be dragged without resistance into the imperialist slaughter. It had not permitted itself to be used without resistance as the instrument of the robber Kaiser and his bourgeoisie. The revolution would rise victoriously from the dead bodies of the victims.

We all believed this, both in France and Great Britain. The British Socialist Party wrote in a Manifesto to the working class:

"No one knows how many German social democrats and trade union leaders have been shot or imprisoned for their convictions since the declaration of war."

"L'Humanité" and "Bataille Syndicaliste" published leading articles glorifying the heroic revolutionary deeds of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, deeds, which unfortunately no one, no one, in France committed.

The report concerning the shooting of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg turned out to be false. Still more, it turned out that Karl Liebknecht had also voted for the war credits, for the voting was unanimous.

II.

Karl Liebknecht did vote for the war credits on the 4th August. He submitted to the discipline of his parliamentary fraction. Three or four dozen open social chauvinists and an equal number of hypocrites and cowards who wished to avoid exposing themselves, prohibited "in the interests of the party" fourteen other members of the fraction who wished to save the honour of the social democracy at least by voting against the war credits, or at the very least by withholding their votes, from making any such "embarrassing" demonstration, for "serious conflicts" with the government might have resulted.

But why did Liebknecht permit such pressure to be imposed upon him? How could a revolutionary permit himself to be disarmed by traitors? At this time there was in Germany no organisation of the revolutionary proletariat. The basis of such an organisation was laid upon the same day, the 4th August 1914. Up to that day the possibility of founding such an organisation was prevented by the blind belief of the workers in the "revolutionary nature" of the German social democracy, and by the fetishist prejudice in favour of the so-called "necessity" of a so-called "unity". In the ranks of the German social democracy there was no Lenin.

After the 4th August Karl Liebknecht admitted his error. In the meeting of the Berlin revolutionary workers his attitude on this day was criticised still more bitterly than that of Ebert, Scheidemann, David and Co. What was to be expected from these curs other than treachery? But Liebknecht?

Liebknecht was no Lenin. He made a mistake. But he was an honest soldier of the revolution. He admitted his error. He declared, "The International is superior to party discipline. I will repair my error."

And he did repair his error. On the 2nd December 1914 during the discussion in the social democratic fraction concerning the vote upon the second war credits, thirteen members of the fraction under the influence of Liebknecht declared themselves prepared to vote against the credits. But on the day of the session, Liebknecht stood alone. He alone was prepared to fulfil the elementary parliamentary duty of a revolutionary whilst the hearts of the "independent heroes" had fallen into their boots and they preferred either to withhold their votes or to vote for the credits as demanded by the traitors. Liebknecht kept his word. He repaired the error of the 4th August and voted against the credits.

One man against 110 social traitors. One man against 400 representatives of robber imperialism. The only man who publicly declared, even after the course of four months of war, that the imperialist war was the greatest possible crime against the whole of humanity.

The historian of the German imperialist and civil war has written the following concerning this action:

"Liebknecht's action found an echo which sounded above the roar of battle. In Germany his name became a standard. His voice penetrated into the trenches. His voice penetrated through the iron walls around Germany and caused millions of proletarians over the whole world to hope again: The International has arisen. The International is alive!"

III.

On 4th August 1914 the basis for an illegal organisation of revolutionary social democratic agitation was laid. At the head of the revolutionary group, the group "International" were Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring and Clara Zetkin. For a long time the means and the possibilities of the

group were very modest, but the action of Liebknecht in the Reichstag and the traces of the activity of the Liebknecht-Luxemburg group all over the country, produced a bitter and furious campaign against the revolutionaries on the part of the social traitors.

David, the official representative of the policy of Ebert and Scheidemann, wrote referring to Liebknecht's action in the Reichstag, of a "cosmopolitan sect with anarcho-syndicalist methods who are absolutely useless and even dangerous for a party which wishes to pursue a real policy and not lose the confidence of the masses". The chairman of the social democratic trade unions, Karl Legien, proved to his own satisfaction in a meeting of 1,500 trade union employees called by him, that behind the activity of the Liebknecht-Luxemburg group were "anarchist elements seeking to disrupt the united democratic organisations of the workers".

The result of this howling of the social traitors about "anarchism" was that Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were removed from the surface of public life. In the interests of the maintenance of imperialist and military "order" Rosa Luxemburg was arrested and conveyed into a fortress on the 18th February 1915 in order to serve a sentence upon the basis of a verdict passed on 20th February 1914, of one year and a day. The 42 year old Karl Liebknecht was conscripted on the 7th February 1915 for military service.

However, the revolutionary spirit and will of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg continued the work. In March 1915 with the participation of Karl Liebknecht, the first national conference of the Group took place and in April the first (and last) number of its theoretical organ "International" appeared. In May of the same year on the occasion of the entry of Italy into the war, a leaflet intended for mass distribution and entitled "The Enemy is in our own Country" was spread in the factories and found widespread sympathy.

On the 18th February 1916 Rosa Luxemburg was released from prison and at the same time the "Spartakusbund" worked out its platform in the form of theses which were adopted by its second congress. In a pamphlet issued under the name of "Junius" at the beginning of 1916 — pamphlet which was actually written in April 1915 — Rosa Luxemburg provided the theoretical and political basis for the platform. This platform and its theoretical basis were not, as later criticism of Lenin showed, filled with that iron and ruthless logic which Lenin considered necessary for a real revolutionary anti-war agitation and which dominated all his own articles and theses.

"Junius", wrote Lenin concerning Rosa Luxemburg's pamphlet, "is without a doubt decisively against imperialist war and decisively in favour of a revolutionary tactic."

"But Junius has first of all not freed himself from the 'environment' of the German, even the Left wing, social democrats who fear a split and who fear to carry through revolutionary slogans to their logical end,

"Secondly, Junius wanted to begin to develop a revolutionary programme from its 'most suitable, most popular and for the petty bourgeoisie most acceptable side'. That is to say, something like a plan 'to outwit history, to outwit the philistines'."

"Probably such considerations have consciously or unconsciously determined the tactics of Junius. It is not necessary to say that they are false."

"But such an error — it would be very wrong to forget this — is no personal error of Junius but the result of the weakness of all German left wingers who have been surrounded on all sides by the pernicious net of Kautskian hypocrisy, pedantry and 'friendliness' towards the opportunists. The supporters of Junius have, despite their isolated position, been able to issue illegal leaflets and to commence a war against 'Kautskivism'. They will be able to continue the correct path which they have commenced."

On the First of May 1916 Karl Liebknecht headed a mass of workers who demonstrated on Potsdamer Platz in the centre of Berlin against war. The demonstrators shouted "Down with the War!" and "Down with the Government!" Liebknecht was of the opinion that after such a complete collapse of the party as had taken place before the eyes of the workers on the 4th August 1914, it was not possible to appeal to the workers for

an open struggle against the government unless he placed himself at their head in the streets. The government arrested him and placed him before a court martial for "High Treason" and "Assisting the Enemy".

In reply to the Public Prosecutor who demanded that Liebknecht should be sent to prison with hard labour for six years on account of his fight against the robber imperialists, Karl Liebknecht declared:

"No General has ever worn his uniform with so much pride as I will wear the prison garb. I am here not to defend myself, but to accuse you. Not civil peace, but civil war is my slogan. Down with the War! Down with the Government!"

Liebknecht was held in prison for four years and one month in order there to repair shoes. Liebknecht declared to his judges that the day was near when they would sit in the dock and listen to the verdict of the people against them. He was not mistaken. The day of his conviction was the day of the first political mass strike in Germany, a day of revolutionary demonstrations in the streets, the beginning of the German revolution.

Rosa Luxemburg followed Karl Liebknecht into the prisons of the German Kaiser. Rosa Luxemburg was put into prison "in order to remove the possibility that she would commit a crime". She was arrested without having been caught red-handed in a "crime" against the German Kaiser, against the bourgeoisie and their social democracy. Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and shortly afterwards, Franz Mehring and Clara Zetkin were all buried alive in order to permit the social democratic traitors, the Eberts and the Scheidemanns, to continue their work for the Kaiser and for the German bourgeoisie by seeking to maintain the patriotism of the soldiers in the trenches.

The inevitable occurred.

The imperialist war turned into a civil war, as Lenin had prophesied.

The civil peace turned into civil war, as Lenin had prophesied.

Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg supported this movement as far as possible from prison. The development of the civil war in Germany as a result of the victory of the proletariat in Russia, showed that Rosa Luxemburg's doubts with regard to the tactic of Lenin were unfounded. In October 1918 German imperialism nearing the catastrophe, attempted to postpone the inevitable by allying itself openly with the social traitors. As a concession to the masses Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were released. Once again they were at their posts, once again they plunged into the foremost ranks of the struggle!

From that time on there was only a short period up to the time of their murder, but this short period was full of passionate struggle and revolutionary enthusiasm.

On the 9th November the old order collapsed. "What has happened?", declared Rosa Luxemburg on the 31st December 1918 at the first congress of the newly formed Communist Party, "is rather the collapse of the giant imperialism of its own weight, than a conscious revolution".

It was the task of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg to lead the conscious revolution which was still to emerge gradually out of the chaos caused by the collapse of the old order.

Their work was difficult, because although the party had been founded on the 4th August 1918, it had not taken on any consolidated form until the 31st December 1918, and from the beginning it was confronted with an enemy who had at his disposal both material resources and extreme cunning.

The counter-revolution hid its nakedness from the eyes of the masses with the figleaf of the alliance of Haase with Ebert and Scheidemann. Under the given circumstances the Scheidemann group represented the most favourable cloak for the bourgeois counter-revolution. The masses were fed with the illusion of "the unity of socialism". When the Scheidemanns began to break up this "unity" with machine-gun fire, the "eternal rebel" Spartacus was unfortunately not yet in a position to consolidate its influence upon the masses organisationally. Thus, the counter-revolution did not meet with the necessary energetic resistance.

"The second and most intense phase of the struggle has commenced", declared Rosa Luxemburg at the first congress of

the Communist Party on the 31st December 1918. "The government of Ebert-Scheidemann must inevitably be crushed." The resolution put forward by Rosa Luxemburg declared: "The government of Ebert and Scheidemann is the deadly enemy of the German proletariat. Down with the Ebert-Scheidemann government!"

Unfortunately the struggle between the Ebert-Scheidemann government and Spartacus proved that the latter was the weaker. It was a life and death struggle. And in order to be victorious Spartacus needed in its ranks a band of revolutionaries, not necessarily very numerous, but steeled for their work by party discipline and their revolutionary past experience, capable of drawing the masses with them not only in a final struggle against the bourgeoisie, but also against the bourgeois government cloaked with the social democratic facade. The history of the German social democracy during the course of decades had not prepared Spartacus to fulfil this task. The policy of the Spartacus League even in the most difficult period of the struggles, was not calculated to get the best out of these struggles, a revolutionary organisation with leaders at their head.

The following is a description of Rosa Luxemburg's ideas concerning party organisation, according to her intimate friend and comrade Clara Zetkin: In Rosa's opinion "a firmly organised party should be the organisational signal and the leading brain of the great fighting determination of the working masses.

But not the party, the idea must be the chief driving force".

When we remember with bitter grief how the white bandits succeeded in murdering Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, in stamping the heart and brain of the German revolution into the mud, we must involuntarily put the question: Did not perhaps the error expressed in this attitude of Rosa Luxemburg, an error which was understandable in the old Social Democratic Party, but no longer so after the revolutionary socialists had founded their own party, contribute to the fact that Scheidemann and Reinhardt succeeded in murdering Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, whilst in Russia Lenin and Zinoviev survived the witches sabbath from July to September?

The whole force of the counter-revolution was mobilised around Ebert and Scheidemann: the extreme and the "simple conservative" agrarians who had let the towns go hungry for four years, now set to work with heart and soul to provide the towns with provisions in order to counter the Spartacist danger; the industrial bourgeoisie of all shades, from the conservatives to the "democrats", with the iron and coal barons at the head, the industrialists who had concluded a "hearty and fraternal" alliance with the social democratic trade union leaders, the so-called "Arbeitsgemeinschaft", or class-collaboration; the sharks of high finance and the wolves of the Stock Exchange who had all become "democratic", the military clique who were longing to make good their drubbing at the hands of the French and the British by slaughtering the "internal enemy"; the priests, parsons and rabbis of all shades of religious opinion who were anxious to save the Fatherland, the Church and the Family from degeneration and violation and the womenfolk from "nationalisation" and finally all possible doubtful elements in the towns who lived like parasites from the degeneration and the exploitation of capitalism. All these elements rallied around the social democratic government of Ebert-Scheidemann and together with the social democratic leaders and the social democratic bureaucracy, they commenced a merciless struggle against Spartacus and the proletarian masses behind the Spartacists.

"Death to Spartacus!", "Spartacus is the deadly enemy of Society!", these were the war cries of the counter-revolutionary army.

During the course of the following two months both Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were to be found daily at their posts in the revolutionary movement where they expended their utmost and exerted all their capacities, their revolutionary experiences, their mental equipment and their iron will power in the services of the revolutionary proletariat. After having attempted to slaughter a band of revolutionary sailors during Christmas week, the bands of Ebert, Scheidemann, Noske, Groener,

Luetvitz, Reinhardt and the rest of the social democratic, military clique attempted in the January days to crush Spartacus in a sea of blood and a mountain of corpses.

In the last article written before her violent death and published in the "Rote Fahne" under the title of "Order has been restored in Berlin", Rosa Luxemburg scourged the "victors" on the streets of Berlin and declared with revolutionary pride: "The revolutionary masses of the workers were compelled to take up arms, the honour of the revolution demanded it!" In conclusion she declared the revolution to be still alive despite the "restoration of order", the eternal revolution "that was, is and will be!"

Karl Liebknecht admitted together with Rosa Luxemburg that the revolutionary workers of Berlin had suffered a defeat and declared with revolutionary confidence: "There are defeats which are victories, and there are victories which are more fateful than defeats.... The bodies of the fallen fighters will arise again and demand atonement from their murderers.... Today there is only the underground rumbling of the volcano to be heard, to-morrow the volcano will spit fire and bury the murderers under an eruption of glowing lava".

On the 15th January 1919 Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were brutally murdered by the atrocious agents of the counter-revolution. We will not deal at length with the details of the brutal murder which makes the blood run cold and involuntarily raises the question: "How could the German proletariat permit such a thing?"

The "bloodhound of the German revolution", social democratic leader and Prussian Sergeant-Major in one person, Gustav Noske writes the following concerning the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg in his memoir book "From Kiel to the Kapp Putsch":

"Liebknecht and Frau Luxemburg were the two persons chiefly responsible for the fact that the revolution which had been won without bloodshed, developed into a civil war with all its horrors. It is true that in the days of the terror thousands asked themselves the question, is there no one who will put those responsible for the terror out of the way? None of those who involuntarily asked themselves this question were responsible for the killings. When the thing occurred under such horrible circumstances, sympathy with the dead arose, I am opposed to all murder. Those who were most indignant at the death of Liebknecht and Frau Luxemburg were those who in other and not less terrible cases, maintained an indifferent calm".

The action of Scheidemann, Ebert and Noske after the murder was worthy of those who had incited the murder, they let the murderers go free, who had carried out their orders, who had done that which the "thousands" of friends of Scheidemann and Noske longed for.

On the tenth anniversary of the brutal murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, we can do no better than repeat the glorious words of Clara Zetkin:

"Legend declares that in the battle of Châlons in 451, the fighting was so fierce that the spirits of the dead warriors continued to fight in the air. Our fallen comrades Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg are continuing the struggle, not in the air, but in our midst. Their memory is immortal, that which they gave us in their life and work will never die. It has been embedded into the bone and flesh of innumerable class-conscious workers and expresses itself in their determined revolutionary activity. Thousands of Liebknechts, Luxemburgs, Jogiches, Mehrings and Levinés are now in the ranks of the German proletariat and in the ranks of the workers all over the world. Thousands of new fighters equal to our dead leaders in determination, will, purity of conviction, devotion to their proletarian duty, courage and self-sacrifice are now in the ranks of the workers. Therefore we shall not mourn for Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, but fight for their cause. Once again the signal sounds for the fight! The great struggle begins anew!"

Rosa Luxemburg in the Struggle against Trade Union Bureaucracy.

By G. Smoliansky.

The question of the tactics to be employed in the trade unions by the revolutionaries plays an exceedingly great role at the present time. We are living in the epoch of the "third period" of the post-war development of capitalism, characterised by an extreme aggravation of class antagonism on a higher stage of the partial capitalist stabilisation. A mechanical and simplified conception of the partial stabilisation has found its way into our own ranks, especially in Germany, and upon this basis tendencies towards opportunist capitulation have developed with regard to reformist trade union bureaucracy, leading in actual practice to a passivity of the communist vanguard towards trade union bureaucracy. At the same time the Communist "revisionists" not infrequently attempt to refer to the authority of Rosa Luxemburg, and to seek cover behind the banner of the "Spartacus League". Hence an examination of Rosa Luxemburg's actual standpoint with respect to the problems of the trade union movement is of the utmost interest at the present moment, for the greatest historical service rendered by Rosa Luxemburg was precisely her exposure of reformism, and her relentless struggle against the blind and narrow-minded cretinism of the trade unions.

In the struggle against reformism in the ranks of German social democracy, Rosa Luxemburg indubitably occupied a leading place. It was only natural that Rosa Luxemburg drew down upon herself the hate of her enemies, the bourgeoisie and the social reformists, and it is to her honour that she did so. In 1905, when the after effects of the first Russian revolution began to be intensely felt all over Europe, the bureaucratic clique in the trade unions and in the Social Democratic Party conducted a particularly despicable campaign against Rosa Luxemburg. The chairman of the Miners' Union, Otto Hué, one of the most reactionary figures in the German trade union movement, wrote as follows in the "Bergarbeiterzeitung", the organ of the Union:

"In Russia the struggle rages for the freedom of the people. It has long been a matter of wonder to us that our trade union theoreticians (that is, Rosa Luxemburg, G. S.) do not hasten to Russia, in order to collect practical experience there and to take part in the fight. Workers' blood is being shed in Russia; why do the comrades from Poland and Russia, now employed in Germany, France, and Switzerland in writing "revolutionary" articles, not hasten to the scene of battle? Try to learn there, you "theoreticians of the class struggle!"

This article was written a few months before Rosa Luxemburg went to Russia, where she was promptly arrested. The campaign was taken up at that time by the whole bourgeois press of Germany, and Pastor Naumann, a then well-known "national socialist" and "intermediary" between labour and capital, wrote in his organ:

"This is well said! Let the international revolutionists tell us why they are now not sufficiently international to go to Warsaw!"

Rosa Luxemburg differed in opinion from Bolshevism in a number of essential questions. Her under-estimation of the organisational questions of the labour movement and of the rôle of the proletarian party as leader of the proletariat and organiser of the revolution, is well known. Her experiences in Russia brought her to an erroneous standpoint in the peasant question, the result of a reaction against the Narodniki (populist movement). But the historical importance of Rosa Luxemburg is not diminished one iota by this. Rosa Luxemburg paved the way for Bolshevism in the West. Her most valuable service was her unmasking of trade union reformism, for the trade union apparatus was the main fulcrum of reformism. The "practical people" in trade union bureaucracy, with the narrow-mindedness and presumption peculiar to them, accused Rosa Luxemburg, as a "theoretician" and "foreigner", of understanding nothing of the

trade union movement in general or of the German trade union movement in particular. But Rosa Luxemburg had devoted the greatest attention to the trade union movement from the first day of her active participation in the labour movement. This may be seen very clearly in the fourth volume of Rosa Luxemburg's complete works, published in 1928, a book of more than 700 pages, devoted exclusively to the questions of the trade union struggle.

Three stages can be distinguished in the development of Rosa Luxemburg's activity in the German labour movement, corresponding approximately to the three main stages in the development of the relations between the Social Democratic Party and the German trade unions: 1. Up to the revolution in 1905; 2. from the first Russian revolution up to the imperialist war; and 3. the period of war and revolution. Three historical periods must be distinguished in the relations between German social democracy and the "free" trade unions: the period of organisational and ideological dominance of the party; the period in which the trade unions fought for equal rights, and finally the present period of dominance over the party, which actually became observable immediately after the fatal victory of the trade unions over the party in 1906. Rosa Luxemburg, with her revolutionary intuition, perceived what was going on, and saw in advance that it was not a question of "equal rights", but of the intention of the trade unions to drag the party in their wake.

During the first period the struggle against revisionism was the fundamental question. For the revisionists the trade unions were the instrument for the "peaceful penetration" of capitalism by socialism. The chief danger represented by the revisionists was their dissemination of the illusion that wages could be increased not only absolutely but also relatively within the confines of the capitalist system, that is, they believed it to be possible to increase the share allotted to wages from the price of the product of labour, a belief contradicting the Marxist "theory of impoverishment". It was precisely this circumstance which induced Rosa Luxemburg to emphasise — at that time still in conjunction with the whole "Marxist centre" (Kautsky, etc.) — the limits of the trade union struggle under capitalist conditions, a struggle insufficient in itself for the emancipation of the working class.

The trade unions, although they are the schools of socialism, cannot overcome capitalism. Hence Rosa Luxemburg's famous designation of the work of the trade unions as a "labour of Sisyphus", which evoked furious attacks on her by the reformists. These questions of the law of capitalist wages, elementary for a Marxist, aroused a whole campaign of calumny against Rosa Luxemburg by the trade union bureaucracy.

Trade union bureaucracy was anxious for quiet, and therefore it sowed illusions regarding the unlimited possibilities of the trade unions within the confines of the capitalist state of society. Leipart and Naphtali, anxious to bring about "economic democracy" in bourgeois capitalist Germany, may well repeat the words of the sage Ben Akiba: "Everything has already existed" (and so may the liquidators, who, in the name of Rosa Luxemburg and the Spartacus League, preach what is actually co-operation with trade union bureaucracy and through this with capitalism). The "Bergwerkszeitung" which led this campaign against Rosa Luxemburg, commented as follows on the appointment in 1905 of a new Left "Vorwärts" editorial staff, in which Rosa Luxemburg was one of the most prominent co-workers:

"This lady (!) has been making herself conspicuous for some years by her discrediting of trade union work and of the trade union leaders. It was she who spoke of trade union work as being a labour of Sisyphus (fruitless labour)... In trade union circles this lady is well known as the source of those calumnies which are being spread against the independence of the trade unions, and which

have become customary for a long time. The appointment of the new "Vorwärts" editorial staff was a severe blow for the trade unions..."

One can now understand why Rosa Luxemburg became the object of the furious attacks of that trade union bureaucracy whose limitedness she continually emphasised. Revisionism represented the immediate interests of the labour aristocracy. When it suffered a temporary defeat at the beginning of this century, the heads of the trade unions, representing the same social interests, naturally advocated the most speedy possible separation from the Party, as the source of radical influence. This was the meaning of the slogans of "neutrality" and "equal rights". Rosa Luxemburg was perfectly right when she wrote that such a "neutrality", and such "equal rights", must lead inevitably to reformism.

In describing this courageous revolutionary fight waged by Rosa Luxemburg against the reformist and bureaucratic degeneration of the trade union leaders, we must at the same time mention the not inconsiderable errors into which she fell. These errors were, in the first place, the result of her incorrect estimate of the rôle played by the Party, and in the second of her erroneous conception of the essential character of imperialism. Rosa Luxemburg, whilst exercising a justifiable criticism of trade union bureaucracy, failed to grasp the social and economic causes conditioning the development of the labour aristocracy and with it the vitality of social democratic and trade union bureaucracy. She regarded the reformist leadership as an evil "in itself", as a leadership which had torn itself away from the masses, and had become a foreign body in the movement.

— This is the reason why Rosa Luxemburg, even later on, during the war, when social democracy collapsed openly, still long remained under the influence of the illusion of a possible return of social democracy to the "old" revolutionary path!

On the other hand, this same false view led at the same time to Rosa Luxemburg's "Left" errors in the trade union question at the time of the founding of the Communist Party. It is significant that one of the present liquidators, Paul Frölich, the editor of Rosa Luxemburg's complete works, has broken off the 4th volume, dealing with the trade unions, with the great war. For precisely Frölich has passed through a tremendous evolution since that time and on this question, from extreme ultra-Left opposition to work in the reformist trade unions in general to the present "trade union legalism" and to capitulation to the bureaucracy of the General German Trade Union Federation.

There is only one written record of this period available: the short speech made by Rosa Luxemburg at the inaugural Party Conference of the C. P. G. (December 1918), referring to Paul Lange's report on "economic conflicts". Trade union bureaucracy was already appearing openly in the camp of counter-revolution, and the hate against it reached its culminating point. "History", declared Rosa Luxemburg at the Party Conference, "knows of no baser betrayal than this betrayal committed by the German trade union leaders". Three currents were observable at the Party Conference (Otto Rühle and his group on the one hand, Frölich and the Hamburg comrades on the other, and finally Schuhmann with his followers), who demanded the immediate break with the trade unions. Many of these joined the Communist Labour Party of Germany. Others have now got stuck in the opportunist bog. Rosa Luxemburg at first resisted the withdrawal from the trade unions, but then agreed to it on account of practical considerations — in order to gain time. She proposed the appointment of a commission to investigate the question of a transference of the trade union fractions into the works councils and workers' and soldiers' Soviets. In her speech on this question she said:

"Germany is the sole country in which, thanks to the disgraceful attitude of the trade unions, there were no great economic struggles during the whole war. Were there no other charge to be laid at the door of the German trade unions than this, they deserve to be abandoned for this reason alone. Out of labour organisations they have developed into the strongest pillars of the bourgeois state and bourgeois society, and it is therefore obvious that the fight for socialisation cannot be carried on without raising the question of the liquidation of the trade unions. In this we are all agreed. (The emphasis is mine, G. S.) But our opinions differ with regard to the path to be taken."

It was precisely this against which Lenin was fighting in his "Left-Wing Communism. There is no doubt that the experience gained with the sectarians of the so-called Communist Labour Party of Germany (Wolfheim and Laufenberg), would have convinced Rosa Luxemburg, had she still been alive, of the necessity of revolutionary mass work in the trade unions — work, it need not be said, free of all illusions as to the possibility of "winning over" the traitorous trade union bureaucracy. But two weeks later Noske's bloodhounds and the trade union bureaucracy had murdered Rosa Luxemburg.

The Victims of the Imperialist War 1914-1918.

By J. Sigur.

The war of 1914/18 which was waged concerning the re-distribution of the world, affected hundreds of millions of human beings in all parts of the earth. For over four years millions of men fought and died in Europe, Asia and Africa. They fought on dry land and they fought on the seas in the interests of imperialism. To-day when imperialism is once again rattling the sabre of war in its scabbard, when the question of a new re-distribution of the world is again acute, we should remember the victims of the world-war, and then fight with tenfold energy against the war-mongers and for the overthrow of the capitalist system which inevitably leads humanity into new robber wars.

The following sober figures should cause hatred in the hearts of the workers against the war-mongers and should cause them to join with revolutionary determination in the fight against armaments.

The Mobilised Populations 1914/1918.

	No. Called up	Percentage to total Population
France (without her colonies)	7,960,000	20.4
Great Britain (without her colonies)	4,971,000	10.7
British Dominions, Colonies and India	4,525,000	—
Russia	15,123,000	8.5
Italy	5,615,000	15.3
The United States	3,800,000	3.8
Roumania	1,000,000	13.3
Germany	13,260,000	20.0
Austria-Hungary	9,000,000	17.5
Approximate total	70,000,000	

Approximately 70 millions of the most fit and healthy men were withdrawn from the process of production and delivered over to the terrors of death and disablement and to the sufferings of life in the trenches. 70 million wage-slaves of capitalism took part in an insane mutual slaughter in order to protect the interests of capitalist profit. Millions of deceived and betrayed workers and peasants fell in the war and millions of other returned to their homes as cripples.

The Losses of the Combatant Armies during the War

	Dead and Died of Wounds	Wounded	Permanently Disabled
France	1,550,000	3,100,000	800,000
Great Britain	725,000	2,050,000	350,000
Germany	1,835,000	4,215,000	665,000
Russia	700,000	2,750,000	410,000
Approximate total losses			
losses of all belligerents	9,000,000	19,000,000	3,500,000

Reduction of the Population*) caused directly by the War**)	
Population at the end of 1913	400,850,000
Probable population at the middle of 1919 under normal conditions of development	424,480,000
Actual population in the middle of 1919	389,030,000
Total loss in consequence of the war	35,380,000
including, killed and died of wounds	9,829,000

Thus in ten European countries alone the population diminished by 35 millions as a consequence of the world war. In the post-war years death also reaped a rich harvest. Many

millions of people constitutionally weakened and undermined by the sufferings of war, privations and lack of sufficient nourishment were swept away in numerous epidemics. Approximately 12 millions of people died in all countries as a result of influenza.

Apart from those 70 millions who were risking their lives in the trenches, many millions of workers were employed in all countries producing weapons, ammunition, aeroplanes, poison gas and other means of destruction. Numerous large-scale plants which had previously produced exclusively for consumption concentrated during the war exclusively on the production of war-material. During the imperialist war 1914/18 industry produced the following amounts of war-material:

Name	Guns	Machine-Guns	Aeroplanes	Tanks
Great Britain	27,000	24,000	55,000	2818
France	21,000	88,000	51,000	3200
Italy	10,000*)	37,000	—	—
Russia	17,860	27,477	3,000	—

In order to produce such enormous quantities of war material, the following numbers of workers were withdrawn in 1917/18 from the normal process of production:

- In France 1.8 million workers
- In Great Britain 2.0 million workers
- In the U. S. A. 1.2 million workers

During the war all factories worked feverishly to produce modern instruments of murder.

During the war the German army alone used no less than 286 million cartridges to the value of approximately 1200 million pounds sterling in present values.

This 1,200 million pounds sterling was literally pulverised and the German national economic system was so much the poorer. Not only that, but these 286 million cartridges killed millions of human beings and did enormous damage. Artillery fire etc. destroyed in Northern France 290,000 homes, 500,000 buildings and 65,000 kilometres of roadway etc. (Railways, roads, canals), 9,700 railway bridges and 22,100 factories.

The tremendous armies and the machinery of destruction used up not only the total national income of the belligerent nations, but also a considerable part of the national wealth, as can be seen from the following table:

Country	National Wealth	National Income	Immediate War Costs Total	Yearly Average
colonies	70.5	11.0	33.4	7.7
Great Britain without				
France	58.5	6.0	31.3	7.2
Germany	80.5	10.5	46.3	16.8
Austria-Hungary	40.0	3.8	24.8	5.7
Russia	60.0	6.5	26.5	7.6
A Total of Eleven	567.0	80.8	249.4	57.5

important belligerent countries.

The fact that many millions of the best and most capable workers had been withdrawn for over four years from the normal process of production, the fact that industry as a whole had been adapted to the production of war materials and finally, the devastation caused by the war, produced in the most important belligerent countries a general economic decline and the general impoverishment of the toiling masses. The world economic system as a whole was very much weakened.

*) In ten European States.

***) The Calculations are those of Chr. Daringa.

*) Light Artillery.

The World Economic System before and after the Imperialist World War.

Commodity	1913	1919	Reduction in %
Coal in millions of tons . . .	1,216	1,058	13
Pig iron in millions of tons . . .	77.2	61	21
Steel in millions of tons . . .	73.6	68	7.7
Copper in thousands of tons . . .	1,133	1,076	5
Lead in thousands of tons . . .	1,292	940	27.3
Zinc in thousands of tons . . .	1,100	715	35
Cotton in millions of bales . . .	25.4	20.6	19
Wool in millions of pounds . . .	3,162	2,894	9
Wheat in millions of tons ¹⁾ . . .	79.9	76	5
Rye in millions of tons . . .	21.4	17.7	17.3
Barley in millions of tons . . .	26.5	22.1	16.3
Oats in millions of tons . . .	49.4	42.7	13.6
Maize in millions of tons . . .	97.1	92.6	5.7
Potatoes in millions of tons . . .	113.4	92	19
Sugar in millions of tons . . .	18.8	15.9	15
World Turn-over of Foreign Commerce in milliards of pounds sterling ²⁾	7.7	6 ³⁾	

¹⁾ Exclusively in the U. S. S. R. territory.

²⁾ In 40 countries.

³⁾ In the year 1922.

The Economic System of the European States, where the main drama of the toiling population was performed, suffered still more as a result of the war.

The European Economic System before and after the World War Average Monthly Figures

	1913	1919	Reduction in %
Coal in millions of tons ¹⁾ . . .	46.1	35.6	23
Cast iron in millions of tons ²⁾ . . .	3,015	1,65	55.3
Steel in millions of tons ²⁾ . . .	2,579	1,845	28.7

¹⁾ Gt. Britain, Belgium, Germany, Poland and France.

²⁾ Gt. Britain, Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg, France and Sweden.

European agriculture also suffered in a similar fashion. The years of hunger and chronic undernourishment are still fresh in the memory of all the people of Central Europe.

Only in the year 1925/26 did the world economic system succeed in reaching its pre-war level. A number of countries, particularly Great Britain, have not even yet succeeded in reaching the pre-war level of production.

"The proletariat manufactured machinery of destruction. Together with the peasantry the proletariat served behind these engines of destruction. The proletariat and the peasantry of various nations murdered each other mutually. To-day everyone asks himself: How was such insanity possible? But another question is of much greater present importance: are we threatened with a repetition of this insanity?"

"... Only the revolutionary struggle, only the armed insurrection of the toilers against imperialism can prevent war and make wars impossible for ever. Such an insurrection, no matter how cruel and brutal its forms, would not cost one hundredth, not one thousandth part of the victims and destruction caused by the last imperialist war.

"... All the creations of humanity on the fields of economics, politics, science and art recede into the background in face of the tremendous task of preventing a new war at all costs and saving the whole of humanity from decay and decline. Only the broad masses of the toilers under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat are capable of carrying out this great task. If the proletariat rises in a united front against war, then all measures of repression and all the forces of militarism are powerless. The greatest engines of destruction are helpless unless they are set in motion by human hands.

"... War technique is untiringly continuing its work. New long-range guns are being built on a scale hitherto unknown. New types of machine-guns and automatic rifles have strengthened the fighting force of the infantry. Poison-gas is taking the place of dynamite. Aeroplanes carrying the latest achievements of the chemical industry have tremendously increased the immediate radius of the area of hostilities... The horrors of the last war pale before the horrors of the coming storm.

"... The struggle against militarism must not be postponed until the moment when war breaks out. Then it will be too late. The struggle against war must be carried on now, daily, hourly." (From the Manifesto of the Communist International on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the imperialist war.)

The Growth of Militarism.

By Soldat.

"The boycott of war is a stupid phrase. The communists must take part in every reactionary war". Lenin.

I. The preparations for the new imperialist war.

The preparation of national economy for the war.

Parallel with the ever acuter conflicts among the greatest imperialist states for the redistribution of the world, there is an unceasing growth of armaments.

Armies numbering millions of men, equipped with the latest instruments of destruction, naturally place an enormous strain on the national economies which have to provide these armies with food and munitions in time of war. The last imperialist war imposed an intense strain on the national economies of the warring states. Russia stood this strain for three years; the Central powers were able to stand it for four years; but in these four years war and human material were so completely exhausted that great inner social-political convulsions followed.

The coming imperialist war, with its more perfect war techniques, will place an even greater strain on the economics of the warring states, and demand an even closer unification of the working class and all workers.

The imperialist states, fully aware of these perspectives for the war of the future, are exerting every effort to prepare their countries for the impending war.

Every great state has its special organs, engaged with the problems of the economic preparation for war. In every ministry there are branches of these organs.

As an illustration of the preparations for war being made by the imperialist powers, we give below the main points of the French law (under the "socialist" Paul Bencour) "on the organisation of the nation in time of war". This law is built up on the following primary propositions:

1. We must prepare for a lengthy war.

2. War comprises every sphere of "national activity": military, political, and economic.

3. The preparation and utilisation of the material reserves of the country come under two periods:

a) In time of peace the most perfect technical instruments of war are elaborated; reserves are collected as required for the equipment and provision of a fighting army until this work is taken over by the mobilised industries; the productive possibilities of those branches of industry which are of great importance for the carrying on of war are increased.

b) The moment of mobilisation must be automatically accompanied by the mass production of weapons, munitions, and every description of war material.

4. "Every French citizen, regardless of sex and age, as also all organisations and undertakings, is bound to take part in the defence of the country, or in the support of this defence in some economic or moral activity."

5. The government can obtain the material means necessary for the war in agreement with the owners, or by requisition.

6. In case of war, the ministerial council has the right to regulate the production, the distribution, and the consumption of the material reserves and supplies of energy of the country.

This is the main content of this "model" law of the "socialist" Paul Boncour. This law signifies the complete militarisation of the whole country.

We also observe a steady growth of the military budgets. But even this does not exhaust the military expenditure of the present imperialist states. Enormous sums are expended, under other items of the budget, for the preparation of the mobilisation of industry, the transport service, etc. If we add together the whole of the expenditure incurred in this way by France, during the past war and in preparation for the next, we shall find by far the greater half of the state budget devoted to military purpose. This military expenditure weighs heavily on the shoulders of the workers.

2. Armaments.

States	Land forces (in thousands)				1928 trained reserves
	1913	1923	1927	total	
United States	226	372	404	413	3,500
France	546	732	727	695	5,500
Great Britain	516	329	372	381	4,500
Italy	264	248	270	369*)	4,000
Japan	275	236	205	208	3,200
The 5 great powers total .	1827	1917	1978	2066	20,700

We see that the land forces of five great powers increased by 240,000 from 1913 to 1928, whereby a gradual increase in the number of land forces during the last few years may be observed. But the growth of land forces here ascertained does not by any means give a full idea of the state of preparation of the population or of the number of trained reservists. In all countries with conscription the term of active service has been considerably reduced. As compared with before the war, when the term of service was two to three years, most countries have now reduced this to eighteen months, with a tendency to the transition to a one-year term of service. Consequently the number of men passing through the army is increased, and the military training of the population intensified. The armies of today train twice as many men as were trained, in the same time before the war. The quality of the training imparted in a shorter term of service is compensated by training outside of the army (in all kinds of schools, in military, sport, and other organisations). At the present time the above-named five great powers have at their disposal more than 20 million trained reserves capable of active service, enabling them to form and supplement the multi-million armies of the future.

The modern army is extremely well equipped with machine guns, up-to-date tanks, and other instruments of destruction, and in this respect surpasses by far the armies of the last imperialist war.

3. The growth of naval armaments.

(Number of ships.)

States	Cruisers			Submarines			Aircraft-Carriers		
	1922	1928	1932	1922	1928	1932	1922	1928	1932
Great Britain	48	55	71	85	56	85	6	6	9
United States	23	32	40	142	121	127	2	2	3
Japan	17	38	44	58	68	85	1	4	6
France	11	13	17	51	60	86	0	3	4
Italy	13	15	20	43	42	63	0	1	1
Total	112	153	192	379	347	446	9	16	24

*) Including gendarmerie (66,000), colonial troops (50,000), but not including Fascist militia (300,000).

We observe a general increase in naval forces, especially in the number of cruisers, aircraft-carriers, and up-to-date submarines.

In 1927/28 Great Britain commenced building, two ships of the line (Rodney and Nelson) two cruisers, two torpedo boats, and two submarines. In the United States three ships of the line were modernised, the building of two modern aircraft-carriers (each carrying 100 aeroplanes) completed, and a mine-layer built; in Japan four cruisers, one aircraft-carrier, and several torpedo boats and submarines, in France three cruisers, one aircraft-carrier, six flotilla leaders, and various submarines; in Italy two cruisers, 16 torpedo boats, and several submarines.

The last few years have witnessed an especially keen competition in warship-building between Great Britain and the United States.

After the "Naval Disarmament" Conference held at Geneva in the summer of 1927 proved a failure as far as the three greatest naval powers (United States, Grand Britain, Japan), were concerned, and the United States and Great Britain were not successful in coming to an agreement on the equality of their naval forces, the United States began at once feverishly to enlarge its navy. The programme accepted for the naval forces for the next 5 years includes the construction of 25 cruisers of 10,000 tons each, 5 aircraft-carriers of 33,000 tons each, 9 torpedo boats, and 32 submarines. 725 to 1,000 million dollars will be required to carry out this programme of naval armaments.

The State Secretary for the Navy, Wilbour, justified this naval armament programme as follows:

"Our merchants and manufacturers must have the possibility of winning foreign markets... and we must seek fresh markets for our production. The demonstrating of our flag promotes the struggle of our merchants for new markets, but the success of this struggle depends greatly upon the prestige of the government which gives it up-to-date cruisers."

Admiral Plunkett, in the course of a public speech in New York in 1928, stated:

"We (the United States of North America) are nearer to a war than ever before... Before we venture to dispute the rule of the ocean with other powers, we shall have another war, as surely as we are now sitting in this room."

In reply to a question as to whether he was thinking of war with Great Britain, Plunkett replied:

"Yes, I am thinking of war with Great Britain, or with any other nation with whose interests we collide."

Here we see the perfectly open preparation for war.

4. Number of military and naval aircraft in course of construction.

States	1923	1928	1930/32
	1923	1928	1930/32 (probable)
France	1350	1650	2000 to 2500
Great Britain	385	850	1000 to 1200
United States	420	950	1200 to 1300
Italy	250	600	1000 to 1200
Japan	250	475	600 to 800
Five great powers total . .	2655	4525	5800 to 7000

The air fleets of the great powers were increased by more than one half (70%) during the past five years; this rate of growth will be kept up for the next two or three years.

The air fleet, besides growing numerically, is being rapidly perfected technically.

In comparison with 1918, that is, with the last year of the imperialist war, the quality of the war aircraft was improved as follows: speed 50 to 60%; action range of scouting aeroplanes and destroyers 30 to 70%, of bombing aeroplanes 250 to 300; the rate at which bombs can be dropped has tripled.

quadrupled, the rate of fire of the machine-guns has increased six or sevenfold.

The fighting capacity of the air-fleet of today is therefore very considerably greater than that in 1918. This may be illustrated by an example: During the whole war the German air-fleet dropped 280 tons of bombs on British territory (the ensuing losses were 1413 killed and 3408 wounded). France's present air-fleet is capable of dropping this same quantity of bombs in one single attack on London. The employment of chemical instruments of war by the air-fleet means a great danger for the cities and big industrial centres. In 1927/28 air-fleet manoeuvres were carried out by all the great states (Great Britain, Italy, Japan, France), taken part in by 300 to 500 military aircraft. Air attacks on large towns were "practised", and attempts made to defend the towns so attacked attempted. All the military staffs came to the conclusion that the existing means of defence against air attacks are incapable of protecting a town.

This development of the air-fleets greatly increases the extent of the scene of war, both in breadth and depth, and creates a very actual danger not only for the army, but for the peaceful civilian population in the interior of the country.

The war of the future, with the aid of these perfected war technics, will far exceed the last imperialist war in regard to destruction and sacrifice of human life.

5. The Military Budgets.

(in millions of dollars).

States	1923/24	1927 total	total	in % of total budget 1928	per head of population (in dollars)
France	300	300	346	21.1	8.7
Great Britain	690	578	561	15.0	11.5
United States	580	685	653	18.4	5.7
Italy	136	203	254	23.8	6.3
Japan	187	229	235	27.8	3.9
Germany	109	169	168	8.3	2.7
Total for the six states	2002	2164	2217		6.1
Growth of military budget, 1923/24 taken as 100	100	107.8	110.3		

We see that the French peasant or worker has a burden of almost 9 dollars annually to bear, the British 11.5 dollars, in addition to all other taxes. At the same time it must be remembered that the economic offensive of the bourgeoisie is steadily lowering the wages of the workers. The candle is being burned at both ends.

How Should the Lenin-Liebknecht-Luxemburg Campaign Be Carried out?

By Tatiana Glebova.

The Agitation and Propaganda Department of the Executive Committee of the Communist International proposes to unite the memorial meetings etc., this year for Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg. From this the campaign has received the name "Three L. Campaign". This Lenin-Liebknecht-Luxemburg campaign is to be carried out in the week from the 15th to the 22nd January.

The Ideological Content of the Campaign.

This unification should affect the character and the results of the campaign favourably by increasing its ideological firmness. Instead of the amorphous "memorial meetings" of former years, the Agitprop is planning this year a fighting agitation connected with the most burning political questions, for instance, the question of the danger of war, whereby it will be possible to connect the propagandist enlightenment work and the propagation of the lessons of Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg with actual reality, with the most urgent tasks of our Party and with the directives of the sixth World Congress of the Communist International.

We must demonstrate the revolutionary courage of our leaders to the broad masses, their determination to fight against the stream of imperialist war, their efforts to defeat the exploiters and to turn the imperialist war into a civil war.

We must show how correct their statements were that the war of 1914/18 would not solve the contradictions of world capitalism, but would only intensify them still more.

We must demonstrate the steadfastness of Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg in the face of repression, their struggle against opportunism, their constant fight for the correct revolutionary policy.

The imprisonment of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, the persecutions suffered by all three leaders, not only at the hands of the monarchist, but also at the hands of the "revolutionary"

governments of their countries with the approval of the "socialists" must be compared with the repression which is applied to the present Communist Party on account of its revolutionary activity and above all on account of its anti-militarist activity, also with the complete approval and support of the present-day "socialists".

It is particularly important to inform the masses what Lenin said about that secret which conceals the preparation and the origin of war, and concerning the invincible difficulties of the struggle against war which arise immediately after the outbreak of war. These lessons of Lenin are particularly important today, when even in our own ranks there are voices which declare that the masses are tired of hearing false prophecies about the coming war, and that in reality the danger of war is not immediate. These dangerous contentions which are nourished from the source of lies and deception with which the bourgeoisie with the aid of its socialist lackeys, covers the preparations for imperialist war. These contentions must be exposed in the coming campaign as a right-wing deviation, as the most dangerous form of opportunism. In his draft Theses concerning the Tasks of our Delegation to the Hague, Lenin wrote in 1922:

"With regard to the struggle against war, it occurs to me that declarations have been made on the part of our communist delegates both in parliament and outside, which contain incredibly incorrect and incredibly frivolous remarks about the struggle against war. I am of the opinion that such declarations, particularly when they are made after the war, must be refuted with all possible energy and ruthlessness, including mentioning the names of the comrades who made the statements. The form in which such names are mentioned may be modified according to the circumstances, but it is necessary that no single case should be passed over in silence, for a frivolous attitude in this question is extremely dangerous, more dangerous than in any other, and it is absolutely impossible to be conciliatory.

"There are a series of decisions of workers congresses which are unforgivably stupid and frivolous. All this material must be collected immediately . . .

"For our part, we cannot even tolerate an incompleteness in this question, not to mention an error".

We must take these contentions (The contentions that the masses are tired of hearing prophesies about the approaching war, which never come true, etc.) into account in our agitation, and we must make our agitation more concrete and more varied. We must abandon the old worn-out phrases and bring our anti-militarist agitation and information upon a practical basis, by supporting our political and theoretical contentions by facts and figures, both on an international and national and even local scale. The connection of the problems of the struggle against the danger of war with the necessary preparation for its transformation into a civil war, as also the connection of the problems with the daily struggle of the proletariat for the improvement of its conditions of work and life, will assist us in this. When we support our contentions concerning the approaching war with figures concerning the sums which are being expended for armaments, when we give figures concerning the labour intensity of the works which are occupied for military purposes, when we give figures concerning the burden of taxes per head of the population, we must not forget to mention the growing pressure of the employers to cut wages and increase working hours and to speak of the increase in the cost of living, the increase in the price of foodstuffs, of rents, of clothing. When we report about the militarist activity of the bourgeoisie we must avoid one-sidedness. That is, we must not only point to the power of the bourgeoisie, but we must at the same time point out the possibilities which exist to utilise the war preparations of the bourgeoisie for revolutionary purposes. For instance, the reduced period of service introduced in the capitalist armies means that ever larger numbers of the workers will be trained in the use of weapons, and this fact will undoubtedly increase the chance of the workers and peasants alliance of being victorious in its struggle with the bourgeoisie. The tasks of our agitation are to give the masses courage and the will to win.

Unification and Connection of the Campaigns.

One of the great faults of our agitational work is its desultory and unsystematic character and that we are unable to connect it with organisational successes. It happens when several campaigns follow each other, that the last campaign weakens the effect of the first upon the masses. We must try to make the effect of each campaign increase the impression left by the campaign which went before it, supplement the problems of the former campaign and prepare the consciousness of the masses for the coming campaigns.

The plan worked out by the Agitprop of the E. C. C. I. for the campaign is in general connected with the idea of the struggle against the danger of war and the preparation of the consciousness of the masses for the only way out of the imperialist war — with the preparations to terminate the war by a revolutionary insurrection. All the coming campaigns up to the First of May will be built up upon this basis, whereby the possibility is given of closely connecting these campaigns together. We must of course take care that we do not repeat ourselves and that we do not become boring: every new campaign must deal with this question from the standpoint of the concrete questions with which it deals.

The campaign in connection with the eleventh anniversary of the November revolution in explaining the danger and the inevitability of new interventions against the Soviet Union, pointed to a type of the future war. In the "Three L. Campaign", we must unite these questions with the information about the danger of war between the capitalist countries whereby we must pay particular attention to the war prospects of our own "Fatherland". The struggle against "patriotism" and chauvinism which are spread by the bourgeoisie and the reformists can be brought into line when we remind the proletariat that it must defend "the country of Lenin", the Soviet Union, against the enemy, not only as the most democratic country in the world, but also as the only fatherland of the world proletariat, the centre and the support of the world revolution.

Concentration of the agitational and propagandist forces.

It happens that our campaigns overlap sometimes, the international with the "national", the campaigns of the Communist Party with the campaigns of the Young Communist League, of the trade unions, of the Red Aid etc.

We must try to avoid any mutual disturbance between the work of the Communist Parties and that of their allies, and see to it that all forces are united in the common struggle. It is therefore necessary that the plans of work of the Agitprop organisations shall be drawn up in connection with the women's departments, the parties, the youth, the trade unions and the non-party organisations of the workers.

The incentive to the organisation of the "Three L. Campaign" was sent out with the signature of the Agitprop and of the International Women's Secretariat of the Comintern and of the Young Comintern. It is proposed to unite the forces of the party and of the communist youth in order, first of all, to enlarge the basis of our activity and to save labour by avoiding parallel work and in order to support the youth where they hold meetings independent of the party. The International Women's Secretariat gave the women's sections the instructions to assist the communist youth in its efforts to win the young girls for their meetings and to win them as members of the Young Communist League and for the trade unions. The trade unions must also be drawn into the campaigns by the work of the communist fractions, both for the collection of material concerning the economic attack of the bourgeoisie upon the working class and in particular upon the young workers and also for the utilisation of the trade union agitators as speakers in the meetings. The trade union press must also be used to this aim. The Agitprop department of the Red International of Labour Unions has given the necessary instructions to its national organs.

With regard to the collection of material concerning the impoverishment brought about by the war, the Red Aid organisations can help us and can also support our meetings by sending their speakers, who may either speak independently or as speakers in the discussion. The Red Aid has also given its local organisations the necessary instructions.

The worker correspondent organisations can give us particularly valuable support in this campaign. They can supply both material concerning the economic offensive of the bourgeoisie against the wages and working hours of the proletariat and concerning the preparation for war in industries which work for the army and navy.

In its instructions for the "Three L. Campaign", the Agitprop draws the attentions of the parties to the fact that our agitation remains fruitless unless it leads to a certain organisational consolidation of our influence upon the broad masses. This must be borne in mind when preparing instructions for speakers and preparing articles for the press. Such an organisational consolidation is any form of demonstration inside the ranks of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the trade unions and the non-party organisations of the workers. Our agitation must be of such a nature that it supports the demonstrations of the youth and of the associations of ex-soldiers, and that it supports the youth in its attempts to increase its political education (support of the schools and circles) to consolidate its ranks and to increase its membership (recruiting amongst the youth for the Comintern and for the unions).

In some parties the carrying out of the "Three L. Campaign" will be made difficult by the discussion preceding the party congresses which will distract both officials and ordinary members. It is therefore all the more important that the comrades of the Agitprop department recognise the importance of the campaign and do everything possible in order to secure its carrying out in the normal way. For the inner-party life which serves the education of the party members, must under no circumstances lead to the lessening of the work of the party amongst the non-party masses. This would be political suicide, it would be grist to the mill of our political enemies. We must under no circumstances console ourselves with the idea that we will make up for lost time afterwards. We are able to see how important it is to use every opportunity for the preparation of the masses for the struggle against war and for the transformation of imperialist war into civil war, from the following words of Lenin, which characterise his anxiety for the carrying out of its tasks by our Party:

"We do not give the masses any tangible idea of how a war might break out. The press of the ruling classes suppresses this question daily and spreads such lies in innumerable newspapers that the weak socialist press is quite helpless in face of them, all the more because also in times of peace the socialist press takes up a totally wrong attitude to this question. The communist press also makes itself ridiculous in most countries" (Lenin "Draft Thesis concerning the Tasks of our Delegation to the Hague" 1922).

In the six years which have passed since then our parties have of course learned very much. But we must remember that Lenin was thinking of a concrete preparation of the masses for war and revolution. No one will say that we are doing everything possible in this connection. The "Three L. Campaign" must be utilised in this connection. The unification of the forces of the communists with those of their allies must give the guarantee that the campaign will attain the necessary level.

To All Organisations Affiliated to the R. I. L. U.

Dear Comrades.

From January 15th to 22nd the Communist Parties and Young Communist Leagues are conducting the L. L. L. Campaign — Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg.

This campaign is being conducted in order to widely explain the roles played by Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg in the struggle against imperialist war and for transforming it into civil war, the role of L. L. L. in the struggle against opportunism and inner-party deviations from the Marxist-Leninist line, the role of the Communist youth in the struggle both against war danger and opportunism. The agitational week of the Three L's has as its purpose the wide propagation and explanation to the masses of the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, especially the theses on the struggle against the war danger.

The Agit-Prop. Department of the R. I. L. U. draws your attention to the importance of this agitational campaign. The revolutionary trade union organisations and the revolutionary trade union opposition should take active part in the organisation of this campaign. It is necessary to conduct extensive enlightenment work, especially among the masses, regarding

the role played by Lenin in the struggle against deviations and the adoption of a conciliatory attitude towards deviations in the trade union movement. The L. L. L. Week must be utilised by the revolutionary trade union movement in order to popularise the decisions of the Fourth Congress of the R. I. L. U. and to expose the anti-proletarian and anti-class line of the policy and tactics of the reformists in the labour movement, particularly during the recent class struggles.

It is necessary to widely expose the role of the rights and conciliators, who are at the present time waging a desperate attack on the decisions of the R. I. L. U. and are thus willy nilly, accomplices of reformism.

Whilst concentrating chief attention on anti-militarist agitation, in conformity with the directives previously given by us, it is also necessary to utilise this week to draw into the ranks of the revolutionary trade unions new cadres from amongst the unorganised, and in the first place young workers and women.

Red International of Labour Unions.
Agit. Prop. Dept.

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 sh.
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble

For other countries the subscription rate is six dollars for one year.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39, East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent. The subscription rates in the U. S. A. are, \$ 2 for three months, \$ 3.50 for six months and \$ 6 for one year.

The Business Manager.