

"The idea becomes power when it penetrates the masses.—
Karl Marx.

Special Magazine Supplement THE DAILY WORKER

LENIN
Memorial
Edition

LENIN, THE SOUL OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

By MAX BEDACHT.

LENIN is dead.

Words so simple, and yet so awe-inspiring. Slowly we learn to grasp the full significance of the news. The heart of the greatest man of his time no longer beats. The working class has lost its greatest thinker and ablest teacher. The proletarian world revolution is robbed of its outstanding leader.

Lenin the revolutionist was a true son of Russia. Yet he was an internationalist. He assimilated all the experiences that the fertile soil of the native class-struggle in Russia provided. And thru these experiences he helped to open the eyes of the workers of the world as to the real character of the struggle they are engaged in.

Scylla and Carybdis.

He led his party safely thru the Scylla of all kinds of temporary alliances into a position of leadership over the working masses of Russia. He steered the ship of the revolutionary proletariat without loss thru the carybdis of a bourgeois revolution and finally planted the banner of victory of the working class over the vast empire of old Russia, now the United Soviet Socialist Republics.

Lenin's tactical skill treated history to the phenomenon of two revolutions in one: The long delayed last battle of the universal bourgeois revolution; and the first victorious battle of the universal proletarian revolution. And Lenin was the master statesman of this fastest period of development of human society.

Lenin's Childhood.

Lenin's cradle stood in Simbirsk on the Volga. He was born just about the time when Bismarck built, with blood and iron, the foundation for the upward flight of German capitalism, on April 19, 1870. His father was a teacher whose learning and understanding fostered and encouraged intellectual interests in his family and especially among his children. There even in his childhood Lenin developed and showed already the intellectual honesty which characterized the great leader. The constant spectacle of slavery in the masses around him decided the future of the man. On the 20th of May 1886 Lenin's brother was hanged in the courtyard of the Schluesselburg Bastille, by order of the Czar, for revolutionary activity. Deeply impressed though he was by this terrible event, the fate of his brother could not shake the determination of Vladimir Ilyich to dedicate his life work to the movement of the exploited and downtrodden for their liberation.

In Lenin the man of thought and the man of action found a most perfect unity. For Lenin all the theories of social change were of value only as they served the exploited in their struggle for the change. Lenin personified reconstructed Marxism.

In the rut of stereotyped phrases the socialist movement had lost all substance. And when the great clash came that was to herald the bankruptcy of capitalism, when the crisis of imperialism came in those memorable days of 1914, there was no revolutionary spark to explode the great fraud of capitalism, and crowd the imperialist war off the stage of history. Lenin created the spark. He set off that great blast that tore Russian absolutism to shreds, that tore the basis from under Russian capitalism, the state power, and that

Letter Written by Lenin

*To comrades
Halliday
and Kari
Dear comrades,
I read your letter about
the evolution of a general idea
in the United States.
I should be very much obliged
if I could have the opinion
of some of you, if any of you
could be put in touch with the
an English or German
translator.
I should like also
to receive from you
bulletins, if possible,
official publications of
the caucus of 1920 (I have only
read a few from your caucus
of 1900 & 1910)
If any publication would like
to publish my letter in English
in the States I should like to work
small profits for my only Lenin.*

drove the first opening wedge into the seemingly impregnable line of defense of world capitalism. Thus he unquestionably hastened the end of the world war.

Marx Fights Utopianism.

At a time when the inconsistencies of capitalism formed the basis of endless speculations, when utopian aims and conspiratory plans of action exhausted the physical and mental energies of the revolutionary strata of the workers of Europe, Marx appeared on the scene, awakened the masses from the enervating dreams of utopian speculations and destroyed the futile hopes for the success of proletarian conspiracies. He uncovered the intricate laws of social development. And on the basis of an analysis aided by the knowledge of these laws he proclaimed to the working masses of the world that their emancipation can only be accomplished by themselves. He said to them: Workers of the world, unite!

Upon the rockbed of the scientific accomplishments of Karl Marx the modern Socialist movement was built. Idle speculations into the future were replaced by purposeful action. Purposeless criticism of capitalism was replaced by a scientific analysis and a conscious political struggle against the ruling powers.

Capitalism did not stand still. It pushed on and on in the direction of imperialism. The middle classes and the petty bourgeoisie found themselves

pressed harder and harder. They learned to hate and fear imperialist capitalist groups. So they, too, indulged in bitter criticism of certain manifestations of capitalism. This caused a great influx of the petty bourgeois elements into the revolutionary workers' movement. This influx made itself felt more and more. The apparent rapid growth of strength of the Second International became its weakness, for it meant the submerging of the revolutionary labor movement in the quagmire of petty bourgeois indecision and vacillation.

Lenin Combats Menshivism.

Lenin foresaw this development. His clear insight into the economic background of all class groupings taught him to recognize the political reflexes of those groupings. To his clear eye petty bourgeois substance could not hide successfully behind revolutionary phrases. As early as 1903 he broke with the Russian Scheidemanns to set up that party which under his leadership fought out the proletarian class struggle in Russia to its logical conclusion by establishing a proletarian state power. In 1904 Lenin introduced to the congress of his party all those practical questions that demanded solution by the revolutionary awakening brewing in Russia: The question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The question of expropriation of the capitalists. Form and essence of revolutionary action. Immediate steps to prepare for the coming revolutionary struggle. Thus the thinker Lenin performed an operation on the official "Socialism" of the Second International not less radical, not less important than the one performed by Karl Marx on utopian Socialism more than a half century ago.

The indomitable revolutionary spirit of the great leader never shone forth brighter than after the defeat of the revolutionary movement in Russia in 1905. The Mensheviks wailed about a defeated revolution and proposed to replace action by mere propaganda. But Lenin knew not the term, defeated revolution. The proletariat can lose battles in the revolution. But it can not lose its revolution. Action is the only form of struggle that leads to success. Action is the only teacher that gives understanding and self-confidence to the masses. One battle of the revolution is lost. Long live the Revolution! Lenin nailed to the pillory and held up to the contempt of the workers those charlatans who clothed their petty bourgeois cowardice and hatred of the working class in a pseudo-Marxian wrapper to pass them on, with treacherous intentions, as revolutionary socialism.

Lenin Accepts Facts.

As a man of action Lenin hated phrases, but he paid his respect to facts. His popularity meant nothing to him, success of the revolution everything. The dark days of Brest-Litovsk demonstrated that. Indignation ran high against the impudent proposals of General Hoffmann, the outstanding military member of the German peace commission. Rather die than accept this shameful brigand peace, was the cry. But Lenin stood up against this sentimental wave. He carefully weighed the chances for success of a continued struggle. He came to the conclusion that no amount of sacrifice on the battlefields of German imperialism could save the revolution. It is unworthy of a revolutionist to sacrifice himself to an emotion. The revolution demands

our devotion. A continuation of the war is equal to the sacrifice of the revolution. Therefore peace by all means, even a brigand peace.

Lenin was the proletariat's greatest teacher because he was its greatest leader. His maxim was that the working class will learn methods and aims of struggle only in the struggle itself. The Marxist, as a leader, leads the masses on to the highways of experience, and, as a teacher, he interprets that experience for and to them. The application of that maxim is the essence of Leninism. And Leninism is the secret of success of the Russian revolution, a success gained apparently against terrible odds. Leninism is the guiding principle of the Third International. Leninism accomplishes the tremendous task of clarifying and crystallizing the international revolutionary workers' movement out of the indefinite mass it became under pseudo-Marxian leadership.

Leninism.

Lenin was the undisputed leader of his party and of all Russia. His enemies and especially those who felt the lash of his accusations for their treachery toward the working class explain this leadership by accusing Lenin of dictatorial methods. But it is not the heartless despot who gains the love of millions. The despot is feared, not loved. To convince and to inspire his comrades and his followers, and not to terrorize them, that was his tactic.

Yet he was no sentimentalist. Like a rock he stood and fought for the thing he considered of importance and value to the success of the revolution. He was ruthless against what he considered treacherous and false theories and tactics. But he was patient with the masses that lacked understanding.

Soul of Russian Revolution.

The theoretician, the teacher and the leader of the working class combined in a wonderful harmony in Lenin the revolutionist. Lenin cannot be disassociated from the Russian revolution. Lenin was the head and the soul of that revolution. His convictions supplied hope to it when all seemed hopeless. His resourcefulness supplied new ways and new methods when all seemed lost. His indomitable spirit supplied energy when the long and terrible struggle seemed to have exhausted everybody. He led the revolution. He guarded the revolution. He was the revolution.

Though Lenin is dead, Leninism will live and will lead the proletariat on and on. The revolutionary workers of the world realize the tremendousness of their loss. They close their ranks more tightly than ever. Every individual revolutionist tries to double his energy and activity to make up for the loss.

Over the bier of Lenin the communists the world over, pledge to follow the path that he has hewn as his life work out of the solid rock of the via dolorosa of the working class. And to those of his enemies, who rejoiced at the death of our leader we will demonstrate that Lenin in his death is as terrible to them and to their system as ever he was while alive.

Lenin will live in the memory of mankind forever. His life work has put its stamp upon future society. And the loyalty and love of the revolutionary working masses will complete whatever was left undone at the time of the unexpected death of their great leader Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov, Lenin.

Lenin on the March Action in Germany and the Theory of Offensive

WE can find examples in our struggle against the Mensheviks which go to prove that before the Russian revolution there were people still who doubted that the revolutionary party must start the offensive. When a Social Democrat—at that time we were all called that way—would raise such a doubt, we took up the fight against him and said that he was an opportunist, that he understood nothing about Marxism or about the dialectic of a revolu-

tionary party. Can a Party have any disputes over the entire admissibility of the offensive? Is there a Centrist, or disguised Centrist, who disputes the idea of offensive on principle? This cannot permit of any dispute in any way.

Was it not wrong to begin to speak of the theory of Offensive in Germany when no real offensive had been prepared? The March action is nevertheless a great step forward, notwithstanding its faulty leadership. But

that does not matter. Hundreds of thousands of workers fought heroically. Even when the K. A. P. D. (Communist Labor Party of Germany) fought heroically against the capitalist class, we could not but say what Radek said about Max Holz in a Russian article. When anyone, be he even an anarchist, fights heroically against the capitalist class, it already means a great deal. When, however, hundreds of thousands fight against the vile provocation of the Social traitors and the capitalist class—that

is a real step forward.

And it is important to criticize the mistakes committed. When anyone, after a struggle of hundreds of thousands, behaves like Levi, he must be expelled. Did we prepare the offensive? (Radek: Not even the defensive.) Yes, indeed, the offensive existed only in leading articles. This theory, applied to the March Action in Germany in the year 1921 is wrong, we must admit that. But the theory of Offensive in general is not wrong.

A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKINGMEN

By NICOLAI LENIN

(This was the first direct word that came to the American people from Nicolai Lenin after he became the recognized leader of the proletarian world. Early efforts to get it past the censorship lines evidently failed. It arrived in this country in December of 1918.)
Moscow, August, 20, 1918.

COMRADES: A Russian Bolshevik who participated in the revolution of 1905 and for many years afterward lived in your country has offered to transmit this letter to you. I have grasped this opportunity joyfully, for the revolutionary proletariat of America—in so far as it is the enemy of American imperialism—is destined to perform an important task at this time.

Russia Deserted at Brest-Litovsk

Had the Anglo-French and American bourgeoisie accepted the Soviet invitation to participate in peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, instead of leaving Russia to the mercy of brutal Germany, a just peace without annexations and indemnities, a peace based upon complete equality could have been forced upon Germany, and millions of lives might have been saved. Because they hoped to re-establish the Eastern Front by once more drawing us into the whirlpool of warfare, they refused to attend peace negotiations and gave Germany a free hand to cram its shameful terms down the throat of the Russian people. It lay in the power of the Allied countries to make the Brest-Litovsk negotiations the forerunner of a general peace. It ill becomes them to throw the blame for the Russo-German peace upon our shoulders. . . .

The workers of the whole world, in whatever country they may live, rejoice with us and sympathize with us, applaud us for having burst the iron ring of imperialistic agreements and treaties, for having dreaded no sacrifice, however great, to free ourselves, for having established ourselves as a socialist republic, even so rent asunder and plundered by German imperialists, for having raised the banner of peace, the banner of Socialism over the world. What wonder that we are hated by the capitalist class the world over. But this hatred of imperialism and the sympathy of the class-conscious workers of all countries give us assurance of the righteousness of our cause.

Must Make Sacrifice for Revolution

He is no Socialist who cannot understand that one cannot and must not hesitate to bring even that greatest of sacrifices, the sacrifice of territory, that one must be ready to accept even military defeat at the hands of imperialism, in the interests of victory over the bourgeoisie, in the interests of a transfer of power to the working class. For the sake of "their" cause, that is for the conquest of world-power, the imperialists of England and Germany have not hesitated to ruin a whole row of nations, from Belgium to Serbia to Palestine to Mesopotamia. Shall we then hesitate to act in the name of the liberation of the workers of the world from the yoke of capitalism, in the name of a general honorable peace; shall we wait until we can find a way that entails no sacrifice; shall we be afraid to begin the fight until an easy victory is assured; shall we place the integrity and safety of this "fatherland" created by the bourgeoisie over the interests of the international socialist revolution? . . .

The great Russian revolutionist, Tchernychevski, once said: "Political activity is not as smooth as the pavement of the Novski Prospect." He is no revolutionist who would have the revolution of the proletariat only under the "condition" that it proceed smoothly and in an orderly manner, that the proletarians of all countries immediately go into action, that guarantees against defeat be given beforehand, that the revolution go forward along the broad, free, straight path to victory, that there shall not be here and there the heaviest sacrifices, that we shall not have to lie in wait in besieged fortresses, shall not have to climb up along the narrowest paths, the most impassable, winding, dangerous mountain roads. He is no revolutionist, he has not yet freed himself from the pedantry of bourgeois intellectualism, he will fall back, again and again, into the camp of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

Hypocritical Accusations

They are little more than imitators of the bourgeoisie, these gentlemen who delight in holding up to us the "chaos" of the revolution, the "destruction" of industry, the unemployment, the lack of food. Can there be anything more hypocritical than such accusations from people who greeted and supported the imperialistic war and made common cause with Kerensky when he continued the war? Is not this imperialistic war the cause of all our misfortune? The revolution that was borne by the war must necessarily go on thru the terrible difficulties and sufferings that war created, thru this heritage of destruction and reactionary mass murder. To accuse us of "destruction" of industries and "terror" is hypocrisy or clumsy pedantry, and shows an incapability of understanding the most elemental fundamentals of the raging, climactic force of the class struggle called revolution.

In words our accusers "recognize" this kind of class struggle, in deeds they revert again and again to the middle class utopia of "class-harmony" and the mutual "interdependence" of classes upon one another. In reality the class struggle in revolutionary times has always inevitably taken on the form of civil war, and civil war is unthinkable without the worst kind of destruction, without terror and limitations of the form of democracy in the interests of the war.

America's Revolutionary Tradition

The best representatives of the American proletariat—those representatives who have repeatedly given expression of their full solidarity with us, the Bolsheviks—are the expression of this revolutionary tradition in the life of the American people. This tradition originated in the war of liberation against the English in the Eighteenth and the civil war in the Nineteenth Century. Industry and commerce in 1870 were in a much worse position than in 1860. But where can you find an American so pedantic, so absolutely idiotic as to deny the revolutionary and progressive significance of the American civil war in 1860-1865?

The representatives of the bourgeoisie understand very well that the overthrow of slavery was well worth the five years of civil war, the depth of destruction, devastation and terror that were its accompaniment. But these same gentlemen and the reform socialists who have allowed themselves to be cowed by the bourgeoisie and tremble at the thought of a revolution, cannot, nay, will not, see the necessity and righteousness of a civil war in Russia, tho it is facing a far greater task, the work of abolishing capitalist wage-slavery and overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie.

Bourgeoisie Used Terror

We are accused of having brought devastation upon Russia. Who is it that makes these accusations? The train-bearers of the bourgeoisie, of that same bourgeoisie that almost completely destroyed the culture of Europe that has dragged the whole continent back to barbarism, that has brought hunger and destruction to the world. This bourgeoisie now demands that we find a different basis for our revolution than that of destruction, that we shall not build it up upon the ruins of war, with human beings degraded and brutalized by years of warfare. O, how human, how just is this bourgeoisie!

Its servants charge us with the use of terroristic methods. . . . Have the English forgotten their 1649, the French, their 1793? Terror was just and justified when it was employed by the bourgeoisie for its own purposes against feudal domination. But terror becomes criminal when working men and poverty stricken peasants dare to use it against the bourgeoisie. Terror was just and justified when it was used to put one exploiting minority in the place of another. But terror becomes horrible and criminal when it is used to abolish all exploiting minorities, when it is employed in the cause of the actual majority, in the cause of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat, of the working class and the poor peasantry.

Mass Slaughter in World War

The bourgeoisie of international imperialism has succeeded in slaughtering 10 millions, in crippling 20 millions in its war. Should our war, the war of the oppressed and the exploited, against oppressors and exploiters cost a half or a whole million victims in all countries, the bour-

geoisie would still maintain that the victims of the world war died a righteous death, that those of the civil war were sacrificed for a criminal cause.

But the proletariat, even now, in the midst of the horrors of war, is learning the great truth that all revolutions teach, the truth that has been handed down to us by our best teachers, the founders of modern Socialism. From them we have learned that a successful revolution is inconceivable unless it breaks the resistance of the exploiting class. When the workers and the laboring peasants took hold of the powers of state, it became our duty to quell the resistance of the exploiting class. We are proud that we have done it, that we are doing it. We only regret that we did not do it at the beginning, with sufficient firmness and decision.

Force Must Be Met With Force

We realize that the mad resistance of the bourgeoisie against the socialist revolution in all countries is unavoidable. We know too, that with the development of this revolution, this resistance will grow. But the proletariat will break down this resistance and in the course of its struggle against the bourgeoisie the proletariat will finally become ripe for victory and power.

Let the corrupt bourgeois press trumpet every mistake that is made by our revolution out into the world. We are not afraid of our mistakes. The beginning of the revolution has not sanctified humanity. It is not to be expected that the working class which has been exploited and forcibly held down by the clutches of want, of ignorance and degradation for centuries should conduct its revolution without mistakes. The dead body of bourgeois society cannot simply be put into a coffin and buried. It rots in our midst, poisons the air we breathe, pollutes our lives, clings to the new, the fresh, the living with a thousand threads and tendrils of old customs, of death and decay.

We Learn By Mistakes

But for every hundred of our mistakes that are heralded into the world by the bourgeoisie and its sycophants, there are ten thousand great deeds of heroism, greater and more heroic because they seem so simple and unpretentious, because they take place in the every-day life of the factory districts or in secluded villages, because they are the deeds of people who are not in the habit of proclaiming their every success to the world, who have no opportunity to do so.

But even if the contrary were true—I know, of course, that this is not so—but even if we had committed 10,000 mistakes to every 100 wise and righteous deeds, yes, even then our revolution would be great and invincible. And it will go down in the history of the world as triumphant. For the first time in the history of the world not the minority, not alone the rich and the educated, but the real masses, the huge majority of the working class itself, are building up a new world, are deciding the most difficult questions of social organization out of their own experience.

Every mistake that is made in this work, in this honestly conscientious co-operation of ten million plain workingmen and peasants in the recreation of their entire lives—every such mistake is worth thousands and millions of "faultless" successes of the exploiting minority in outwitting and taking advantage of the laboring masses. For only thru these mistakes can the workers and peasants learn to organize their new existence, to get along without the capitalist class. Only thus will they be able to blaze their way thru thousands of hindrances to victorious socialism.

Mistakes are being made by our workmen in their revolutionary activity, who, in a few short months, have placed practically all of the larger factories and works under state ownership, and are now learning, from day to day, under the greatest difficulties, to conduct the management of entire industries, to reorganize industries already organized, to overcome the deadly resistance of laziness and middle class reaction and egotism. Stone upon stone they are building the foundation for a new social community, the self-discipline of labor, the new rule of the labor organizations of the working class over their members.

Pioneered Work

Mistakes are being made in their revolutionary activity by the Soviets which were first created in 1905 by

the gigantic upheaval of the masses. The Workmen's and Peasants' Soviets are a new type of state, a new highest form of democracy, a particular form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a mode of conducting the business of the state without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie. For the first time democracy is placed at the service of the masses, of the workers, and ceases to be democracy for the rich.

Hollowness of Bourgeois Democracy

While the old bourgeois democratic constitutions, for instance, proclaimed formal equality and the right of free assemblage, the constitution of the Soviet Republic repudiates the hypocrisy of a formal equality of all human beings. When the bourgeois republicans overturned feudal thrones, they did not recognize the rules of formal equality of monarchists. Since we here are concerned with the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, only fools or traitors will insist on the formal equality of the bourgeoisie. The right of free assemblage is not worth an iota to the workman and to the peasant when all better meeting places are in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Our Soviets have taken over all usable buildings in the cities and towns out of the hands of the rich and have placed them at the disposal of the workmen and peasants for meeting and organization purposes. That is how our right of assemblage looks—for the workers. That is the meaning and content of our Soviet, of our socialist constitution.

And for this reason we are firmly convinced that the Soviet Republic, whatever misfortune may still lie in store for it, is unconquerable.

It is unconquerable because every blow that comes from the powers of madly raging imperialism, every new attack by the international bourgeoisie will bring new, and hitherto unaffected strata of working men and peasants into the fight, will educate them at the cost of the greatest sacrifice, making them hard as steel, awakening new heroism in the masses.

International Revolution Delayed

We know that it may take a long time before help can come from you, comrades, American Workingmen, for the development of the revolution in the different countries proceeds along various paths, with varying rapidity (how should it be otherwise!). We know full well that the outbreak of the European proletarian revolution may take many weeks to come, quickly as it is ripening in these days. We are counting on the inevitability of the international revolution. But that does not mean that we count upon its coming at some definite, nearby date. We have experienced two great revolutions in our own country, that of 1905 and that of 1917, and we know that revolutions can come neither at a word of command nor according to pre-arranged plans. We know that circumstances alone have pushed us, the proletariat of Russia, forward, that we have reached this new stage in the social life of the world not because of our superiority but because of the peculiarly reactionary character of Russia. But until the outbreak of the international revolution, revolutions in individual countries may still meet with a number of serious setbacks and overthrows.

Soviet Russia Invincible

And yet we are certain that we are invincible, for humanity will not emerge from this imperialistic massacre broken in spirit, it will triumph. Ours was the first country to break the chains of imperialistic warfare. We broke them with the greatest sacrifice, but they are broken. We stand outside of imperialistic duties and considerations, we have raised the banner of the fight for the complete overthrow of imperialism for the world.

We are in a beleaguered fortress, so long as no other international socialist revolution comes to our assistance with its armies. But these armies exist, they are stronger than ours, they grow, they strive, they become more invincible the longer imperialism with its brutalities continues. Workingmen the world over are breaking with their prayers, with their Gompers and the Scheidemanns. Inevitably labor is approaching communist tactics, is preparing for the proletarian revolution that is capable of preserving culture and humanity from destruction. We are invincible. The proletarian Revolution is invincible.

THE FATHERLAND AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

By NICOLAI LENIN

(Lenin wrote this article on Nov. 1, 1914. The idea of the Third International is expressed for the first time in this article.)

THE question of the fatherland—this is meant for the opportunists—cannot be considered properly while the concretely historical character of this war is ignored. This was an imperialist war, that is, a war of the epoch of the most advanced form of capitalism, the epoch of the consummation and end of capitalism. The working class first has to "establish" itself within the national frame-work, says the Communist Manifesto, while pointing out at the same time the limits and conditions of our recognition of nationality and fatherland as the indispensable forms of the capitalist system as well as of the capitalist fatherland. The Opportunists distort this truth; and that which holds true for the epoch of capitalism's start they transfer to the epoch of the end of Capitalism. But Karl Marx speaks clearly and distinctly of this epoch, and of the tasks of the working class in the fight to destroy, not feudalism, but capitalism. He says: "The workers have no fatherland." It is clear enough why the Opportunists are afraid to recognize this truth of Socialism, or why they are afraid, for the most part, even to take it openly into account. The Socialist movement cannot be victorious within the old framework of the fatherland. It creates new, higher forms of human co-operation, for the justified needs and forward looking endeavors of the laboring masses of every nation-

ality will be gratified for the first time by international unity, with the elimination of the present national limitations. The attempts of the present capitalist class to separate and to split the workers by means of hypocritical arguments of "defense of the fatherland" will be answered by the class-conscious workers with new and ever new and repeated attempts to restore the unity of the workers in the fight for the overthrow of the rule of the capitalist class of all nations.

The capitalist class deceives the masses and cloaks every imperialist predatory attack with the old ideology of "national war." The working class exposes this deception and proclaims the slogan: conversion of imperialist war into civil war. In fact this slogan was the object of the Stuttgart and Basle resolutions which did not foresee war in general, but precisely the present war; these resolutions did not speak of "defense of fatherland," but of "hastening the collapse of capitalism," of the utilization of the crisis created thru the war, and utilization of the example of the Commune. The Commune was a transformation of a national war into a civil war.

Such a transformation is of course, not easy and cannot take place "by desire" of single parties. But it is just this transformation which is inherent in the objective conditions of capitalism in general and the epoch of the end of capitalism in particular. And Socialists must act in this sense, and only in this sense. Not to vote for war credits, not to aid and abet the chauvinism of one's "own" country (or of the allied countries), but

to fight in the first place against the chauvinism of one's "own" capitalist class, not to confine oneself to legal forms when the crisis is an actuality and the capitalist class itself has done away with the very legality which it created—that is the direction which leads to civil war and which at one moment or another even of the present European conflagration may lead to civil war.

The war is no accident, not a "sin," as the Christian clergymen believe (who preach patriotism, humanity and peace exactly like the opportunists), but an inevitable stage of capitalism, just as much justified a form of capitalist existence as peace. The war of the present is a people's war. But it does not follow from this truth that we must swim with the "people's current" of chauvinism; but on the contrary, in war times, in the midst of war, the class antagonisms by which the nations are lacerated will continue and will come to the surface. Refusal to serve in the army, military strike, etc., is simply idiotic, a deplorable and cowardly dream of unarmed struggle against the armed capitalist class, a fancy that capitalism can be done away with without a desperate civil war or a series of wars. The propaganda of class struggle remains even in war a duty of Socialists. The work which aims for the transformation of the national war into civil war is the only Socialist war in the period of imperialist, armed clash of the capitalist class of all nations. Down with the priestly, sentimental and deluding dreams of "Peace at any price!" We must raise the banner of civil war. Imperialism has staked

the destiny of European culture. If there are not a series of successful revolutions, this war will be followed by other wars—the myth of the "last war" is a flat, injurious fairy-tale, a petty bourgeois "mythology." Today or tomorrow, after the present war if not during it—in this war or the next war, the proletarian banner of civil war will rally, not only hundreds of thousands of class-conscious workers, but also millions of semi-proletarians and petty bourgeois at present misled by chauvinism, who are not only terrified and disgusted by the frightfulness of war but are being taught, enlightened, awakened, organized, steeled; and they will be prepared for war against the capitalist class of their "own" country as well as of "foreign" countries.

The Second International is dead, vanquished by Opportunism. Down with Opportunism and long live a Second International purified of its "deserters" as well as of Opportunism!

The Second International has done its share of useful work of preparation in organizing the proletarian masses during the long "period of peace," during the cruellest capitalist enslavement and the most rapid capitalist advance in the third part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Upon the Third International devolves the task of organizing the forces of the working class for the revolutionary onslaught against the capitalist government: for civil war against the capitalist class of all countries, to secure political power and the victory of Socialism!

Lenin

By SIMON FELSHIN

In the Children's Homes
The orphans are weeping
For their father, who is dead.
The men of the Red Army
Stand at attention.
The men of the Red Army
Who never bow their heads
Are bowed with grief.

I am standing in the snow,
I am there in Moscow.
We are eight abreast waiting.
My heart is lying in the snow
Waiting to see Lenin.
I go by and look at his face,
It is the last time,
Our leader is lying dead.

I know in Russia
Humble women are wailing,
Men are weeping.

I know in Russia
The peasants are grieving,
Because Ilyitch is dead.

In the whole world
There is mourning
In the homes of the poor.
A rending cry arises from the lower depths.

The cautious ones in our midst say:
"We must make Lenin's retreats."
We reply:
"First make Lenin's advances."

Our enemies say:
"Lenin, the dictator."
Our answer is:
"Lenin, the leader."

The wiseacres say:
"It's all over with Russia."
But we answer:
"Leninism lives."

Lenin on De Leon

Told By ARTHUR RANSOME

LENIN said he had read in an English Socialist paper a comparison of his own theories with those of an American, Daniel De Leon. He had then borrowed some of De Leon's pamphlets from Reinstein (who belonged to the party which De Leon founded in America), read them for the first time, and was amazed to see how far and how early De Leon had pursued the same train of thought as the Russians. His theory that representation should be by industries, not by areas, was already the germ of the Soviet system. He remembered seeing De Leon at an International Con-

ference. De Leon made no impression at all, a gray old man, quite unable to speak to such an audience, but evidently a much bigger man than he

looked, since his pamphlets were written before the experience of the Russian Revolution of 1905. Some days afterwards I noticed that Lenin

had introduced a few phrases of De Leon, as if to do honor to his memory, into the draft of the new programme of the Communist Party.

THE LIGHT OF LENINISM



TROTZKY'S MESSAGE

"With the light of Leninism in our hand, we shall find the true road, by collective thought and collective will."

LENIN THE REALIST

By KARL RADEK

LIKE everything else in nature, Lenin was born, has developed, has grown. When Vladimir Ilyitch once observed me glancing through a collection of his articles written in the year 1903, which had just been published, a sly smile crossed his face, and he remarked with a laugh: "It is very interesting to read what stupid fellows we were!" But I do not here intend to compare the shape of Lenin's skull at the age of 10, 20, or 30, with the skull of that man who presided over the sessions of the Central Committee of the Party or the Council of Peoples' Commissars. Here it is not a question of Lenin as leader, but as a living human being. P. B. Axelrod, one of the fathers of Menshevism, who hates Lenin from the bottom of his soul—Axelrod's case is an excellent example of how love can change to hate—related, in one of the philippics with which he sought to convince me of the harmfulness of Bolshevism in general and of Lenin in particular, how Lenin went abroad for the first time, and how he went walking and bathing with him. "I felt at that time," said Axelrod, "that here was a man who would become the leader of the Russian Revolution. Not only was he an educated Marxist—there were many of these—but he knew what he wanted to do and how it was to be done. There was something of the smell of Russian earth about him." Pavel Borisovitch Axelrod is a bad politician, he does not smell of the earth. He is one who reasons at home in his own study, and the whole tragedy of his life consists of the fact that at a time when there was no labor movement in Russia, he thought out the lines upon which such a labor movement should develop, and when it developed on different lines, he was frightfully offended, and today, he continues to roar with rage, at the disobedient child. But people often observe in others, that which is lacking in themselves, and Axelrod's words with regard to Lenin grasp with unsurpassable acuteness precisely those characteristics which make Lenin a leader.

Must know Labor Movement

It is impossible to be a leader of the working class without knowing the whole history of the class. The leaders of the labor movement must know the history of the labor movement, without this knowledge there can be no leader, just as nowadays there can be no great general who could be victorious with the least expenditure of force unless he knew the history of strategy. The history of strategy is not a collection of recipes as to how to win a war, for a situation once described never repeats itself. But the mind of the General becomes practiced in strategy by its express study; this study renders him elastic in war, permits him to observe the dangers and possibilities which the empirically trained general cannot see. The history of the labor movement does not tell us what to do, but it makes it possible to compare our position with situations which have already been experienced by our class, so that in various decisive moments we are enabled to see our path clearly, and to recognize approaching danger.

But we cannot get to know the history of the labor movement without being thoroughly acquainted with the history of capitalism, with its mechanism in all its economic and political phenomena. Lenin knew the history of capitalism as do but few of Marx's pupils. Lenin has independently grasped and thought out the theory of historical materialism as no one else has been able to do, for the reason that he has studied it with the same object in view by which Marx was actuated when creating the theory.

Lenin entered the movement as the embodiment of the Will to Revolution, and he studied Marxism, the evolution of capitalism, and the evolution of socialism, from the point of view of their revolutionary significance. Plekhanov was a revolutionist, too, but he was not possessed by the Will to Revolution, and despite his great importance as a teacher of the Russian Revolution, he could only teach its algebra and not its arithmetic. Herein lies the point of transition from Lenin the theorist to Lenin the politician.

Combines Marxism with Strategy
Lenin combined Marxism with the general working class strategy, but at the same time he applied it concretely to that strategic task involv-

ing the fate of the Russian working class. Herein lies the whole of Lenin's genius: in his utmost intensity of intimate contact with his field of activity.

I must take some other opportunity of debating why so great a mind as that of Rosa Luxemburg was not capable of understanding the correctness of Lenin's principles on the origin of Bolshevism; I can only outline the fact. Rosa Luxemburg did not grasp concretely the economic and political difference between the fighting conditions of the Russian proletariat and those of the proletariat of Western Europe. Therefore she inclined to Menshevism in the year 1904. Menshevism regarded historically, was the policy of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, and of those strata of the proletariat most closely related to the petty bourgeoisie.

being of whom we are convinced that his like will not occur for a century, it is but a poor compliment to praise his common sense. But it is in just this that his greatness as a politician lies. When Lenin has to decide on an important question, he does not think of abstract historical categories, he does not think of ground rents, of surplus values, of absolutism or liberalism. He thinks of Sobakevitch, of Gessen, of Sydor from the Tver Province, of the Putibov worker, of the policeman on the street, and he thinks of the effect of the measure on the Mujik Sydor and on the workman Onufria, as bearers of the revolution.

And I shall never forget my talk with Ilyitch before the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk peace. Every argument which we brought up against the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk peace rebounded from him like

"They must have a rest, they are very tired." Such was Lenin's decisive argument. He saw before him the real Russian worker, as he was in the winter of 1921, and he felt what was possible and what was not possible.

Not Blind to Reality.

Marx, in the introduction to his Critique of Political Economy, states that history only sets itself such tasks as it can fulfill. This means, in other words, that only he who grasps what tasks are historically capable of fulfillment at a given moment, and who does not fight for the desired, but for the possible can become the instrument of history. Lenin's greatness lies in the fact that he never permits himself to be blinded to a reality when it is in process of transformation, by any preconceived formula, and that he has the courage to throw yesterday's formula overboard as soon as it disturbs his grasp of this reality. Before our seizure of power, we issued as revolutionary internationalists, the slogan of the peoples' peace against the government's peace. And suddenly we found ourselves in the position, of a Workers' Government surrounded by peoples that had not yet succeeded in overthrowing their capitalist governments. "How can we conclude a peace with the Hohenzollern government?" was a question put by many comrades. Lenin answered mischievously: "You are worse than hens. A hen cannot make up its mind to step over a circle drawn around it with chalk. But it can at least justify itself by the assertion that this circle was drawn by a strange hand. But we have drawn up our formula with our own hands, and now you see the formula only, and not the reality. Our formula of peace to be concluded by the peoples, has for its object the awakening of the masses against the military and capitalist government. Now you want us to go to ruin, and to let the capitalist governments carry off the victory in the name of our revolutionary formula."

Lenin's greatness lies in his aiming at goals arising out of realities. In this reality he sees a powerful steed which will carry him to his goal, and he trusts himself to it. But he never abandons himself to his dreams. This is not all. His genius contains another trait: After he has set himself a certain goal, he seeks for the means leading to this goal thru reality; he is not content with having fixed his aim, he thinks out concretely and completely everything necessary for the attainment of that aim. He does not merely work out a plan of campaign, but the whole organization of the campaign at the same time. Our organizers, who are organizers only, have often laughed at Lenin as an organizer. Anyone seeing how Ilyitch works at home, in his room, or at the Council of Peoples, Commissars, might think it impossible to find a worse organizer. Not only has he no staff of secretaries to prepare his material, but up to now he has never even learned to dictate to a stenographer, and gazes at the pen he is writing with, something like a Mujik from the Don district gazes at the first motor-car he sees. But show us in the whole Party one single individual capable of realizing within decades this central idea on the reform of our bureaucratic apparatus, altho this reform is inevitable if we do not want the Mujik, indignant against officialdom, to begin to howl. We all know our bureaucratic apparatus, we all cry out against the scandalous state of affairs named by comrade Steklov (chief editor of the Izvestia), with all the delicacy of a semi-official organ: "slight defects of Soviet mechanism." But which one of the party leaders puts himself the question: The new economic policy has created a fresh basis for an alliance between proletariat and peasantry; how are we to prevent bureaucracy from destroying this alliance? But the great politician of the Russian proletariat, prevented by his illness from going thru his daily routine, thought of the central question of state organization, and worked out the plan of the struggle for decades in advance. But this is only the preliminary draft—details are dependent on the confirmation of experience. But the more attention we devote to this superficial draft, the more plainly we see that in Lenin's personality, the great politician and the great political organizer are combined.

Afterword to "The State and Revolution"

By NICOLAI LENIN.

This little book was written in August and September, 1917. I had already drawn up the plan for the next, the seventh chapter, on the experiences of the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917. But, apart from the title, I had not succeeded in writing a single line of the chapter, being prevented therefrom by a political crisis—the eve of the November Revolution of 1917. Such a hindrance can only be welcomed. However, this final part of the book devoted to the lessons of the Russian Revolution of 1905 and 1917, will probably have to be put off for a long time. It is more pleasant and more useful to live thru the experience of a revolution than to write about it.—The Author.

Petrograd (Nov. 30) Dec. 12, 1917.

Today it is most interesting to read the controversy on the famous first paragraph of the Party Statutes, the paragraph which led to the split of the Social Democratic Party into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. At that time Lenin's demand, that only the members of illegal organizations were to be counted as party members, appeared highly sectarian. But what was the real point in question? Lenin sought to prevent the confused ideas of certain intellectuals from determining the policy of the labor party. Before the first revolution, any malcontent of a physician or lawyer who happened to have read Marx styled himself a social democrat, altho at bottom he was only a liberal. Even when they entered an illegal organization, even when they had broken with their petty-bourgeois way of living, history shows many intellectuals to have remained liberals at the bottom of their souls. But the limitation of the Party to such persons as were willing to face the dangers of belonging to an illegal organization, had undoubtedly the advantage of lessening the danger of bourgeois ascendancy in the labor party, and permitted the revolutionary ray emanating from the working class to penetrate the party organizations, however much filled with intellectual elements. But in order to be able to grasp this, in order to be even prepared to split the Party on this account, it was necessary to be as closely bound up with Russian realities as was Lenin, in his capacity of Russian Marxist and Russian revolutionist. And if this was not fully clear to many a good Marxist in the years 1903 and 1904, it became clear enough from the moment when Axelrod began to mix up the class struggle of the proletariat against the Russian bourgeoisie with the famous agrarian campaign, that is, with the appearance of workers at liberal banquets for the double purpose of: getting to know the bourgeoisie, and of becoming filled with hate against the capitalist class which, as is well known, had never seen the working class except at the banquet; moreover, the capitalists were to be thus educated into a comprehension of the necessity of furthering general national interests.

Applies Common Sense.

Lenin's way of knowing Russian actuality is another point in which he differs from all others who have stretched out their hands towards the sceptre of leadership over the Russian proletariat. Not only does he know Russian actuality, he sees and feels it as well. At every turning point in the history of the Party, and especially at the moment when we seized power, and the fate of 150 million people hung on the decisions of the Party, I have always been amazed at Lenin's store of what the English call "common sense." It may be remarked that when we are speaking of a human

peas from a wall. He employed the simplest argument: A war cannot be conducted by a party of good revolutionists who, having seized their own bourgeoisie by the throat, is not capable of closing a bargain with the German bourgeoisie. The mujik must carry on the war. "But don't you see that the Mujik voted against the war?" Lenin asked me. "Excuse me, when and how did he vote against it?" "He voted with his feet, he is running away from the front." And for him that settled the matter. That we would not be able to agree with German imperialism, this Lenin knew as well as everybody else, but when he spoke in favor of the Brest pause for breath, he did not conceal from the masses for a single moment the sufferings which were bound to follow. But it was no worse than the immediate breakdown of the Russian Revolution; it gave us a shadow of hope, a pause for breath, if only but a few months, and this was the decisive moment. It was necessary that the Mujik should touch with his hands the earth which the revolution had given him; it was necessary that he be confronted with the danger of losing this earth, for then he would defend it.

Let us take another example. It was at the time of our defeat in the Polish war, when negotiations were taken up at Riga. At that time I went abroad, and before leaving I paid Ilyitch a visit, in order to speak with him on the differences of opinion which had arisen between us on the relations to the trade unions. Just as Lenin held the Mujik from the Riazan Province before his mental vision when deciding on the Brest peace, knowing that this Mujik was the decisive personality on the drama of war, in the same manner he placed himself in the position of the plain workman as soon as it was a question of transition from civil war to economic reconstruction, for without this plain workman no economic reconstruction is possible. How did he put the question to himself? The Party meeting discussed the role played by the trade unions in political economy; there were controversies on syndicalism and eclecticism. But what Lenin saw was the victimized workman, enduring unheeded of and indescribable sufferings, and now called upon to reconstitute political economy. That the economic reconstruction was an imperative necessity, that we had to assemble all our forces, and that we had the right to call upon the working class to take part in the work, all this appeared incontestable to him, but it was a question whether we should begin with this at once, whether we should withdraw thousands of our best comrades from the army, where they had accustomed themselves to commanding, and send them back into the factories at once. Nothing would be produced by pursuing such tactics.