ПРАВДА

BELA KUN:

Published by
– CARL SLIENGER – LONDON –

REVOLUTIONARY ESSAYS

REPRINTED from



8/2

REVOLUTIONARY ESSAYS

(Reprinted from PRAVDA*)*

By

BELA KUN



B. S. P.

REVOLUTIONARY ESSAYS

(Reprinted from PRAVDA*)*

By

BELA KUN




CARL SLIENGER · LONDON

OPUSCULA SOCIALISTA

Volume 4

Published by

CARL SLIENGER

Originally published

by

B.S.P.

London 1919

Reprinted 1977

THIS EDITION IS LIMITED TO 250 COPIES
OF WHICH THIS IS NUMBER 68

ISBN 0 904758 33 8

A New Centre of Infection.

("Pravda," April 26th, 1918.)

Not long ago Count Czernin, the former Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, was formally repudiating territorial annexations at the expense of the Russian Revolution. At that time the disturbances in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy were only beginning. The frightened ruling classes of the Danubian monarchy were then still having recourse to methods which were successful, up to a certain point, in disguising the dissolution of capitalism.

Since that time, however, Austria-Hungary also has become a nest of revolutionary infection. The German Imperialists are now not only imposing their quarantine on the Russian frontier: they are defending themselves against the revolutionary bacilli drifting in from amongst the peoples of Austria-Hungary.

The note of the German Government demands the isolation of German prisoners of war, not only from Russian Soviet agents, but also from the "allied" Austrian and Hungarian prisoners. In the eyes of the German Government, the subjects of the Hapsburg Monarchy now in Russia are one mass of "infection." The German Imperialists have become aware of a new danger—a danger arising from an "allied" country, and portending revolution nearer home. The revolts in Austria-Hungary are now not problems of the future, but questions of the day; they are not isolated hunger riots that blaze up here and there, but harbingers of revolution, steadily making their appearance in all corners of the monarchy.

The ground has been splendidly prepared for revolution, despite the fact that the official Social-Democratic Party has completely abstained from taking part in these risings. Germany is daily making new impossible demands on Austria-Hungary; the broken Monarchy cannot satisfy these demands; and the German Imperialists are treating it in exactly the same way as the "great" Powers before the war treated Turkey.

The reins of power in Hungary are once again in the hands of Tisza, that best disciple of the Ministers of Tsarism, hated by the whole of Hungary. Even in 1912 he drew up a row of machine guns in front of the Hungarian Parliament, and bombarded the demonstrating workers with artillery. Tisza is the last hope of the Monarchy, the last card of German Imperialism in its attempts to forestall the revolutionary explosion of the proletarian movement.

The Hungarian Cabinet, at Tisza's demand, has been dismissed, and his servile follower, Baron Burian, has been appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs. Tisza is thus once again dictator—now no more under the Austrian Charles IV., but under the German William II.

Meanwhile, in Galicia, proletarian and peasant revolts are breaking out. The social traitors in Hungary are losing, with the fall of the Wekerle Cabinet, their last opportunity of carrying on the former policy of compromise. The feeling amongst the Hungarian workers is tense to the last degree, and the party leaders will not be able to avert a general strike. The Magyar troops, formerly, thanks to the assiduous agitation of the Nationalists, the worst oppressors of the Czech proletariat, have already become "unreliable." The Magyar detachments have now been replaced on guard by Tyrolese sharpshooters, not only at Prague, but also at Budapest and Vienna.

Count Tisza is officially the strategist of the Austro-Hungarian counter-revolution: but he is really the chief factor of revolution.

Germany, beyond all possible doubt, has reason to be afraid—and she is afraid. They have already tried the old method—that of concealing the danger: "Vorwärts" has been suppressed for a day. Not because it has dared energetically to raise its voice against the German Imperialists—those street-corner banditti; oh, no, that could not possibly happen with the Scheidemann Party. But, only because the social-traitorous paper dared to say, very cautiously, that in Austria-Hungary the position had become serious, it was closed by the German censorship.

The German Empire is having recourse to the old methods of Tsarism—lies, and the suppression of any hint of revolution. But this will be of as little avail to save the

situation, as the dictatorship of Count Tisza will be to help the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. . . .

These circumstances, on the contrary, are the best possible pledge that the Russian proletarian Republic is not waiting in vain for the international revolution. . . . In Austria-Hungary the crisis has matured.

The Monument at Penza.

("Pravda," April 28th, 1918).

Far from the London cemetery with its grave covered by a plain stone slab, there has been erected, in the depths of the first proletarian State, the first monument to the first thinker and champion of the proletariat—the first public monument to Marx.

"Let us turn to Russia. The Tsar was placed at the head of European reaction. To-day he is a prisoner of the revolution, and Russia is in the front rank of the revolutionary movement in Europe."

These words, taken from the introduction to the second Russian translation of the Communist Manifesto, published under the supervision of Marx and Engels, have now passed into reality. Though continuing but painfully in the great struggle, surrounded by a ring of the imperialist executioners of all countries, the proletarian Republic remains the living proof of the truth of the Marxian teaching.

All the distorters of Marxism, traitors to the work of the proletariat in Russia as in Western Europe, the social-traitors and Mensheviks of all shades, are following the progress of the revolution, and the work of the organs of proletarian dictatorship, gnashing their teeth. But the proletariat, erecting a monument to Karl Marx, has left behind these semi-revolutionaries; and now this first stone monument is a splendid and visible demonstration of the fruitful propagandist work of the Communist Party in Russia.

However high the cultural level of the German or French proletariat, the scientific theory of the class struggle has not entered so deep into their soul as it has in Russia.

Even if the mass of the Russian proletariat was as "dark" as the leaders (without followers) of social-democracy are screaming in impotent fury, yet, in the task of awakening

class-consciousness in the working-class, the proletarian revolution has done more than the propaganda of all the opportunists—now the deadly enemies of the revolution—taken together. The class struggle has reached the highest degree of intensity in which it was conceived by Karl Marx. The proletariat has organised itself as the ruling class, in spite of all the attempts to hinder it on the part of the social-philosophers, semi-philosophers, and aesthetes.

For the proletariat as a ruling class, a monument to Karl Marx is a monument to its own final victory. Thanks to this victory, Marxism in Russia has ceased to be the affair of intellectual study-circles whose intention it was to alter that teaching as it seemed good to them. The Marxian theory has become the accepted doctrine of the proletarian State, which was born of the revolution, and which continues it. If only because the dictatorship of the proletariat is carrying through the revolution to its logical conclusion, Marxism in Russia will not become an "official" theory in the sense in which it became such amongst the German Social-Democrats. Marxism was and is the theory of the revolution, just as Marx himself was never *merely* a theorist, but a revolutionary champion of the proletariat who always stubbornly fought for its victory.

The revolutionary class can never fall into the error of worshipping of individuals. Nevertheless, what one of the greatest Marxian economists said is true: "Names are factors." The same can be said of monuments. If the victorious Russian proletariat erects monuments on all its squares to its greatest fighters, this will be not the cult of individuals, but an act of respect towards its own revolution. And even if the priceless treasures of art disappear into the melting pot, it will not be barbarism, as some gentle souls affirm. Everything must be subordinated to the end of the proletarian revolution, just as everything hitherto was subordinated to the purpose of enslaving the proletariat.

The first monument to Marx, unveiled at Penza, is assisting the work of the revolution, since the memory of Marx, in common with all his writings and actions, is in all its forms a factor in the victory of the proletariat.

Two May Days.

("Pravda," May 1st, 1918).

One is the First of May of the victorious proletariat, already organised as the ruling class. It is the holiday of the proletariat which is being attacked on all sides by world-capitalism, which sees in it the greater danger. . . . But this holiday already celebrates a victory over the Russian capitalist class, and heralds the final victory over the capitalists of the whole world. Of the propertied classes we make no demand but this: *to disappear, and as quickly as possible;* but we make this First of May demand of Imperialism the world over.

Such is the First of May in every corner of the Russian Federal Soviet Republic—the First of May of the proletariat which has attained dictatorship.

Miserable slaves, groaning under the scourge: wretched beings, threatened by the sword and the rod: proletarians living in constant deadly fear, seeing nothing before them but the Imperialist slaughter—such is the First of May of the proletariat of other countries. . . . They are celebrating the international holiday of proletarian solidarity in the trenches and dugouts, like primitive men, who lived in caverns. . . .

This picture is supplemented by another, serving as a background for the first. The First of May of the workers, employed in different branches of war work, enslaved, living under the threat of the lash and the knife of the capitalist class. . . .

With their own hands they are turning out the weapons of murder and destruction, the weapons of their own oppression. Crushed by military and police oppression, drunk with the intoxicating flattery of their own traitor-leaders, overwhelmed by want and remorse for their treachery, they begin to revolt: for they are the forerunners of revolution.

There are two May Days: one the holiday of the proletariat which has never abandoned its thoughts of the revolution, the other the holiday of the workers who have renounced the revolutionary methods of the proletarian movement.

* * * *

The seeds of these two kinds of May Day were sown as far back as 1889. At Paris there were sitting in reality two international congresses at the time when the First of May became an international holiday. One of these parallel congresses was even then composed of the opportunist working-class leaders, whose lower middle-class minds were never able to understand the revolution, who could never clearly picture to themselves the final liberation of the proletariat from the yoke of the capitalist class. The leaders of this congress were the French Possibilists and Hyndman, who, in the end, became the servant of English Imperialism. The other congress was sitting under the spiritual guidance of Frederick Engels, then still alive. This was a different kind of Labour Congress, which in effect began the international May Day holiday, as the first, if still a weak, attempt at proletarian mass action.

The two congresses united; and the spirit of Engels, uniting with that of the first congress, in consequence, underwent a process of gradual corruption.

Two May Days were created. On the one hand, meaningless demonstrations: on the other, demonstrations with a new meaning, calling for a revolutionary struggle against militarism in addition to the old struggle for an eight-hour working day.

The spiritual heirs of the international congress of Possibilists and Hyndmans intended not only to distort the meaning of May Day, but even to bring about its disappearance. The Legiens and Bernsteins of various countries—the Trade Union bureaucrats and the revisionists—sought to efface the very memory of revolutionary tendencies in the Labour movement. And when the trustified unions of Imperialist enterprises began to use the anti-militarist May Day demonstrations as a pretext for dismissing the demonstrating workers, the official "leaders" of the working-class began trying to adapt both themselves and the Labour movement to the Nationalist requirements of Imperialism—thereby condemning the First of May to extinction.

The two May Day holidays which are celebrated at the present time arose out of the two sides of the Labour movement described above. One has resulted in the solemn celebration of the victorious revolution by the Russian prole-

tariat; the other has brought only the trenches, the holiday of a proletariat collapsing under the police lash.

To-day's May Day is throwing light upon the shattered Labour movement. The old International, the first act of which was the introduction of this international holiday, has fallen asunder. In all the countries of the Imperialist world there has appeared a differentiation between the revolutionary proletariat and the social-traitors. The powerful working-class organisations have split: on one side, the revolutionaries; on the other, the men who desire to remain slaves.

This cleft in the Labour movement is a pledge of the re-establishment of international unity. The falsifiers of Marxism, who have distorted the "Communist Manifesto" to allege that the history of social progress is the history of the class struggle except during periods of war, have not only become generals without an army, but have ceased to be leaders altogether. They are nothing but charlatans, supported by the capitalist class, and animated by the intention of blinding the workers. But the stupor of the working-class is coming to an end. The salvation of the Russian proletarian revolution will come under the blows of international Imperialism.

The International being born at to-day's First of May holiday will, in virtue of its very essence, be neither the instrument of capitalist peace nor the weapon of capitalist war—despite Kautsky's deception of himself and of the masses. This Internation will itself be a new war—an international civil war; it will be the further guide and support of the Russian Socialist revolution.

We can understand impatience in expecting the international revolution. Revolutionary Russia has already done such a great deal towards the liberation of the workers of all countries, towards the international revolution, that the workers of the world will never be able to give it all the thanks that are due. But any admission of pessimism on the part of the proletariat of revolutionary Russia would be treachery after the manner of the western European Labour leaders.

May each of these First of May holidays serve as a living symbol! One of them—the holiday of the Russian workers—the victorious May Day—serves as a symbol or example of the beginning of the reign of Socialism.

The Western proletariat will not be able to evade its historical destiny: it must become revolutionary.

The May Day of 1918 will be the last of the series of dual First of May celebrations. It will be followed by the true May celebrations of the victorious, ruling proletarian class.

This May Day is not only a symbol, but a signal. It is the symbol of the existence of the International, the signal for the world-revolution.

Marx and the Middle Classes.

("Pravda," May 4th, 1918.)

"The internal enemy" of the proletarian Russian Revolution is constituted first and foremost by the lower middle classes. The expropriation of the expropriators being carried out at present does not represent the most serious obstacle in the path of proletarian dictatorship. In the path of the expropriation of capital the obstacles are of a purely objective nature. The small group of large capitalists has not the masses on its side, and therefore speedily becomes powerless in face of the armed proletariat. The lower middle classes of society, on the other hand, represent a considerable section of the population, especially in Russia—to say nothing of the propertied section of the peasantry. To reckon with the wishes of these lower middle classes would mean the halting half-way of the work of the Revolution: it would mean an end of the aspirations towards the destruction of capitalism.

Exactly because the lower middle-class mass is numerically large, it has retained an influence over the working-class movement. But every concession to this influence represents a departure from the Marxian standpoint, because it was precisely Marx who freed Socialism from lower middle-class adulterations.

The behaviour of the middle-class Socialist parties during the opening encounters and the final decisive struggle of the proletarian revolution doubly imposes on us the duty of recalling, on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of our first teacher, what his *views* were on the subject of the lower middle classes. And, though the representatives of various shades of lower middle-class Socialism are constantly referring to Marx, in reality there is no greater sacrilege than this.

I.

After the revolution alike in Marx's philosophical world-concept and in his views on the material conditions of social production, he shook himself free of the last vestiges of Liberalism.

"The Poverty of Philosophy," from the economic aspect, and "The Communist Manifesto," from the political aspect herald the final liberation of Socialism from the last lower middle-class swaddling clothes.

The founders of scientific Socialism had not had as yet the experience of a revolution, but by the path of theoretical analysis they had even then succeeded in establishing the fact that, in the progress of the revolutionary movement, the lower middle-class can display itself only as a reactionary and Utopian factor.

This lower middle-class—as "The Communist Manifesto" proclaims—"stands half-way between the proletariat and the capitalist class. Being a necessary complement of capitalist society, this class is constantly being reborn." Composed of extremely mixed elements of the pre-capitalist epoch—the so-called "toiling intelligentsia," the lackeys of the capitalist class—this class was to be found, in France, in Switzerland, and to a certain extent in Germany, at the advanced posts of the revolution of 1848. According to "The Communist Manifesto," the Communists were to support the various party groupings of these elements, while the latter were in opposition, understanding clearly, however, that if the representatives of the lower middle-class were really revolutionary in sentiment, it was only when faced with their immediate descent into the ranks of the proletariat.

These hopes of the lower middle-class, little sanguine though they were, nevertheless were completely shattered: the revolution of 1848 clearly revealed the political bankruptcy of the revolutionary section of the bourgeoisie. That revolution laid bare not only their weakness, but also how dangerous they were to the work of the revolution. During the French revolution of that year, the proletariat was crushed, not by the capitalists, but by this very lower middle-class. "The small shopkeeper," wrote Marx in "The Class Struggle in France," "rose up and moved against the barricades, in order to restore the movement from the street into

his shop. And when the barricades had been destroyed, when the workmen had been defeated, when the shopkeepers, drunk with victory, turned back to their shops, they found their entry barred by the saviours of property, the official agents of financial capital, who met them with stern demands: 'The bills have become overdue! Pay up, gentlemen! Pay for your premises, pay for your goods.' The poor little shop was ruined, the poor shopkeeper was undone!"

The lower middle-class is not fit to wield power, and a long government by it is unthinkable. This, first and foremost, for economic reasons: the small shopkeeper is the debtor of the great capitalist, and must remain in dependence on him as long as there exists the system of credit—which cannot be destroyed while the domination of private property continues.

The Imperialist era of capitalist production has fully justified this view of Marx's. If the democratisation of capital by means of joint stock companies—the wild dream of the distorters of Marxism—were an economic possibility, even then the majority of the lower middle-class shareholders would be powerless to govern society.

The roots of the dilemma created by Imperialism are to be found in the economic relations on which Imperialism is based. There are only two classes capable of governing: the class of great capitalists, and the proletariat.

Every compromise with the *upper* bourgeoisie is treachery to the proletarian revolution. Every compromise with the *lower* middle-class after the victory of the revolution would mean the restoration of the supremacy of the upper bourgeoisie—the restoration of capitalist rule.

The experience of the revolution of 1848 completely confirmed Marx in his conviction that the revolution can blazon on its banner these watchwords only: the complete overthrow of *all* sections of the capitalist class, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

II.

Within the framework of capitalist society, the lower middle-class is immortal. Not only do small traders and small producers, worshippers of the principle of private pro-

perty and credit, inevitably ensure the existence of parasites on the social organism, as being causes of the dissipation and waste of social labour; but also from out of their midst there appear the bearers of a special philosophy, directed for the purpose of restraining the proletarian revolution.

"The lower middle-class," in Marx's words, "has no special class interests. Its liberation does not entail a break with the system of private property. Being unfitted for an independent part in the class struggle, it considers every decisive class struggle a blow at the community. The conditions of his own personal freedom, which do not entail a departure from the system of private property, are, in the eyes of the member of the lower middle-class, those under which the whole of society can be saved."

And this is the very reason why the lower middle-class masses are the most dangerous enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They represent a very strong section of society. Their special interests are absolutely incompatible with the economic disturbances which are the inevitable accompaniment of transitional periods.

The disturbance of credit cuts the ground from under their feet. They begin shouting for order, for the strengthening of credit, in such a way that every concession to them leads in effect to a complete restoration of the old order.

The bearers of middle-class philosophy, who took up their stand as critics of capitalism in the working-class movement at the time when that movement was still in the stage merely of a critical attitude towards capitalism, and who brought in with them a peculiarly lower middle-class outlook, feel disillusioned when the era of decisive battle arrives. Their supremacy in the realm of ideas can continue no longer; while it is beyond their powers to free themselves from the lower middle-class world-concept.

This is what Marx says in his "Eighteenth Brumaire," in which he gives a masterly analysis of this lower middle-class outlook, on the subject of these "representatives" of the Labour movement—or, to speak more correctly, of these leeches which have attached themselves to it:

"By their upbringing and individual position, the former can be as far apart from the latter as heaven and earth. What makes them the spokesmen of the lower middle class

is the fact that their thoughts do not leave the path in which the latter's whole life moves, and that therefore they come, by a theoretical road, to the same problems and solutions as the lower middle class reaches in actual life. Such, in general, is the relation between the political and literary representatives of a class and the class itself."

Marx was merciless in dealing with this kind of poisoners of proletarian class-consciousness. The whole Labour movement ought to be the same. With the weapons of ridicule and hatred he fought against the "heroes" of the French social democracy of the time—the political movement which represented an unlawful union between the lower middle class and the proletariat.

He wished to separate the Labour movement from all lower middle class elements, because the lower middle class attitude—attachment to the idea of private property, more or less open striving to uphold credit, terror of every fundamental social disturbance—is in practice the greatest internal enemy of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution.

III.

A proletarian dictatorship that betrays a readiness to make concessions to the lower middle class is threatened with destruction.

A working class struggling against the bourgeoisie "from below" escapes this peril more easily than a victorious proletariat. A proletariat fighting "from above," possessing State power, and grappling with the problems of organisation of production, is in a much more difficult position than a proletariat which has not yet attained victory. The working class itself is not yet free from all lower middle class habits of mind, while the mass of middle class parasites which lived on the back of the old order is now equally ready to live on the back of the proletarian State.

The crushing of counter-revolution in Russia shows that, here too, the time has come when, as Marx says in "The Civil War in France," all sections of the bourgeoisie except the great capitalists—"shopkeepers, tradesmen, merchants" recognise that the proletariat is the only class capable of initiative in the sphere of social reconstruction. This means,

however, that the same section of the lower middle class which "offered up the workers as a sacrifice to their creditors" will once again attempt to come to an agreement with its creditors.

While the lower middle class exists, it is not capable of renouncing itself, even if it does submit to the proletariat. Though incapable of independent resistance, it will nevertheless try by roundabout ways to distort the meaning and the aims of the Revolution.

If it once manages, under whatsoever disguise, to reappear in the arena of the workers' struggle, it will use all its energies to the end that it may remain the proprietor of its little shop, and the client of capitalism. It demands first of all "the re-establishment of credit"—but this cry is, for the lower middle class, only "a disguised form of the cry for the re-establishment of private property."

The Revolution, when celebrating the centenary of Marx's birth, will not forget the sentence he passed on the lower middle class.

"The Desocialisation of Minds."

("Pravda," May 11th, 1918.)

At Kieff, the gallows is the weapon used against the minds of the *German* soldiers who have been converted to Socialism and revolutionised. At Reval, mutinous *German* sailors have been hung.

Immediately behind the front line time is more valuable: there is no time to build gallows there, but the bullet is quite sufficient. There it is bullets which are prescribed as remedies for revolutionary minds.

Nevertheless, the devastation in human material wrought by the war has been so great that the German and Austro-Hungarian imperialists, though they make use of gibbets and bullets, are forced to attempt to use the moral weapon also in the struggle with the minds converted to Socialism. In this way a new phrase has been coined, to describe the counter-revolutionary agitation in Germany and Austria-Hungary. This new phrase is "desocialisation of minds."

In Austria-Hungary the revolutionary "danger" is extremely strong. There the layer of workers bought over

by means of the surplus value squeezed out of debtor States is considerably thinner than in Germany. It was there, therefore, that German militarism first gave the order to desocialise minds.

The pamphlets about the Bolshevik Government disseminated by the Ministry for War amongst the ranks of the Austro-Hungarian Army, represent an attempt to paralyse the influence of the Russian proletarian revolution. As for the prisoners of war, the government of the Dual Monarchy has had to give up all hope of them. The Government is so occupied by the struggle with internal collapse, it has become indebted to such an extent, that it has neither time nor money to spend on using these "spiritual" methods with the prisoners of war. Austria's only resource in this respect is the system of punishment camps which await all those returning from captivity; but hundreds of soldiers escape from these camps back to Russia, Ukraine, the Caucasus.

Germany, however, is a "cultured country" and a creditor State. Germany has both money and "spiritual" weapons for the struggle with the Bolshevik poison. She has not yet lost all hope of reforming her returning prodigals. The German prisoners of war are not less infected, but Germany is in a condition, at any rate, to create an apparatus for desocialising them.

The so-called "Chief German Commission," staying at present in Russia, has already been entrusted with the task of desocialising minds. It has brought with it informational material. The productions of German militarist literature will co-operate with the work of counter-revolution, with the object of restoring "voluntary" discipline, and, to quote from military regulations, the "self-reliance" of the troops. If this is insufficient, gallows and bullets will be forthcoming, to desocialise for all time those minds which do not lend themselves to correction.

The diplomatic intervention of German imperialism hitherto relied on could, it is true, bring about alterations in the organisation of revolutionary agitation amongst the prisoners of war, but it was not in a position to prevent the revolutionising of minds. For this it would have been necessary not only to destroy the Revolution, but also to shoot the prisoners themselves.

The German imperialists cannot bring these methods to play; and for that reason—and for that only—they fall back upon the "culturo-informative" work of the German Commission.

Nevertheless, the "culturo-informative" work of the German counter-revolutionaries only assists the revolutionary work of the Communist emigrants from the Central Powers. This militarist propaganda attempts to restore "their native conditions" to the prisoners of war in Russia; and, according to advices from Minsk, Dvinsk, Vilna, and Przemysl, where concentration camps exist, escapes *en masse* are beginning. In this way the German and Austro-Hungarian proletarians will fly to Russia from under the yoke of German militarism.

German imperialism will be able to desocialise minds only by having recourse to the methods it has already tried in the Ukraine, at Reval, and at Vollmar: "Hands up!" and then the gallows or the bullet.

A School of Social Revolution.

("Pravda," May 15th, 1918.)

The counter-revolutionary forces have collected in force. It is quite comprehensible that, amongst the Russian proletarian masses, many should be awaiting the international revolution with impatience. Bolshevism is feeling the full pressure of persecution of the international counter-revolution because Bolshevism is the particular system of ideas which represents the modern revolutionary movement. For the propertied classes, this system of ideas means deadly danger; for the Labour movement it is an inspiring and creative force.

After the many buffetings of the war a considerable part of the Western European proletariat ended up in Russia. We may discover from the diplomatic notes of the German and Austrian Governments what these proletarians and workers have experienced and learnt.

We can see that the revolution has had an infectious influence upon these proletarians, from amongst whom large numbers have emigrated to Russia, when we consider certain phenomena, which might almost be called "mass phenomena."

Naturalisation into citizenship of the Russian proletarian State is a result of the influence of the revolution, although in some cases that naturalisation was prompted not by revolutionary motives, but by a kind of Nazarenism. A mere passively-resisting attitude towards the predatory aims of the imperialists—mere horror—does not represent the awakening of revolutionary consciousness.

But that is not the reason to which we can attribute facts like the events at Neriansk. There, during the course of several days, five hundred Magyar proletarians and workers became naturalised as Russian citizens, and united against the counter-revolutionary bands of Semenov. Amongst these revolutionary volunteers are many who, at home, never took part in the Labour movement; and it is only the Russian revolution that has given them their Socialist education. Those who have participated in the propagandist work of the Social-Democratic parties cannot but agree that the educational significance of the revolution has attained unprecedented proportions.

Revolutions are the locomotives of history; not only in the objective sense, but also in the sense of their rapid development of the minds of the workers, within whom there takes place a process of deliberate re-examination of all previous values.

In this connection the letters received at the editorial and other offices of the foreign groups of the Russian Communist Party are not without interest. We shall quote a few passages from these letters to illustrate the educative influence of the proletarian revolution. They were received by the newspaper "The Social Revolution," the organ of the Hungarian Communist group.

Here, for example, is the letter of a working man—of a miner. He is writing to his wife at Budapest, and sending a copy of his letter to the editorial office. In Hungary he belonged neither to the Labour Party nor to a trade union. He is now living at Kolchugina, in Siberia. He writes to his wife, *inter alia* :

"I received your past-card from Budapest, saying you had sent me 100 kronen. I haven't received them; but it doesn't matter, as I am working here and can earn enough

to live on. But I am very sorry for you: how can you all manage to live on a quarter of a pound of bread? We, at any rate, are living in free Russia. *What grieves me* is not that I have to work in the depths of a pit, but that *you are suffering*. It's no good them writing in the papers that we've still got enough bread—we don't believe it! We know very well that not everyone is starving—Count Tisza and other gentlemen are not going hungry, of course, but the soldiers' wives and children are. Their fathers, after shedding their blood, have been left to suffer in Siberia, while the children, thanks to the lords and ladies, are starving. Oh yes, the workers can perish; so long as Count Karolyi, Lukacs, Kraus, and others can fill their pockets, it doesn't matter to them what happens to the wives and children of the men who were torn away from their families at the very beginning of the war to defend their "king and country." Now everybody's eyes are being opened, though. The capitalists can trumpet abroad as loudly as they like, that the Hungarian soldier was defending his fatherland: there aren't many who will believe it. Why don't they make peace? The Russian soldiers have all come back from the front. But the capitalists' pockets, I suppose, are not yet full enough, and so they've got to fight to the last Hungarian soldier. *I know it all, and so do others*!"

This is the letter of a "latter-day revolutionist."

Here is what workers write who at home took a more or less active part in the proletarian movement; two metal-workers from Budapest, at present employed at Linovka Station (Voronezh Province), who happened to receive one number of a newspaper published in Hungarian: "Your respected newspaper, after passing through hundreds of hands, has reached our remote little hamlet, where a few prisoners of war, amongst them Hungarians, are leading a monotonous existence. We read with great interest every line of the paper, and with every word there rose within us undying hatred and desire for vengeance—vengeance for those who have suffered agonies and poured out their blood on the fields of battle. . . . We longed for peace, and looked forward to returning. . . . But where shall we return? . . . You are quite right to say, honoured comrades, 'from captivity to prison.' But no, we cannot be blinded by 'defence

of the fatherland.' . . . True, we weren't blind before, either: we were made to go. . . ."

The following passage from another letter shows how exactly that process begins, in the minds of working men, which leads to a clear and intelligent adoption of Bolshevik tactics, and how the idea of an armed rising, so foreign to all the western Social-Democratic parties, enters into the soul of the proletariat: "I assure you that I will only return to Hungary if the social revolution breaks out at home. In that case I shall hasten at once with arms in my hands to assist my struggling brothers against the imperialists. In my own country I belonged to the Woodworkers' Union, and here in Sarapul too." Here is the letter of a wheelwright and a mason, working at Akhtirka; in Hungary they were active party workers and agitators. They have become real and true Bolsheviks, as their letter shows: "We are very glad that you (Hungarians) have joined the Bolsheviks. Our return home depends on a revolution there. All we ask of our comrades is to write us immediately what form of activity we should engage in while we are staying here."

These extracts are in no way tendencious. They are snatches from letters taken from a very large correspondence. One may say that an overwhelming majority of the letters breathes forth not only a desire for peace on pacifist grounds, but also a will to, and expectation of, the proletarian revolution.

The mere appearance of this revolutionary will denotes a grave danger, not only for the capitalist class, but also for the opportunist Socialists. The revolution in Hungary will probably assume an anti-German character. German imperialism is the object of universal hatred amongst the Hungarian lower middle class, which, though not so numerous as in Russia, is still large enough to endow the revolution with a general nationalistic character.

But the school of the Russian revolution has created detachments which will be the grave-diggers of that nationalistic character, and may become the grave-diggers of capitalism. It would be difficult to imagine a school which taught better or more quickly. Those who hitherto had taken part in a Labour movement which was distorted by the lower

middle class have now seen civil war at close quarters. Pacifism, which revolted against arms in general, and not against the arms only of the oppressors, has now lost its influence. In Russia the workers have learnt the usefulness of arms for attaining freedom, and the necessity of an armed rising for the purpose of conquering and swiftly shattering the power of the State.

The appearance of the grave-diggers of capitalism and social treachery will play its part; the Bolshevist advance guard is not only going to the help of the oncoming Hungarian revolution, but is itself preparing it for its work.

The Development of the Revolutionary Forces in Austria.

("Pravda," May 19th, 1918.)

Everyone waiting impatiently for the international revolution should recall the events previous to the revolution of March, 1917.

In the attitude of the Austrian Government and the Emperor Karl we find an analogy with the state of affairs in Russia at that time. We must not seek such an extent of similarity as to amount to a complete coincidence of circumstances. We ought not to allow ourselves to be misled by the existence of the so-called Austro-Hungarian constitution. As is shown by the manifesto issued by the Austro-German Social-Democratic Party to protest against the postponement of the opening of the Reichsrath, Parliament has become a meaningless thing, inasmuch as the Imperial Government is quite incapable of sustaining Parliamentary criticism in connection with vital questions of Austrian policy, the organisation of the food question, the Imperial message, the resignation of Czernin, the broad questions of policy and finance of the Monarchy.

At the same time there is no bourgeois party which has not protested against the prorogation of the Reichsrath. Various nationalist groups, amongst them a group of Czech deputies, have unanimously declared that absolutism is being set up, and have issued a protest against the Government. The fraction of German Social-Democrats has reminded the latter of Stürgck, laid low by the bullet of Friedrich Adler.

"If they take it into their heads, in order to please the Pan-Germanists who prolong the war, to re-establish absolutism and to govern Austria by the methods of Stürgck, then the working class will be obliged to rise and fight for the people's rights." The manifesto calls upon all working men and women to remain in fighting order, so that at any moment they will be ready to join in the conflict.

On the other hand, facts are coming to light like the Report of the Commission controlling State debts, which actually deals with "sacred militarism"—the organs of the military system. Apparently the central Government was not able to prevent the appearance of this Report—in Austria, the classic home of the military censorship. Admitting that the issue of credit notes has reached incredible dimensions, the Report states that the feverish work of the bank of issue may awaken the most serious doubts from the financial, banking, and economic standpoint, and that the main reason for the particularly swollen demands of the War Department is constituted by "on the one hand, staff-officers' pay with war-time increases, which in the rear attains totally disproportionate rates; and, on the other hand, the uneconomical massing of troops behind the front. Finally, contractors are receiving excessive prices for supplies."

Who will not have recalled, reading this, the speeches in the Duma before the revolution, directed against the manarchical system? The bribery of officers by means of increased pay, as well as the massing of troops in the rear, are "inevitable and necessary" phenomena. The events at Trieste and Cracow show the necessity of collecting troops in the rear. The troops are so unreliable that the Government has to try several regiments before, at last, volunteers can be found to take upon themselves the repulsive "duty" of fratricide. At Trieste the town militia joined the participants in the hunger riots, while at Cracow the mob nearly managed to sack the military food dumps, until the authorities succeeded in bringing armed force to bear. There were even cases of street fighting. The risings take place without organisation, elementally; but from the point of view of the revolution, they have a symptomatic character.

Desertion is developing with gigantic strides in the Army; and it is measurable only by Russian post-revolutionary

standards. From an order issued by the general officer commanding at Budapest, it is clear that soldiers in service battalions being sent up to the front desert in masses on the way. The number of men arrested for desertion is so great that the military authorities have to make use of the civil gaols because there is no more room in the military prisons. This "uneconomical massing of troops in the rear" has become still more "uneconomical" as a result of the fact that, during the last brigands' attack on Russia, whole brigades and divisions had to be disarmed. When a small military detachment is required at least double the number of soldiers has to be sent: an unreliable regiment must be followed by a reliable one, which remains permanently in the rear: on the one hand, the lives of these reliable persons must be spared, while, on the other hand, all the reliability of these detachments would vanish into thin air if they were to be transferred from the rear to the front.

This is what is meant by the "uneconomical massing of troops in the rear," of which the Report of the Commission controlling State debts speaks. As for the food crisis, it is extremely characteristic that several districts in Austria have to be provisioned by Germany. Hungary is not providing bread for the simple reason that the ruling circles are not disposed to share it with others: the Hungarian well-to-do peasants have plenty of money. They hide their stores from the requisitioning commissions. The small peasant proprietors also defend their little surpluses from the gendarmes. Germany and Austria would only be able to receive food supplies from Hungary if they invaded her. Only by force could the Hungarian peasant be constrained to loyalty to his "Allies."

In Bohemia, as in Galicia, where hunger-riots have been suppressed only by main force, the ground is completely ready for a rising, in the districts populated not only by Czechs, but by Germans. An Extraordinary Congress of commandants of the German-Bohemian districts states in its resolution: "German Bohemia is at the last gasp."

The Tyrol lives only on German supplies, stolen in the Ukraine. Austria herself succeeds in stealing very little; and in this respect also Germany increases the degree of vassaldom of the Dual Monarchy.

The official Social-Democratic Party, which, it must be recognised, is at present beginning to drift to the Left, is still not the interpreter of the feeling of the Austrian working class.

From little notes which have escaped the Censor's eye we can ascertain that every market is a real battlefield—a battlefield in which men and women fight the police and the provisioning authorities. These conflicts are the accustomed daily event in every town. War industry is unstable, thanks to the "idleness" of the workers. Attempts are made—as, for example, on the State railways—to anticipate this form of silent sabotage where raw materials are concerned.

But nothing can be of any avail. In Trieste and in Cracow the workers have already taken up arms. *The weakness of the central government in Austria is merely a guarantee that the mass movement of the workers will one day pass, by means of an armed rising, into a victorious revolution.*

There is now no lack of activity.

The Model Product of Imperialism.

("Pravda," May 24th, 1918.)

A close alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary has been concluded, and is making its appearance as a new factor in the arena of the world-war.

By this new treat, Austria-Hungary is annexed to Germany in the fullest sense of the word. If any of the nations that constitute the Dual Monarchy has recourse to a revolt or a rising, before it there will instantly rise the perspective of military occupation. The fundamental characteristic of the treaty, however, is not its reduction of Austria-Hungary to the position of a colony, not the economic exploitation of the country, but *the guaranteeing to Germany of cannon-fodder in order that she may realise her imperialists aims.*

Annexation is veiled in the form of a treaty: but this circumstance means nothing. The organs of the German military party do not attempt to conceal that that fact implies merely a special act of grace on the part of victorious German imperialism. The "Kreuz-Zeitung" points out that

considerations of a military and political nature do not permit of the publication of the secret treaty, and announces triumphantly that the treaty of alliance between Germany and Austria is first and foremost the result of the German military successes. And the paper does not conceal the military and aggressive character of the new agreement; it does not hide the fact that its aim is the utilisation of Austro-Hungarian man-power for German military ends.

From the economic point of view, Austria-Hungary is completely exhausted. She can supply neither bread nor raw material. Its German imperialist allies have no longer any belief in its credit. The only article of commerce which Austria can still supply—albeit with difficulty—is cannon fodder.

Nevertheless, this treaty is meeting with no small opposition from all the peoples of Austria, not excluding the German-Austrians. The "Arbeiter Zeitung" protests sharply against this aggressive alliance, this annexation; although the Austrian Government takes pains to emphasise that "the defensive nature of the Dual Alliance remains unchanged."

In spite of the desperate attempts to prevent the annexation and final reduction of Austria into the status of a colony, a semi-official statement of the Government has to declare, in discharge of "its duty as an ally," that the spearhead of this agreement is directed not only against Russia, as hitherto, but against "all other Powers." The semi-official statement of the Austrian Government goes on to point out that the new alliance, as it now stands, assumes the character of a "League of Nations"—under which title is masked a league of the Central European Powers, headed by Germany.

This may possibly pacify the Austrian social-patriots of the type of Karl Renner, but will in no way satisfy the proletarian masses of Austria and Hungary. Annexations will not calm the soldiers, deserting in larger and larger numbers, and, according to trustworthy information, refusing to go to the French front. . . .

If the Austrian semi-official statement twice emphasises the fact that "an unshakeable foundation has been created for the new alliance"—that military power which, in the eyes of the German papers, constitutes the chief value of the

alliance—the Austrian monarch will not be able to do without the introduction of German troops into Bohemia and Hungary. Tisza and Seidler intend by means of this alliance to buttress the decaying fabric of the State; but the German imperialists will be able to force the Austro-Hungarian workers to observe the conditions of the treaty only by making use of the methods which were employed in the Ukraine.

The provisions contained in this treaty will be revealed only when the publication of the secret archives is accomplished in Austria-Hungary as in Soviet Russia.

The German, Austrian, and Hungarian revolutionaries must use the existence of the new alliance to increase their struggle against German-Austrian imperialism. The state of mind of the troops shows that that struggle has already begun. If there are still "Social Democrats" who, fearing an Austrian defeat, deliberately stand in the way of the revolution, they will be swept away by the masses of true proletarians.

After this treaty, the Austro-Hungarian proletariat is even more definitely than before at the cross roads of the dilemma: endless war or the revolution?

The Fruits of "Revolutionary" Chauvinism.

("Pravda," June 1st-2nd, 1918.)

I.

"A thing, a phenomenon, may at one and the same time be both itself and something else." This dialectical axiom is justified by consideration of the Czech movement. That which in Austria is revolutionary, and which there is aiming at the overthrow of the existing order, in proletarian Russia is counter-revolutionary, in every sense of the word.

We are not speaking, of course, of Masaryk, that accomplished agent of Anglo-Franco-American imperialism, but of the Czech proletariat, at present passing through the stage of the national revolution—the stage in which, in the words of the "Communist Manifesto," the proletariat "fights not against its enemies, but against the enemies of its

enemies . . ." Part of that proletariat, having found its way into Russia as a result of the imperialist war, becomes active in the capacity of a counter-revolutionary mass against the international revolution, and takes up arms against Soviet Russia.

This criminal activity of the Czech National Army cannot be justified by any revolutionary; but it is essential to understand it properly. It must be studied particularly in the interests of proletarian dictatorship—that beacon on which all revolutionaries fix their hopes. In spite of the personnel of the nationalist elements in the Bohemian revolutionary movement, in spite of the treachery of "Social Democrats" like Niemec and Soukup, in spite of all the circumstances indicated, this movement represents an active and important factor in the international revolution.

On the other hand, the events in Russia—the counter-revolutionary attitude of the Czech Army, 70 per cent. of which are workmen—disclose a great peril. This peril threatens the social revolution not only in Russia, not only in Bohemia, but throughout Austria-Hungary. The counter-revolution which is threatening the railway from Penza to Vladivostok has its prototype in Bohemia and Moravia, in the persons of the nationalistic Czech bourgeoisie and the Socialist-tinted chauvinists of the type of Niemec, Soukup, and other leaders of Social-Democracy—none of them better than Scheidemann and Noske.

II.

It should be observed that in the Czech Army, organised on the initiative of the National Rada of Masaryk and Co., all tendencies of the Czech Labour movement except the Centralists are represented.

The opportunism of the leaders of the Czech Social-Democracy, their complete estrangement from revolutionary Marxism, results, as far as the Austrian Government is concerned, in a tendency opposite to that which is noticeable amongst the overwhelming majority of the Austro-German Social-Democracy.

The Renners have become the greatest defenders of the Austrian imperial idea, while the Niemecs and the Soukups are its enemies. The result is the same, however: in

both parties opportunism has led away from the international class struggle and towards a union of the social-patriots with "their" own bourgeoisie; a phenomenon which hitherto was peculiarly Austrian, but which during the war has become the general characteristic sign of all social-chauvinists; the phenomenon which Otto Bauer has named "pan-nationalism."

These Czech Social-Democratic leaders, who during the lifetime of Tsarism organised under Professor Masaryk's leadership a Czech National Army—making use of all the resources of terror and demagogy where the proletarian elements were concerned—had long ago lost all idea of the possibility of an independent movement of the Czech proletariat. Nationalism, revived by the opportunist policy of the "Social-Democratic" party and the trade union bureaucracy, swallowed up the remnants of the Socialist outlook on the world. There grew up a peculiar variety of nationalistic adventurism, similar to that which followed the revolution of 1848. (Karl Marx ridiculed and attacked it without mercy.) These hirelings of the capitalist class after the style of Kerensky sacrificed the Czech proletariat to Tsarism, and only the opposition of the overwhelmingly proletarian majority of the Army held them back, until quite recently, from coming out openly against the Russian proletarian revolution in the interests of international imperialism.

III.

The more honest elements of the Czech proletariat have sunk as far as compromise with their own bourgeoisie and capitulation to imperialist agents only because they did not correctly gauge the strength of the Czech capitalists. But class feeling must still be alive in these workers, because the different adventurers supported by imperialist gold could only carry on their activity in the name of Socialism. They made use of every form of Socialist artifice, beginning with "revolutionary-democratic labour organisations," and ending with the most Left, in order to betray the Czech workers to the nationalists. These hirelings of the capitalist class have found an ultimate shelter for themselves in the

bosom of the counter-revolution; but that criminal policy is cutting the ground from under their feet.

This disgraceful activity with which the masses of the Czech proletariat have spotted their good name, thanks to the demagogy of the nationalistic bourgeoisie, will be their last error. The suppression of this counter-revolutionary rising *will be brought about from within;* it will spring from the proletarian sections of the Army. These sections are now no longer swallowing the bait dangled before them by the capitalists, nor yet that offered them by their "Socialist" leaders. This counter-revolutionary movement will, in all probability, produce detachments to defend the independent action of the proletariat, not only in the Czech, but also in the general Austrian revolution.

That action is inevitable. Where Bohemia is concerned, we foresee quite clearly not only the development of existing forces, but also the course of the revolution itself. Police "pacifications" have done all that they can do; the masses have risen, and the Austrian Government will be hard pressed to find a reliable army capable of crushing the revolutionary movement. Courts-martial are of no avail. The power of the State will none the less continue to become weaker; and this circumstance will strengthen the revolutionary movement in other parts of Austria-Hungary.

The aims of the revolutionary masses in Bohemia are very confused; they leave much to be desired. The responsibility for this lies primarily upon the members of the majority section of the Czech Social-Democratic Party, who, like the Russian Mensheviks, have been quite unable to grasp that a bourgeois revolution is to-day quite unthinkable, as Marx expressed it in his "18th Brumaire." These social-traitors, like their supporters, the soldiers of the Czech Army in Russia, looked on the class struggle of the Russian workers with the capitalists as "fratricidal war of the Slavs," and wished to preserve their neutrality to such a degree that, by a logical process, they finally arrived at the stage of open counter-revolution. About a month ago the various Niemecs and Soukups amalgamated their party with the National Socialist Party, which had always fought under extreme jingo watchwords. In spite of this, they emphasised, in their colourless resolution, that "they stand for the principle

of the class struggle" and that "between the Czech proletariat and the capitalists there exist class antagonisms." The whole course of the negotiations shows, however, that amongst these leader-traitors there is not one who thinks of an independent proletarian line of action in the oncoming Czech revolution.

The Czech bourgeoisie knows very well how to divert the proletariat from its own real aims, and how to use it in the interests of exploitation. Furthermore, Masaryk and his school have taken up their stand very close to the position of the semi-Marxian "lecture-room Socialists." The more danger that the absence of any independent line of action of the Czech Social-Democracy may be used to the end of awakening nationalistic hatred and crushing the Czech revolution.

If it is true (and it is unquestionably so) that the success of the revolution can at the present time be guaranteed only by independent action on the part of the proletariat, then that principle, as far as Austria is concerned, is doubly correct. Only such action can completely safeguard the solidarity of the workers of the different Austro-Hungarian nationalities; only such action is strong enough to neutralise the agitation, the jingo speeches, and the attempts at enslavement, of the German and Magyar capitalist class. It falls to the lot of the Czech proletariat to take its place side by side with the German and Hungarian workers, as the revolutionary advance-guard of Austria-Hungary; while the Czech Scheidemanns in Bohemia, as in Russia, are acting in direct opposition to this destiny.

The class-conscious elements of the Czech proletariat, like the other sections of the Austro-Hungarian labour movement, must have recourse to the most drastic measures to put an end to this disgraceful activity in Russia. The road to that end is disclosed by the "Communist Manifesto," and by the experience, based upon it, of the revolutionary Communist Party in Russia. Those groups and sections of the Communist Party which exist, legally or illegally, in Austria, must have the following character, in keeping with the words of the "Communist Manifesto":

"The Communists are, in practice, the most resolute and progressive section of the working class of all countries;

from the theoretical standpoint, they have the advantage of understanding the conditions, course and general results of the proletarian revolution. The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: organisation of the proletariat as a class, overthrow of the supremacy of the capitalist class, conquest of political power by the proletariat."

The Czech workers who, being in the ranks of their National Army, are thereby serving the interests of the S.R.-Cadet-Octobrist counter-revolution, are in reality the victims of the Czech "Social-Democrats" and emigrants in Russia—men who use the nationalist banner to prevent the organisation of the Czech proletariat as a class.

No mercy can be shown to these traitors, both there and here seeking to find a compromise with the bourgeoisie, and supporting the counter-revolution—at first under the cloak of neutrality, but now openly—just at the moment of the workers' greatest struggle. The Russian counter-revolution must be crushed as quickly as possible, in the interests of both the Czech and the world revolutions.

The Revolutionary Tide in Austria.

("Pravda," June 8, 1918.)

The pulse of the Austrian revolution is daily beating quicker and quicker. The stormy tide of events is daily washing away more and more of the foundations of the existing order, constantly breaking off new buttresses. The governments rest within the country only on a thin crust. It has long lost all hope of the masses of the subject races: but it is now a question of lower middle-classes of the ruling races who are raising their voices against the new alliance with increasing energy. The Austro-Hungarian, and still more the Swiss, papers show us that, while the imperialist classes are closing their ranks around the German alliance, the mass of the lower middle-class is adopting a benevolent attitude towards the Entente Powers, trying to get rid of the war and of their ally, Germany.

The refusal of the war-weary soldiers on the Italian front to serve imperialist interests is a parallel phenomenon with that of the new orientation of bourgeois circles.

In Bohemia, and amongst the Jugo-Slav bourgeoisie, there has long been evident a current hostile to German imperialism. The same tendency is becoming more and more clearly marked in Hungary.

Count Karolyi, the leader of the most left bourgeois opposition and of the pacifists, has protested very sharply in the Hungarian Parliament against the alliance with Germany. In his speech he alluded to the whole dynasty in a tone unusual for Austria.

After this Parliamentary outburst, which found a wide echo in the country, Governmental circles have begun a campaign against him on the ground of alleged high treason. Proceedings have been begun in the Budapest Courts against Karolyi on the basis of a charge of having compromising relations with Italian statesmen. It is characteristic that materials for the case have been collected by the agents of the German General Staff.

The unreliability of the troops has increased by now to such an extent that, after Charles' visit to Constantinople, Turkish troops appeared in Austria-Hungary as the only trustworthy reserve against the internal as against the external foe.

Against the extremely unsuccessful attempt to introduce State Capitalism, after the manner of Germany, there is arising the opposition of not only the workers but also the lower middle-class, so numerous in Austria. Both in Austria and Hungary commercial conferences were recently held of the lower middle-class, whose existence is threatened by State capitalism. In spite of all attempts by official circles to moderate their fury, they more than once raised their voice against the Government, and protested against German colonisation of Austria.

On the other hand, the harvest has been requisitioned in advance, for the needs of the whole of Central Europe; a measure which has evoked from amongst the peasantry an unheard-of strength of resistance. This has determined largely the agitation amongst the troops on the Italian front, as they consist, for the most part, of peasant elements.

Side by side with this, the labour movement in Austria-Hungary is swinging more and more to the left. Even the party leaders, though badly infected with social-patriotism,

have nevertheless become more radical than the German Social-Democracy. A regrouping is going on of the Left, the completely radical elements of the working-class movement, to a certain extent still acting as the opposition within the old parties. Both in Austria and in Hungary there are now in effect two party centres.

The illegal sections of the labour movement are fed by mass desertions of the workers at the front and in the rear. Those organisations are still further and further developed by returning prisoners of war. In reply to a question about the Hungarian Bolsheviks, asked in the Upper House, the Premier Wekerle replied that the Government was quite powerless in this respect, as the elements infected with Bolshevism were returning home by routes of their own choosing, and avoiding the moral aid of the military authorities. Bolshevism is causing governmental circles, both in Austria and in Hungary, more and more anxiety.

The last hope of the reactionaries is that Count Tisza, who occupies a foremost position in the political arena, may, together with his agents Burian and Czernin, supplant the Premier Wekerle.

What the Austrian papers do not mention may be gathered from the small leaflets which are being circulated in Austria in the old, pre-revolutionary, Russian style. On their basis we can state that, within the frontiers of the Dual Monarchy, there are already dauntless champions of the international revolution. "The first problem is to save the Russian Revolution," says one of these illegal leaflets. "Its destruction would mean the victory of pan-European imperialism : its victory will signify the defeat of the latter."

These and many other symptoms show that there is already some sort of connection between the different outbursts of the revolutionary masses.

The lower middle-class mass is now not in the least intoxicated by military victories. The Turkish troops; the trials for high treason of leaders of the bourgeois opposition —all this shows us that military revolts and revolutionary strivings on the part of the workers and the oppressed peoples will not meet with hindrance amongst the lower middle-class mass.

"Social-Traitors, Unite!"

("Pravda," June 22, 1918.)

The Mensheviks, perhaps, may in the near future have the opportunity of realising the hopes ascribed to them in the bourgeois evening papers. According to the latter, these gentlemen intend to oppose the Bolshevik "terror" by an appeal to the public opinion of the International. An "International" corresponding to the Menshevik views is already in the process of formation.

Although the Dutch-Swedish commission, that abode of social-patriotism, has recently been dissolved—because, in the words of Huysmans, there is no hope of an International Socialist Conference in the immediate future—the fathers of social-treachery continue their activity. They are alive, and are again trying to organise a new "International," of the various social-Chauvinist parties, to "defend society" against the Revolution.

Kerensky's agent, Branting, will meet in London two "distinguished foreigners"—A. Thomas and Henderson, who did their utmost to hold in check the Russian Revolution. Vandervelde and Huysmans will take part in the conference. This "Entente International," whose greatest heroes—the late Ministers—will gather in London, will be a fitting body to respond to the appeal of the Mensheviks; for the former are just as much the enemies of the proletarian revolution as our own Social-Democratic pillars of capitalist society, recently excluded from the Soviets.

The Social-Democrats of the Central Powers, on the other hand, also lately carried on negotiations with the social-traitors of the Entente through the medium of Branting. The "tame" German Social-Democrats, together with the "official" Austrian and Hungarian Social-Democrats, received bulky packages from Branting containing materials for the forthcoming International Conference.

These preparations already give a taste of what wonderful perspectives will open before such a conference.

The Messrs. Legien and Co. have followed the example of the Russian Mensheviks. They have liquidated the German Social-Democratic industrial movement by amalgamating the "free" and "yellow" Trade Unions. It is just

this that the Mensheviks are doing in connection with the Russian Revolution. To transform the Labour movement into a non-party, emasculated mass, devoid of all class-consciousness—that is the method common to the Legiens and the Menshevik "workers' plenipotentiaries."

There can be no doubt that these twins, sons of one mother—Opportunism—will be able to find a common tongue. Those who became a hindrance on the path of revolution and coloured the German Trade Union movement yellow, must proclaim their solidarity with the social-traitors who not only place obstacles in the way of the working-class movement but actually attack the proletariat when it has won power.

"For God's sake, don't touch Capitalism!" This haunting appeal of the social-traitors to the working masses, and the watchword of their Russian brothers: "Back to Capitalism," represent only two different stages of development in the process of betrayal of the workers' interests.

The International is arising—to defend capitalism and counterbalance the proletarian revolution. We can rest assured that this time the imperialist governments will not refuse to issue passports.

"Social-traitors of all countries, unite!"

The Birth-Pangs of the Revolution.

("Pravda," June 27th, 1918.)

The communiqués from the internal front of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy daily give us further and further hope. The defeat on the Italian front is not the result of the strength of the Italian Army. On the contrary, it is brought about by the sharpening of the conflict on the internal front. The troops which have fought blindly and senselessly for years, in the cause of imperialism, are now deliberately surrendering. In Austria-Hungary there has at last arisen a yearning for the defeat of one's own imperialism. This denotes already a high level of development of the revolutionary consciousness.

Simultaneously with the news of defeats on the Italian front information has arrived, from the internal front, concerning bloody repression in Hungary. "The factories are

idle," declares the Premier Wekerle, "just at the moment when their intensive activity is required."

This is a patent symptom that, by the undermining of war industry, the workers are instinctively striking for the defeat and dissolution of the military State institutions of their "own" imperialists, in order to clear the path in this way for the revolution. The refusal to accord the most elementary rights to the proletariat raises these waves still higher. The immediate political cause of the recent explosion was the project of electoral reform proposed by Tisza, which annuls all the solemn promises hitherto given. All the efforts of the official Hungarian Social-Democratic Party were directed only towards the achievement of electoral reform. They were attempting to divert the working-class movement into "legal" channels, and thereby were hindering the development of the revolution. But objective conditions broke up these artificial channels, and the workers have begun to use semi-legal methods of struggle. The last events show us that the Government has to suppress the workers' revolts "with blood and iron."

At Budapest, where the movement assumed an extremely threatening character, the Government invoked the assistance of the gendarmes, of whose good offices they had availed themselves hitherto only to maintain order in the villages. In them lie all the hopes of the Government at the present moment, as it is no use counting on the soldiers : they are the worst firebrands of the revolutionary movement.

But the weapon is two-edged, and the repressions of the gendarmes render existing antagonisms still more acute. During the last demonstrations at Budapest four workers were killed, while the wounded are reckoned by scores. This measure will still more rapidly force the workers to forsake the peaceful path of the struggle for the franchise. From day to day the conditions for an armed uprising of the masses become more and more mature.

At Pecs, one of the principal industrial and mining centres of Hungary, the soldiers of the 48th Reserve Infantry Regiment shot their colonel and several officers. On the other side of the Danube, in Western Hungary, the soldiers secretly removed from their barracks arms and ammunition.

Returned internationalist prisoners of war, carrying on revolutionary agitation, are subjected to the most savage persecution.

The Government may possibly improve the economic position of the workers to a certain extent; but politically it is quite incapable of making the slightest concession to them. The composition of the Governmental parties precludes the possibility of any modifications whatsoever in the Tisza-Wekerle project of electoral reform. In those parties are represented not only the semi-feudal aristocrats, but also the rich peasants and manufacturers, compulsorily organised nowadays into manufacturers' associations.

The new project for the compulsory amalgamation of large industrial enterprises, the indirect tax on corn, and the mill monopoly, as a means for uniting the financial and landed aristocracy—all this reduces the proletariat to a condition from which no electoral reform can rescue it. Thanks to this condition, all sections of the lower middle class, as well as the proletariat, have been brought to a state of desperation.

The country has been handed over, lock, stock, and barrel, to the German militarists. The promises and pacifist declarations of Count Czernin could only for a short time keep the people in a state of deception, even with the efforts to the same end of the official representatives of the working-class movement.

The recent meetings and strikes, however, prove that the masses are about to take over the question of Peace into their own hands.

That is a sketch of the general situation in Hungary.

The new Minister of the Interior is trying to calm the frightened bourgeoisie by telling them that the soldiers' mutinies will be suppressed by the most drastic means. But there are no longer any reliable troops available for this purpose. In one small town in Bohemia, lately, the following incident occurred. The 68th Infantry Regiment, which hitherto had been considered trustworthy, and which was specially ear-marked for the work of crushing the Czech revolutionary movement at Prague, suddenly went over to the side of the workmen on strike.

The new alliance with Germany is reviving the movement in the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy as well. The unsuccessful offensive against Italy is there, too, bearing its revolutionary fruit.

The condition of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy clearly points to the fact that the birth-pangs of the revolution have begun.

The Revolution in Hungary.

("Pravda," July 4th, 1918.)

The working-class movement in Austria-Hungary previous to the risings already bore all the signs of developing revolution. The Austro-Hungarian and German papers give us only fragmentary information about the revolutionary movement which has sprung up. But even from that we can make two important deductions concerning the strength, the power of resistance, and the meaning of the revolutionary movement.

First, the strike in Hungary is not a purely local event. It is not a series of strikes embracing separate industries. It is *one mass movement, bearing the stamp of the General Strike,* in the sense that *work has ceased everywhere, in all the most important branches of industry, transport, and mining.*

Secondly, it is absolutely impossible to reduce the causes for the General Strike purely to hunger or the demand for electoral reform. *The General Strike is directed against the machinery of the State*—against militarism and discipline.

All the demands of the strikers are connected with the question of power, and, as such, rise beyond the limits of the parliamentary State. The movement, it cannot be doubted, will not continue on the scale of the usual mass strike, especially as it is fraught with the most deadly peril for the vital interests of a State at war.

The movement has adopted the typical forms of that stage of a revolution which is the forerunner of the actual rising. Here and there more and more frequent cases of stoppage of work are to be observed, representing something unheard of during the first three years of the war—right up to the October Revolution. The "union sacrée" has been smashed

to atoms by the workers themselves. All attempts at conciliation on the part of the leaders of the official Social-Democracy, whose aspirations have never left the bounds set by a narrow Parliamentarism, have beeen in vain.

True enough, the proletarian movement arose elementally; the strikers have not a clear class feeling or a concrete social policy; the movement has no leaders, and is semi-conspirative; but it is undoubtedly revolutionary. Greater results have been achieved than by the last forty years' struggle for the franchise.

In their search for the path to freedom, the workers have entered the trade unions. Before the war, the membership of the Hungarian trade unions never exceeded 110,000; during the last two years, they have had an increase of over 100,000 members. During the war it was impossible to transform the labour organisations in accordance with the revolutionary requirements of the proletariat; but the *workers now are carrying on the struggle in spite of the trade union leaders.* The mass struggle has in Hungary become the accepted method of the working-class movement, even though it has not yet received official sanction. For fifteen long years the official organs of the Party have threatened the bourgeoisie: "We shall begin to talk Russian." At the present moment, the Hungarian proletariat is talking and, actually, acting Russian.

In Budapest there is a general strike. The railwaymen have struck. Other enterprises are on the eve. The postal and telegraph employees are adopting passive resistance, which is nothing but a veiled form of strike.

The chief coal pits are also idle. According to the declaration of the Hungarian Minister for Commerce, 600 truckloads of coal per day are wanting through the strike at Petroszeny alone. The transport crisis has reached its maximum.

The workers openly refuse to obey the orders of the administrative officials of the militarised enterprises. They threaten the commandants and officers with the fate of the colonel at Pecs, whom the soldiers killed with their rifle-butts. The repressive measures undertaken in the case of one individual workman, who had been arrested for a statement of this kind, served as the immediate cause of a strike in the

largest mining district in Hungary. In Budapest, after an exchange of shots in the State railway shops, the workers sacked the office of another factory.

In the demands of the metal-workers' deputies, put forward on June 19th, the following two points appear: (1) The withdrawal of gendarmes from the factories; (2) The dismissal of the railway shop officials.

On June 21st the strike at Budapest *became a general stoppage.* The newspapers did not appear; the tramway services stopped; the postal and railway servants announced their solidarity with the strikes (a strong movement is noticeable in their midst); the private postal-telegraph-telephone services also ceased. The leaders of the Party and of the trade unions made an attempt to moderate the movement; but from day to day new proclamations appear, *calling on the workers to continue the strike.*

The Minister for Commerce and Industry has declared in Parliament that the action of the railwaymen and postal servants will be crushed by the most severe repressive measures. The Government wants to crush the working-class movement by violence. The proletariat must reply not by isolated shots, as happened lately at Budapest, but by a mass movement. The bourgeoisie can no longer rely on its military forces. The soldiers are going over to the side of the people, not only at Pecs, but also in other towns. In the Hungarian plain regular pitched battles between deserters and the gendarmerie have taken place. On the Italian front, the Hungarian troops—like the Roumanian, the Serbian, and the Slovak soldiers—either refuse to take the offensive, or else surrender.

The quantity of "trustworthy" troops is quite insignificant. On the other hand, the number of deserters and men arrested for violation of discipline is growing. *The Hungarian military prisons have long been so full that the authorities have been forced to make use of civil gaols.*

Tisza has appeared in the foreground. Wekerle, the Hungarian Trepov, is still Premier, but Count Tisza has announced that the day is at hand when he will take over the government in order that repressive measures shall be ruthlessly administered. But whether Tisza will have time to do this is another question. The objective situation in

Hungary is such that there is little hope of governing by means of a Parliamentary ministry, and without an open dictatorship.

And from the open dictatorship of the capitalist class, it is not a long step to the open dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Foster Child of Monarchy.

("Pravda," July 20th, 1918.)

During the great French Revolution, the guardian of the principle of legitimity, of the principle of monarchy, was the Holy Roman Empire, as it was then—the Austrian Empire, as it is now. At the present time that part is being played by Germany.

All the present German Chancellors, whatever their name, strive to act up to the rôle of Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor of that time.

But there is a fundamental difference between Germany now and the Holy Roman Empire then. The German Empire does not intend to reinstate the old dynasties; it founds new dynasties, setting on the throne its own representatives. The first such attempt has taken place in the Ukraine. In the person of Skoropadsky there is, in effect, at the the head of the State a Vioeroy, with all the characteristics not of a constitutional but of an autocratic monarch. The question is whether Germany intends to set on the Ukrainian throne one of the "unemployed" still remaining Romanovs, or a German prince. The Romanovs would possibly find some adherents in the ranks of the Black Hundred; but the revolutionary movement in the Ukraine displays the necessity for a "completely reliable" German monarch, who would not under any circumstances show hesitation in crushing opposition.

We have seen the same picture in Finland. The former Grand Duke Cyril Vladimirovitch, a scion of the Romanov house, was amongst the spectators when, in the Parliamentary arena, the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin was proclaimed King. In Finland, just as in the Ukraine, the restoration of the monarchy represents not merely the rehabilitation of the general principle of Monarchism, but the

restoration of the bourgeois State as a whole, in contradistinction to the proletarian State.

In such a case the restoration means the withdrawal of power from a class which can take part in the work of government *only when it is in a position to become the sole master of that power, i.e., when it holds the dictatorship.* A return from the dictatorship of the proletariat to the monarchy can only be a symptom of a form of reaction which, in the end, will, notwithstanding, shorten the path to Socialism.

In future, Skoropadsky and the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin can no longer be displaced by the Rodziankos, the Kerenskys, the Martovs: they can be displaced—and soon will—only by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Materials for the History of the Birth of the Hungarian Revolution.

("Pravda," July 24th, 1918.)

The eyes of all workers are turned towards Russia. Mass emigations of the persecuted reach the Ukraine, but very rarely does anyone manage to reach Russia.

Lately a Hungarian metalworker visited our group. He had deserted from the Italian front, lived in an illegal position near Budapest, and then fled, on June 1st, through Bukovina and the Ukraine, to Russia. His comrade had served in a prisoners-of-war camp, and had picked up a little Russian from the Russian prisoners. They succeeded in reaching the frontier by means of false documents, which are easily procurable in Hungary. One of them has communicated the following to the newspaper, "The Social Revolution"—the Magyar organ of the Russian Communist Party—concerning the reasons which prompted him to start for Russia—

"I am asked why I left Hungary for Russia. I had my good reasons.

"Instead of the régime of Tisza, who was told to go to the devil in 1917, there appeared the far-famed 'democratic' government of Count Esterhazy. He displayed his zeal for democracy 'in practice.' He began negotiations with

the leaders of the social-patriotic party, and begged them on his knees to support him in his work and make the working class realise that 'the fatherland' was in danger.' 'We are surrounded by enemies,' he told them. But he forgot to mention that the danger only threatened his family estates.

"He only underlined the necessity for increasing production, the reward for which would be universal and secret suffrage, including women in its scope. He promised to bring the Reform Bill into Parliament as soon as possible, in order together with it to confirm the war loans which were crushing the workers. 'We shall also assign you seats on the Food Commission at present being organised. After all, such a position is no mean one at a moment when there is no bread, and when we have to cudgel our brains to discover how to satisfy the demands of the mob for bread.' The Party leaders replied something after this style: 'Leave all that to us: we know what to do. Guarantee us a demonstration, which will give us a chance to throw light upon the political situation, and it will not be unsuccessful—Goodbye, Excellency.' The demonstration took place, but the expected 'success' was not forthcoming. Moreover, something took place which the worthy leaders had not even in their dreams expected.

"All the shop windows at the corner of Rakoczy Street and at the Royal Museum were smashed, so it appeared: the shops had been looted, and the goods taken home. This was rather too much . . . "Nepszava" shortly published an explanation, alleging that hirelings of Tisza were responsible for the looting: not sober-minded people, but ruffians hired by Tisza, to oust Esterhazy from the ministerial armchair. And that was not to be recommended: after all, it was only Esterhazy who could get the Reform Bill through . . . The arrests showed that the riot was not organised by hooligans bought by Tisza. It turned out that the arrested men were organised workers, who would never sell themselves to Tisza—as the leaders of the official party who had not gone over to Esterhazy pointed out.

"The distrust of the people towards the Party leaders from that day began to grow, and found expression in the January strike. The leaders had to resign, because the

workers had become more class-conscious, and a crowd of 200,000 people was pouring through Budapest, intoxicated with the Russian revolution, and crying "We too want a revolution!' But the party leaders, who were negotiating with Wekerle, were not capable of that . . . Instead, they tried to bring confusion into the ranks of the proletariat. They allowed the tram-men to come out, but exacted certain sureties from the delegates of some of the workshops, and ultimately we had nothing left us but to stand by our sureties. Then they sent 24 of us from the workshop to the Italian front, whence I fled, via Budapest, Bukovina, and the Ukraine, to Russia.

"I will remark that we did not know that in Russia had been set up the dictatorship of the proletariat. Had that been known to us, our mass strike would have ended quite differently. They deliberately concealed it from us.

"During the January strike we had the opportunity of observing that the elements advocating revolution were for the most part young workmen, between 18 and 24. They defended the extremist point of view, declaring that what we needed was a revolution, not franchise reform. In March and April they were taken for the Army. The same fate threatened me, and I don't in the least regret having escaped it. I now have the chance of making a closer aquaintance with proletarian dictatorship; at home, in our wealthy capitalist country, it is only the labour leaders who cannot even comprehend it.

"I am happy to be able both to observe and to fight for that proletarian dictatorship, and, spiritually enriched, to return home to open the eyes of the workers, starving in our rich Hungarian land of Canaan, concerning the enormous difference between a demonstration in the name of electoral reform, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Will anyone, after all this, ask me why I fled from Hungary to Russia?

"With fraternal greetings, Tanczicz."

In this letter is reflected the state of mind of the Hungarian proletarians, previous to the great June strike.

ISBN 0 904758 33 8

ПРАВДА

BELA KUN:

REVOLUTIONARY ESSAYS

REPRINTED from

