

# Greetings To Communists Abroad

By N. LENIN.

(Continued from last issue.)

The followers of Scheidemann and of Kautzky are still talking of "democracy" in general; they still cling to the ideas of 1848. They pay lip-service to Marxism, but their deeds are those of Louis Blanc. They talk of "majority" rule in the belief that equality at the ballot-box represents equality as between exploiter and exploited, the worker and the capitalist, the poor and the rich, the hungry and the well fed.

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkis behave as if they were honest, noble, peace-loving capitalists had never made use of the forces of wealth, money, capital, bureaucracy, military dictatorship but had always in truth applied the majority rule in the decision of public affairs.

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkis (partly from hypocrisy and partly from extreme dullness engendered by decades of reformist activity) are bolstering up bourgeois democracy, bourgeois parliamentarism and the bourgeois republic and are endeavoring to make the workers believe that the capitalists are conducting State business according to the will of the majority, and not according to the will of the capitalists, not by means of deceit and oppression of the poor by the rich.

The Scheidemanns and the Kautzkis are willing to recognize the proletarian revolution provided that at an election conducted by the bourgeois State with bourgeois election machinery, a majority of the electorate declared itself for the revolution. It is difficult to realize the magnitude of small-bourgeois obtuseness and of small-bourgeois trust in capitalists, in the bourgeoisie in general and in the bourgeois State machinery.

In reality it was the bourgeoisie which was guilty of hypocrisy when it invested the hollow parliamentary equality with the high-sounding name of "democracy," while it oppressed, exploited, and by no end of clever devices tricked the workers and the poorest peasants. The imperialistic war, which the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis were shamelessly bolstering up has revealed this fact to millions of people. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the only means of protection for the workers from the yoke of capitalism, from the military dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and from imperialistic wars. It is the only step which will lead to equality and true democracy not a democracy on paper and consisting of political phrases, but a live democracy, bringing economic freedom with it. The Scheidemanns and Kautzkis have failed to grasp these facts, have proved themselves of bourgeois ideas.

The Kautzki or "Independent" party is dying and will inevitably be finally destroyed by the dissensions between the revolutionary majority of its members and the counter-revolutionary "leaders."

The Communist Party will grow in strength and experience, living down the dissensions which are similar in character to those which confronted the Bolsheviks.

As far as I can judge, the dissensions among the German Communists are centered around the question of "making use of legal possibilities" (to use the Bolshevik terminology of 1900-13). To put it plainly, the question is—should bourgeois parliaments, reactionary trade-unions, "the council's law" (Rat Gesetz), mutilated by the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis, be made use of, or should they be boycotted? We, Russian Bolsheviks, had to go through the same kind of dissensions in 1906 and in 1910-12, and we can plainly see that many young German Communists are simply suffering from lack of revolutionary experience. Had they lived through a couple of bourgeois revolutions (1905 and 1917, they would not be such ardent advocates of the boycott and they would not, at times, fall into the errors of Syndicalism.

Those are growing pains which will pass with the growth of the movement which is developing splendidly. These obvious mistakes must be fought against quite openly, and the greatest care must be taken not to magnify the dissensions, for it must be clear to everyone that in the near future the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the Soviets will do away with most of these dissensions.

From the point of view of Marxist theories, as well as from that of the experience of three revolutions (1905, February 1917, and October 1917), I most decidedly consider it a great mistake to refuse participation in bourgeois Parliaments, reactionary trade-unions (Legien's, Gompers, etc.), and in the most reactionary workers' "soviet," disfigured and mutilated by the Scheidemanns, etc. At times, under certain conditions, in certain countries the boycott is the correct attitude, as for instance was the boycott of the Czarist Duma by the Bolsheviks in 1904. But these same Bolsheviks took part in a far more reactionary, nay downright counter-revolutionary Duma in 1907. The Bolsheviks participated in the elections to the bourgeois Constituent Assembly in 1917, and in 1918 they dispersed it to the profound horror of the small-bourgeois democrats, the Kautzkis and other "Socialist" renegades. We took part in the most reactionary, purely Menshevik trade-unions which, in the matter of counter-revolutionism, are on a par with Legien's infamous and most reactionary trade-unions in Germany. Even now, two years after the conquest of State power, we are still struggling with the remnants of the Menshevik (that is to say, the Scheidemann, Kautzki, Gompers) trade-unions, which goes to prove that this is a long and tedious process, and that in certain localities and in certain unions the influence of small-bourgeois ideas is still very great.

To begin with, we were in a minority in the Soviets, the Trade-Unions, and the Co-operatives. It is only by prolonged hard work and struggle, before, as well as after the conquest of political power that we obtained a majority in all the Labor organizations, and later on in the non-Labor, and still later in the organizations of the small peasants.

Only fools or knaves can imagine that the proletariat must, in the first place, obtain a majority in a ballot conducted by the bourgeois and their hired slaves, and that only then it can strive for power. Such reasoning is the height of stupidity or hypocrisy; it is the substitution of the ballot box under the old regime, the old order, for the class struggle and the revolution.

The proletariat carries on its class struggle without waiting for the ballot before the strike—although the sympathy of the majority of the workers, and consequently of the population, is required to ensure the complete success of a strike. The proletariat carries its class struggle, overthrowing the bourgeoisie, without waiting for a preliminary ballot, conducted by that same bourgeoisie, but it knows all the time that for the successful overthrow of the bourgeoisie it is essential to have the sympathy of the majority of the workers, and consequently of the majority of the population.

The Parliamentary cretins and modern Louis Blancs insist on a ballot, and a ballot conducted by the bourgeoisie in order to ascertain the amount of that sympathy for Socialism that exists amongst the workers. But those are the views of pedants or clever tricksters.

The history of real revolutions shows that the sympathy of the majority cannot very often be proved by any kind of ballot and certainly not by a ballot organized by the exploiters, notwithstanding the existence of Parliamentary "equality" as between exploiters and the exploited.

The sympathy of the majority of the workers very frequently finds expression not through the ballot box, but by the growth of one of the parties, or by the increased number of that party's members in the Soviets, or by the success of some strike which for some reason or other had assumed great importance, or by success in the civil war, etc., etc.

The history of our revolution has, for instance, shown that the approval of proletarian dictatorship on the part of the majority of the workers in the extensive territories of Siberia and the Urals did not manifest itself by the vote, but by the year's experience of the rule over these territories of the Czarist general Kolchak. We must bear in mind that Kolchak's rule also began with a coalition of the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis (translated into Russian the Menshevik and the Social-Revolutionaries, the partisans of the Constituent Assembly), just as to-day in Germany Messrs. Haase and Scheidemann, with their coalition, are paving the way for Von der Goltz and Ludendorff. Here I should like to say, in parenthesis, that the Haase-Scheidemann coalition has come to an end inside the Government but the political coalition of these betrayers of Socialism remains. Proofs of this are Kautzki's books, Stumpfer's articles in the "Vorwaerts," and articles by their followers on their "unity" and so on.

The proletarian revolution cannot be achieved unless the workers give their sympathy and support to its vanguard. But this sympathy and support cannot be gained all at once, nor will they be determined through the ballot box, but they will be obtained by a long, difficult and hard class struggle. The class struggle of the proletariat for the support of the majority of the workers does not end with the conquest of political power. After this conquest, the same struggle continues, but assumes a different character. In the Russian Revolution all the circumstances were exceptionally favorable to the proletariat in its struggle for dictatorship. The proletarian revolution took place at a time when the entire nation was armed, and when the entire peasantry desired the downfall of the landowners, and was incensed at the Kautzkiian policy of the traitor-Socialists, the Menshevik and Social-Revolutionaries.

But even in Russia, where the circumstances were so favorable where there was an immediate unity of the entire proletariat and the entire army and peasantry, even there it took the proletariat months and years to gain the support of the majority of the workers in its struggle for dictatorship. After two years this struggle is almost at an end, but even now the proletariat cannot say that the contest has been absolutely settled in its favor. It has taken us two years to gain the entire sympathy and support of the vast majority of the workers and working peasants in Great Russia, including the Urals and Siberia; but we have not yet achieved that result with the majority of the working peasants (as distinct from the exploiting peasants) in the Ukraine. We may be crushed, and yet we shall not be crushed by the military power of the Entente. In the interior of Russia we enjoy now such a solid support from the majority of the workers that there never has been, in the entire history of the world, a more democratic State.

Anyone who chooses to make a close study of this extremely complicated and long history of the proletarian fight for power, so rich in its manifold forms, sudden changes and transitions from one form of struggle to another, will recognize the error of those who wish to "prohibit" all participation in bourgeois Parliaments, in the reactionary trade-unions, in Czarist or "Scheidemann" workers' committees, or in workshop Soviets, etc., etc. This error is the outcome of the revolutionary inexperience of the most sincere, convinced, heroic revolutionaries of the working class. That is why Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were a thousand times right when in January, 1919, they recognized and pointed out this mistake, but preferred to still remain with the erring proletarian revolutionaries (erring in a matter of secondary importance) than to side with the betrayers of Socialism, the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis who did not err on the question of participation in the bourgeois Parliament, but had ceased to be Socialists and had become small-bourgeois democrats.

But a mistake is a mistake. It must be criticized, and one must endeavor to rectify it.

The struggle with the betrayers of Socialism must be relentless, but it must not be a struggle for, or against participation in bourgeois Parliaments, reactionary trade-unions, etc. This would constitute an enormous error, and it would be a still greater error to recede from Marxian ideas and from the practical line, a strong, centralized political party, to the ideas and tactics of Syndicalism. The chief endeavor of the party should be to participate in bourgeois Parliaments, in the reactionary trade-unions, in the "workshop committees," crippled and castrated à la Scheidemann, in fact to participate in every organization, in order to be in continuous touch with the workers and to exercise the influence of the Communist Party on the working masses. At all costs legal work must be combined with illegal in order to bring about systematically the strict control of the illegal party and its working class organization over the legal activities. This is not easy, but there are not and cannot be "easy tasks" and "comfortable" means of struggle for the proletariat.

This difficult task must somehow be fulfilled. The recognition or non-recognition of the armed rising is not the only difference (and not even the chief difference) between us and the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis. The chief and fundamental difference is—their inconsistent, opportunist, nay even treacherous policy in every field of action, bourgeois Parliament, trade-unions, co-operative societies and journalism.

We must fight on every field of action, without any exceptions whatsoever, against the social-traitors, against reformism and opportunism. Only with the masses the vanguard of the proletariat, the Marxian centralized political party will lead the people without fail to the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat, to proletarian democracy in lieu of bourgeois democracy, to the Soviet republic to the Socialist world order.

The Third International has won a series of brilliant victories in the course of a few months. It grows with a remarkable rapidity. Its frequent errors and growing pains have no terrors for us. By constant and open criticism of these errors we shall bring the working masses of all the cultural countries, who have imbibed Marxism, to the point where they will sever all connection with the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis of all nations; those who have betrayed Socialism are to be found in all countries.

The victory of Communism is inevitable.

# Who Is Santeri Nuorteva?

June 16th, 1920.

I would advise you not to take too seriously the accusations raised by Mr. Nuorteva against Comrade Fraña. At least we, in Massachusetts, cannot do so knowing Mr. Nuorteva and his activity in the Socialist Party in Massachusetts. You might just as well believe Nuorteva's Menshevik friends in Russia, when they call Lenin a German spy and agent of the Kaiser.

This is not the first occasion where Nuorteva has co-operated with the police-powers of the capitalist state. He is one of a group of Finnish yellows, who, after expelling the revolutionary elements from the Finnish Federation of the Socialist Party in 1913, DENOUNCED THEM TO THE POLICE AND COURTS AS ANARCHISTS, SYNDICALISTS, etc., in order to steal their property.

In his Socialist Party activities Nuorteva has always been the worst kind of social-patriot and traitor to the working class. To prove that I will cite a few characteristic examples: "Dealing with Mass. State Socialist Party Fitchburg Convention in 1915, where yours truly happened to be a delegate, and where Mr. Nuorteva with his bloc of yellow Finns and Menshevik Letts showed his skill in "political identity" (pulling the "teeth" out of Bolshevik motions and resolutions). Nuorteva acted as the only spokesman of that bloc, because practically all of his delegates did not understand or could not speak in English, but only raised their hands in voting as soon as Nuorteva raised his.

Our first resolution, to congratulate Comrade Liebknecht for his stand taken against the war, Socialists and "burgfrieden," was defeated by Mr. Nuorteva and his bloc, on the ground that the workers SHOULD defend their "fatherland," and that "everybody's doing it now."

When we pointed out the attitude of the Russian Bolshevik party (then Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party), Nuorteva dismissed them as a sect of irresponsible soreheads.

At the same convention we presented a resolution on "Dick's Military Law," pending in the U. S. Senate at that time, and proposing forced military training. Our resolution advised our young comrades and sympathizers to refuse to become cannon-fodder. Mr. Nuorteva gave us the following advice: THIS IS NOT RUSSIA BUT AMERICA. This is a free country and we must all obey the law once it is passed. "Law and Order" won and our resolution was defeated.

At the same time U. S. agents of the capitalist class were ready to invade Mexico for the glory of Standard Oil Company. We presented a resolution, calling on the working class to refuse to serve, if conscripted, but in case they are forced to fight, they should fight against their only enemy—the capitalist class of this country.

"Treason" and "traitors" were the only arguments of Mr. Nuorteva against us. I pointed out to Nuorteva, that he cannot avoid being a traitor. He should only decide, whether to become a traitor to the working class of U. S. and Mexico, or commit treason against Standard Oil. Nuorteva decided for Standard Oil, and then there again showed that he is a traitor to the working class by defeating our resolution.

On the same day (Sunday), a well-known minister of the Gospel in Boston, preached a sermon on the subject: "WAR IS HELL. CHRISTIANS SHOULD NOT GO THERE," and called upon his congregation to refuse to serve in any army.

But, you may argue, Nuorteva is a Bolshevik now. If so, just read his "Open Letter to American Liberals," and you will see that he is just a plain, everyday middle-class liberal and nothing more.

As to his connections with the Soviet Bureau—birds of a feather flock together. You'll find there also Mr. Hilquit, the great Red Army slayer; Mr. ———, ex-inspector of ammunition under the regime of bloody Nicolas; Mr. Preedin, Mr. Weinstein and other worthy Mensheviks who all ways fought against Bolshevism in Russia and in this country, and are doing it now.

The real reason for accusing Fraña, as I understand it, was to keep our party out of touch with Soviet Russia and the Third International. How long they will succeed in this remains to be seen.

Meanwhile we should continue our work of agitation and education, and not pay too much attention to the barking of "dog-hounds" of the American capitalist class, as represented by Mr. Nuorteva.

Hoping you will agree with this, I remain  
Fraternally yours,  
John Moran.

## LENIN AND LONGUET

Lenin publishes an article in the "Kommunistische Internationale" with regard to a letter written to him by Longuet. In this article Lenin points out that under the influence of the considerable movement towards the Left on the part of the working masses, certain leading Socialists would seem to be ready to save their positions by a formal acceptance of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, being even ready to join the Third International, but, says Lenin, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is a serious matter and can only be brought about by those who accept it in fact, as well as on paper. It is impossible to accept the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and yet at the same time to work side by side with Thomas Sombat, and Bracke (their English namesakes will readily be supplied by our readers). The Dictatorship of the Proletariat implies the continual exposing of the character of the war just ended and the daily emphasis of the possibility of war breaking out again as soon as the people show a tendency to organize the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. One must also show up the traitorous behavior of the Social-Democracy during the war and avoid every union with them. Further, it is essential to carry on a propaganda amongst the masses for the total abolition of capitalism instead of carrying on a struggle merely to better the daily conditions of the workers.

Longuet and his friends, says Lenin, do not understand this, and he compares them to the Hungarian Social Democracy, who, accepting the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in words, yet sought to keep Bela Kun's Government back when the latter attempted to put the dictatorship into actual practice. As a result of this, thousands of Hungarian Communists have been martyred.  
(London "Call.")

## THE LAST WORDS OF A COMMUNIST

The "Mitmenschen" prints the last words of Eugene Levine (the German Communist executed by the "Socialist" Government of Hoffman in Munich) at his trial. It is well for all workers to remember them:

"If your verdict corresponds to the intentions of the public prosecutor, then I beg you to be present when it is being carried out. I have known a long time now that we Communists are but the dead on leave. It depends on you, gentlemen, whether my ticket of leave shall be once again renewed, or whether I must go and join Karl Liebknecht, but my ideas will live on, and sooner or later, judges will sit in this court before whom will be indicted those who have dared to do anything against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."