

We need only remind him of the official orders of the reactionary Generals who threatened all the Communists with death. "Good luck to the Communists" wrote Yudenitch in his appeal published in the first number of the "Prinevsky Kral at Gatchina"—and he will be reminded of the fact that the cruelty of the white "democrats" of the 20th Century fell nothing short of the princely cruelty of the 16th century.

It is curious to note that Kautsky, the historian of the proletarian revolution—explains the necessity of the use of terror by the workmen's commune in the same manner that the impartial historians of the greatest of bourgeois revolutions explain that of the anti-feudal terror of 1793.

Let A. Aulard speak (Political History of the French Revolution, 3rd edition, Petrograd, 1919).

"Up to August 10th, 1792, the revolution had tried to organize a government on the basis of legality and liberty. Then, when the opposing forces of the past had coalesced, provoking civil and general war, when it felt itself attacked in the rear and menaced in its very existence, the revolution interrupted the application of the fundamental principles of 1789 and employed against its enemies the repressive measures of the old regime, since then, always employed against it.

The terror consists precisely in this suspension of the fundamental principles of 1789, which was consummated when the danger reached its zenith, when Paris fully realized this danger and suffered most intensely from it in the months of August and September 1793". (page 245).

"And thus the terror had been called forth by the necessity of the French Republic to defend itself when its revolution was in mortal danger, when France was suffering from foreign invasion, when the Royalists in concert with Girondins, incited insurrection after insurrection in the interior of the country.

"It was then that the word 'terror' entered into daily speech indicating one of the measures employed by the government. Sept. 5th, a deputation, composed of commissaries of 48 sections of Paris and of members of the Jacobin Club, came to declare to the convention "Legislators! consider the terror as the business of the day". At the same session, Barriere, speaking in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, employed this phrase in the following place in the discourse:

"Everything indicated, it seems, that a movement was prepared at Paris. The intercepted letters were replete with declarations about the efforts made by the agents of foreign governments and by the aristocracy, to create uneasiness and trouble in the big city, as they call it. Exactly so. They will get what they want; but this uneasiness and this trouble will be organized and centralized by the revolutionary army which will finally carry out the great words uttered by the French Commune: 'Let us consider the terror' the business of the day'.

"The reign of terror, in truth, attained the civil rights proclaimed by the revolution. But certain blows directed against individual liberty, were explained by the intensification of the severity of the laws directed against emigrants, laws which become indispensable as a result of the meetings in which arms were furnished to our enemies by the majority of the emigrants" (page 247).

And the terror, at the time of the Great French Revolution, has received its absolute before the tribunal of history!

The old feudal world took up arms against the victorious revolution by allying itself with its enemies in the interior of the country; the bourgeoisie, still revolutionary during that epoch, safeguarded its acquired rights by applying force against the feudal class. Why then should not the victorious proletariat of to-day have the right to employ against the bourgeois world which assails it the very means the bourgeoisie availed itself of during the time it overthrew feudalism?

But let us leave the last word to Kautsky the Kautsky of former days.

In his analysis of the history of the insurrection of Munster, Kautsky emphasizes acts quite new, explaining the necessity of the anti-bourgeois terror employed by the proletarian revolution:

"Rather than the special situation which instigated bloodshed, let us take into consideration the character of the century, which was one of the most sanguinary and perhaps the most sanguinary of all.

"The Anabaptists—living in real peace—nevertheless were systematically pursued as savage beasts, were cruelly martyred. We must

be astonished that, driven by despair, they ended by losing patience and defending themselves with every means; it is astonishing, on the contrary, that it took so long for such a state of mind to develop and that it was not general!! (page 356-7).

If Kautsky, had not assumed, in respect of the Russian Revolution, the attitude of a "partial" historian, he would have reckoned with the character of our own century, which falls nothing short of the 16th century in regard to cruelty; for the war was an imperialistic enterprise for the conquest of new markets and the enrichment of the capitalists, and has exterminated 10,000,000 men and mutilated 20,000,000.

If Kautsky had been ever so slightly objective, in his method, he would have remembered that the Russian Revolution was born of a monstrous military catastrophe and that this circumstance had to effect the character of the civil war, sprung from the imperialist war.

Our historian would have been able to remember the words of one of the greatest historians of all ages and of all peoples, who said that "war leads to the abuse of force". (Thucydide, History of the Peloponnesian War Book 3).

The historian Kautsky would have remembered the callousness of the Germans, the result of the 30 years war, of which the German novelist of the 17th century, Grimmelshausen had given a magnificent description in his celebrated novel "Simplicius Simplicissimus".

Finally, our historian should have remembered the words of Marx in his "Civil War in France", concerning the soldiers who had fired at the Bonapartist generals, Lacomte and Cleent Thomas:

"The military reforms implanted in them by the school of the enemies of the working class, could not be completely eradicated without leaving some traces at the time they went over to the proletarian Party".

The Kautsky of 1895 would undoubtedly have been astonished to find the workers and the Russian peasants so gentle toward their enemies for so long a time; this only resulted in protracting the civil war.

But let Kautsky continue his description of the "red terror" at Munster.

"A series of fortunate circumstances had placed into the hands of the persecuted and outraged a fortified city when complete discouragement threatened from without

"How would they act in the circumstances? "After the beginning of the siege, those of the conspirators caught communicating with the external enemy, who however had been in perfect accord with the military laws and the good example of the bishop, had not been put to death. They were simply asked to leave the city. And this is what they call "terror"—what base hypocrisy?"

Terrorist measures of a similar nature were, unfortunately, employed at the beginning by the revolutionary proletariat. In the summer of 1918, K. Arsenoff, ardent defender of liberal journalism, still took cognizance of the fact that "Soviet Power had not had recourse to terror until that moment"

Only from necessity and the pitiless war that the bourgeois world declared against us forced the workers and peasants to take the path of revolutionary defense.

But continues Kautsky: "At the time of the siege it was necessary to establish severe regulations, and a series of executions took place. But if one will see that they were violations of the laws against the peace of the city; alliance with the enemy, violations of discipline, attempts at desertion or of stirring up trouble in the city. It is beyond doubt that the death-penalty is not a greater cruelty than war itself. It had been imposed upon them, but on every favorable occasion they did not fail to express their pacific sentiments" (page 358).

If our historian had cited events that in his judgment actually transpired in Russia, he would have given an account of only a hundredth part of the objectivity which he manifests in his study of the Commune of Munster; that the Russian revolutionists put to death traitors to the Socialist country, spies of the Entente, all who made attempts against the revolutionary order at the time of one of the most desperate struggles, and those who desert the ranks of the Red Army. The Russian Commune has just as much right in time of a life-and-death struggle to destroy its enemies as the Munster Commune had. And these words of the Kautsky of old, that "the death-penalty is not a greater cruelty than war", than the war imposed upon the Soviet Republic, and that "on every favorable occasion, it expressed pacific sentiments", conform perfectly with the course of the Russian proletarian revolution.

Formerly, Kautsky comprehended very well indeed, the differences between the Red and White terror.

"Terror did not reign only at Munster,

but also in the locality under the control of the bishop, and comparison was scarcely in favor of the latter. The bishop attacked and the Anabaptists resisted his attacks. The bishop killed for his benefit and the Anabaptists in order not to be slain themselves. They fought for their lives. The followers of the bishop avenged themselves by putting the condemned to death. Most often they drowned them or burnt them alive. At Munster they did not torment the condemned; two kinds of death-penalties were in force, employed even in the humanitarian 19th century, capital punishment and running the gauntlet".

At present, Kautsky seems to ignore the fact that terror reigns not only in Soviet Russia, but also in the localities under the control of the counter-revolution. He does not even see the terror, whose victims, the German proletariat, and those executed by Scheldemann and Noske, stand before his very eyes.

Forsooth, the "very thoughtful" historian knows that comparison is not in favor of the white terror—therefore he does not mention a word of it.

Kautsky adds, that the Anabaptists, far from being too cruel, seemed, on the contrary too humane for their time and the circumstances in which they found themselves. Their whole cruelty consisted in not permitting themselves to be slaughtered like sheep; in the eyes of every "very thoughtful" citizen to shoot at the Anabaptists is a very laudable act dictated by the love of one's neighbor; but when the latter in their turn permit themselves to do some shooting, that is something which becomes diabolical "cruelty".

A very well known proverb from the Hotentots says, "I do very well to take the wife of my neighbor, but he does wrong to take mine".

Having become "very thoughtful" to-day, Kautsky finds excuse for the acts of the Russian Communists, acts which he found natural enough on the part of the pioneers of Communism about 400 years ago.

In speaking of the past Kautsky seems willing enough to expose the bourgeois lies: "The accusation of cruelty is closely linked up with the accusation of tyranny. Munster seems to prove where liberty and communistic equality lead" (page 359)

Soviet Russia shows to what the realization of Socialism leads to, cry the silk-stocking Socialists of every country!

The Kautsky of old knew, 25 years ago, the real worth of bourgeois tales; now he repeats them without the slightest criticism.

Let us see what our historian replies to the accusations hurled at the Munster Commune:

"A state of siege has always resulted from the abolition of civil rights and of liberty, and of the unlimited right of the military power to dispose of the life and property of the besieged population. And it is so true that the same expression, "state of siege", has become synonymous with the abolition of all the rights of civil liberty. Communism has unfortunately, not yet discovered the marvelous elixir which would be able to obviate these inevitable consequences of the state of siege.

"It is because of this fact that it has not been able to prevent, even at Munster, the state of siege from introducing the military dictatorship. Why then not, end once for all, all talk about the criminal culpability of Communism and of the Communists? (page 360).

Note how many things Kautsky understood twenty-five years ago that he no longer understands to-day!!

It is hard to furnish better evidence than he has given, or in stronger words, the entire inevitable logic of the development of the proletarian revolution—it is impossible better to refute the accusations of the bourgeoisie against Communism!

But what seemed clear to the historian Kautsky, is now utterly beyond the comprehension of Kautsky the politician.

"The bourgeoisie attribute to the workers all the base acts which they themselves have never failed to commit in the event of victory". Written in 1874, Frederick Engels, in his article, "Bakounists at Work".

Kautsky agreed to expose the bourgeois lies in the past—when it concerned absolving from slander the memory of martyrs of Communism—but he repeats the lying tales of the sycophants of the bourgeoisie at the expense of those who are continuing the work of the Communists of Munster towards the noble goal, of those who are destined to bring about the triumph of Communism.

One is tempted to say to him with the Russian poet: "Awake! Open your eyes, see what you are and what you have become!"

And the revolutionary proletariat, in comparing the Kautsky of our days, for whom revolutionary Marxism has a book fastened with seven seals, will justly stigmatize him along with the rest of the renegades.