

ment. The land committees of the rural districts are unified into the county committee, which in turn elects delegates to a provincial committee, the provincial land committees being centralized into the Main Land Committee acting for all Russia. On this central body are represented the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Peasants and Workers, the Commissaire of Agriculture, etc. The abolition of private ownership in land includes city real estate and buildings, land and buildings being declared public property.

It will be observed that this elaborate machinery for the management of agriculture starts at the bottom, and not at the top. It is the same with the workers' control of industry. The state expresses the activity of the organized producers, and not the producers the will of the state. As a reading of the decree establishing workers' control of industry will show, industry has not been completely socialized; the employer, or the owner, is still retained as a director, but his rights as owner are obrogated. This control of industry starts with the local workers, and gradually it should transform itself into

the unification of all the separate parts of a particular industry into one industrial department, as provided in the theory of industrial unionism, and the unification of these separate industrial departments into one industrial centralized administration.

A particularly important measure was the nationalization of the banks, which destroys the potential power of finance to control industry. By means of nationalization, the banks become exclusively a means for the development of industry, and not dominantly a means of exploitation as under the bourgeois regime. One of the first measures of the proletarian revolution must necessarily be the destruction of the power of monopolistic finance by means of the nationalization of the banks.

Systematic and intensive measures of labor legislation are introduced, measures directed to the improvement of the workers' status at the expense of the "owners" of industry.

This is a rough sketch of the measures of reconstruction introduced by the Soviets. The great problem is the reorganization of industry, the rapid and intensive increase of production. This

great problem is made exceptionally difficult by the sabotage of the bourgeoisie and the moderate Socialists, who do all in their power to disrupt the work of the Soviets. Obviously, the working of this process of reconstruction is not a smooth one, considering the disorganization inherited by the Bolshevik regime and the intense opposition of various elements of the population.

The *petite bourgeois* pedants of Socialism, the characteristic pseudo-Marxists reviled by Marx, piled theory upon history and history upon theory to prove the impossibility of a proletarian revolution in Russia; but life itself and the proletariat achieved the apparently impossible. Russia for nine months has been a proletarian community, a magnificent expression of the Social Revolution. The ultimate fate of this proletarian revolution only the future can reveal. It is a challenge to the proletariat of the world; it is particularly a challenge to the Socialist, since if the proletarian revolution is crushed the bulk of the responsibility will belong to moderate Socialism and in and out of Russia. In the great crisis, a crisis produced by the convulsions of the old

society pregnant with the new, moderate Socialism is a conservative and conserving factor in the bourgeois system of things, directly and indirectly an ally of Imperialism and a traitor to the revolution.

The fate of the proletarian revolution in Russia only the future can reveal, truly. But one thing is clear: the proletarian revolution in Russia is the call to the new day; it marks the entry of the international proletariat into the epoch of the final struggle against capitalism—the epoch of the Social Revolution. Marx is the source of Socialist theory; the proletarian revolution in Russia is the source of Socialist practice.

The world is in the agonizing travail of a new birth. Capitalism, the Capitalism of this imperialistic epoch, is in a new stage of its development—the final stage. It is the task of the revolutionary Socialist to work devotedly and unflinchingly for the reconstruction of Socialism as determined by the requirements of the new epoch. By dedicating ourselves to this task, we shall worthily answer the challenge of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

# The Collapse of the International

By N. LENIN

[Lenin wrote this article in May, 1915, and expresses the general revolutionary Socialist attitude toward the collapse of the Second International. Karl Kautsky, attacked herein by Lenin, has since joined the opposition in the Independent Socialist Party, but his tendency is still that of the Kautsky indicted by Lenin.]

THE collapse of the International is sometimes looked upon purely from its formal side, as a rupture of the international tie between the Socialist parties of the belligerent countries—the impossibility to convene either an International Socialist Conference or the International Socialist Bureau, etc. This point of view has been adopted by the Socialists of the small neutral countries, perhaps even by the majority of their official parties, also by opportunists and their defenders.

For class-conscious workingmen Socialism is an earnest conviction and not a convenient cover for bourgeois-conciliatory and nationally-conflicting aims. By the collapse of the International they understand the flagrant treason of the majority of the official Social-Democratic parties to their convictions, to their most solemn declarations expressed in the speeches at the Stuttgart and Basel International Congresses, and in the resolutions at said Congresses, etc. Only those will not see such treason as do not want to see it, those to whom it will be disadvantageous to see it. To formulate the matter in a scientific way, i. e., from the standpoint of the relations of classes in modern society, we must state that the majority of the Socialist parties, at the head of which was the largest and most influential party of the Second International—the German party—placed themselves at the side of their general staffs, their governments, and their bourgeoisie, against the proletariat. This was an event of world-historical significance and it is impossible to pass it without a more exhaustive analysis. It has long ago been recognized that wars with all the horrors and misery they bring, are of more or less benefit in mercilessly exposing and destroying a great deal of the rotten, defunct and the cadaverous in human institutions. The European war of 1914-15 is beginning to bring undoubted benefit, in revealing to the most advanced class of civilized countries,

that in its parties has ripened a sort of disgusting, purulent abscess, and from somewhere there is being emitted an unbearable, cadaverous odor.

## I.

Is the treason to all their convictions and problems of the chief Socialist parties of Europe evident? It is to be understood that neither the traitors nor those who well know or vaguely guess that they will be obliged to make peace and friends with them—like to speak of this. But no matter how unpleasant it may be to various "authorities" of the Second International or their party friends among the Russian Social-Democrats, we must look things straight in the face, give them their own names, in short tell the truth to the workers.

Are there any real data as to the position taken prior to this war and in expectation of it, by the Socialist parties? Undisputably there are. They are the resolutions of the Basel International Congress of 1912, together with the resolution of the Chemnitz German Social Democratic Convention, of the same year, which live as a remembrance of "the forgotten words" of Socialism.

Summing up the propagandist and agitational literature of all countries against war the Basel resolution represents the most correct and full, the most solemn and formal exposition of Socialist views on war and of the tactics in relation to war. We can not call by any other name than treason the fact that no one of the authorities of the International of yesterday and of the social-patriotism of today—neither Hyndman, nor Guesde, nor Kautsky, nor Plechanoff, dare to remind their readers of this resolution, and are either altogether silent about it or they cite (as does Kautsky) the unimportant, while they pass over the important parts of it. The most "extreme" arch-revolutionary resolutions and the most shameless neglect or repudiation of them—such is one of the striking manifestations of the collapse of the International—and at the same time one of the striking proofs that to believe in "the reformation" of Socialism and in the "straightening of its line" by means of resolutions alone is a belief only of people in whom an unexampled naivete is combined with a cunning desire to perpetuate the former hypocrisy.

The views of Guesde have lately been expressed by the Guesdist, Charles Dai-

nas, who cites the former Socialist declarations of patriotic context (as does the German Social-Chauvinist David in his last pamphlet, on the defence of the fatherland), but who does not cite the Basel manifesto. About this manifesto Plechanoff is completely silent while offering up with an especially smug air, his chauvinistic commonplaces. Kautsky is like Plechanoff; in citing the Basel manifesto he skips all the revolutionary places (that is all which is substantial) very likely under the pretext of prohibition by the censor. The police and the military heads with their censorial prohibition against mentioning the revolution and the class struggle, have been very "handy" in helping the traitors of the Revolution. But perhaps the Basel manifesto presents some sort of an empty appeal, which has no definite content, neither historical or factional—which may directly refer to this present war?

On the contrary the Basel resolution contains less than others of declamation, and more concrete substance. The Basel resolution deals specifically with the very same war which did come and especially of those same imperialistic conflicts which broke out in 1914-1915. The conflict of Austria and Serbia because of the Balkans, of Austria and Italy because of Albania, etc., of England and Germany because of markets and colonies in general, of Russia with Turkey, etc., because of Armenia and Constantinople—that is what the resolution of Basel, foreseeing the present war, deals with specifically. Precisely of the present war between "the great Powers of Europe" the Basel resolution states that such war "can not be justified under any pretext whatsoever of national interest"!

And if now Plechanoff and Kautsky—to take only two of the typical Socialists of authority—are searching for all sorts of "national justifications" for the war, if they, with learned air and with a stock of false citations from Marx, refer for "examples" to the wars of 1813 and 1870 (Plechanoff) or 1854, 1871, 1876-77, and 1897 (Kautsky)—then, in truth, only people without a shadow of Socialistic convictions, without the least bit of Socialistic conscience, can take such proof seriously, and not style them as unmitigated Jesuitism, hypocrisy and prostitution of Socialism. Let the German "Vorstand" of the party deliver

unto damnation the new magazine of Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg (*Internationale*) for its correct estimation of Kautsky. Let Vandervelde, Plechanoff, Hyndman & Co., with the help of the police of the "Triple Entente" treat their opponents in the same way we will reply simply by reprinting the Basel manifesto, which convicts these leaders of their change and for which there is no other word but treason.

The Basel resolution treats not of a national, not of a people's war, examples of which have occurred in Europe, which even were typical of the period between 1789 and 1871, and not of a revolutionary war which Socialists have never renounced, but of the present war on the basis of "capitalistic Imperialism" and "dynastic interests" on the basis of "a policy of conquest" of both the belligerent groups, Austro-German as well as Anglo-French-Russian. Plechanoff, Kautsky & Co. are plainly deceiving the workers in repeating the selfish falsehoods of the bourgeoisie of all lands who strive with all their power to represent this imperialistic colonial, predatory war—as a national and self-defensive war (no matter for whom), and in searching justifications for it from the sphere of historical examples of non-imperialistic wars.

The question as to the imperialistic, predatory, anti-proletarian character of this war has long ago passed from the purely theoretical stage. Not only has Imperialism been theoretically appraised in all its main characteristics as the struggle of a perishing, rotting, decrepit bourgeoisie for the partition of the world and the enslavement of "small" nations; not only have these conclusions been repeated in all the vast literature of the Socialists of all countries; not only has, for example, the Frenchman, Deleze, a representative of one of our "Allied" countries, in the pamphlet "The Inevitable War," (in the year 1911!), popularly exposed the predatory character of the present war even from the standpoint of the French bourgeoisie. That isn't enough. The representatives of the proletarian parties of all countries unanimously and formally declared at Basel their firm conviction that a war was imminent precisely of an Imperialistic character and drew tactical conclusion because of that. Therefore, in passing, all allusions as to failure to define the difference be-