

THE TWELVE WHO ARE TO DIE

THE TRIAL OF THE
SOCIALISTS-REVOLUTIONISTS
IN MOSCOW

Published by the Delegation of the Party of
Socialists-Revolutionists

Berlin
1922



\$ 4.50

repl.

DK

266

P285

1922

343.1

D959X

SEP 10 1938

408115

RECEIVED

TUOMTA

RELLCO

YHARLI

DK266

P285

1922a

MAIN

I. K. KAUTSKY

Preface. The Moscow Trial and the Bolcheviki

II. W. WOITINSKY

The Twelve who are to Die

III

Tactical positions of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party as
shown by the party records

PREFACE

PREFACE.

THE MOSCOW TRIAL AND THE BOLSHEVIKI.

The Russian Party of Socialists-Revolutionists differs radically from the Social-Democratic Party; nay, more, both parties disagree in their basic conceptions of policy and principle. Nevertheless, I gladly accepted the invitation to write a preface to the book on the Moscow trial, published by the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. More than that: I feel that I not only have a right but am duty-bound to write this preface, in the name of my social-democratic principles. For these principles indicate clearly that the proletariat, as the most exploited and enslaved of all classes, cannot emancipate itself without emancipating at the same time all those who are enslaved. A proletarian, Socialist party cannot fulfill its great, historic mission without making itself the protector of all the enslaved and oppressed.

For this reason, Marx and Engels took up the cudgels in behalf of oppressed Poland and raised their voices in defense of Ireland. For this reason, Socialists always fought for the liberation of native peoples suffering under the colonial domination of imperialist governments. And in doing so, Socialists frequently cooperated with non-socialist, bourgeois elements. We are, therefore, all the more obliged to come to the defense of the persecuted and oppressed when they belong to a party which, like ours, although not always in the same way, seeks the emancipation of the toilers, a party which, like ours, had for many years waged bitter, holy war against the meanest enemy of the world proletariat, — Russian absolutism. The fight waged today by the Socialists-Revolutionists is but a continuation of the old fight. For there is no

substantial difference between an absolutist government which holds its power by heritage or one which is of recent creation. There is no material difference between the rule of a „legal“ Czar and a clique that accidentally established itself in power. There is no difference between a tyrant who lives in a palace and a despot who misused the revolution of workers and peasants to ascend into the Kremlin.

And the fact that the new Russian despotism is bonapartist rather than czarist in character makes it all the more essential for the Socialist parties of the world to come to the defense of the Russian Socialists persecuted by this bonapartist regime. For what this regime seeks is to make the Socialists of the entire world its associates in its policy of persecution, — something which Czarism, for obvious reasons, never aimed at. The Bolshevik rulers want the Socialists of the whole world to applaud their persecution of the Socialists-Revolutionists and Mensheviki, but the time has passed when they could expect their assertions to pass unchallenged.

The Bolsheviks maintain that their policy constitutes the only genuine application of Marxism, that it constitutes a strict application of the principles of the class struggle. But the oppression and persecution of workingmen, belonging to another current of Socialist thought, and for no other reason than that these workers prefer to interpret Socialism in a manner different from the Bolsheviks, is in sharp contradiction with these class-struggle principles. We, Marxian Social-Democrats, in common with nearly all other Socialists, stand for democracy and for the right of unrestricted political propaganda for all political parties. This right of unrestricted propaganda we must, above all, demand for all the Socialist parties in Russia. It is quite inevitable for the respective Socialist parties to find themselves frequently in disagreement with one another. But this must be expressed only in a struggle of argument, in a struggle for the soul of the proletariat. Socialists who resort in this struggle against the opinions of other Socialists to guns, bayonets, Che-Ka organizations and jails are committing an act of violence against the proletariat and the idea of the class struggle.

Even the Bolsheviks themselves feel this. For this reason they seek to excuse their regime of violence in the eyes of the

Socialists of the entire world by asserting, like the wolf in the old fable, that the sheep are trying to pollute the water which they, the Bolsheviks, forsooth, seek to maintain unpolluted. To convince the world of the truth of this claim was the chief purpose of the Moscow trial. By this trial the Bolsheviks sought to destroy not only physically but morally the foremost representatives of the Socialists-Revolutionists. But the trial produced quite the opposite effect. It resulted in the moral victory of the accused and the moral execution of the accusers.

The Bolsheviks were first to use violence against other Socialists. They dissolved the Constituent Assembly not by way of resistance against any violence on the part of the Socialists-Revolutionists and Mensheviks but because of their realization of their own inability to obtain the support of the majority of the peasants and workers by means of free propaganda. This was the fundamental cause of the Bolshevik coup d'état against the representatives of the revolutionary workers and peasants. Hence, the abolition of all rights of all other Socialists who refused to submit to the crack of the Bolshevik whip. Hence, the establishment of a political regime which leaves but one form of open, political action for the opposition — civil war. The Social-Democracy was never averse to the use of violence in resistance against violent persecution. It simply made the advisability of the use of such violence conditional upon considerations of purpose and the possibility of success. If the Social-Democracy found itself in disagreement with the Socialists-Revolutionists in this regard, it was not from considerations of principle but of tactics. But, if I am correctly informed on this point, there are no substantial differences of opinion at the present moment between the Socialists-Revolutionists and the Mensheviks. Both recognize that an anti-Bolshevik uprising at the present moment could not be successful and would even, under certain circumstances, lead to a result diametrically opposed to that sought, by provoking foreign and reactionary intervention. Armed uprising against the Bolsheviks, at the present moment, would only delay the process now in progress in Russia and pregnant with great consequences, — the process of the desertion of Bolshevism by the proletariat and

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

peasant masses and their return to the other Socialist parties. This process represents a deadly danger for the Bolshevik dictatorship. The real crime of which the Socialists-Revolutionists are guilty before the Bolsheviks at the present moment is not in the preparation of terroristic acts and armed uprisings, but in that, like the Mensheviks and perhaps even to a larger extent, the Socialists-Revolutionists, whose ranks are constantly growing in number, are acquiring in ever increasing measure the confidence of the toiling masses of Russia. This bids fair to bring about the complete isolation of the Bolsheviks in a short time, so that the only ones who will stand behind them will be a few capitalists and the Red Army. Nor is the army, too, likely to continue its support of the Bolsheviks very long, for military dictatorships must have military successes abroad and cannot thrive merely upon suppression of uprisings of hunger-driven peasants. In vain do the Bolsheviks seek to stem the tide against them. The only thing they still command in full is the art of destroying their opponents by means of falsehood and violence. They have shown a complete lack of understanding of the pre-requisites under which alone Socialist production is possible, as well as entire lack of perspicacity in determining the conditions essential for the development of capitalist production. In their aspiration for the realization of Socialism they have destroyed Russia's entire machinery of production, while their present effort to patch it up with the assistance of capitalism carries the danger of aggravating this destruction. But even should they succeed in establishing a new capitalism in Russia and to resume production with its assistance, they would do so in the presence of a proletariat which they themselves have rendered unfit for struggle and resistance.

In both cases, misery and poverty will continue to reign in Russia for many years and will continue to fan apathy and despair, on one side, and uprisings, provoked by the despair of the masses — on the other. The Moscow trial was intended to distract the growing opposition of the masses against the Bolsheviks and direct popular wrath against the Socialists-Revolutionists. How vain the effort! The arrow, in falling, struck the ones who fired it.

The Bolsheviki hoped to represent the accused Socialists-Revolutionists and their entire party as allies and associates of the counter-revolution and foreign powers. To accomplish this aim, they did not hesitate to employ the most shameless and dishonest methods of the regime of the old police. They outdid the limitless shamelessness of that regime, whose prosecutors, as is well known, needed but a few lines penned by the accused to send him to the gallows. With all that, however, the Bolsheviki succeeded only in exposing the mean depths of their own soul.

When the counter-revolution suppressed Marx's „Neue Rheinische Zeitung“, in 1849, Freiligrath branded this act in words of fire as contemptible violence. He said: „This is not an open blow in an open fight. Against me are barbarism and meanness. This blow has been struck against me by the forces of sneaky, dirty, despicable Asiatic barbarism“.

The defendants in the Moscow trial were likewise struck not by an open blow in an open fight. The blow struck against them was delivered by the hired, contemptible, low hirelings of Tartar or Kalmyk socialism.

But how innocent was the despicableness assailed by Freiligrath in comparison with the despicableness revealed by the Bolsheviki in the Moscow trial! The shameless falsehood, contemptible cowardice and devilish cruelty of the prosecutors, judges and secret service men revealed in the Moscow trial are unprecedented in the history of the world and will mark one of its most shameful pages.

How heroic do the figures of the accused men and women appear and how disgusting and pitiiful are the pack of hounds who demanded their blood, who hurled insult and humiliation upon them in their eagerness to persecute them in order that they might revel in their suffering!

The moral loftiness of the accused and the moral degeneration of their accusers at the trial were so selfevident and convincing, that the whole thing formed a picture of remarkable clarity and produced an indelible impression upon everybody, with the exception of the pack of bloodthirsty hounds hired by the Moscow executioners to defend their miserable case in the European press and who were low and mean enough to do it.

The accused Socialists-Revolutionists saved the honor of Socialism, trampled by the Bolsheviki. The names of Gotz, Timofeyeff and their comrades will be enshrined in the hearts of the workers of the entire world, regardless of party affiliations.

Never did the Bolsheviki descend to their present low level. Time was when we knew many of them as honest fighters and idealists. But the coup d'etat of 1917 placed them in a false position, which was bound to lead consistently to their inevitable and ever-growing perversion.

From the very beginning, they founded their power upon falsehood and violence directed against the proletariat, upon the principle that the end justifies the means. This principle always and inevitably leads to the degeneration of the party applying it, for it perverts the party and paralyzes those who do not oppose this perversion.

Parties who aspire to great aims cannot afford to use any other means than those these aims demand. A party who seeks the emancipation of the proletariat cannot, in its efforts to gain and hold power, use means which disorganize and demoralize the proletariat. But it was only by such means that the Bolsheviki could strengthen their hold upon Russia and, therefore, they preferred the destruction of the Russian and the weakening of the world proletariat to understanding with the other Socialist parties of Russia, which alone could secure the establishment of a revolutionary regime that would support itself upon the broad masses and give these masses that freedom without which it is impossible for them to promote their spiritual development and economic wellbeing.

By resorting for the sake of the strengthening and preservation of their power to measures leading to the weakening and dissolution of the proletariat, the Bolsheviki have shown that they are not concerned with the emancipation of the proletariat but are simply a clique concerning itself solely with the preservation of its own power.

This attribute of Bolshevism makes it akin to the heritage of the French Revolution: bonapartism. Like bonapartism, Bolshevism is founded upon falsehood and violence. But both the first and second Empires marked the opening of new eras of economic prosperity for France and could, there-

fore, support themselves not only upon the capitalists and peasantry but also upon the broad masses of the people. Bolshevism, on the other hand, has destroyed Russia and set all the people against it. Its falsehood and violence, therefore, exceed the falsehood and violence of French bonapartism. And for this reason, despite its falsehood, meanness and cruelty, Bolshevism will not be able to maintain itself as long as did the regime of Bonaparte in France.

The Moscow trial constituted a desperate effort on the part of the Bolsheviks to discredit their most dangerous opponents at the present moment in the eyes of the Russian and world proletariat. They sought to represent these opponents as associates of the counter-revolution and thus rehabilitate the prestige of Communism, which has lost the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of the proletariat.

But the Bolsheviks lost the trial. It is not the accused but the accusers and their hirelings who today stand condemned in Russia and throughout the world. This trial, which provoked the deepest, universal contempt, revealed even to those who hitherto still failed to see the truth, the utter decay and degeneration of the Bolshevik regime.

But the Moscow trial is merely one of the episodes incident to the world-wide, historic conflict conducted by Bolshevism. Out of this conflict it will emerge discredited and condemned. A regime like that of the Bolsheviks has already grown rotten-ripe for destruction. It is impossible to foresee yet when and how it will fall but one thing can be said now and with absolute certainty:

BOLSHEVISM WILL FALL IN SHAME AND DISGRACE, BEMOANED PERHAPS ONLY BY THE SPECULATORS OF THE CAPITALIST WORLD, BUT ACCOMPANIED BY THE CURSES OF THE ENTIRE WORLD PROLETARIAT STRUGGLING FOR EMANCIPATION. THAT IS THE LESSON AND THE HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSCOW TRIAL.

K. K a u t s k y.

**The Trial of the Socialists-
Revolutionists in Moscow**



A. R. Gotz — Α. Ρ. Γου

Cette tribune nous l'avons utilisée pour conter à la classe ouvrière notre activité passée. . . .

Et si cette confession que nous faisons est appelée à devenir notre testament, nous accomplirons jusqu'au but notre devoir révolutionnaire.

Oui, hélas! nous n'avons pas signé de pacte avec la victoire, il nous reste, à présent, à signer un pacte avec la mort. . . .

J'ignore ce que le sort nous prépare: la vie ou la mort. Si c'est la mort, nous mourrons en révolutionnaires, en la regardant vaillamment en face; si c'est la vie, nous continuerons à lutter en socialistes de toutes forces au nom des intérêts de la classe ouvrière. . A. Gotz

Diese Bühne benutzen wir, um der Arbeiterklasse von unserer früheren Tätigkeit zu berichten. . . .

Und sollte dieses Bekenntnis unser Testament sein — wir werden unsere revolutionäre Pflicht bis zu Ende erfüllen.

Ja wir haben mit dem Siege keinen Pakt geschlossen und müssen dafür jetzt einen Pakt mit dem Tode schließen. . . .

Ich weiß nicht, was uns das Schicksal beschieden hat: den Tod oder das Leben. Ist es der Tod — werden wir als Revolutionäre sterben, dem Tode kühn ins Angesicht blickend; ist es aber das Leben — werden wir als Sozialisten auch weiter mit aller Anstrengung zugunsten der Arbeiterklasse kämpfen. . . . A. Gotz

We have taken advantage of this pulpit to relate the story of our former activity to the working classes. . . .

If this credo is fated to become our legacy, we shall nevertheless do our duty as revolutionaries to the bitter end. Alas! It is true that we had not taken Victory into partnership and therefore now we must pay the penalty of partnership with Death. . . .

I am not sure whether it is Life or Death that Fate holds in store for us. If it be Death, we shall die as revolutionaries looking it straight in the face; if it be Life, we shall work on as socialists straining every effort in the interests of the working class. A. Gotz

Эту трибуну мы использовали для того, чтобы рассказать рабочему классу о своей прошлой деятельности. . . .

И если этой нашей исповеди суждено будет стать нашим завещанием — мы выполним свой революционный долг до конца.

Да, — увы! — мы не заключили договора с победой и в расплату за это намъ остается заключить теперь договоръ со смертью. . . .

Я не знаю, что суждено намъ судьбой: жизнь или смерть. Если смерть, — мы умремъ какъ революционеры, смѣло глядя ей прямо въ глаза; если жизнь, — мы будемъ и дальше бороться со всѣмъ напряженіемъ силъ какъ социалисты во имя интересовъ рабочаго класса. . . . A. Гоцъ

Použili jsme této tribuny, abychom pověděli dělnické třídě o své nekdjší působnosti. . . .

A jestli že tato naši zvěsti bude souzeno, aby se stala naší zvěstí, splnili jsme svou revoluční povinnost až do konce.

Ano — Běda my jsme nouzavřeli dohody s Vítězstvím a odplatou za to jest nam nyní uzavřiti dohodu se smrtí. . . .

Nevím, co nam osudem bude souzeno, zda život nebo smrt.

Jestliže smrt, — zemřeme jako revolucionáři, smeie hledece smrti přímo do očí; jestliže život-všemi silami jakožte socialisti i nadále budem zápasiti ve jměnu zajmu dělnické třídy. . . . A. Gotz

This trial, which has touched to the quick the conscience of the civilized world and has united in an outburst of protest all tendencies of socialist and democratic thought, all sections of the labor movement, — this unprecedented trial has been concluded with a monstrous verdict.

Twelve men who have sacrificed their youth, their life and all their strength to the cause of the emancipation of the workers and peasants of their country, to the cause of the Russian Revolution and International Socialism have been condemned to death by a court, pretending to be the bulwark of defense of the interests of the Revolution and Socialism.

The noose is thrown about their necks but those who hold the rope have not yet tightened it. They are still waiting.

What are they waiting for? Do they expect the condemned, weakened by the psychic tortures to which they and their near ones are subjected, to fall upon their knees before them? Do they expect that the party to which the condemned belong will for the sake of preserving their lives, abandon its struggle against the Soviet Government? No. It is not that that the Bolsheviki expect. They have simply chosen to postpone the execution to a moment suitable for them.

The fight is on for the lives of The Twelve Who Are To Die.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to contribute, if in small measure only, to the triumph of the truth in this fight.

The reader will find on these pages some information concerning the condemned as well as those who accused and tried them, the preparations for and development of the trial, the verdict and the echoes it provoked in Europe.

In trying to give as exact a picture as possible of the events bearing upon the Moscow trial, the author availed

himself of the reports of Bolshevik newspapers, Soviet radio grams, information supplied by the foreign members of the defense who participated in the early proceedings, the testimony of eyewitnesses and official documents. The author must admit that all these sources fail to give a complete picture of the case. Some sidelights, particularly unwelcome to the Soviet Government, remain untouched, but the facts and data which despite the efforts of the Bolsheviks to conceal them have come forth to the surface are sufficient to enable us to form an opinion in the Moscow trial.

The author of this pamphlet is a Social Democrat, a member of the party which differs in tactics from the party of Socialist Revolutionists. And it is not considerations of party politics but those conceptions of principle and right common to the Socialists of the entire world which determine his attitude in the matter.

I.

The Condemned.

Who are these twelve, sentenced to death by the Moscow tribunal for counter-revolutionary activity? Here are their names, dear to the whole of Revolutionary Russia.

1. Abraham Gotz; entered the Revolutionary Movement in 1900; beginning with the year 1904 one of the most active members of the fighting brigade of the Socialist Revolutionists, the organization so terrifying to the Czarist Government. Under his direct participation were organized attempts at assassination upon Minister of the Interior Durnovo, the suppressor of the Moscow rebellion in 1905, General Min and Colonel Riman, Minister of Justice Akimoff, the Mayor of Moscow Schuwaloff and the head of the Czarist Secret Service and Assistant Director of the Department of Police, Rachkovsky; his record is imprisonment in the fortress of St. Peter and Paul, in expectation of execution, trial by court martial, eight years of hard labor and exile to Siberia, where the Revolution of 1917 found him.

2. Eugene Timofeyeff; entered the revolutionary movement in 1900; sentenced by a Czarist court in 1905 to five years of hard labor and resented, shortly before the con-

clusion of his term, to 10 years; liberated from prison by the Revolution.

3. Gendelman, entered the revolutionary movement in 1898; in 1901 sent into the army as a private for participation in student disturbances; spent about 3 years in Czarist prisons.

4. Donskoy; entered the revolutionary movement in 1897; sent into the army as a private for participation in student disturbances; exiled thrice; spent 6 years in Czarist prisons.

5. Eugenia Ratner; joined the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists in 1903; arrested eight times under the Czarist regime; spent more than 6 years in Czarist prisons.

6. Gerstein; self-educated workman; in the revolutionary movement since 1898; previous record: four and half years' imprisonment and five years exile.

7. Nicolai Ivanoff; entered the revolutionary movement in 1906; member of the fighting brigade of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists; participated in the preparation for and the assassination of the Chief of the Prison Administration Maximoff, sentenced to death by the party for cruel treatment of political prisoners; also participated in the plot to blow up the Imperial Council in 1907; spent ten years at hard labor; was arrested by Kolchak but escaped death by flight.

8. Lichatch; entered revolutionary movement in 1903; spent two years in jail and six years in Siberian exile under the Czar.

9. Sergei Morozoff; member of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists since 1905; sentenced twice to hard labor; spent seven years at hard labor in various prisons.

10. Nicolai Artemieff; entered the revolutionary movement in 1903; in exile four times, spending part of it in the Turchansk district of the Polar region.

11. Helen Ivanova; entered the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists in 1905; member of the fighting brigade of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists; cooperated in the assassination of the Prison-Chief Goodim and the Police Chief of the Ochtinsk section Rodziersky, who was guilty of severe tortures of workmen in cells under his supervision; she also organized the assassination of the chief of the Petrograd pri-

son „Kresty“, and participated in the assassination of the Chief of the Prison Administration Maximovsky; condemned to death in 1908, the sentence being commuted to hard labor for life; regained her liberty with the revolution.

12. Vladimir Agapoff, the youngest of the condemned; entered the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists in 1909; exiled to Siberia under the Czar.

And thus the Twelve Who Are To Die have a total record of 240 years' service to the Revolution and the cause of the emancipation of Russia and a total record of 70 years' imprisonment. Five of them wore prison chains, two of them stood upon the gallows — Gotz and Ivanova —, two of them served two terms at hard labor. And it is these people whom the Bolshevik Government is attempting to represent as dangerous enemies of the revolution, as fierce foes of the toiling masses. And in preparing to murder them the absolutists of the Kremlin are seeking to convince the world that the salvation of the revolution demands the blood of these men and women.

The foregoing dispassionate figures do not however give the reader any idea of the spiritual makeup of the Twelve Who Are To Die. All of them entered the political struggle at that period of the Russian Revolution which knew neither commissars residing in Czarist halls, nor the lure of newspaper notoriety, nor brilliant careers made possible by flattery, servility, cruelty and disregard of means and method; they joined the revolutionary movement at a time when the calling of a revolutionist brought neither emolument, authority nor honor, when the lot of a revolutionist was suffering, danger, humiliation. And, true to themselves, they followed unflinchingly the road they had chosen.

The representatives of the Socialists internationale, who met them for the first time in a Bolshevik jail, immediately felt the flame that burns in the hearts of these Twelve and their comrades.

Here is what Emil Vandervelde wrote of the accused in the Moscow trial:

„Every day we visit the jail where the Socialists-Revolutionists are confined — an old structure of dark,

blood red hue. It is one the few places where people still dare to speak, — perhaps the only place I observed in Russia where human beings spoke freely, gaily, in unsubdued voice, disregarding whether or not the eye of Moscow is directed upon them. They are facing death. They are facing long imprisonment, but they laugh, they are gay, gay with the gayety of those who prepare to do battle for a dear cause.

„I have no space to describe for you all the accused. But out of the common background of their heroism stand out some of the brightest figures:

„Eugenia Ratner, — one of the two women in this great trial. Alas, the youth spent behind prison walls, first czarist and then under Lenine! But what a miracle to see her strength of character, unshaken by these experiences, combined with joyous grace, with love of life and unbounded faith in the ultimate triumph of the cause to which she has consecrated her life burning in her black eyes.

„Timofeyeff, former member of the Samara Government, overthrown by Kolchak. Before the war he was in Siberian exile. There he commanded such influence both among prisoners and administration that everybody called him „the prison chief“. It is he who is entrusted to deal with questions of foreign policy at the trial. We, his counsel, are called upon to defend him, to save him, but he thinks only of attack, of turning the trial instituted against him and his comrades into a trial of his enemies.

„If Timofeyeff is the minister of foreign affairs of this group, Gotz appears as leader of general policy. I met him in Petrograd in 1917. He was vice-president of the All-Russian Parliament of Labor, — the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. In our prison conferences Gotz always acts as spokesman for the accused. He comes of a well-to-do-family. His life need not have been a hard one. But with exception of a few months of liberty, in 1917, he spent most of his life in exile and in jail“.

(Brussels „People“.)

The other members of the defense, too, spoke and wrote of the accused as heroes. „We have no such people in our country!“ said Kurt Rosenfeld in deep emotion.

We would like to add a few words to these opinions:

The author of these lines had the good fortune to work with some of the condemned in the revolutionary movement. He made the acquaintance of some of the others in Siberia, at the Alexandrovsk penitentiary. The prisoners there belonged to various parties: Mensheviki, Socialists-Revolutionists, Bolsheviki, and anarchists. But there was no one among us who did not cherish the deepest respect and warmest sympathy for Gotz and Timofeyeff. Both of them were the „representatives“ of the prisoners in their relations with the administration, both of them were regarded by the comrades as representatives of the noblest revolutionary traditions —fearlessness before the foe, stoicism in trial and danger, and devotion to the common cause. Nor can the Bolsheviki who were prison partners of Gotz and Timofeyeff have forgotten them. Why, then, did not these former comrades of the present condemned speak out in protest in the course of the trial? Why did they not cry out to their party followers, intoxicated with blood and power: „Halt!“

One would have thought that at least some of the Bolsheviki, would feel the prick of conscience. One would have thought that at least those of the Bolsheviki whose lives Gotz had saved at the risk of his own head from the hands of infuriated mobs in the July uprising of 1917, would have come forward to speak a word of protest. No! No Bolshevik dared not violate his party „discipline“.

Writing to a member of the Moscow Government Gorky said:

„If the trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists results in murder it will be preconceived, contemptible murder. I beg you to transmit this opinion to L. D. Trotzky and the others. I hope it will not surprise you, for throughout the revolution. I have pointed out repeatedly the crime and stupidity of rooting out the intelligenzia in our illiterate and uncultured country.

„Today I am convinced that the murder of the Socialists-Revolutionists would provoke a moral blockade of Russia by the whole of Socialist Europe“.

But the murder of political opponents has become too common an occurrence for the Bolshevik government and Gorkys condemnation as „preconceived murder“ of the latest Bolshevik crime is not sufficient to prevent it. For this kind of murder is not a matter of recent development stet the Bolsheviks: This is the fifth year since the blood of workmen and peasants began to flow in Russia. And nothing has been done to stop it. The Moscow absolutists were able to „put it over“, for there remained in Europe and in America a sufficient number of people ready to see in the Soviet Government the torchbearer of the triumphant revolution. Was there anything to prevent the Bolsheviks from carrying out another experiment?

The Moscow trial is the last link in the long chain of persecution of Socialists in Soviet Russia. A brief explanation of the character of these persecutions will enable the reader to understand what the Supreme Tribunal which tried the Socialists-Revolutionists represented.

II.

The persecution of Socialists in Russia.

The persecution of Socialists in Russia began almost from the very first day of the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks. At first scattered and chaotic, these persecutions eventually assumed the form of a regular, definite system, embodied in a whole series of specially created government bodies, and became one of the government's main objects and one of the chief functions of the Communist „cells“.

This follows from the very nature of Bolshevism. The basic idea of Bolshevism is the dictatorship of the minority over the majority, of the party over the working class and all the people. This idea determined and defined the life road of the Bolshevik Party. Having started out with the idea of the necessity of its dictatorship in the interest of revolutionary emancipation of the toiling masses, the Bol-

shevist Party arrived at the point inevitable for any dictatorship — to despotism, to merciless suppression of all self-reliance and independent activity of the people, to the denial of all principle for the sake of the naked preservation of its power. Thus a government which has come into power in the course of revolution and has preserved all superficial attributes of revolutionary substance has in reality revived all the despotic methods of Czarism and has destroyed all the conquests of the revolution.

There is no greater danger for the Bolshevik Government than the awakening of class consciousness and independent activity of the masses of workers and peasants, for once the masses realize their interests and their power they will inevitably seek to take power into their own hands and will hurl their absolutist rulers — no matter under what flag they may be sailing — off their necks. Right here is the source of all bolshevik hatred against the Socialist parties in Russia, who not only defend the principle of democracy and popular rule but are the representatives of activist self reliance of the toilers, of the workers and peasants.

. The Mensheviks are anathema to the Moscow Government as the class party of the proletariat, and the Socialist-Revolutionists, as the party competing with the bolsheviks for support of the peasantry. Which is the most dangerous enemy? This has long been a matter of dispute among the Soviet ochraniks. Some of the chekists believe that the Mensheviks are most dangerous because this party may eventually move the worker's battalions against the Bolshevik dictatorship. Others consider that the greatest danger looms from the Socialist-Revolutionists because the peasant masses, once under their influence, may wipe out all the results of soviet experimentation. These two tendencies in this theoretical dispute have found a compromise in the persecution of Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionists and non-partisans. This takes the form of jailing, exile or execution of all those whose work threatens to stimulate the activity and self-consciousness of the masses or to promote the solidarity and independent organization of the workers and peasants. In other words, the motives and purposes which actuated Czarism in the persecution of Socia-

lists are the same which actuate the Soviet Government today. The representatives of authority have changed but the old despotic order remains, and that is why the prison cells continue as before to be filled with political prisoners and the personnel of these „politicals“ under the Bolsheviki, in its overwhelming majority, continues the same.

But arrests, imprisonment and exile are not the only measures employed by the Soviet Government in its struggle with heresy: the chief measure is execution, capital punishment.

The Bolsheviki assert that they resort to capital punishment as a necessary means of defense of the workers' and peasants' government against counter revolutionists, against „the enemies of labor“. This assertion is contradicted by the fact that since the establishment of the Bolshevik government in Russia there has been no cessation of mass executions of workers and peasants. It is sufficient to recall such events as the shooting up of the workers' demonstration in defense of the Constituent Assembly in Petrograd, January 5, 1918; the mass slaughter at Astrachan, when thousands of workers were shot, sabered or drowned in the Volga for demanding bread, — to be more exact, for demanding the reestablishment of free trade in grain; the bombardment of Elisavetpol in Azerbaidjan, when 20 000 mussulmen, in the overwhelming majority workers and peasants, were murdered; the repeated shooting of strikers in all large cities of Soviet Russia; the firing upon workmens' meetings for adoption of anti-bolshevist resolutions; the shooting of peasant hostages for the desertion of recruits or in reprisal for the activity of partisan detachments; the shooting of peasants or the destruction of whole villages for non-payment of grain taxes.

Who will undertake to measure the blood of workmen and peasants shed in those terrible days of 1918 when a wave of execution of hostages in reprisal for the assassination attempt on Lenine swept the whole of Russia?

And here is another illustration: In evacuating Sarapul at the height of the civil war in 1918, the Bolsheviki, finding it difficult to take their local prisoners along with them, decided to clear the jails by mass execution of all inmates. Among those killed was a leader of the Petrograd and Ural workers, member of the Central Committee of the Socialist-

Revolutionist Party, the worker Ivan Teterkin. Many other workers perished with him.

Take the following case: in 1921 the Bolsheviki loaded a barge with 600 prisoners taken from various Petrograd jails with orders to deliver them to Kronstadt. On reaching a deep point between Petrograd and Kronstadt the barge was sunk. All the prisoners, with the exception of one who succeeded in reaching the Finnish shore, lost their lives.

Here is another illustration:

Hand in hand with mass executions in Soviet Russia, there are also individual executions of Socialists. Thus in Astrachan, in 1918, there were executed 15 Socialists-Revolutionists, assembled for a provincial conference. Thus in the famous Saratoff „ravine“, in 1918—1919, fifteen hundred human beings, gathered by special blacklist or seized at random, lost their lives. Among them rest the bodies of a number of prominent members of this party. Thus in the Kuban, in 1920, were executed leaders of the struggle against Denikin, peasants whose influence upon the population was feared by the Soviet Government. Thus in the same year, following the occupation of Baku, the Bolsheviki murdered the leaders of the local labor movement, among them the Socialist-Revolutionist Zimin, who had exposed the slaughter of 26 Bolshevik commissars by Denikin (the Bolsheviki explained later that Zimin was killed by mistake).

The memorandum submitted April 2, 1922, by the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists to the Berlin conference of the three internationales points out that among those who perished was the old revolutionist and member of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists, Strumilo-Petrashkevitch, the party veteran Alexander Turba, the member of the Constituent Assembly and representative of the peasants of his district Gorelin, the wellknown local party workers Timofeyeff, Chari-onoff, Livsin, Kurbatoff and others.

There is hardly a province or a city in Russia that has not witnessed the execution of Socialists within the past few years. Among the victims are names known throughout Russia:

Onipko, member of the First Duma and hero of the Kronstadt revolt of 1905.

Almazoff, wellknown educational leader and writer. Cohan-Bernstein, an old Socialist-Revolutionist and party worker.

Boris Flekel, accused of being Kerensky's secretary, which, by the way, he never was.

Samuel Fineberg, one of the most prominent leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party in Siberia.

Concerning the latter we may add the following details: a prison comrade of Gotz and Timofeyeff and their close friend, Fineberg no doubt would have been tried and sentenced to death together with them had not the Bolsheviki executed him long before without trial. They executed him as a „counter-revolutionist“ at Irkutsk, the very same Irkutsk which was captured by the Socialists-Revolutionists from Kolchak after two days' battle and where the Socialists-Revolutionists released from jail some 1000 prisoners, principally Bolsheviki, set there by Kolchak from all parts of Siberia. Fineberg's past record was death sentence, fifteen years of hard labor and many years of imprisonment in the most terrible of all Czarist prisons, — the Orloff „zentral“.

Is it still necessary to ennumerate here other proletarians, Social-Democrats, murdered by the Bolsheviki, or to list the „crimes“ for which they were executed? Here they are:

Tuliakoff — workman, member of the Fourth Duma, leader of the Don region; executed on order of the Che-Ka in 1918.

Krakowsky, a workman of the Sestrorietzk plant; executed by the Tamboff Che-Ka as a „counter-revolutionist“.

Samushkin, executed at Vitebsk in October, 1918, for distributing leaflets among representatives of the local conference of factory employees, arrested in a body by the Bolsheviki.

Levin, chairman of the Ribinsk soviet of trade unions.

Rom, secretary of the same organization.

Sokoloff, chairman of the Ribinsk Workmen's Sick Benefit Fund and of the local Social-Democratic Committee, executed for leading a twenty, four hour strike called in support of the

demand of freedom of trade union organization, cessation of the terror and modification of the government's food policy.

Anarchists and Socialists-Revolutionists of the left wing, who in October, 1917, helped the Bolsheviki in their coup d'état, have been executed by the bolsheviki with even lesser concern.

We have not attempted to enumerate all Socialists who have perished in Soviet Russia. These are but a few lines of the endless book, but they are sufficient to illumine the psychology of the Bolsheviki, who cannot understand the cause of the mighty protests raised by the Socialists of Western Europe against their attempt to hurl into the bottomless grave of their victims the corpses of twelve more Socialists.

The reader who may desire to familiarize himself more thoroughly with this phase of soviet reconstruction will find some additional details in the anthology „Tche-Ka“, in „Two Years of Travail“ by Dan, in the memorandum presented to the Berlin conference of the three internationales by the Socialist-Revolutionist Party, in the columns of the „Socialistichesky Viestnik“, „Revoluzionnaya Rossia“, and other Socialist publications abroad. The reader will also find therein some detailed information concerning the tortures to which prisoners are subjected by the Soviet Government to compell „sincere confession“. For this, too, is one of the means by which the Bolsheviki fight heresy. As under Czarism, this method is rarely applied to political prisoners more or less well-known. But simple workmen and ignorant peasants who fall into the hands of the Che-Ka are, together with pure criminals, subjected to merciless assaults and painful tortures. In such cases the weapons of the Che-Ka hangmen are na-gaikas, blackjacks, knives and the butt ends of rifles and revolvers. But the most favored weapon of the Komintern's servants is torture by threat of death. After putting a person through examination he is stripped naked and put up against the wall. He is then fired upon, with the bullet whistling past his ear, the impression suggested being that the shot missed its mark. The questioning is then resumed or the man is taken back to his cell with the explanation that this was merely the rehearsal. Sometimes he is informed that

his father, mother or wife would be shot. By this method the man is forced to confess or to squeel, following which either the man who confessed or the person he has betrayed is executed.

The mere physical annihilation of opponents, however, does not satisfy the Bolsheviki. They seek also what they term the „moral annihilation“ of those who stand in their way. This is achieved by slandering and calumniating accused and prisoners. Every wholesale arrest of Socialists, every transfer of them from one prison to another, every case of exile, every assault on prisoners, every execution, and especially every trial, is accompanied by a stream of slander and abuse in the columns of the press. And there is no chance of reply or defense, for all newspapers in Russia are in the hands of the ruling party. The mouth of the opposition is shut. How free indeed is life for the Radeks, Bucharins and Stekloffs! How free they are to lie, slander and villify their enemies, for the latter are disarmed, defenseless, bound hand and foot, silent as the grave that awaits them. Nowhere and at no time were liars, professional and natural, been so well armed as under the soviet regime.

All this is woven into a regular system. Such „moral annihilation“ of opponents is regarded as of too great importance to entrust it entirely to the press, for in this work the publicists of the Komintern have the assistance of Che-Ka investigators, prosecutors and judges.

It is only necessary to recall the government announcements of plot discoveries — long-winded announcements in which the names of Socialists are purposely intermingled with the names of reactionaries. Some of these announcements reach the European press, which has now learned, however, to understand these inventions as excuses for new repressions. Arrests, exile, executions are the purpose. The invention of plots is the means. These, however, are sometimes reversed, when the purpose of the bolshevist ochrana is to slander a hated party. In such instances a „case“ is framed up. To cover up the stupidity of the charge the accused are sentenced to death. To prevent possible exposure the condemned are murdered in the cells of the Che-Ka.

Only those cases are brought to public trial which have „a propaganda value“, i. e. those where the purpose is to slander the accused. And the judges understand well what the Soviet Government expect of them. It would therefore be entirely naive to expect impartiality, independence of judgement or respect for law on the part of Soviet judges. There is no difference whatever in the moral level or judicial conscience of a Soviet judge or prosecutor, and a Che-Ka executioner. The judge, prosecutor and executioner receive the same orders: to do the will of the powers that be and put the intended victim out of the way. The only difference is that the judge and prosecutor work by the light of day, while the executioner works in the darkness of the dungeon cell.

The bolshevist prosecutor's ever present assistant is the provocateur. This creature's work is surrounded with particular glory under the Bolshevik regime.

All the elements herein mentioned were at work in the Moscow trial: the two-fold purpose of physical and moral annihilation, the accompaniment of the trial by a press campaign, the presence of judges representing the Che-Ka and of prosecutors with the mental make-up of executioners, torture by keeping the victims in suspense, humiliation and mockery of the accused.

The people demanding bread are offered the spectacle of executions. This spectacle is surrounded by a superficial form of judicial procedure, in proof of the fact that the establishment of „law and order“ in the country in no way indicates that the Soviet Government has in any way rendered itself helpless against heresy. This is intended to reassure the ruling party, to raise the spirits of its members and to give „intellectual food“ for propaganda.

Thus under all despotisms does terrorism have its ebb and flow. Its forms change in accordance with the fear or sense of security that may animate the government at given moments.

The material in the case of the Socialists-Revolutionists was supplied to the Moscow government by the provocateurs Semionoff-Vassilieff and Konopliowa.

III.

Provocateurs in the service of the Soviet Government.

Semionoff and Konopliowa, whose names have recently appeared so frequently in the press, are not particularly striking characters. Their chief characteristics are complete amorality and a perverted taste for strong sensations.

Semionoff made his first appearance in political life in 1917. He was a private attached to an engineers regiment of the 12th army and, with the revolution, was chosen a member of the army committee by his regiment. He termed himself a Socialist-Revolutionist, and since with the outbreak of the revolution and the downfall of Czarism all revolutionary parties in Russia worked openly and above board, without scrutinizing carefully the vast stream of new members that poured into their ranks, there was no particular objection to Semionoff's admission into the party. He was admitted without close questioning as to his origin and as to how he came to embrace Socialism and the revolution. The other stages of his development are outlined in his so-called confession, — the pamphlet published by the Soviet Government in Berlin, in preparation for the trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists, and in the testimony of witnesses, given partly at the trial or published in the European Socialist press. At the time of the October coup d'etat Semionoff worked with the military committee attached to the Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. At this early point, at the end of 1917, he already came into conflict with the party because of his demand for terroristic action against the Bolsheviks, in contradiction with the policy of the party. (1.)

After the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly Semionoff and Konopliowa organized a fighting brigade of their own, composed of several workmen and a few inexperienced youths.

In the name of his group Semionoff suggested to the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists the organization of a terroristic campaign against the heads of the Soviet Govern-

(1) See Semionoffs Berlin pamphlet.

ment. The Central Committee rejected the suggestion. (2) Despite this, however, a member of the Semionoff group, a certain workman Sergeyeff, assassinated Volodarsky on meeting him accidentally in the street. The Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists publicly disavowed this act. Semionoff was severely censured, being informed that he deserved the severest punishment for breaking the party discipline, particularly under the difficult circumstances then existing. (3) Unfortunately the party could not rid itself of this dangerous adventurer. Semionoff soon came forward with a series of other irresponsible projects, all of which met with the same rejection and disapproval. He then launched upon several terroristic enterprises without the sanction of and in defiance of the party's responsible organs. In these he deceived his followers by telling them that he acted with the approval of the Central Committee. (1) Thus he carried out expropriations of a purely criminal character, organized and prepared assassinations, etc. (2)

Semionoff was arrested in the summer of 1918, at the height of the civil war. While a prisoner on the Lubyanka he attempted to escape after firing upon a guard. He was captured and was confronted by the prospect of certain execution. He then addressed a plea for pardon to Lenine, got into communication with Dzjersinsky, chief of the Bolshevik gendarmerie, and obtained his release. He left prison a fullfledged member of the Bolshevik Party entrusted with a special, confidential task: to work in the party of Socialists-Revolutionists as an informer. Great indeed must have been the service of this man to the bolshevist hangmen and exceptionally low must he have revealed himself to obtain not only his own amnesty and freedom but also an honorable place in the ranks of the Russian Communist Party.

(2) This fact was clearly established at the trial.

(3) See the testimony of B. Rabinovitch, „Golos Rossii“, No. 918.

(1) This was corroborated by all witnesses at the trial. Particularly interesting information on this point is found in the testimony of M. Tislenko, published in „Golos Rossii“, No. 923.

(2) See Semionoff's Berlin pamphlet.



Е. М. Тимофеев — E. M. Timofeeff

Nous avons servi l'avenir et ne voulons servir que lui. Vos lauriers actuels ne nous tentent pas et ne nous ferons pas abandonner notre vole. . . .

Timofeev

Wir dienen der Zukunft und wollten nur ihr dienen. Eure Oegenwartsloerbeeren locken uns aber nicht und ihretwegen werden wir von unserem Wege nicht um Haaresbreite abweichen. . . .

Timofelew

We have worked for the Future, we intend to work for it and for nothing else; your present power has no attraction for us, therefore we would never go out of our way to attain it.

Timofeleff

Мы служили будущему и хотим служить только ему. Ваши лавры современности насъ не соблазняютъ и ради нихъ мы ни въ чемъ не отступимъ отъ своей стези. . . .

Тимофеевъ

Sloužili jsme budoucnosti a pouze ji chceme sloužiti. Vaše vavřiny přítomnosti nás nelekají a my pro ni v ničem nesejdeme se své cesty.

Timofejev

There is reason to assume that at that time Semionoff revealed to the Soviet ochrana all details of Volodarsky's assassination as well as all the material which was to form the basis of the trial three and a half years later. But at that time there was much talk of abandonment by the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists of its armed struggle against the Soviet Government, the „legalization“ of the Party and amnesty for its members. This was not a convenient moment for making use of this material.

Be that as it may, the Bolsheviki realized that they had in Semionoff a valuable acquisition, for in Soviet Russia there is a great demand for provocateurs. As early as in 1918, the Soviet Government adopted the policy of employing provocateurs in the ranks of the Socialists-Revolutionists and Mensheviks. Later in its career the Soviet Government organized a network of provocateurs extending beyond the fondest dreams of the Czarist police.

The ochranniks of the Third Internationale recruited their army of provocateurs by the method employed by the Czar's gendarmes — by threat of execution. An investigation in the Butyrki prison has revealed that between November, 1920, and February, 1921, no less than 150 men, or 40% of the prisoners, were approached by agents of the Che-Ka with the proposal to do provocateur work. 30% of these were threatened with execution as an alternative.

Thus, on becoming an agent of the Che-Ka, Semionoff found before him many competitors. The majority of these, however; were small fry, creatures low and miserable, but not beyond the measure characterizing their usual, professional requirements. Semionoff-Vassilieff and Konopliowa advanced rapidly in their new work and having won their spurs as common, vulgar traitors and informers were soon promoted to the position of pillars of the international, communist revolution.

The „Sozialistichesky Viestnik“ contributes the following additional information on Semionoffs career:

„During the Russo-Polish war Semionoff was arrested by the Poles with a group of other Russians accused of espionage. All of the prisoners were executed, with exception of Semionoff. Instead we find him working immediately after-

ward as agent for Boris Savinkoff, this condotiere of the reaction and himself an agent for Pilsudsky. After receiving from Savinkoff some cash and instructions Semionoff returned to Moscow and at once reported to the Che-Ka, where he declared that Savinkoff entrusted him with the task of assassinating Lenine. He revealed to the Che-Ka the names of Savinkoff's other agents and his plans for the destruction of strategic railways, arsenals, etc. It was then that the Bolsheviks first attempted to utilize this provocateur's „sincere confession“ as the basis of their frame-up against the Socialists-Revolutionists. The Che-Ka announced officially that a certain „witness“ (whose name it kept secret) had exposed the close cooperation of the Socialists-Revolutionists with Savinkoff's agents. Because of that, the Che-Ka announced, the members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists would be held as hostages and would be executed immediately in event of assassination upon any member of the Soviet of Peoples Commissaries.

„But the blow aimed at the Socialists-Revolutionists failed. The idea of their plotting with Savinkoff, the friend of Wrangel and the mad Burtzeff, was so monstrous and improbable that even the Communists themselves did not believe it. Dzjersinsky himself, head of the Che-Ka, personally visited Gotz and the other leaders of the Socialists-Revolutionists in Butyrki prison and informed them that the Che-Ka's threat would under no circumstances be carried out.“

But what the Bolsheviks did not venture upon in 1920, they undertook without scruple two years later.

In February, 1922, Semionoff published his Berlin pamphlet, allegedly intended as an expose of the military and terroristic activity of the Socialists-Revolutionists. The pamphlet apparently constituted a repetition of the material supplied by Semionoff to Dzjersinsky at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919. In his pamphlet Semionoff discusses his own work as member of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists during 1918, „directed against the interests of the peasants and workers“, and reveals the crimes of the enemies of the Soviet Government.

The pamphlet is written in the classic style of the police informer. Pictures of expropriations, murders, attempts at

assassination, and especially names, names and names, follow upon each other with kaleidoscopic speed. Altogether no less than 93 persons are incriminated in the small pamphlet. If during his sojourn in Warsaw Semionoff has betrayed as many persons to Savinkoff, and as many more upon his return to Moscow from Poland, then, indeed, is he fit to occupy a leading place among the authors of the Moscow trial, and quite correct was Frossard when in his correspondence to the „Humanite“ he characterized him as a perfect type of communist, physically and morally.

The general substance of Semionoff's testimony is that the Central Committee of the Socialists - Revolutionists was aware of all his (Semionoff's) martial enterprises and approved them secretly while disavowing them publicly.

Vandervelde gave a juridical estimate of the value of this testimony in a few words:

„Semionoff's entire accusation rests upon the allegation that the assassination plots he carried out were undertaken with the approval of the Central Committee, each of which, however, were regularly disavowed by the Committee. Nevertheless he continued engineering his plots, and the party continued to disavow them, while he, despite this conduct of the Central Committee, persisted in manufacturing new assassination plots. Is this likely? It is quite clear that all this is pure invention on the part of Semionoff, concocted long after, in cooperation with those who inspired him.“

Vandervelde's conclusion is: „No normal court could possibly accept such testimony“. The leader of the Belgian proletariat does not seem to know, however, that such testimony is in accord with old gendarm traditions: district attorneys under Czarism would always aim, in revealing at a trial the name of a witness-informer, to utilize this name and testimony in as great a number of cases as possible. The author of this book, while serving a term in the Ekaterinoslav jail, made the acquaintance of an old semi-illiterate railway guard upon whose testimony and information the Czarist district attorney based his accusation against 102 anarchists (the old guard himself figured in the trial as the 103rd defendant). The

impression aimed at was that the witness knew about all the expropriations and assaults carried out or contemplated throughout the province. He was supposed to have spoken personally with the leaders of these anarchists and thus there could be no doubt that the entire group was collectively responsible in every case. Thus, under Czarism, a provocateur's testimony underwent thorough preparatory dressing before it was offered at the trial. The Bolshevik ochranka could not abandon this good, old method, tried and true. It could not forego the preparatory, literary confession of its agent. It felt itself obliged to coach him to show him how to group and illumine his facts, what to add and what to eliminate — for do not two or three words or an accidental conversation with members of the Central Committee of the accused organization alter the entire perspective of a situation? It is natural therefore that Semionoff's Berlin pamphlet and his testimony in court should have been the collective product of the Che-Ka's creative genius.

Comrade Vandervelde will say this makes the testimony as a whole unworthy of trust and deprives it of any value in the eyes of a normal court! But what can we do? The Czarist gendarmes never hesitated to make use of such testimony and the new Red gendarmerie differs from the old only in greater ignorance and shamelessness.

IV.

On the eve of the Moscow trial.

With the appearance of the first report from Moscow of the proposed trial of 47 Socialists-Revolutionists before the Supreme Tribunal for alleged terroristic acts and with the very beginning of the bloodthirsty cries of the Communist press in Russia and abroad it became clear to everybody that what was being contemplated in Moscow was a peculiar species of judicial murder.

At the conference of the three internationales in Berlin (in April, 1922) the Socialists of Europe demanded that the Bolsheviki abandon their terror in Russia. The Bolsheviki naturally rejected this demand, but being badly in need of a

„united front“ with the Socialists of Western Europe at that moment (the eve of the Genoa conference) and as the Western Socialists, true to their bourgeois, traitorous character, refused to form a united front with hangmen and executioners, the representatives of the Third Internationale added their signatures to those of the representatives of the Second and Vienna Internationales to a general declaration which contained the following references to the proposed Moscow trial:

„The conference takes note of the declaration of the representatives of the Third Internationale to the effect that all counsel who may be chosen by the accused would be admitted to the trial of the 47 Socialists-Revolutionists; that, as has already been pointed out in the soviet press prior to the conference, there will be no death sentences imposed at this trial; and that, in view of the public hearing of this trial, representatives of all three Executive Committees (i. e. of the three Internationales — V. V.) may be present as observers, who will be permitted to take stenographic records for the information of the parties represented by these executive committees“.

This agreement made possible the participation of representatives of Western Socialist Parties at the trial. This agreement was unfavorably received in the Kremlin. In an editorial, in the „Pravda“, April 11, under the heading „We Have Paid Too Much“, Lenine said:

„In my opinion, our delegates acted improperly when they agreed to accept the following conditions: 1) that the Soviet Government will not render a single death verdict in the case of the 47 Socialists-Revolutionists; and 2) that representatives of the three Internationales would be permitted to be present at the Trial. These conditions represent nothing else than a political concession. . . . But what are the concessions made to us by the international bourgeoisie? The answer is: none. What, therefore, are the conclusions to be drawn from this. In my opinion, Radek, Bucharin and the other representatives of the Communist Internationale acted improperly in making concessions without assuring for themselves corresponding concessions by the other side. This need

not, however, lead us to the conclusion that the agreement should be nullified. Such a conclusion would be wrong. We must simply draw the lesson that in this case the bourgeois diplomats proved themselves more skillful than our own and that we must learn to manoeuvre and act more skillfully in the future“.

Thus, after upbraiding his unskillful envoys, the supreme ruler of Soviet Russia none the less accepted the declaration signed by them and agreed to by the Executive Committee of the Communist Internationale, as binding upon the Soviet Government. But in May of this year, i. e. not more than a month after the foregoing agreement had been concluded, the Rote Fahne launched a campaign intended to prove that the Berlin agreement was in no way binding upon the Bolsheviki. The Bolsheviki, the paper contended, would be idiots if they undertook to carry out the obligation they assumed with regard to the admittance of counsel. This, however, appeared for some time to be merely the opinion of this „independent“ Communist organ. The Moscow government did not venture immediately to declare the obligations it assumed a scrap of paper. It did not venture to do so even after it had already been compelled to abandon its hypocritical efforts for the establishment of a „united front“ of the Socialist parties of Europe. Thus, upon the dissolution of the Committee of Nine (the committee chosen to represent the three internationales following the Berlin conference) the Communist delegate Radek thought it necessary to declare officially that the failure of the „united front“ negotiations in no way nullified that part of the Berlin declaration bearing upon the pending trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists.

Considering themselves bound by the declaration the Bolsheviki agreed, after distinct hesitation, to admit foreign counsel. But the role they had assigned these foreign attorneys from the very beginning in the forthcoming trial is manifested in the following leader taken from the „Pravda“ of April 11.

„The Second Internationale has transmitted a communication demanding the admission of ten social-traitors, lackeys of the bourgeoisie, as counsel for the Socialist-Revolutionist incendiaries and murderers. Among these fellows is a former bourgeois minister of France and

three Russian Socialists-Revolutionists, who are themselves guilty of the treachery and crimes of their party colleagues (we use the word „party“ reservedly). The very list itself is a monument of brazeness. . . . Proletarian Russia has succeeded in crushing her foes but she is not yet secure against possible treacherous blows from the rear. And if the Second Internationale ventures to send here its „favorites“, permitting them to make use of its trademark, it must expect a corresponding welcome for them on our part. By the Berlin agreement we have agreed to admit freely-chosen counsel to the court trial. We will carry out this obligation the letter. But so far as the situation outside the limits of the court is concerned, these gentlemen must be so treated as to protect our country against their espionage and the incendiary tactics of these rascals, who on one hand engage in the murder of labor's leaders and, on the other, are too cowardly to admit it, continuing all the while to burn, to lie and to deceive those of their misled comrades whom they assign to the most dangerous posts“.

Is it possible to conceive anything more brazen than the style and tone of this editorial? Yet it shows the „Pravda“ to be conscious of the obligations of the Berlin agreement. This made it possible to continue negotiations with the Bolsheviki with regard to the organization of the defense. Finally, Vandervelde, Waters, Kurt Rosenfeld and Theodore Liebknecht (the first two being representatives of the Belgian Labor Party and the others of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany), supporting themselves on the Berlin agreement, left for Russia, knowing full well that what awaited them were insults, humiliations and even possible personal danger.

The representatives of the Socialist proletariat of Europe arrived in Moscow May 26. The trial began June 8, i. e. there were actually two trials with a double purpose: first the „moral annihilation“ of the Soviet Government's enemies and, second, the preparation of the ground for their murder. On one hand, the Bolsheviki unleashed a campaign of „popular wrath“, and, on the other, combined with this campaign of slander, proceeded the comedy of the trial.

V.

Staging of Popular Wrath.

The purpose of the Bolsheviki in this campaign was not simply to prepare public opinion for the execution, for if the more execution of twelve more Socialists had been the purpose the Bolsheviki could have accomplished that without the beating of tom-toms, — under the guise of „le fuga“. somewhere in the vicinity of Moscow, for example. The problem the Bolsheviki had set for themselves was to c o m p e l l the workers to demand the execution and by the campaign of villification against the accused and their counsel to raise the spirit within the Communist Party itself and encourage Bolshevik sentiment among the non-partisan workers.

On the very frontier of Soviet Russia the representatives of the Internationale rushing to the defense of the Socialists were met by a hostile demonstration. Such demonstrations marked the rest of their journey to Moscow. The Soviet press was enthusiastic in its reports of these demonstrations. Lack of space forbids reproduction of these reports. We will confine ourselves to the characterization given of this staging of „popular wrath“ by Märtoff in his „Sozialistichesky Viestnik“:

„In Sebezsh, Velikija Luki, Volokolamsk and, finally, at the Windau railway station in Moscow crowds were assembled, driven together by the authorities, composed of Che-Ka agents and Communist appointees. These crowds, representing allegedly the „Russian proletariat“ attacked the train bearing the counsel for the defense with the demand that they explain their „counter-revolutionary“ action in offering to defend the accused Socialists-Revolutionists. At the frontier station of Sebezsh, the population of which, outside of some Jewish tradesmen, consists of contrabandists and Che-Ka spies, who work together on a „fifty-fifty“ busis, there suddenly appeared upon the scene the „vanguard of the world proletariat“, fully conversant in the sins of Vandervelde and eager to interrogate him as to why he signed the Versailles peace treaty. Naturally, this „vanguard“ was already fully aware, long before the opening of the trial, that the assassination of

Volodarsky and the attack on Lenine were organized by the Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists and that the very willingness of the counsel for the defense to appear in their behalf was tantamount to participation in the crimes. No less enlightened was the „proletariat“ at Velikija Luki, with this addition: that the „proletariat“ of this world centre was entrusted with the task of bringing „moral pressure“ to bear upon the representatives of the 2nd and 2^{1/2} Internationales by smashing the train windows and, according to the correspondent of the London Daily Herald, by firing upon the train. The shot was probably fired by some Che-Ka agent transformed for the occasion into a representative of the Russian proletariat“.

The preparations made for welcoming the defense at the Windau station in Moscow were of a more elaborate character. Here is what happened, according to the „Pravda“ of May 27:

„As early as one o'clock organized groups of people, singing and with flags and banners, began assembling about the Windau station. One huge banner depicted the King of Belgium, with Vandervelde beside him. Beneath the portraits, in huge letters, was the following inscription: „Mr. Royal Minister Vandervelde, when will you be brought to trial before the revolutionary tribunal?“

„Another banner, addressed to Liebknecht, bore the legend: „Cain, Cain, where is thy brother Karl?“

„Other banners were decorated with the inscriptions: „Down with the defense of those whose hands are steeped in the blood of the workers!“ „Shame on Theodore Liebknecht, defender of his brother's murderers!“ The inscriptions were in various languages: Russian, French and German.“

To complete the picture, there was a choir of singers, who had thoroughly mastered the special song prepared by some official poet and bristling with insults against Vandervelde. Permit me to quote this song in full, as an eloquent illustration of the cultural and moral level of the Kremlin dictators who had staged this demonstration:

„Vandervelde is coming,
We will meet him merrily,
Of all the Menshevist lackeys
He is the biggest lackey.

He is coming to us,
The universal ignoramus.
The guests, of course, are welcome
But a pity 'tis, my friends
That we cannot hang them here.

Himself a first-class murderer,
The scoundrel realized at once
That his own end would come
When we convict the Essers.“

In the chaos of shouts, whistling and threats, Kurt Rosenfeld managed to catch sight of the leader of this scene, who himself was busily engaged, with fingers in his mouth, in adding to shrillness of the whistling. This man was Bucharin, member of the Socialist Academy of Science, one of the chieftains of the Third Internationale, a leading grandee of the Soviet State and Semionoff-Vassilieff's counsel at the trial.

The next day, May 28, the villification of the Socialists-Revolutionists and their counsel assumed a different form: a squad of clowns, dressed for the occasion, in gaily decorated automobiles bearing improvised circus tents, went up and down Moscow and in indecent verses laid before the public the „facts“ in the „treachery“ of the Socialists-Revolutionists, their alleged robberies and murders of the champions of the working class.

On a platform in the Tversky Square, not far from Pushkin's monument, one of these clowns conveyed to the public the „thoroughly established facts“ concerning the crimes of the Socialists-Revolutionists, Mensheviks, Kadets and black-hundreds (all these were, naturally, grouped together). To make this more convincing, the clown proceeded to kill the criminals by means of a huge club. First came the effigy of the traitor Martoff, who immediately fell dead beneath the fierce blow. Then came Tchernoff, who, disliking to be killed, entered into mortal combat with the public entertainer. But

„virtue“ triumphed and the club duly cracked the skull of the bandit Tchernoff. The same fate befell Vandervelde and his colleagues.

These entertainments were accompanied by city-wide meetings. Headed by Trotzky, Bolshevik orators made the rounds of plants and factories, delivering inflammatory speeches and urging adoption of resolutions demanding merciless treatment and execution for the Socialists-Revolutionists. From these orators the workers learned that the Socialists-Revolutionists provoked the civil war in Russia, that they were responsible for the famine, and that all would be well as soon as these enemies of the working people were put to death. This information, however, was of secondary importance. The important thing was that the Bolshevik authorities forced the adoption of resolutions demanding execution of the Socialists-Revolutionists, so that in many factories even some non-partisans voted obediently with other small bands of workers, inflamed and perverted by Communist demagoguery, for execution of the Socialists-Revolutionists.

Such obedience may perhaps appear incomprehensible to the workers of Western Europe, but you who live in free countries, you who have your party and trade union organizations, you who have freedom of speech, press and assembly and enjoy at least some human rights, — you must realize that the proletarian in Russia is a man without any rights and that he must be of particular courage and manhood to vote against a resolution proposed by the „great“ Trotzky himself as he appears at some plant and factory, surrounded by his Che-Ka suite and a special red army guard.

But the Bolsheviks were not satisfied with merely holding factory meetings and passing resolutions demanding execution of the Socialists. They also circulated petitions in all factories, demanding the blood of the accused, and which the workers were forced to sign.

In many instances the workers refused to sign these calls to murder.

„Oh, you don't want to sign?“ asked the Communists, „and do you want to lose your job or take a walk to the Che-Ka?“

The petitions gathered many signatures and the columns of the „Pravda“ and „Izvestia“ were filled with the blood-thirsty demands.

If you, workers of the West, could read all this raving nonsense, you would think that the Russian workers are an aggregation of cruel savages. But, no! These petitions are a calumny upon the Russian proletariat, a crying misuse of its name, a contemptible falsehood. For thus have all despotism, wielding the knout and the rifle, always spoken in the name of the enslaved people. It is not remarkable therefore that the Bolsheviks succeeded in putting through some hundreds of resolutions in the factories. What is far more important is the fact that despite all this, voices of protest against the violence perpetrated upon their conscience in this campaign were raised by the workers.

Thus, the workman Ivanoff, who was present at the scene at the Windau station, loudly raised his voice in protest and opposition. He was immediately arrested and taken to jail.

At the meeting at the Bogorodsko-Gluchosky plant, the workman Terentieff turned to his comrades and to the Bolsheviks and said:

„Comrades, whatever the Socialists-Revolutionists may be, they would hardly drive us, like sheep, to these meetings, under threat of having our families deprived of food from the government stores and cooperatives; they would hardly demand that we put the stamp of our approval upon the actions of a government composed entirely of members of a ruling party, as you, Communists, are doing. I am an old man and I need not fear you. I have no fear of threats and, therefore, I say quite frankly that in 1917, when the Socialists-Revolutionists were in power, we, the workers, regardless of party affiliation, felt ourselves, first of all, Russian citizens and not toiling cattle. We were not compelled then to dance to the tune you are now playing to please your rulers, who for four years have been riding on our backs“.

In many factories the workers managed to meet secretly, while the Bolshevik police was not looking, and adopted resolutions protesting against the murder of the Socialists-Revolutionists that was being prepared. But there was not a

single newspaper in all Russia in which they could make these protests public!

On June 6, the Moscow Soviet debated Radek's report on the pending trial. Some of the speakers declared that the Berlin agreement should be disregarded and urged the execution of the accused without further consideration.

This campaign reached its apotheosis two weeks later, when, on June 20, the anniversary of Volodarsky's assassination the Bolsheviks held street demonstrations of workers and red army men in Moscow and Petrograd, in support of the demand for the execution of the Socialists-Revolutionists. The Red Army men were brought out in parade formation. The workers and government employees were ordered to appear at the points of assembly for rollcall. It was announced officially that those who participated in the demonstrations would be given their day's wages (in some districts they were offered special meals in appreciation). The workers were given to understand that the demonstrations would be used as proof of their „loyalty“ and that severe repressions awaited the nonconformists.

Here are some facts illustrating how the manifestation of „popular wrath“ was engineered in Moscow and how the workers reacted toward it:

1. The Bogatyr plant. — Although the gates were locked, the majority of the workers managed to slip away from the meeting by jumping over the fence or sneaking away to the shops. Of the 2500 employees, not more than 300 or 400 were present. The bloodthirsty resolution obtained some 35 or put the question clearly and definitely: „those who failed to To this was added the threat of possible dismissal. Yet, 40 votes. The rest did not vote at all. The factory manager appear at the demonstration would be fined three day's pay“. despite this, not more than 300 or 400 employees of the plant participated in the demonstration.

2. Kalinkin plant. (Employing 200 workers). — Instead of adopting the proposed resolution, the workers were called upon to approve the Communist Party's declaration on the trial. The audience replied with severe silence. But one voice was raised: „the resolution should be put to a vote“. It never was. The representatives of the factory committee

and the factory administration simply announced: those who will not appear at the demonstration would be dismissed. This threat proved of little use, however, for but a small minority obeyed the order.

3. At the office of the Zentrosoyuz a bulletin was exhibited for some days before the demonstration, announcing that „all participants would be offered a meal“. The promise was duly kept.

4. At a meeting of members and employees of the Transport Division of the Petrograd Consuler's Society 120 of the total membership of 300 were present. The resolution demanding „merciless“ punishment for the accused received 9 votes, six of which belonged to the administration. This threw the authors into wild frenzy, accompanied by threat of dismissal. The resolution was put to a vote five times but the number of its supporters failed to increase. The resolution was then withdrawn and the question of participation in the demonstration, June 20, was put, instead. It received 13 votes.

5. Farmazavod No. 2. (120 workers). The resolution proposed by the chairman received 5 votes. Demands that speakers representing other parties be heard were made. The aforementioned 5 participated in the demonstration.

6. The Electric Works. — Here petitions demanding death for the Socialists-Revolutionists were put into circulation several days before the demonstration. The petitions were taken around the shops personally by members of the factory committee and administration, who offered it to each worker individually. But the signatures were few. A preliminary meeting was held on the day of the demonstration, at which not more than 100 of the 1500 employees were present. Not more than 30 employees participated in the demonstration.

7. Mussky Car Barn. — Here the workers greeted the Communist orators with cries of protest: „We are against the death penalty!“ The resolution was not even put to a vote. None of the employees went to the demonstration.

8. Pressnensky Car Barn. — The meeting dispersed as soon as it became known that the question of the Socialists-Revolutionists would be considered. The demonstration was boycotted.

9. Savelovsky Railway Shops (4000 Employees). — Here the workers had sometime before refused to participate in the „welcoming“ of Vandervelde. Very few appeared at the meeting against the Socialists-Revolutionists. The resolution demanding the death penalty received 19 votes. After the voting the resolution was taken around the various shops, with threats of repressions. Between 90 and 100 signatures were gathered. Between 60 and 70 employees participated in the demonstrations.

10. Moscow Municipal Shops. — Thanks to the leaflets distributed by the Communist Party on the eve of the demonstration among the employees of the locksmith shops, it was unanimously decided not to participate in the demonstration. On their appearance at the plant the next day they were each interrogated by the assistant manager as to the cause of their non-appearance. He then announced that they would be fined five days' pay (17½ millions). In the needle shops, the communist „cell“ hung up a banner without asking the consent of the employees as to the slogans. Several score marched under that banner. (There are 700 employees in the shops).

11. Clothing plant. — Of the 400 employees 40 agreed to participate in the demonstration. These included only Communists and candidates for admission into the Communist Party.

12. Maikapar Plant. — On appearing at the plant and observing a banner demanding death for the Socialists-Revolutionists, the workers demanded its removal. The Communist „cell“ refused, for which it was compelled to participate in the demonstration quite alone.

13. Twenty-Seventh Printing House of the Moscow Soviet of National Economy. — Not a single vote was cast for the resolution proposed by the communist „cell“. The next day, the „Pravda“ demanded in an editorial the dispersal of this „menshevik nest“. No sooner said than done. A new chief, the well-known Polonsky, was appointed, who despite the overabundance of work at the plant laid off 200 of the 300 employees until fall. He then called another meeting and put through the resolution demanding the „highest measure of punishment“ for the Socialists-Revolutionists.

The „Sozialistichesky Viestnik“ gave the following account of the demonstration in the great Presnensky district:

„Not more than 4000 residents of this great districts, driven together by force, participated in the demonstration. The workers marched together with the red army men, who carried no arms. There were many women and youths (between 12 and 13 years of age). The Briansk railwaymen were conspicuous by their absence. The banners bore legends taken from the „Pravda“. The spirit of the crowd was distinctly dull and humdrum. Everybody was in a hurry to see the thing over and go home. Characteristic was the exchange of repartee between a group of red army men and several women:

„And what are you, women, doing here?“

„And you?“

„We are government people, — we were driven here on orders“.

„Well, and so were we“.

To make the demonstration as imposing as possible, the government mobilized all the Communist „cells“ as well as all those workers who still retain some faith in the Bolsheviki, and who, thanks to the daily streams of villification, calumny and slander pouring out of the pages of the „Pravda“ and „Izvestia“, are animated by mad hatred toward the Socialists. These elements comprised an insignificant minority but they were the ones who supplied the spectacle of „popular wrath“.

Thus was this demonstration carried out, — a demonstration of workers deceived by Bolshevik demagogy and terrorized by the Soviet Government, a demonstration supported by the perverted praetorian guards of the Soviet State and the dreggs of society, who but yesterday were the chief actors in Jewish massacres under leadership of the Czarist police and now ready to follow their Che-Ka leaders wherever they might lead.

At four o'clock, the members of the revolutionary tribunal, prosecutor-general Krylenko, president of the Moscow Soviet Kamenef and the representatives of the Third Internationale Radek, Clara Zetkin, Sadul and Schmeral, appeared before the mob filling the Red Square. The first to speak was Piatakoff, president of the revolutionary tribunal, who informed the mob that while he must not anticipate developments



E. Ivanova - Е. Иванова



E. M. Ratner - Е. М. Ратнер



D. D. Donskoi - Д. Д. Донской



M. I. Guendelmann - М. Я. Гендельман

Il ne me reste que le bonheur de mourir avec ceux que je considère comme mes amis les plus chers et les plus proches.

E. Iwanowa

Mir bleibt nur das Glück, mit Jenen zu sterben, die mir am nächsten stehen und die ich am meisten liebe.

E. Iwanowa

The only happiness which I have now is to die with my nearest and dearest.

Мнѣ остается только счастье умереть съ тѣми, кого я считаю самыми близкими мнѣ и любимыми людьми.

E. Иванова

Zůstalo mi pouze to štěstí, že zemřu s těmi, jež pokládám za lidi mně nejbližší a nejmelejší.

E. Ivanova

Vous nous accusez de nous placer sur le terrain du socialisme scientifique. — nous acceptons cette accusation et nous sommes prêts à en assumer la responsabilité devant le prolétariat russe et international.

E. Ratner

Eure Anklage, wir ständen auf dem Boden des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus, erkennen wir als richtig an und sind bereit, die Verantwortung für dieses Verbrechen sowohl vor dem russischen als auch vor dem internationalen Proletariat zu tragen.

E. Ratner

You are justified in accusing us of Scientific socialism, we admit this accusation of yours and are ready to bear the responsibility of it before the Russian and international workers.

E. Ratner

Ваше обвиненіе, что мы стоимъ на почвѣ научнаго социализма — мы признаемъ правильнымъ и за это преступленіе готовы нести отвѣтственность и передъ русскимъ и передъ международнымъ пролетаріатомъ.

E. Ратнеръ

Vaše nařknutí, že stojíme na půdě vědeckého socialismu-provažujeme za správné a jsme hotovi nésti za tento zločin zodpovědnost před ruským a mezinárodním proletariátem.

E. Ratner

Pour la cause de notre parti, pour démasquer votre dictature aux yeux de la classe ouvrière, russe et internationale, pour la cause du socialisme et de la révolution, par ce procès, nous avons fait, nous, prisonniers, plus que nous aurions fait si nous étions libres, et morts nous, ferons plus que nous n'aurions pu faire vivants.

A partir du moment où nous sommes tombés entre vos mains, nous étions sûrs d'être condamnés à mort. Il nous est indifférent que vous nous amnistiez ou non. Mais de ce banc vous n'entendrez pas de recours en grâce.

Quendelmann

Für das Werk unserer Partei, für die Entlarvung Eurer Diktatur vor dem russischen und internationalen Proletariat, für das Werk des Sozialismus und der Revolution haben wir, Gefangenen, mehr getan durch diesen Prozeß als wenn wir in Freiheit wären; und als Toten werden wir mehr tun als die Lebenden hätten tun können.

Seit dem Augenblick, wo wir in Eure Hände geraten sind, waren wir sicher, daß Ihr uns zum Tode verurteilen werdet. Uns ist es gleichgültig, ob Ihr uns begnadigen werdet oder nicht. Aber von dieser Bank werdet Ihr eine Bitte um Begnadigung nicht zu hören bekommen.

Quendelmann

(Fortsetzung auf dem nächsten Bildblatt — Suite au verso de la prochaine page illustrée)

he could say with assurance that the tribunal would meet out severe punishment to those who raised their hand against the Soviet Government.

He was followed by Radek, who heaped insults and abuse upon the foreign counsel of the accused. Bucharin spoke next. In his speech he extolled Semionoff and Konopliowa, who placed at the disposal of the Soviet Government the material for the case against the Socialists-Revolutionists.

The mob then passes in review before the members of the court. Some of the judges, on returning to the courtroom, order that the accused be brought to the open window, in full view of the raging mob below. Those of the accused who stood at the head of their party, approach fearlessly closest to the window, ready to be first to meet their death. A block of wood with the inscription „death to the Socialists-Revolutionists“ strikes Gotz. The judges laugh, the prosecutor-general grins with enthusiasm. A look of triumph illumines the countenances of counsel for the provocateurs.

This amusement continues for five hours. But the Bolsheviks are still unsatisfied. At ten o'clock in the evening, the president announces that a delegation representing the demonstration requests permission to appear before the tribunal. Prosecutor Krylenko „explains“ that while such a procedure is not provided for by the law it is not at all out of harmony with the spirit of the Soviet Government and is therefore permissible. And the „people“ being permitted to appear before the „court“ there followed the spectacle of a raging mob of wild, electrified fanatics, degenerate Che-Ka agents and street bums. Threats, curses and unprintable abuse fill the air.

And the judges listened attentively to the „orators“, shook their hands, thanked them for their loyalty to the Soviet Government and promised to do their best to satisfy the „people's will“.

The Socialists-Revolutionists stood this torture for two and a half hours, but the experiences of these hardened fighters are trivial in comparison to the tortures experienced by their wives, mothers and sisters, who had been permitted to attend the trial as spectators.

I cannot reproduce here the letters of these martyrs of Bolshevik justice, letters written in their heart's blood, letters

which it is impossible to read without tears and anger. They had already bidden goodbye in their minds to their dear ones, for they were convinced that their last hour had come and that this terrible day would end in the lynching of the accused.

This, too, was the feeling of the accused themselves, who preserved their calm self-control to the end, combined with kind, encouraging smiles for their own people and a gaze of courageous contempt for the executioners.

But neither the accused nor their relatives realized that the hired canaille representing the „aroused people“ before the court had received the order to work their tongues but to keep their hands still, to yell, to curse but not to murder those for whom the Bolsheviki were preparing another fate.

The campaign designed to provoke „popular wrath“ died down after the demonstration of June 20. Why? Was it because the Bolsheviki had been seized suddenly by a sense of shame? Were they frightened by the impression produced upon the public opinion of Europe? Did their inventive genius simply cease working? Or did they decide upon some new plan? I cannot tell.

Let us see how the work of the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal proceeded in the meanwhile. Let us first examine the mode of procedure.

VI.

The comedy of the trial.

Originally the Bolsheviki had planned to try 47 defendants. After the Berlin conference, this number was reduced to 33. This included 22 who actually were members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. They constituted the „first group of defendants“ at the trial. Next to them sat the „second group“, composed of ten persons, headed by Semionoff and Konopliowa. These were turncoats, who had deserted, the Socialist-Revolutionist camp and most of whom had long ago entered the Communist Party and had secured beforehand the mercy and forgiveness of the ruling cast by betraying their comrades.

The defense was divided similarly. The „first group“ was defended by the Russian attorneys Muravioff, Tager and others, and by the representatives of Western European Socialism, Vandervelde, Rosenfeld and Liebknecht. The „second group“ was defended by about ten Communists, headed by Bucharin, and including Graziadey, Sadul, Schmeral and Felix Cohn.

The defenders of the „second group“ stated their position in the following official declaration bearing their signatures:

„Counsel for the defense, as a body, do not regard themselves in agreement. We have nothing in common with Messrs. Vandervelde and Rosenfeld. We do not regard it possible for us to defend the enemies of the proletarian revolution, who belong to the camp of the Russian Vandee. But among the accused there is a group who admit their participation in counter-revolutionary work and who have come to the conviction that the policy of the Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists was a criminal one. These persons have honestly joined the camp of the proletarian revolution. On this ground we consider it our revolutionary duty to undertake their defense.“

The charges were pressed by prosecutors Krylenko, Lunacharsky, Pokrovsky, Clara Zetkin, Muna, Sadul and Bokani.

The tribunal consisted of three Bolsheviks. The „public“ or the „people“ were represented by 1200 Communists and Che-Ka agents. The families of the accused received only 22 cards of admission. The taking of stenographic reports and all translation work were entirely in the hands of the Communist „ochranka“.

In reality, the prosecution against the 22 Socialists-Revolutionists was conducted by four sides:

1. by the official prosecutors,
2. by the traitors (the so-called 2nd group)
3. by the counsel of these traitors,
4. by the court.

And all this took place in an atmosphere of incessant newspaper villification, in the midst of an inflamed, infuriated, carefully picked mob.

Counsel for the „first group“ were frequently forbidden to speak, their remarks were often garbled by the translators and their requests or suggestions invariably met with mocking rejection by the court.

The speeches of the accused, as evidenced even by the tendentious reports of the Soviet press, were repeatedly interrupted by the president, prosecutors and by Che-Ka agents in the audience.

The tribunal declined to hear witnesses called by the defense, refused to admit four Russian Socialists chosen as attorneys by the defendants, and rejected the admission of documents exposing the falsity and ridiculousness of the charges.

It is hardly necessary to say that the defendants of the „first group“ were denied the right of preliminary examination of the details of the charges, that the foreign counsel were deprived of the right to confer freely with their Russian colleagues and that the stenographic records were so garbled that neither the accused nor their counsel could recognize their own speeches.

The whole comedy of the trial was simply the prelude to the bloody epilogue contemplated by the Bolsheviki.

At the very first session, Piatakoff, the presiding officer, announced that the court does not intend to handle the case from a dispassionate, objective point of view but would be guided solely by the interests of the Soviet Government.

This was no trial, as trials are supposed to be conducted in Western Europe. It was a dance of cannibals about their prisoners, bound hand and foot.

When the defense attempted to support itself upon the Berlin agreement, the Bolsheviki replied that this agreement was in no way binding upon them and that their tribunal would do what it pleased.

This meant: we refuse to observe our obligations, we defy the opinion of the proletariat of Western Europe, and we will treat the accused as we have already treated thousands of Socialists, peasants and workers.

After seven days of fierce struggle for fair play, for observance of the Berlin agreement, the foreign members of the defense filed with the court the following declaration:

1. „The court has declined to admit four new attorneys for the defense and, contrary to the Berlin agreement, it has forbidden us to take stenographic records.

2. „The court has declared that, under certain circumstances, it would even question the desirability of permitting foreign counsel to continue their participation in the trial.

3. „Prosecutors Krylenko and Lunacharsky have declared that the Berlin agreement was in no way binding upon them.

4. „The representative of the delegation of the Third Internationale at the Berlin conference, Bucharin, has declared that the Berlin agreement is abrogated.

„We are guided entirely by the interests of the defense and, therefore, despite the foregoing facts, are still at the disposal of the defendants, should they desire it.“

The whole character of the trial had by this time become so obvious that the continued participation of the European attorneys had become quite useless. They could not obtain from the court even a semblance of fair procedure, their presence in no way guaranteed the honest publicity the case demanded, and thanks to the deliberate garbling of stenographic records and the degeneration of the trial into a street meeting, they were deprived of active participation in the discussions.

On the other hand, the continued presence of these European attorneys at the trial tended to create the illusion that the case was proceeding normally, in accordance with the conditions set in the Berlin declaration of the three internationales. The lawyers felt, therefore, that the strengthening of this illusion was more detrimental than beneficial to the task they had undertaken in appearing before the court. This prompted their decision to decline further participation in the case — a decision approved unanimously by the defendants.

On June 19, Vandervelde, Liebknecht, Rosenfeld and Waters left Moscow (but only after they had declared a 24 hour hunger strike to compell the Bol-

sheviki to grant them permission to leave Russia).

On their return to Western Europe, they issued a declaration addressed to the Socialist parties of all countries, in which they detailed the circumstances which compelled them to abandon the case. The declaration follows:

„The purpose of the Berlin agreement was to give the proletariat assurance that the Moscow trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists would be conducted on the basis of all legal guarantees of freedom of defense and from a purely objective viewpoint.

„Trusting the promises given to the three internationales at the Berlin conference, we went to Moscow to conduct the defense of the defendants, accused of serious crimes, and at the same time, by our presence at the trial, to give the proletariat the assurance that these promises were being kept, and thus to contribute, on our part, to the removal of the obstacles barring the road toward a united proletarian front. The manner in which the trial is conducted has failed to satisfy our expectations. From the very beginning, it became obvious that contrary to the promises made by the Third Internationale in Berlin, the accused were brought not before their judges but before their political foes, whose purpose it was to convict them for reasons and considerations of state. Particularly significant was the declaration of the president, immediately upon the opening of the trial, that this court was a class court and that it would consciously meet out class justice.

„The president of the Supreme Tribunal, Krylenko, appeared before the presiding officer, who is actually subordinate to him, in the role of prosecutor, contrary to Krylenko's own recent ruling forbidding, for obvious reasons, the appearance of a court president before his own court in the capacity of prosecutor. In his own place Krylenko appointed Piatakoff, his wife's brother-in-law and subordinate. Krylenko's wife herself conducted the preliminary inquiry and signed the indictment. Before the opening of the trial, Krylenko personally offe-

red resolutions at public meetings demanding conviction of the accused.

„On our arrival in Moscow we were met with a demonstration apparently previously organized. The demonstrators carried signs and banners, with inscriptions insulting to us. Threats and abuse were hurled upon us, combined with demands that we be thrown into jail. The government resorted to the utterly false assertion that the attitude exhibited toward us in the demonstration reflected the attitude of all the workers of Moscow and, with this as an excuse, the government put us up at a place two hours distant by train from the city, and surrounded us by several officials whose purpose it was to spy upon us. For this reason we felt ourselves prisoners in Moscow, which we were.

„Two witnesses were arrested on the eve of the trial, while a search was made in the home of one of the Russian counsel for the defense and part of the material he had prepared for the defense confiscated.

„The court, which had at its disposal 1200 cards of admission, failed to give the accused a sufficient number of these for their immediate relatives. Almost all these tickets were distributed, in the face of our protests, and with the assistance of Communist political and trade union organizations among members of their party and agents of the Che-Ka. As a result of this the courtroom was at times disturbed by such noisy demonstrations that, in the end, the president was obliged to interfere.

„On June 20, the anniversary of Volodarsky's death, the Moscow organization of the Communist Party organized a big demonstration in front of the court-building with the slogan demanding „rigorous punishment for the accused“. Within the building, adjoining the courtroom itself, there was an exhibition of pamphlets and pictures, the purpose of which was to reveal graphically the alleged „crimes“ of the Socialists-Revolutionists. While those of the accused who denied emphatically any participation in terroristic acts were kept in jail, the informers Semionoff and Konopliowa, who confessed that they had killed Volodarsky and carried out the assault

on Lenine, were left at liberty. During the intermissions they were to be seen conversing in the friendliest manner with the Communist leaders, the close party comrades of those whom they had killed or tried to murder. But at the trial itself there were incidents which provoked the determination of the accused, as well as our own, to abandon the defense. On this point we refer you to our declaration at the trial, in which we indicated in detail the reasons which made it impossible for us, in full agreement with the defendants, to participate any longer in the case. The Berlin agreement was not observed. This destroyed the basis of our defense. Our continued presence would have only created the false impression that the promises given in Berlin were being observed.

„In view of the violation of the Berlin agreement, there now arises before you the most important of its provisions, — that there shall be no death verdicts at the trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists. For many weeks the Communists have been conducting a campaign in the press and from the platform, demanding not only that death verdicts be rendered but also the execution of these verdicts. The court declared that it is in no way concerned with the Berlin agreement. The representatives of the Third Internationale declared that the agreement is abrogated and that all promises made by the Third Internationale are no longer in force. If we had not protested against these declarations, if we had permitted these to pass without the sharpest protest and had not appealed with all our strength to the conscience of the international Socialist movement, we would have faced the danger of finding ourselves before an accomplished fact.

„This must not come to pass! A death verdict must under no circumstances be permitted! The lives of the accused must be preserved!

„The gulf that is dividing the parties of the workers has already shown itself wide enough in weakening our fight against capitalism and reaction. This gulf must not be widened. If it is to be filled with the blood of the

accused Socialists-Revolutionists it will never be bridged at all.

„The interests of the entire working class, therefore, now demand that you halt the hands of those who are thirsting for the blood of the accused.

„The slogan of all working class parties of all lands and currents must be: „No death sentences for the accused Socialists-Revolutionists!“

Thus was the trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists taken from the seat of the Moscow court, prostituted and covered with shame, before the court of the international proletariat.

Three days after the departure of the European Socialists from Moscow, the Russian attorneys for the defense likewise declined to act any longer. Their action was prompted by the scenes that took place inside and outside of the court building on June 20. In the name of all counsel for the „first group“, Muravioff submitted to the court the following declaration concerning the events of that day:

„On June 20, in the face of our protest and regardless of the prosecutor's refusal to make a formal statement regarding the admission of the reading in the courtroom of resolutions adopted at the meeting of June 20, the president admitted groups of demonstrators into the court, who heaped insults both upon the defense and the accused and read the resolution demanding the highest measure of punishment for them, a resolution allegedly adopted at the meeting in the name of all labor organizations of Petrograd and Moscow.

„The appearance of the demonstrators in the courtroom and the presentation of their resolution to the court constituted a violation of normal proceedings, determined beforehand the court's verdict, rendering it illegal, and destroyed the character of the highest judicial organ of the republic by the violation of the technical mode of judicial procedure. For these reasons the defense is compelled to request that the trial be discontinued, in order that it may be resumed before a new court and another body of government prosecutors“.

To this the court replied:

„The request of the defense for the discontinuance of the trial and the self-liquidation of the tribunal cannot be considered, as the tribunal was fully conscious of the significance of its action in admitting the workers' delegations to the proceedings“.

The defense insisted upon its demand, supporting itself upon the legal code of Soviet Russia, which regulates fully the presence of outsiders in court proceedings, and which clearly provides that whatever the grounds offered in an appeal may be, „the verdict must positively be annulled in all instance of admission into the case of persons not involved by the juridical provisions of court proceedings“, i. e. of all persons „outside of members of the court, the accused, counsel and prosecutors, witnesses, experts, and in all cases of admission in the course of the court proceedings of persons not provided for by juridical procedure and who have had or may have had any influence upon the nature of the verdict“.

The text is quite clear. The appearance of delegations at the trial and the exchange of speeches between them and court, as was pointed out by the „Socialistichesky Viestnik“, constituted precisely a violation such as is guarded against by the law and „which might have had an influence upon the nature of the verdict“. So that from a purely juridical point of view the verdict of the Supreme Tribunal was liable to positive annulment from the very beginning.

But the Bolsheviki attach no more importance to their laws than they do to their promises and obligations. The court simply laughed at the protest of counsel and their references to the law, whereupon Muravioff, stirred with ire, shouted:

„Woe to the country, woe to the people who have no respect for their law and who laugh at those who defend the law“.

In reply the judges ordered Muravioff's indictment for contempt of court!

It was then that the attorneys for the defense, following a conference with the accused, announced that they could no longer take part in the proceedings, to

which the court replied with the following statement, published in the entire Soviet press. This product of the creative genius of Soviet judges follows:

„The request for its self-liquidation submitted by the defense to the present court can be explained only by the complete ignorance of Counsel Muravioff and his total misconception of the court's juridical nature. The Supreme Tribunal was fully conscious of its act in admitting the workers' delegation into the courtroom and in its own participation in the demonstration of June 20. The action of the court was in no way accidental but was taken in full consciousness and in complete understanding of its nature.

The argument of counsel Muravioff that the court can render its verdict only if it remains within a glass case can be explained only by the blindness of bourgeois thought. Judges are human beings and it is impossible to isolate them from public life. The important thing in this case is not what had actually occurred but how the court reacted toward it. The court believes that much that was said here on June 20 was not true, but it is possible that some of it was true. It was important for the court to establish only two facts, which were evidenced by the workers' delegation: 1. that the working masses support the Soviet Government and 2. that the court is acting not in isolation from the working masses but in an atmosphere of confidence and support on the part of these masses. That is why the president of the court declared that the declaration made by the demonstrators was of value to us.

„So far as the complaint of the defense against the insults hurled by the demonstrators against the accused is concerned, the court declares that these workers did not go through any law college and do not know the laws of etiquette, and for this reason permitted themselves to use expressions which should not have been used in the courtroom. Because of these considerations, the court regards it as inadmissible to pick on' the rough language that came from the workers' lips.

„Concerning the impartiality of the court, the tribunal declared on the very first day that it laughs at the hypocritical assertion of bourgeois countries that a court must stand above classes and should render verdicts of some sort of unearthly impartiality. Counsel Muravioff may, therefore, succeed in discrediting the verdict of the proletarian class court in any other country but not in the state of the workers and peasants. The court therefore refuses to consider the declaration of the defense and suggests that in case of its dissatisfaction with the court's actions to direct its complaints to the people's commissary of justice or to the praesidium of the Central Executive Committee. (These lofty institutions have already examined the declarations of the defense. Muravioff, Tager and Zehdanoff have been ordered exiled to distant parts of Russia).

This document requires no comment.

And so, the defense was compelled to withdraw from the case. On June 23, the accused were left alone face to face with their executioners. On the same day, Gendelman made the following declaration to the court, in the name of all his comrades:

„From the very first day of the trial, the lawful demands of our counsel have been invariably rejected by the court and have provoked it to ironic comment. The court's behaviour has compelled first our foreign counsel to withdraw from trial. They have been subjected to slanderous persecution everywhere and at all moments. Not even this high institution, called the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal, could protect them from insults and ridicule by the 'public' commanded to attend the trial or on the part of the members of the court and the prosecution. Yesterday, the Russian members of the defense were also compelled to abandon their task because of the open violation of the revolutionary law by its own guardians.

„Under these circumstances it would hardly be proper to call this a court. Its members and the members of the prosecution appear at public meetings arranged by the Communist Party during intermissions, where they discuss the opi-

nions and impressions they have formed in the course of the trial. And if we still remain here, instead of demanding our return to jail, we do so in order to prove to the authors of this trial that we do not fear it.

„The participation of members of the court at the meeting where a resolution was adopted demanding the highest measure of punishment for us, i. e. the death penalty, forces us to conclude that our judges are in full solidarity with those leaders and organizers of the government's demonstration who terrorized the workers into approval of the resolution of which the government was in such great need. It is known to us that wholesale arrests in plants and factories preceded the demonstration and meeting on June 20“.

The president interrupted at this point:

„The tribunal will neither deny nor affirm the fact of its participation at the meeting, but requests proof of the arrests of workmen and their compulsory attendance at the demonstration“.

Gendelman replied:

„Wholesale arrests took place at the Prochoroff, Nosoff, Kiaboff and Ranenberg plants, in the railway repair shops and others, the workers being informed also that their failure to appear at the demonstration would be regarded as proof of their solidarity with the Socialists-Revolutionists. Before departing for the demonstration the workers at every plant and factory were checked off by lists“.

The president again interrupts Gendelman, who pointing to leaflets in the hands of some of the public in the courtroom declares:

„I have always avoided hearsay assertions. I ask the court to examine the declaration of the Moscow workers, protesting against the misuse of their name in the resolution of June 20“.

The president asks Gendelman:

„Have you nothing else to add?“

Gendelman: — „It seems to me it would be difficult to add anything to what has already been pointed out — and thus everything is clear“.

Yes, everything was clear. The „trial“ continued.

VII.

What they were accused of

Vandervelde summed up the political and juridical substance of the Moscow trial in the following words:

„The Bolsheviki brought four indictments against the Socialists-Revolutionists:

„1. The Socialists-Revolutionists defended the Provisional Government with arms in their hands.

„The Socialists-Revolutionists admit this fact and are proud of it.

„2. The Socialists-Revolutionists, with arms in their hands, defended the Constituent Assembly.

„The Socialists-Revolutionists admit this fact and are only sorry that they did not succeed in carrying this to a successful conclusion.

„3. The Socialists-Revolutionists waged an armed struggle against the Soviet Government.

„The Socialists-Revolutionists admit this as an undeniable, historic fact. But all these three accusations must be ruled out of court for the Soviet Government had issued an amnesty covering all these actions and even legalized the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

„4. The Socialists-Revolutionists took part in Volodarsky's assassination and in the assault on Lenine.

„There is not a shred of evidence nor a single witness to support this charge, — except the confessions of the provocateurs Semionoff and Konopliowa, whom nobody believes“.

The first three accusations concern the participation of the party of Socialists-Revolutionists in the civil war, covering the period from the end of 1917 to the beginning of 1919.

This civil war was begun by the Bolsheviki who, in October, 1917, seized power by means of a conspiracy, dissolved the Constituent Assembly and rejected all proposals of the Socialist parties for a united Socialist front. The entire responsibility for the blood of peasants and workers shed in this war falls, therefore, upon the Bolsheviki.

The memory of the Bolsheviki is not so short that they have forgotten how Lenine, as early as in April, 1917, summoned the workers to civil war.. This was his first word on crossing the Russian frontier. The Bolsheviki remember very well how their trucks filled with armed men moved up and down the streets of Petrograd, in July of the same year, with guns and banners proclaiming: „Long live the Civil War!“ They remember the efforts made at that time by the Socialists-Revolutionists and Mensheviki to save the unity of the democracy, in order to avert fratricidal strife within its midst. What right, therefore, have these gentlemen at this time to accuse the Socialists-Revolutionists that in participating in the civil war they defended the Provisional Government and the Constituent Assembly?

One may estimate as he please the policy of the Provisional Government during the first period of the Russian Revolution. One may or may not criticize its basic idea of the coalition of Socialists with bourgeois-democratic elements. But there can be no doubt on one point: that the party which delegated its members into the government not only had a right but was duty bound to defend that government against the attacks of conspirators and „putsch“ heroes, such as were the Bolsheviki, who had behind them bayonets but not the majority of the people.

There may, likewise, be more than one opinion on the principles of democracy and the Constituent Assembly, which is the expression of these principles. But it is clear, that a party standing on the platform of democracy, and which has received by popular election a majority of votes, was duty bound to use all means at its command in defense of the Constituent Assembly against violent encroachments upon its sovereign rights.

The civil war and the Volga front were nothing else than a continuation of the defense of the Constituent Assembly, the defense which the Bolsheviki had broken so easily in January. And, again, there may be difference of opinion on the policy of the Socialists-Revolutionists at that period; one may condemn the line followed at that time by individual members of the party delegated by the party into the government that was directing the struggle on the Volga front and

in Siberia, the so-called „Directorate“ (afterwards overthrown by Kolchak conspirators). But this is a question subject to political or historic criticism but which cannot be transformed into the juridical question of the legal responsibility for this policy of a party defending, in the course of civil war, the idea of democracy against a party that initiated this war in the name of the establishment and preservation of its dictatorship.

From the juridical point of view this question lost all actuality after the abandonment by the Socialist-Revolutionist Party of its armed struggle against the Soviet Government, — a step approved fully by the party conference in February, 1919, and followed by the amnesty granted by the Bolshevik Government to all members of the party who had participated in the civil war.

Shortly after this the party was legalized and was even permitted to publish its organ in Moscow.

To be sure, this organ was suppressed after the tenth issue and wholesale arrests of its members were resumed two weeks after the legalization of the party. To be sure, the party was again compelled to return to underground activity, but for two and a half years it remained uncontested that the amnesty granted by the Soviet Government excluded all possibility of legal prosecution for acts covered by this amnesty act.

But now, in 1922, the Bolshevik tribunal has revived these old questions. The victors in the civil war, the usurpers of power, are trying as rebels those people who four and a half years ago sought to defend against violence the elected representatives of the people. They are being tried in violation of soviet law itself, in violation of the Soviet Government's own oath, — for an act amnesty is tantamount to a law and a promise.

The Bolsheviks themselves apparently felt the weakness of the case, but the Soviet jurists found a way out of the situation by inserting into the indictment against the Socialists-Revolutionists the following argument:

„The members of the Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists directed the par-

Un groupe d'accusés avec leur défenseurs.

Die Angeklagten mit ihren Verteidigern.



En haut: 1. M. Védénipine. 2. N. Artemiev. 3. N. Jdanov (avocat).
4. M. Lvov. 5. A. Wauters (avocat). 6. E. Timofeev. 7. K. Rosenfeld (avocat).
8. P. Zlobin. — En bas: 1. D. Donskoï. 2. E. Ratner. 3. Vandervelde (avocat).
4. A. Gotz.



En haut: 1. D. Rakov. 2. D. Donskoï. 3. F. Fedorovitch. 4. A. Lieberov.
5. N. Jdanov (avocat). 6. Th. Liebknecht (avocat). 7. S. Morosov. 8. L. Rosenthal
(traducteur). 9. E. Berg. 10. A. Tagher (avocat). 11. C. Rosenfeld (avocat). —
Au milieu: 1. L. Querstein. 2. M. Likhatch. 3. E. Timofeev. 4. E. Ratner.
5. A. Gotz. 6. G. Gorkov. — En bas: 1. P. Zlobin. 2. M. Lvoff. 3. W. Agapov.
4. B. Outgoff.

(Fortsetzung vom vorhergehenden Bildblatt — Voir au verso de la page illustrée précédente)

Standing as prisoners before this Court, we have done more for the sake of our party, we have accomplished more towards revealing the true nature of your dictatorship in the eyes of working classes at home and abroad, than we could possibly do if we enjoyed liberty; through Death we shall gain more for the common cause, than if we remained alive.

From the very moment we fell into your hands we expected nothing else but a death warrant. We don't care whether you amnesty us or not. But from this bench you will never hear a request for pardon.

Gendelman

Для дѣла нашей партіи, для разоблаченія вашей диктатуры въ глазахъ русскаго и международнаго рабочаго класса, для дѣла социализма и революціи мы, плѣнные, этимъ процессомъ сдѣлали больше, чѣмъ если бы находились на волѣ; а мертвые сдѣлаемъ больше, чѣмъ могли бы сдѣлать живые. . . .

Съ того момента, какъ мы попали въ наши руки, мы были увѣрены въ томъ, что вы намъ вынесете смертный приговоръ. Для насъ безразлично, амнистируете ли вы насъ или нѣтъ. Но съ этихъ скамей просьбы о помилованіи вы не услышите. . . .

Гендельманъ

Pro věc naší strany, pro odhalení vaší diktatury před očima ruské a mezinárodní dělnické třídy, pro věc socialismu a revoluce my, zajatci, tímto procesem jsme udělali více než kdybychom byli na svobodě; a smrti udeláme více, nežbychom mohli udelati jaouce živi.

Od okamžiku, kdy jsme padli do vašich rukou, byli jsme přesvědčeni, že nás odsoudíte k smrti. Je nám lhostejno, zdali nás budete amnestovatí nebo ne. Z těchto lavic prosby o milosti neuslyšíte. . . .

Gendelman

ty's counter-revolutionary activity, in preparation for the overthrow of the Soviet Government, both before the amnesty of 1919 as well as after the said amnesty, which thus, in accordance with the idea of the amnesty, renders it inapplicable to them."

A fair estimate of the authors of this argument was given by Martoff in the „Sozialistichesky Viestnik“:

„The Jesuit Fathers are indeed pupps and youngsters in comparison with the Communist casuists. We can readily imagine the explosion of protest that would sweep the Third Internationale if some bourgeois government attempted to interpret an amnesty granted by it to Communists in the sense that it was to be applied only to those of them who on their release would not resume their former struggle against the bourgeoisie! Not even the Czarist government, in granting us amnesty in October, 1905, dared to send us back to jail in punishment for old „crimes“ because we have committed new ones“.

The defendants in the Moscow trial themselves did not, however, resort to this pointed and powerful argument. In accordance with the political character of the trial, as they regarded it, they did not care to employ formal, juridical arguments in repulsing the attacks upon them but preferred, instead, to base their defense upon devotion to their revolutionary duty.

Thus Gotz, in reply to the president's question as to whether he had anything to add to the bill of indictment, said:

„As member of the Central Committee of the party which sent its members into the Government, duty bound to support that government and being always well-informed of the government's moves, I take upon myself entire responsibility for our armed resistance in October, 1917. There was no other way open for the Central Committee, especially because our political opponents had at that period of the struggle between us raised the slogan ‚peace at any price‘.

„After the October coup d'etat, we considered it our bounden duty to our country to wage armed resistance against the usurpers of power, who signed the Brest-Litovsk peace and were ready to accept other compromises leading to the

enslavement of the Russian people, who had just thrown off the fetters of Czarist rule“.

This stand of the defendants rendered the prosecution's efforts to „expose“ the struggle of the Socialists-Revolutionists against the Soviet Government both pitiful and useless. For this reason, the Kremlin prosecution transferred its attention from the general question of the civil war to the particular question of the relations between the Socialists-Revolutionists with foreign missions during the civil war.

The reply to this accusation was given by Timofeyeff in his discussion of the bill of indictment:

„The accusation brought against us regarding our relations with foreign powers and our receipt of military and financial assistance from them in 1917 should be addressed to the Provisional Government, recognized by all the people of Russia, and into which members of our party entered. This government stood for the preservation of our treaty obligations and other understandings with the Allies, and the members of our party, forming part of that government, regarded it as their highest obligation to preserve the honor of the Russian people and the life interests of Russia. They regarded Russia's continued participation in the war as essential, and in basing their program upon Socialist ideas of peace they hoped to wrest at the future peace conference conditions of peace acceptable to Russia. The Brest-Litovsk treaty, concluded in 1918, made continued cooperation with the Allies for salvation of our country from German imperialism, supported by the Soviet government, doubly essential. Our relations with the Allies continued up to the German revolution.“

The testimony of witnesses brought before the court corroborated this declaration of the accused in every way.

The only support left to the prosecution on this point were the oral assertions of the traitors and turncoats. These could not, however, state a single fact and simply referred to each other as the source of their information.

No less than thirty sessions were devoted by the court in its efforts to prove the Socialists-Revolutionists guilty of terroristic acts against the Soviet government. The concrete cases discussed were Volodarsky's assassination, June 20, 1918, and the attack on Lenin.

Regarding the first of these terroristic acts it was fully established that the murder was committed by the worker Sergeyeff, of the Semionovsky detachment, and that the Central Executive Committee of the party not only did not sanction the act but condemned it in the sharpest possible terms.

The attack on Lenine was committed without the knowledge of the party, by the emotional Dora Kaplan, formerly an anarchist, who joined the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists almost on the eve of her act, driven to desperation by the spectacle of Bolshevik savagery and dreaming of liberating the Russian people from the yoke of dictatorship by her self-sacrifice. The Bolshevik's reply to the shot fired by Dora Kaplan was wholesale murder of hostages. Thousands of perfectly innocent people were murdered and savagely tortured to death.

But this mountain of corpses did not satisfy the Bolshevik leaders and four years later they raised the question of the responsibility of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists for the fatal shot fired by Dora Kaplan.

They could not, of course, show the party's direct connection with this act. Instead, they resorted to insinuations: the party had raised the question of terrorism, it sympathized with terroristic acts, it was inclined to launch a terroristic campaign.

At the very beginning of the trial Gotz declared:

„I deny emphatically the accusations brought against me, as member of the Central Committee, with regard to our sanction of individual acts of terrorism committed against the leaders of our political foes by individual members of our party. I deny the accusation as utterly baseless, unsupported by concrete data and founded entirely upon the statements of former members of our party on their admission to the Communist Party. Such terroristic acts were in sharp contradiction with the policy of the Central Committee.“

On the point of the Party's discussion of the question of terroristic action, Timofeyeff made the following statement:

„The question of terrorism was first raised in the Central Committee in the middle of January, 1918, but was taken off the agenda by an absolute majority. This was repeated a second time. The question was raised for the second time in

January, and for the third time in June, in Moscow, but was decided in the negative by the same absolute majority."

But why was this question repeatedly raised before the party? Because there were among its membership some unbalanced and emotional characters who proved good instruments for the machinations of provocateurs.

The testimony of witnesses proved conclusively that Semionoff and Konopliowa were behind these terroristic plans and that these provocateurs, with the aid of the recruits they had enlisted and deceived without the knowledge of the party's centre, committed those acts the responsibility for which the Bolsheviki sought to place upon the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. This proved the decisive blow to the chief point of the indictment.

The Bolsheviki then raised another accusation against the defendants. They undertook to try them for the actions of the so-called „Nonpartisan Union“ in Paris.

The Bolsheviki based this new accusation upon documents stolen by monarchists from the archives of the so-called „Administrative Centre“ of that organization. When Prosecutor Krylenko raised before the court the question of admitting this material to the proceedings, Gotz speaking in the name of all the defendants declared:

„We, the accused, members of the Central Committee, have repeatedly declared to the court that we assume full responsibility for the acts of all groups of our party insofar as these acts took place in Russia. We likewise assume all responsibility for the actions of our foreign delegation at the present time. With regard to the new documents submitted against us, documents of dubious origin, allegedly illuminating the activity of alleged groups alleged to have acted abroad in the name of our party and who, in the opinion of the state prosecutor, were closely connected with our work, we declare that we cannot and will not accept responsibility for actions unknown to us, committed by persons likewise unknown to us. We, therefore, request that these documents be stricken from the record, as material having no direct connection with the indictment against us.“

The court declined this request. The documents were admitted into the case and the tribunal, deserting the question

of what Gotz, Timofeyeff and the other defendants did in Russia, took up the question of what certain third persons did in Paris at the time when the defendants were kept in jail.

Gotz then addressed another declaration to the court:

„The first group of defendants has delegated me to inform the court that we decline to participate in the discussion of the new documents and to request the court's permission to excuse us from attending the proceedings during the reading and discussion of these documents.“

This request of the defendants was granted. They were permitted to leave the room and the judges proceeded to examine the Paris documents without them.

What are these documents? What was the „Nonpartisan Union“? What did the Moscow prisoners of the Soviet Government have to do with it?

These questions are answered in the declaration of the foreign delegation of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists, June 14, 1922:

„With the assistance of monarchists, the Bolsheviki have stolen some documents from the Paris archive of the Administrative Centre of the Nonpartisan Union. Several days after the theft, Krylenko presented part of these documents to the revolutionary tribunal, with the request that they be admitted into the case of the Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. The Bolshevik court, regardless of the protests of the defendants, granted the request.

The foreign delegation of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists declares:

„1. Not a single member of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists now on trial in Moscow belonged to the Non-Partisan Union.

„2. During the entire period of the union's activity (1920—21) the defendants were in prison.

„3. The union's activity was confined entirely abroad and as indicated a year ago in the Administrative Centre's declaration in the „Volia Rossii“, consisted in helping to bring about the union of all forces of the revolutionary democracy, in the establishment and support of press or-

gans the purpose of which was to fight intervention and oppose both red and white dictatorship, and to keep European public opinion informed along the line of these aims.

„4. Individual members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists residing abroad were members of this union and cooperated in such publications as „Volia Rossii“ and „Pour la Russie“, established or supported by the union, and which, while not party organs, did not in any way differ with the general political sentiments of the party.

„5. The Administrative Centre of this nonpartisan organization was in no way connected with any of the party's centres and acted entirely outside the control of the party, which cannot, therefore, assume any political responsibility for its actions.

„6. The effort to „incriminate“ the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists in the organization of uprisings, on the basis of correspondence stolen from the Nonpartisan Union, an organization operating abroad, (to say nothing of the criminal method used in obtaining these documents for the prosecution or the stupidity of the attempt to establish a connection between an organization of that type and local uprisings in Russia) simply manifests the helplessness of the Bolshevist prosecutors in trying to find sufficient material to support their preconceived verdict.

„The Party of Socialists-Revolutionists does not intend to shirk historic and political responsibility for the entire struggle it waged and still wages against bolshevist and white guard dictatorship, not excluding the period when it resorted to arms in defense of democracy. But it hurls back with contempt the cheap effort to put upon it the responsibility for actions in which it neither took nor takes any part.“

I am not going to enter here into analysis of the documents stolen from the Paris archive. I will not attempt to discuss the activity of the „Nonpartisan Union“. I am not speaking here of the merits of this or that doctrine, of this of that policy, but of the Twelve Who Are To Die. For can there be

more than one opinion about a court that rendered a death verdict against them for the actions of an organization of which they were not members, of which they knew only by hearsay and upon which they could exercise no influence whatever!

But in order to appreciate fully this phase of the Moscow trial, it must be remembered that the persons who were being tried had long before the trial declared openly and emphatically their opposition to the tendencies of the Paris „Nonpartisan Union“ and its auxiliary, the Conference of Members of the Constituent Assembly. I have in mind the „Letter to Comrades Abroad“, which appeared in Nos. 14—15 of „Revolutionnaya Rossiya“ (November-December 1921), and signed by Timofeyeff, Gendelman, Gotz, Donskoy, B. Ivanoff, Lichatch, Rakoff, Eugenia Ratner and the others.

The letter follows:

„What should be the chief aim of the representatives of the party abroad? They should aim to make the struggle conducted by our party, as a Socialist and revolutionary party, in Russia, coincide with the struggle waged by the international working class. They should aim, on one side, to familiarize European Socialist opinion with the experience of the Russian Socialist parties, with their mistakes, their defeats, their victories, and, on the other, to internationalize our struggle against the dictatorship of the Bolshevik party, to rivet the attention of the working classes of all countries upon this struggle, to assist the efforts of our organizations fighting under indescribably difficult conditions by attracting the moral and intellectual sympathy of the international working class. The comrades abroad must devote all their attention to this task, for they must remember at all times that our party is but one of the detachments of the international working class. And from this point of view we reject most emphatically the „imperialist“ policy with which some of the comrades abroad are infatuated. No matter how broad the perspectives of the party may appear in the future or how luring the vistas arising in the imagination of some of the individual leaders, — we must never forget our present, alas, so modest. There

must be no place for illusions and self — deceptions. For what confronts us today, on one side, is a battered, mercilessly persecuted party, driven underground, and, on the other, the shattered, weary bleeding masses of the people. This is the reality of things. Under such conditions it would be a grave mistake to distract the party from the only right task before it of organizing, training and disciplining the masses, as part of the process of the political struggle against the dictatorship of the Soviet Government — a task in which all the active elements of the party in Russia are engaged.

„In this struggle the Russian Socialist parties, the parties of the Russian toiling masses, have but one ally in Europe and America, — the international working class. And it is in this direction that our comrades abroad should devote all their efforts. All short cuts leading in the direction of European governments, and of so-called „influential“ circles, being made by individual comrades, supporting themselves either on the authority arising out of their activity in the past, or on the hopes that may be laid by some Western European circles and governments upon the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in the future, will not only fail to ease the burden of the struggle against the Bolshevik dictatorship, placed by history upon the shoulders of our party, but on the contrary, will make the situation worse confounded, lead us off on a tangent, set the European Socialist parties and the broad masses of the people against us and thus make more difficult the sufficiently hard struggle against the Bolshevik rule. The isolation of Bolshevism from the international Socialist movement should be the first and fundamental aim of the party's representatives abroad. The policy of some of you, however, can lead only to the isolation of the party from the international labor movement. If the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists is destined again, in response to the will of the people, to take the lead in the Russian Revolution, it will, when that time comes, be in a position, by means of its governmental authority, to establish such relations with the governments of Western Europe as will correspond to the in-

terests of the state and the people. But to anticipate coming events is useless so far as the future is concerned and highly injurious for the present, for it detracts the comrades, we repeat, from the only task before us — the establishment of close concrete and intellectual relations between the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists and the international working class.

„This substitution of fictitious attempts to „influence“ European governments for regular, revolutionary party work abroad must also be emphasized as highly detrimental with regard to another question which troubles the minds of the comrades in Russia: the question of the so-called Paris Conference. The party indicated quite clearly its attitude on this question at its Xth congress and condemned unequivocally this entire enterprise as the baseless venture of a group of individuals acting on their own initiative, delegated by no one to do so, representing and supporting themselves upon nobody. The fact alone that on this question the party unanimously disowned so many of its former tried leaders and did not hesitate disavow their acts and policy before the Socialist public opinion of Europe should have sufficed to make the authors of this unfortunate enterprise realize the extent to which their venture contradicted the whole policy of the party and damaged the interests of the revolution. It is not the fear of demagogic criticism by the Bolshevik press — as some of you were inclined to believe — but deep consciousness of the grave danger this venture held out to the party as a whole, in the policy which it is now working out, which forms the sole motive actuating all members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists now at work in Russia, as well as its leading representative bodies, in their unanimous and emphatic demand that the comrades abroad abandon the Parisian venture. If on one scale we put the mythical political advantages arising out of coalition or cooperation with Miliukoff, who, according to your own declaration, is but a „pittiful fragment of the Kadet Party“, representing nobody, and on the other we put the real dangers confronting the unity of the party in the continued, obstinate pursuit of the policy

followed by some comrades abroad, it should not be difficult for any one who holds dear the party's interests to choose the proper course. So it seems to us.

„The foregoing reasoning must make clear to representatives of the party abroad that we must pursue but one policy with regard to the attitude of the Western European and American governments — unceasing struggle against all kinds of intervention, open or camouflaged.

„The reality of the situation and the demands arising therefrom should be our sole guide in determining our tactics and policy. And if you would listen more carefully to the advice of the comrades working in Russia you would readily agree that an understanding with the Mensheviks, with an eye to coordinating the political struggle and establishing a united democratic-socialist front, is the only real problem before us, rather than coalition with „fragments of a party“ representing most unreal quantities at the present moment in Russia. The united action of the delegations of both parties abroad before the court of the international proletariat would constitute a wiser and more desirable policy in defense of the Russian Revolution abroad, regardless of the many differences that exist between our party and the Mensheviks. Such closer cooperation with the foreign delegation of the Mensheviks becomes all the more possible in proportion as the Mensheviks, acting under the influence of the stubborn facts of Russian reality and Bolshevik practice, abandon their utopian conception of the Socialist nature of the Russian Revolution in its present Bolshevik stage and their dreams of the possibility of peaceful evolution of the Kremlin dictatorship into a workers' and peasants' government.

„Such, in our opinion, are the problems confronting the party's representatives abroad. We consider it our duty to state our opinion as sharply and as emphatically as possible, in order to leave no room for ambiguity and misunderstanding. The Party of Socialists-Revolutionists never suffered from the disease of dogmatism and sectional irreconcilability. But never before

was the party so much in need of solidarity of action and unity of organization as it is now. The defeat of the Bolshevik dictatorship, which is the main task placed before us by the development of the Russian Revolution and put forward as our chief problem by the Xth congress of the party, demands the concentrated attention of all forces of the party. It demands patience and methodical effort, liquidation of all side-shows and the cessation of interrenine strife within the party. This is the unanimous demand of all comrades from the front trenches. You dare not ignore it“.

It is the authors of this letter whom the Bolsheviki dare to accuse of intriguing with the Entente, of intervention plots and of supporting the blockade of Russia! It is these people whom the Bolsheviki sentenced to death for the very same acts which the defendants so unequivocally condemned as inexcusable from the point of view of international Socialism.

Let us, however, be fair to the Bolsheviki. Let us not represent the Moscow judges as more stupid and naive than they really are. Not for their participation in the civil war, covered by the amnesty act, not for the terroristic acts and robberies carried out by Semionoff and Konopliowa, and not for the acts covered in the documents stolen in Paris did the Moscow judges condemn the Socialists-Revolutionists. No! They condemned them to death because while kept prisoners in the dock, the Socialists-Revolutionists turned the tables and indicted the whole system of Soviet absolutism before the proletariat of the world.

The declarations of the accused already cited are perhaps sufficient to give the reader an insight into their souls, but I would like to reveal them more clearly. And could this be done any better than by citing their letters, their words, their speeches.

Here is what the accused wrote to their foreign counsel on the day after the aforementioned demonstration at the Windau railway station:

„Dear Comrades:

„With heavy hearts we learned that the campaign of slander and misrepresentation raised against you by

the entire Bolshevist press has produced the inevitable result: the wild scenes which took place on your arrival in Moscow. Having greeted at one time the arrival in „red Moscow“ of the representatives of German imperialism, Mirbach and Helfferich, as marking the „victory of the revolution“, the Bolsheviki today see in the arrival of the representatives of international Socialism an insult to the Russian working class. The Russian working class is as little responsible for these disgusting excesses as it is for the policy of terrorism and violence pursued by the Bolshevist government, covering itself with the name of the workers and peasants.

„The artificial staging of the spectacle of ‚popular wrath‘, with the aid of paid agents of the Che-Ka and Communist cells, is so obvious, that it will hardly deceive even those who are but little familiar with the tactics and methods of the Bolshevist government.

„Such incidents, which will hardly prove humiliating to you, old and tried leaders of the international proletariat, can only bring indelible shame upon its organizers — the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party — and prove again before the face of the international Socialist movement that the Bolsheviki do not hesitate to use any means, however dishonest, in their struggle against their opponents. The spectacle of ‚popular wrath‘ staged by agents of the Che-Ka no more represents the real attitude of the Russian toiling masses than do the gala parades in honour of the Third Internationale bear witness to the devotion of the Russian proletariat and peasantry to the ideas of Bolshevist communism. We have grown familiar with this kind of ‚popular‘ movements under the Czarist regime, when the Czarist police staged as successfully as does the Bolshevist Che-Ka its impressive spectacles intended to emphasize the people's loyalty and their hatred against Socialists. We, Russian Socialists, have long grown accustomed to all this.

„But the Bolshevist excesses incident to your arrival have been accompanied by something which compells even us, well familiar with the practices of the Bolshevist

government, to raise a word of warning. To the usual methods of the Communist Party — slander, falsehood and insinuation — there has now been added incitement of the street mob to lynching. For how else can you interpret the resolutions now being adopted by Communist 'cells' in the name of the workers of individual plants and factories, — resolutions demanding the murder of the members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists about to be tried and their counsel, the representatives of the Second and Vienna Internationales? How else can you interpret the bloodthirsty ditties specially prepared by Soviet poets for your arrival? We have no assurance that these scenes will not be reenacted on a larger scale with the opening of the trial. We, the prisoners of the Soviet Government, have long grown reconciled to the possibility of being lynched by the Che-Ka. But we do not feel justified in subjecting you, the leaders of the international proletariat, to similar danger. And if the government will not abandon immediately its persecution against you, which threatens to take the form of a lynching party, and will not cease the staging of street scenes of alleged 'popular wrath' we would rather be deprived of your defense in the coming trial than subject the international proletariat in the present bitter campaign of international capital against Socialism to the danger of losing some of its foremost chieftains.

„(Signed). A. Gotz, M. Gendelman, S. Markoff, E. Ratner, M. Vedepianin, P. Zlobin, L. Gerstein, B. Utgoff, D. Donskoy, E. Gorkoff, Dobroluboff, F. Fedorovitch, E. Timofeyeff, D. Rakoff, N. Ivanoff, E. Ivanova, A. Liberoff, M. Lichatch, N. Artemieff, B. Agapoff, A. Altovsky, B. Ivanoff, inmates of the Lefortoff Prison and members of the Central Committee of the Party of S. R.“

Their conduct at the trial was marked by the same nobility of spirit which animates this noble, courageous letter. Their appearance in „court“ was like the entrance of a group of uncompromising accusers rather than a group of defendants. Like a thunderous wave roll out the first words of Gendelman's declaration:“

„We do not recognize your court. We do not recognize it not only because of your crying violations of your own laws but principally because what we are about to witness here will be a political struggle between the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists and the Bolshevik Party, the judges in which will consist not of a neutral or nonpartisan body, or of members of other parties, freely chosen by the people, but of members of the very same Bolshevik Party, appointed by its Central Committee, and who have come here with a verdict prepared in advance by the Central Committee of Russian Bolshevik Party“.

„Your bill of indictment bristles not only with inaccuracies, which you yourselves admit, but with downright forgeries“, is the accusation hurled by Gendelman into the face of the court.

„Why did Clara Zetkin come here for, — did she come here to get the heads of the accused?“ asks Timofeyeff.

„What becomes of your promises of a free trial and free defense given at the Berlin conference of the internationales, when you prevent the appearance of eleven of our witnesses by keeping them under arrest?“ is the question of the accused.

And Lichatch hurls the following at the Court:

„We have come here only because you had promised before the face of the international proletariat, in Berlin, as well as in your press, that the trial would be free, public and open to everybody. But your perverted sense of honor, your black conscience enabled you to fill this hall with Communists mad with thirst for blood“.

„You refuse to call our witnesses because you fear them“, declares Timofeyeff, „but we invite your witnesses, we are waiting for them“.

Proud contempt for death permeates Gendelman's declaration before the court:

„From the moment we fell into your hands we were convinced that you would condemn us to death. But from these benches you will never hear any plea for mercy!“

Waters, writing in the Brussels „Peuple“, thus described the accused in the Moscow trial:

„They are sitting behind us. They are triumphant! Their actions are being discussed publicly! They proudly accept full responsibility for all they have done.

„The first to speak is Gendelman. He begins with a sharp attack:

„We do not recognize your court. It has been ordered to convict us. It derives its authority from a government akin to the government of the 18th Brumaire, which was composed of convicted criminals, bums, alleged students, prostitutes and journalists for sale“.

„Timofeyeff follows:

„We have not come here to save our heads — they belong to the Revolution. We will never surrender our right to revolution, for this right is the holy heritage of the French Revolution and the unwritten law of every Socialist party“.

„Here is Lichatch, complete master of himself, waiting calmly for the mob to cease yelling. Here is Gotz, this leader of clear mind, greeted with insults by the mob. Here is Berg, a plain workman, who in reply to the question: „are you guilty?“ says: „yes, I am guilty before the revolution of not fighting hard enough to destroy your rotten dictatorship“.

„They should all be quoted, for they are all of the same courage and manhood.

„Wednesday, June 14th. The accused have requested us to withdraw from the defense. It is a painful moment. We are parting from them. We embrace them all, these twenty-two heads, over which there hovers a grave threat. The strains of the „Internationale“ are heard, melancholy, heart-rending. We leave quite shattered“.

All despots like to chop off heads that will not bend. Under Nicholas Romanoff these people pined in Siberian dungeons. Under Lenine, they are sentenced to death.

VIII.

The Verdict.

After the examination of witnesses, the prosecutors took the floor. The only one of them who tried to draw the line between his function and that of a Che-Ka agent was Sadul. He attacked the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists but did not demand the heads of the accused. The others, from Lunacharsky to Clara Zetkin, while not offering to execute the accused themselves, evinced their eagerness to prepare the rope. The most bloodthirsty speech was Krilenko's.

The accused were then given the floor. Timofeyeff concluded his speech as follows:

„There is no common ground between us. We remain what we were“.

And Gotz, confirming this, declared:

„We were and will always remain Socialists“.

With his usual calm, he added:

„I have not been able all these years to give my party an account of my stewardship. Let my remarks from this platform, therefore, serve as a testament to those who remain. If we must die we will meet death without fear, but if we remain among the living we will, after our release, continue to wage our fight against you as we have done in the past“.

The prosecutor was again given the floor. Discussing the verdict he said that it was clearly determined by the declaration of Gotz, Gendelman and Timofeyeff, who declared that as long as they remained alive they would do what they had done before and that it was useless to expect from them either a change of tactics or plea for mercy. „What is there left for us to do after such declarations?“ asked the prosecutor. „What do we see when we look into the past? Rebellion and blood in Petrograd. The October uprising in Moscow and blood. In Archangel — blood. In Samara and in Siberia — blood. In Tamboff and recently in Kronstadt — blood. Therefore, I say quite calmly: blood must flow here in order that it may not flow again, or at least not in such measure.“



G. Gorkov - Г. Горьков



A. Libarov - А. Либеров



M. A. Védéniairine
М.А. Веденяпин



F. F. Fedorovitch
Ф.Ф. Федорович



E. Berg - Е. Берг



S. T. Rakov - Л. Ф. Раков

Thus spoke the hangmen of Versailles in their wholesale executions of the Communards. Thus spoke Horthy and Denikin.

But we have learned already that the Bolsheviks are not satisfied with mere murder. They seek also the „moral annihilation“ of their opponents. With this purpose in mind, the prosecution's demand for the execution of the accused was followed by a proposal that the accused repent and disavow their party. They were offered their lives and their freedom and they rejected the proposal with contempt.

Timofeyeff replied:

„The State Prosecutors Lunacharsky and Krilenko who pressed the indictment against us on all counts, not being sure themselves of our guilt, have deemed it necessary, in order to lighten their task, to request us to repent and disavow our past activity. I have been delegated by the defendants of the first group to make the following declaration in reply to this proposal before the court and prosecution: There can be no question of repentance or disavowal. From these benches you will never hear anything like that. As we have stood before so will we continue to stand in the future, and in this regard we will always remain, so far as you are concerned, unrepentant opponents.“

Unsatisfied with this declaration, the court in withdrawing for discussion of the verdict, again addressed the defendants of the first group, asking them to state what their attitude toward the Soviet Government would be if they should be acquitted and given their liberty.

Timofeyeff replied:

„We stick to the unalterable position expressed by every one of us individually during the interrogation at the preceding sessions“.

On August 7, the court rendered its verdict:

A) Twelve of the defendants to be executed: Gotz, Donskoy, Gerstein, Gendelman, Lichatch, Nikolai Ivanoff, Eugenia Ratner, Timofeyeff, Morozoff, Agapoff, Helen Ivanova, Altovsky.

B) Imprisonment from 2 to 10 years: Zòbin, Utgoff, Berg, Lvoff, Liberoff, Artemieff, Rakoff, Fedorovitch, Vede-
pianin.

C) For the traitors — Acquital.

This verdict was submitted in this form for the examination of the conference of the Bolshevik Party, then in session at Moscow. Here the members of the Soviet Government (with the exception of Trotzky), part of the praesidium of the Central Executive Committee, members of the conference from the provinces, and heads of Soviet bureaus and embassies abroad, urged the verdict to be commuted to permanent exile of the condemned outside the confines of the RSFSR. The group composed of Trotzky, Stalin and Bucharin, opposing this suggestion, proposed that the condemned be given 24 hours to sign an undertaking promising to abandon forever all resistance to the Soviet Government, resign from their party and cease all relations with any of its members. In event of their assent to this proposal the sentences of the condemned to death were to be commuted to five years, exile at hard labor to Northern provinces, while those sentenced to imprisonment were to be sent to concentration camps for one year. In event of refusal, the verdict was to be executed at once.

After stormy discussion the conference accepted a compromise proposed by Kameneff: the verdict is to be made conditional and is not to be executed if the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists abandons all active opposition to the Soviet Government, in Russia and abroad.

The verdict was confirmed in this form and made public by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. Its final form shows how little the Bolsheviks are inclined to let their prey out of their hands:

„With regard to those twelve of the defendants sentenced to the extreme measure of punishment, the Central Executive Committee decides: the verdict is confirmed but its execution is postponed.

„The verdict will not be executed if the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists actually abandons all underground, conspiratory, terroristic, and rebel activity, as

well as all military espionage against the Soviet Government.

„If, however, the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists will continue in the future to wage armed war against the Soviet Government, it will inevitably bring about the execution of all the condemned inspirers and organizers of counter-revolutionary terrorism and rebellion.“

The Bolsheviki thus qualify their verdict by the application of the principle of CONDITIONAL SENTENCE.

Is this ignorance or hypocrisy?

IF THE PARTY WILL DISCONTINUE ALL UNDERGROUND CONSPIRATORY ACTIVITY.

But who will decide whether the work of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists is of an underground, conspiratory nature? The Che-Ka? But who will arbitrate the difference that may arise in the Che-Ka on the nature and character of the work of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party? Will the Che-Ka turn to Semionoff, Konopliowa and other traitors in such cases? And is it not clear that every action of a party, deprived of the right of free political activity must of necessity be of underground, conspiratory nature?

IF THE PARTY ABANDONS ALL TERRORISTIC ACTIVITY AGAINST THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT.

Both both the accused and the representative bodies of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists have repeatedly declared that the party never resorted to terrorism in its struggle against the Soviet Government. Yet, the leaders of this party are sentenced to death on the testimony of adventurers and provocateurs who succeeded to penetrate into its ranks. What is there to prevent the Che-Ka from bringing out another Judas upon the stage, who will in obedience to his masters' orders, testify that some Socialists-Revolutionists had sought to persuade him to blow up the whole of Moscow?

IF THE PARTY WILL ABANDON MILITARY ESPIONAGE.

What has the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists done that comes under the category of military espionage? The Moscow judges can give no reply to this question. We recall, however, the charge brought by the Bolsheviki against the

French Communist La Fone to the effect that he was performing espionage work for Poland. We recall also, in this connection, the execution of the Russian scientist Uchtomsky on the charge that he was guilty of ESPIONAGE in sending information abroad on the condition of Russian museums. What is there to prevent the Bolsheviki in bringing a charge of espionage against any Socialist-Revolutionist newspaper published in Russia or abroad and interpreting Russian affairs in a style contrary to that of the „Pravda“ or „Izvestia“?

UPRISINGS?

But we know well that the Bolheviki never hesitate to make the Socialists-Revolutionists and Mensheviki responsible for any uprisings led by counter-revolutionary generals, for all local rebellions and for the operations of bandit groups. The Bolsheviki can thus take advantage of the very first military uprising or the very first bread riot or disturbance of workmen and peasants, of the very first indication of a new movement of Wrangel, Petlura and Savinkoff and say:

„And so the Socialists-Revolutionists have not ceased their rebel conspiracies, — to the wall, then, with Gotz, Timofeyeff, Gendelman, Donskoy and their comrades!“

In short, the ACTUAL MEANING of the verdict is that the Twelve Who Are To Die may be executed at any moment.

As the Moscow „Pravda“ (No. 178) wrote:

„Let there be one attempt to burn a factory or one attempt at murder — and the Socialists-Revolutionists will be punished according to law.“

„Punished according to law“ means they will be killed. And that this may come to pass it is not necessary that the incendiaries or murderers should be members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. The fact of the fire or the murder is to be regarded sufficient cause for the execution of the condemned.

As I write about them now I see Gotz before me, this brave revolutionist, who knows fear no more than he knows ambition. I see his fine, kind, smiling, intelligent face. I recall his quiet, simple, intelligent conversation, permeated at all times with deep conviction, and I do not know whether the Moscow executioners will not finish him in a few days.

I recall Timofeyeff, his proud head, white as snow at 30, his eyes gleaming with fire, thought and will power, his quick movements. I see him as he was in Siberia, in the days of the reaction, and I do not know how long the death sentence is to hang over his head.

We, Russian Revolutionists, are accustomed to look death in the face. We remember the death houses of Czarism. Nothing can ever erase from our minds the memory of the scenes that were enacted in those cells of death! But not even in the worst times of the black terror under Czarism was a verdict possible even remotely resembling the verdict of the Bolshevik court in Moscow.

The „Golos Rossii“ (No. 102) well described it as „worse and more shameless than naked murder.“ It combines a thirst for blood and contemptible political blackmail with the most subtle kind of torture.

What does the conditional character of the verdict mean? The All-Russian Executive Committee reserves the right to execute the verdict whenever it feels like it. The condemned are subjected to the constant torture of expectation of death. They are lifelong hostages. They are responsible with their heads in case of every new slander against the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists, for every new action of those members of the party who are at liberty.

The Bolsheviks are not satisfied with mere executions. They trade in and speculate with the blood of their victims. By holding out the threat of executing Gotz, Timofeyeff, Donskoy and the others they mean to bind, to paralyze the activities of the entire party of Socialists-Revolutionists.

The Bolsheviks hope to deceive the aroused workers of all countries who protested against the death verdict: they do not intend to execute the condemned immediately but the condemned may be executed at any moment. When the protests cease, when the attention of Socialist Europe is distracted, then will it be possible to execute the condemned, — singly or in a body, quietly, unobserved, somewhere in the labyrinth of Che-Ka dungeons or in some out of the way jail. Such is the plan of the

Bolsheviki. Did human imagination ever conceive anything more contemptible or martyrdom more painful? Our comrades are not only condemned to death but to daily execution. This execution began at the moment when the verdict was pronounced.

The confirmation of the verdict by the Central Executive Committee of Soviets was officially announced to the condemned on August 10, at 10 o'clock in the morning, by the assistant commandant of the Lubianka prison, who said:

„I have been ordered to inform you that the Central Executive Committee has confirmed the verdict of the Supreme Tribunal. Get ready. Please inform me if any of you should desire to convey anything to your relatives.“

The condemned prepared letters and waited until 8 o'clock in the evening for their transfer to the death house. At 8 o'clock in the evening the commandant himself, accompanied by Che-Ka agents and representatives of the prison administration, appeared and again announced the decision of the Central Executive Committee in its final form. The commandant then informed the condemned that henceforward they will be deprived of all privileges enjoyed by prisoners, including the daily walk and the weekly visit of relatives, and ordered that the condemned be immediately searched. The order was carried out to the accompaniment of insults and laughter by the agents of the Che-Ka and representatives of the prison administration.

Thus were the condemned officially transferred from their former position of prison inmates to the position of prisoners sentenced to death. To be sure, the Central Executive Committee recalled this action and ordered that the condemned be treated as long-term prisoners. But several days later they were transferred to the terrible „sekretki“ of what is known as the „inner prison“ of the Che-Ka! This cat-and-mouse game was intended to add to the torture of the prisoners.

This inhuman game was accompanied by punitive measures against the relatives of the condemned. Thus, immediately after the pronouncement of the verdict by the court, and

even before its confirmation, the wives of Lichatch, Gerstein, Liberoff and the others were arrested and taken out of Moscow. Their destination was kept secret.

And this was the verdict, these were the measures that received the praise of the Executive Committee of the Third Internationale in its last declaration addressed to the workers of all countries. In THIS verdict the leaders of the Third Internationale profess to see proof that „the revolutionary government of the workers does not know any policy of vengeance and is guided by considerations of revolutionary necessity“.

It was the moment of the pronouncement of THIS verdict that the Executive Committee of the Third Internationale chose to call upon the workers of all parties to compel the leaders of the Second and Vienna Internationales to cease „their shameless assaults upon the Soviet Government“. The Third Internationale urged the workers of the world to address the following demand to the leaders of the Second and Vienna Internationales:

„You must compel your allies, the Socialists-Revolutionists, to abandon their civil war against the Soviet Government, to abandon not in word but in deed their shameful cooperation with capitalist governments, to abandon their preparation of civil war in Soviet Russia, which seeks only to labor in peace. The Soviet Government, which is devoid of the bloodthirstiness of bourgeois governments, has halted the sword of punishment. It is the duty of the workers to support the generous action of the Soviet Government, to prevent the renewal of civil war and to help Soviet Russia in its struggle against the avaricious plans of world capitalism“.

If there are in the Third Internationale any decent, sincere people, who have fallen by mistake into that house of intellectual prostitution, lured thither not by the jingle of Moscow gold but by the phantom rays of demagoguery, which they mistook for the fire of revolutionary idealism, people who hold dear the noblest aspirations of the proletariat and who hate the barbarism of the old world; and if they are not so completely deceived by the Bolsheviki as to have retained some measure of ability to reason and to account to themselves for their own actions, — they will die of shame when they

realize how low and contemptible a deed they committed when they put their signature to the foregoing declaration, at the time when twelve men condemned to die were returning to their prison cells, with heads proud and erect, and followed by the eyes of their near ones, their wives and their mothers, who under Czarism first learned the torture of waiting for the execution of those they loved.

IX.

THE MOSCOW TRIAL AND EUROPE.

At the very first news of the preparation of the trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists, the suspicion arose that what was being prepared in Moscow was not a trial but a spectacle of bloody vengeance. This impression gained in strength with the approach of the opening of the trial and in proportion as the Bolshevik press and the press subsidized by the Bolsheviki grew louder and louder in their demands for the blood of the accused.

And when the curtain rose upon the scene of the trial, with the accused prisoners on one side and their judges and executioners, on the other, the resentment hitherto suppressed broke forth into a wave of mighty protest that swept the whole of Europe.

Then followed the criminal violation of the vow given by the Bolsheviki in the Berlin agreement, the withdrawal of the foreign counsel, the „demonstration“ of June 20, the retirement of the Russian counsel, the long series of judicial forgeries and the mockery of every principle of judicial fair play.

And, finally, came the verdict, followed by the campaign of political slander and calumny raised by the Third Internationale against the condemned.

The conscience of the cultured world in general and of the proletariat, in particular, refused to reconcile itself to this crying abuse, just as 20 years before it would not be reconciled to the conviction of Dreyfus in France, or to the conviction of Beilis, in Czarist Russia, 10 years later.

Both of these cases come to one's mind thinking of the Moscow trial. But there is, however, a great difference bet-

ween these now historical cases and the Moscow trial. The Dreyfus case was founded upon lies. But however low the court which sent an innocent man to Devil's Island proved itself to be, it still retained some resemblance of a court compared with the Moscow tribunal.

The Beilis case in its nature approaches closer to the Moscow trial. It was staged shortly before the war, at the very height of darkest reaction in Russia. The Russian Government was bending all its energies to rousing the ignorant masses against the Jews. To accomplish this purpose, and with the assistance of false witnesses, it staged the trial intended to prove to the whole world that the Jews were using the blood of Christians for ritual purposes. The trial was woven around the murder of the boy Justchinsky, found dead in the environs of Kieff. It was proven at the trial that he was killed by a band of thieves, headed by Vera Tcheberiak. This band succeeded, however, in purchasing the government's mercy and forgiveness by throwing the guilt upon the Jews. Vera Tcheberiak thus played in the Beilis case the part of Konopliowa at the Moscow trial. The Beilis case had also its Semionoff, whose part was taken by the renegade clergyman Pranaitis, who undertook to prove by Hebrew Scripture that the Jews were given to seizing Christian youths in order to murder them and use their blood for ritual purposes.

The judges knew very well the real characters of Tcheberiak and Pranaitis, but pretended to believe them. The reactionary press sang the praises and unselfishness of these witnesses.

Simultaneously with the trial proceeded the staging of manifestations of „popular wrath“. Branches of the Union of the Russian People (who played the same role under Nicholas II now performed by the Communist „cells“) were adopting resolutions demanding merciless punishment for the accused. Street demonstrations were held, demanding the execution of the murderers of Christian babes. There were threats of lynching of Jews and Jewish pogroms should the judges evince restraint and mercy in the handling of the case.

The government, supporting this entire campaign and directing it behind the scenes, pretended that it was merely

giving ear to the voice of public opinion. At the same time it suppressed newspapers who dared to tell the truth.

Finally, the court rendered its verdict. It was to the effect that the charge concerning the murder of Justchinsky had been fully proven, but the judges of Czarist Russia, which had its own Semionoffs and Konopliowas, hesitated to descend to the level of Piatakoff, Bucharin, and Krilenko, and acquitted Beilis and his fellow defendants.

The Moscow trial was a repetition of the Beilis case, with the substitution for the ritual murder charge of the charge that the accused Socialists were guilty of terroristic murders and espionage. To this was added the tragic finale of the verdict.

It is not remarkable, therefore, that public opinion, deeply moved by the Beilis case, rose in redoubled protest against the Moscow trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists.

The resolutions, telegrams and other manifestations of protest adopted or sent to Moscow would fill scores and hundreds of pages. This movement of protest was led by Socialist parties throughout the world. The Second and Vienna Internationales were the first to rouse the world to energetic protest in an effort to save the victims from the clutches of the Moscow hangmen. To their voices were added those of the French Socialist Party, the German Social-Democratic Party, the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, the British Labour Party, the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, the British Social-Democratic Federation, the Belgian Socialist Labour Party, the Socialist and Social-Democratic Parties of Tchecho-Slovakia, the Socialist parties of Italy, the Social-Democratic parties of Sweden and Holland, the Socialist parties of Bulgaria, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, White-Russia, Ukraine, the Bund, the Party of Socialists-Zionists and the united Socialist parties of India.

Among others who added their voices to the protests against the Moscow comedy were the trade union organizations of the entire world, headed by the Amsterdam Internationale. Protests came from the French General Confederation of Labour, the German Trade Union Congress, the National Committee of the Trade Unions of Belgium and the Italian Confederation of Labor. To these were added the

protests of the leading individual trade union organizations of Europe. Workers' massmeetings and demonstrations throughout the world likewise protested against the Moscow judicial murder.

Particularly widespread was the protest movement in France. In that country, where the overwhelming majority of the workers cherish the great traditions of the great Revolution, the proletariat took up the defense of the Russian Socialists-Revolutionists with the eagerness and enthusiasm that marked its fight for the triumph of the truth in the Dreyfus case, under leadership of Jaures, 20 years ago.

Let Trotsky console his followers with assurances that it was the Western-European bourgeoisie that rose to the defense of the Socialists-Revolutionists, as its allies in the struggle against the Soviet Government. Mr. Trotsky cannot stifle the cry of unanimous resentment coming from the hearts of millions of workers by resorting to such petty and ill-conceived falsehood.

To the protest of the proletariat against the Moscow trial were added those of the foremost representatives of science, literature and art. Among those who signed the declaration to the Soviet Government demanding that it „abandon, in the name of humanity and universal reconciliation, what otherwise will be regarded by mankind as an act of vengeance“ were: A. Aulard, professor at the Sorbonne; Paul Painleve, member of the Institute; A. Meillet, professor at the College de France and correspondent of the Petrograd Academy of Sciences; Gabriel Seailles, professor at the Sorbonne; Emile Borel, of the Academy of Sciences; R. Schneider, professor at the Sorbonne; M. Alleman, former member of the chamber of Deputies; Xavier Leon; Henri Ozere, professor at the Sorbonne; Charles Gide; Emil Terquam; J. Adamar, member of the Institute; L. Levy-Bruhl, professor at the Sorbonne; P. Alphanderi; Henry Levy-Bruhl; J. Bruns-vig; Victor Bash, professor at the Sorbonne; Ch. Segnobos, professor at the Sorbonne; and many others. This protest was signed also by H. G. Wells.

The following were among those who protested in Germany: Professor A. Einstein; Count Harry Kessler; Ernst Feder, editor-in-chief of the Berliner Tageblatt; Dr. Fort-

man, editor-in-chief of the Centrist „Parlamentskorrespondenz“; P. Gerstenberg, member of the Reichstag and editor of the „Volkszeitung“; Dr. Rudolph Breitscheid, member of the Reichstag; Rd. Paul Nathan; Prof. Hugo Preuss; Friedrich Stampfer, editor of „Vorwärts“; Dr. B. Gutman, editor of the „Frankfurter Zeitung“; Gabriel Reiter; Eduard Bernstein; Bernhard Kellermann; Felix Liebermann; Prof. Alois Kil; Hermann Sudermann; Heinrich Stroebel; J. Sassenbach; Karl Kautsky and others.

But the most eloquent proof of how deeply the Moscow trial roused the conscience of the world were the protests of a whole group of public men known to Europe as enthusiastic supporters and defenders of the Soviet Government.

First among these was Maxim Gorky, who on this occasion found words worthy of his great talent and his great heart. He was the first among the defenders of the Soviet Government to warn it that by its action it would provoke the moral blockade of Soviet Russia by the Socialists of the entire world.

Among those who joined Gorky in his protest were Anatole France, Henri Barbusse and Romain Rolland, — three great names with which French Communism has been trying all these years to cover its pitiiful intellectual poverty.

From Italy came the protest of the old anarchist leader Malatesta. To the protests from that country was added that of the Turin congress of trade unions, where the friends of the Moscow dictators were expected to be in the majority.

In England, Turner and George Landbury were among Bolshevik sympathisers who condemned the action of the Soviet Government.

It is impossible to enumerate the names of all those who in those days expressed the resentment of the aroused conscience of the world. The wave of protest grew from day to day, warning the Soviet Government that there were limits which even absolutist rulers were forbidden to cross.

The political significance of this wave of protests is by no means confined to its effects upon the outcome of the Moscow trial. Its significance is much greater, for it facilitated the emancipation of the proletariat of Europe from those remnants of illusion anent Russian Bolshevism which

it still entertained and helped the proletariat to comprehend the real substance of Bolshevism.

Thus, a year and a half ago, the treacherous invasion of democratic Georgia by Bolshevist armies and the enslavement of this small, liberty-loving country by „red“ bayonets, opened the eyes of the workers of Europe to the real nature of the Third Internationale and revealed that imperialist, czarist ambitions were the basis of the intrigues conducted by the Kremlin absolutists with the assistance of the reactionary forces of the East. This killed the legend of the international, pacifist mission of Bolshevism and of Moscow's protection of oppressed peoples. But one legend still remained: the legend that the terror raging in Soviet Russia was pursued in self-defense by the „workers and peasants' government“ against the plots of counter-revolutionists. The Moscow trial revealed to Europe the real victims against whom the Bolshevist terror is directed.

The conquest of Georgia exposed the IMPERIALIST NATURE OF BOLSHEVIST FOREIGN POLICY. The trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists exposed the reality of THE TERRORISM OF BOLSHEVIST INTERNAL POLICY.

Twelve revolutionists, who gave their whole lives to the emancipation of the toiling masses of Russia and to the cause of international Socialism, were simply reaffirming their devotion to that cause when from the prisoners' dock they continued to expose the dictators of Russia. They utilized their position before their Moscow judges to hurl a burning indictment against those who for the sake of their own power hold the workers and peasants of their country in slavery. They fought with boundless courage to scatter forever the last illusions that may still be entertained by the proletariat of the world. They did not think for a moment about saving their own lives.

But the fight for their lives goes on. Behind the condemned is the conscience of mankind, the public opinion of the world-proletariat. Against them is the Che-Ka. Who will win?

It is hardly necessary to speak of what the outcome of this struggle means? The victory of the Che-Ka and its acceptance by mankind would not only imply the death of

these twelve brave fighters in the cause of Socialism and prove the signal for a renewal, on a larger scale than ever before, of the terror in Russia and the countries conquered by the Bolsheviki, but would also fan the dying fires of the savagery that has been sweeping the world in recent years. The victory of human conscience in this fight, on the other hand, would mark a great step forward to its triumph on a still broader, universal scale.

The MORAL BLOCKADE of the jailers and executioners of Russia — this must be the weapon of the world-proletariat in this fight. The Soviet Government will not dare to scorn such action. With this weapon in hand, the proletariat of the world, pursuing the road of fraternal, Socialist intervention, will win the battle for the lives of The Twelve Who Are To Die and put an end to the red terror in Russia.

W. Voitinsky.

**Tactical positions
of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party as shown
by the party rekords**



P. Zlobin - П. Злобин



S. Morosov - С. В. Морозов



L. Guerstein - Л. Я. Герштейн



M. A. Likhatch - М. А. Лихач



W. Agarov - В. Агапов



A. Altovsky - А. И. Альтовский

Le verdict que vous vous préparez à pronocer ou, plutôt, que le Comité Central de votre parti a déjà prononcé, je l'attends avec la plus grande indifférence, sinon avec mépris. Morosov

Dem Urtheil, das zu fällen Ihr im Begriffe seid, oder das vielmehr das Zentralkomitee Eurer Partei bereits gefällt hat, sehe ich mit größter Gleichgültigkeit, um nicht zu sagen Verachtung, entgegen. . . .

I am completely indifferent as to the sentence, which you are about to pass, which has already actually been voted by the Central Committee of your party. I despise it. Morozoff

Къ приговору, который вы собираетесь вынести, вѣрнѣе, который уже вынесенъ Центральнымъ Комитетомъ Вашей партіи, я отношусь съ величайшимъ равнодушіемъ, чтобы не сказать презрѣніемъ. . . . Морозовъ

Na rozsudek, který se chystáte vynésti, lépe řečeno, který byl již vynesen Ústředním Komitétém vaší strany, pohlížím s naprostou lhostejností, abych neřekl s pohrdáním. . . . Morozov

Vous avez oublié cette vérité: on peut tuer les hommes, mais les idées ne peuvent pas être atteintes par des balonnettes et des balles. En nous fusillant, vous n'exterminerez pas notre parti.

Ihr habt die Wahrheit vergessen, daß man die Menschen wohl töten kann, daß aber die Idee sich nicht auf Bajonette und Kugeln einfangen läßt. Indem Ihr uns erschießt, werdet Ihr unsere Partei nicht vernichten. . . . Gerstein

You forget this: that you can kill men, but you are powerless to annihilate ideas by the means of bullets and bayonets. Through murdering us you cannot destroy our party. Gerstein

Вы забыли истину, что людей убить можно, но идеи на штыки и пули не улавливаются. Разстрѣлявъ насъ — вы не уничтожите нашей партіи. . . . Герштейнъ

Zapomněli jste té pravdy že zabít lidi, ale ideje bodaky a kulkami že odpravití nelze. Tim, že nas postřelíte, nezničíte naši stranu. . . . Gerstein

Et même s'il arrivait un miracle et les portes de vos Bastilles s'ouvrèrent pour nous — nous ne serions pas pour cela libres, puisque vous avez transformé la Russie entière en un immense prison.

Sollte sogar ein Wunder geschehen und die Türen eurer Bastille sich auftun — wir würden dennoch nicht in Freiheit sein, denn Ihr habt ganz Rußland in einen ungeheuren Kerker verwandelt. . . . Altowski

Even should a miracle happen, should the gates of your Bastilles open — nevertheless there would be no freedom for us, as you have turned Russia into one gigantic gaol. Altovsky

И если бы даже случилось чудо и двери вашихъ бастилей раскрылись — мы все же не оказались бы на свободѣ, ибо всю Россію вы превратили въ огромную каторжную тюрьму. . . . Альтовскій

A i kdyby se stal zázrak a dveře ruských Bastil se otevřely, přes to neocitli bychom se na svobodě, neboť celé Rusko učinilo jste ohromným žalářem. . . . Altovsky

Although formally the Socialist-Revolutionary Party was founded only in 1901, and its first conference did not take place till the 1905 Revolution (Dec. 29, 1905 — Jan. 4, 1906), it is in substance the oldest Russian Socialist party.

In 1901, various Socialist-Revolutionary groups in Russia and among the political emigrants abroad came to an agreement and formed a united party. But these groups had merely been continuing the tradition of the revolutionary Populists of 1876—1879 and of the socialist-revolutionary party known as „the People's Will“, which had been broken up by the Government's repressions during the years 1881—85.

The most prominent workers of this Party had been executed or condemned to life imprisonment in the Schlüsselburg Fortress; others had been sent to penal servitude in Siberia; the remainder had hidden beyond the frontier.

It was only some ten years after this defeat that Socialist-Revolutionary groups began to spring up again in Russia. They gradually spread, in parallel development with the revival of the labour and political movement in Russia at the turn of the century.

An active part was taken in the rebirth of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party by members of both old parties, who had returned from exile or were still living abroad. When the S. R. P. was eventually formed, they occupied in it leading places, side by side with new and younger workers. Abroad were the old Populists, Felix Volkovskoi, Shishko and Egor Lazareff, and members of the old „People's Will, E. Rubanovitch and K. Tarassoff (N. Russanoff) and, from the more youthful generation of that time Michael Gotz, and Victor Tchernoff; in

Russia were „Grandmother“ Catherine Breshkovskaya, who had escaped from Siberia and was carrying on an exceedingly energetic propaganda among the peasants, workmen and educated youth, Gregory Gershuni, Stephan Sletoff, and others.

In the interval between the defeat of the People's Will Party and the appearance of its spiritual and political successor, the S. R. P., there were formed in Russia Marxist Social-Democratic groups, which also, towards the end of the nineties, coalesced and formed the Russian Social-Democratic Workmen's Party. In 1903, this Party split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

The Social-Democrats differed from the Socialist-Revolutionaries in concentrating their attention exclusively on the urban artisans, and chiefly on the industrial proletariat.

They regarded the petty labouring peasantry as a class approximating to the bourgeoisie in its social position and interests, and for long, therefore, put forward no agrarian programme, carried on no propaganda in the country districts (except in the case of agricultural labourers), and considered the agrarian programme which the Socialist-Revolutionaries submitted to the peasants „reactionary“, since it would retard the development of capitalism in agriculture. The Socialist-Revolutionaries, however — continuing in this question the policy of the socialists of 1878—85 — took the view that the interests of the great mass of the labouring peasantry with little land, who were exploited by the estate-owners, the capitalists and the State, could be reconciled with the interests of the urban artisans. They saw in the peasantry the fundamental revolutionary force, without which it was impossible to overthrow the autocratic government. But at the same time the Socialist-Revolutionaries always endeavoured to unite the labouring peasantry and the industrial proletariat in one world of labour, since they believed that the realisation of socialist ideas was in the interest of the entire working population of Russia. A union of the peasantry, the proletariat and the working „intelligentsia“ always formed the basis of Socialist-Revolutionary doctrine.

The S. R. P. put forward an agrarian programme demanding the socialization of all land.

This programme quickly gained the Party great popularity among the masses of the peasants.

During the 1905 Revolution, the S. R. P. carried on a successful agitation in the villages. At the time of the elections to the first State Duma (1906), numerous village associations adopted resolutions in the spirit of the party's programme, and in this sense sent instructions to the elected at Petersburg. The S. R. P. did not put up candidates for these elections (it boycotted the elections, holding that the electoral law was too undemocratic and the State Duma itself too imperfect an institution), but there were a large number of Peasant-Labour deputies, who adopted the fundamental points of the agrarian programme of the S. R. P., and in all political questions acted in harmony with this Party, which kept up a close connection with their fraction.

In the elections for the second State Duma (1907), the S. R. P. put up its own candidates. Some dozens of S. R. deputies were elected, and the agrarian bill of the Party was signed by 106 deputies.

The S. R. P. did not put up its own candidates for the third and fourth Dumas. Kerensky, who had been a Socialist-Revolutionary, was elected to the fourth Duma (1908) as a Peasant-Labour deputy, and was the Chairman of this fraction.

An agrarian bill was worked out afresh by the Party in 1917, and was introduced into the Constituent Assembly, which, however, sat only one day — January 5, 1918 — and was then dispersed by the Bolsheviks. This bill was drawn up by the ministry of agriculture, headed by Victor Tchernoff, in agreement with the Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, which met in 1917, at the time of the Provisional Government, and was presided over by a member of the Party, Avksentieff. An overwhelming majority of the Soviet of Peasants' Deputies supported the S. R. P. In the Constituent Assembly, the S. R. P. had an absolute majority.

We consider it advisable to adduce the text of the fundamental clauses of the Agrarian Bill proposed by the S. R. P. to the Constituent Assembly. (In the first sitting of the Con-

stituent Assembly there were 244 S. R. deputies and 153 Bolsheviks and so-called „left“ Socialist-Revolutionaries who had broken away from the Party.

„(1) The right of property in land within the frontiers of the Russian Republic is abolished now and for ever.

„(2) All lands within the frontiers of the Russian Republic, together with their mineral deposits, forests and waters, are the property of the nation.

„(3) The disposal of all lands, with their mineral deposits, forests and waters, belongs to the Republic, as personified by its central organs and the organs of local self-government, according to principles laid down by this law.

„(4) Areas of the Russian Republic enjoying rights of state autonomy will realise their agrarian rights on the basis of this law and in harmony with the federal constitution.

„(5) The tasks of the state authority in the disposal of the land, its mineral deposits, forests and waters are: a) the creation of conditions favouring the best possible utilisation of the natural wealth of the country and the highest development of productivity; b) fair distribution of all natural blessings among the population.

„(6) The rights of persons and institutions to land, mineral deposits, forests and waters can only be in the form of usufruct.

„(7) The rights of usufruct of lands, mineral deposits, forests and waters may be held by all citizens of the Russian Republic, without regard to race or creed, and by their associations, but also by state and public bodies.

„(8) Rights of agrarian usufruct are acquired, realised and cancelled according to the principles laid down by this fundamental law.

„(9) Agrarian rights now belonging to individuals, corporations and institutions are cancelled in so far as they are not in harmony with this law.

„(10) The expropriation as national property of lands, mineral deposits, forests and waters at present held by individuals, corporations and institutions as private property or under any other legal claim takes place without compensation.“

In consequence of the enormous popularity of this law, the Bolsheviks, with demagogic aims, borrowed some of its provisions, but they did not dare either to adjust it to the actual needs and conditions of agriculture or to put it into force. That would have demanded a vast work by statisticians and surveyors, with the support of the population and the participation of all the necessary professional skill. All these conditions were destroyed by the Bolshevik dictatorship, and were replaced by the anarchical appeal to the villages: „Take the land yourselves -- where, how, and as much as you wish!“

Lenin and other Bolsheviks subsequently admitted that they did not believe in the possibility of settling the agrarian problem in Russia by the law which they passed in the Council of Soviets; that the demonstrative adoption of this law was dictated to them exclusively by tactical considerations; that they wished to demonstrate before the Russian peasantry that the Bolsheviks were defending the peasant's interests; that by this means they sought to strengthen their authority among the masses of the peasants.

In so far as the programmatic demands of the S. R. P. on the labour question are concerned, the Socialists-Revolutionaries differ little from any other European socialist party. Their ultimate aim was the socialization of the means of production; their immediate aims, the introduction of the eight-hour-day, control of production, and so on.

Besides its agrarian programme, another special characteristic of the S. R. P. was its sharply-revolutionary, aggressive and terroristic struggle against the autocracy.

The Socialist-Revolutionary groups which came into existence in the years 1895—99 considered themselves differentiated from the then existing Social-Democratic groups in this, that the latter gave first place to the defence of the economic interests of the workmen, and took up an attitude of great reserve towards the immediate political struggle, whereas the Socialists-Revolutionary groups called the workmen to a revolutionary struggle for political freedom and a republic. These first groups occupied themselves with agitation and the promotion of political street demonstrations, and did not shrink from the inevitable collisions with the police, be-

ring in mind the necessity of developing a revolutionary movement among the people and believing that a bold revolutionary initiative might stimulate this movement.

Later, when the S. R. P. was founded in 1901, it acknowledged the necessity of a sharp political struggle, and, in reply to the repressions of the Tsarist Government, decided to retort with direct attacks on responsible high officials and members of the ruling house — in other words expressed itself in favour of terroristic tactics.

It must be pointed out that the terror of the S. R. P. had nothing in common with the „red terror“ of the Bolsheviks. The S. R. P. considered legitimate the execution of such enemies of the people as the Ministers of the Interior Sipiagin and Plehve, or the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, because they were responsible for the policy of crushing all freedom and the most elementary civic rights, for the unexampled oppression, starvation and beggary of the labouring masses and for the brutal treatment of all attempts to shake off this yoke or even to help the people to understand and improve their position.

Only the utter impossibility of calling to account before the people, parliament or law courts the autocratic rulers of Russia, and the defencelessness of the whole population, and especially of the artisan class and socialist parties, who were, of course, hidden „underground“, against the arbitrary actions of these rulers, justified, in the eyes of the S. R. P., the application of the bloody methods of murder to Tsarist ministers and the administrators of the Tsarist political police.

Moreover the Party always took upon itself the responsibility for all the terroristic acts accomplished by it and announced them to the public.

The S. R. P. always strongly condemned tactics of political murder in countries with democratic administration and with freedom of press and public opinion. It always declared that it would at once stop the terroristic struggle if the elementary political guarantees existing in all civilised countries were adopted in Russia.. It always categorically condemned post-revolutionary terror — that is to say the capital punishment and murder of the defeated representatives of the old regime.

The S. R. P. took the view that the victorious working class could and should be magnanimous, and sought not to follow the example of the French bourgeois revolutionaries of 1793. Both morally and politically, the terroristic acts of the revolutionaries, who went to certain death in order to strike down some tyrant of a day like Plehve in the very centre of his authority and surrounded by clouds of secret police and gendarmes, were in the sharpest possible contrast to the Che-Ka order for the shooting of some former police officer or even minister, grand duke or even Tsar, disarmed, defenceless, impotent and pitiful.

Whereas the terroristic fight of the S. R. P. against the autocracy produced noble self-sacrificing, and profoundly humane heroes, absolutely devoted to the Revolution, the Extraordinary Commission of the Bolshevik regime opened a broad career for the morally obtuse, malicious, gloomy fanatics, or simply for criminal sadists — not for heroes but for hangmen.

It should be recalled that down to 1917, the Bolsheviks always condemned the S. R. P. for its terroristic methods, and in general regarded it as a party of the petty bourgeois „intelligentsia“, which in consequence of a misunderstanding of the term called itself „socialistic“.

The chief theoretician of the S. R. P. has been Victor Tchernoff.

The most conspicuous members of the Party from the time of its formation have been: Michael Gotz, Shishko, Lazareff, Volhovskoi, Gershuni, Breshkovskaya, Minor, Rubanovitch, Sletoff.

The position of the Party during the revolution was determined by its third conference (Moscow, May, 1917), fourth conference (Petrograd) December, 1917) and afterwards by the eighth (May, 1918) ninth (June, 1919), and tenth (July, 1921) councils of the Party. An appreciation of its policy and tactics also requires a familiarity with the resolutions and letters of its Central Committee, which, in consequence of the impossibility of convening a party conference under the conditions of the Soviet regime, was obliged to take independently important political decisions.

From the resolutions of the sitting of the Party in 1917, we adduce those referring to the War, to the International and to the Provisional Governments:

„The present War arose from the soil of the imperialistic efforts of the ruling classes of all the great states to gain fresh markets and to subject to economic and political influence the small and backward states — efforts which exploited for their objects both the aspirations of nationalities so far without selfdetermination and the remnants of unconscious chauvinism. Up to the present, the ruling classes of the belligerent countries still cherish these annexationist ideas which are inimical to the interests of the labouring classes.

„We call upon the peoples of the belligerent countries to compel their governments and ruling classes to abandon annexationist efforts, and to take the question of peace into their own hands. For our part we declare that the imperialistic objects of the War are foreign to the Russian people and the broad masses of its workmen and peasants, and that the Russian democracy did not and does not desire annexations.

„Starting from these positions, and adopting the standpoint that there is an internal coincidence between the ideals of international socialism and the vital interests of the labouring masses in Russia, the third conference of the S. R. P. takes the view that at the present moment the following are the immediate tasks of Russian democracy.

„I. As a termination of the War is possible only through the united efforts of the democracies of all countries, the S. R. P. recognises it to be necessary:

„a) That the socialist democracy of Russia should cooperate by all means in its power in the creation of a revolutionary international and the convening of an international socialist conference for the establishment of a solidarity of the labouring classes of all countries and for the working out of definitive conditions of peace and measures for putting them into force.

„b) That the socialist democracy of Russia should appeal to the democracies of all countries to unite under the watchword: 'Peace without annexation or indemnities', and to use their influence on their governments in this sense.

„2. Recognising that the Provisional Revolutionary Government has taken as the basis of its foreign policy the programme advanced by the Russian democracy, of peace without annexation or indemnities and of the realisation of the right of all peoples to self-determination, and believing that the question of disputed areas should be solved by a plebiscite of the populations, held under international guarantees, the S. R. P. considers it necessary that the Provisional Revolutionary Government should, at the earliest possible moment, take all steps in its power to secure the adherence of Russia's Allies to this peace programme. By similar international agreement, the financial burdens of the War, whether on states or private individuals, should be laid on the ruling classes of all countries directly or indirectly involved in the War.

„3. The third conference of the S. R. P. demands that the Provisional Revolutionary Government should take all steps necessary for a reconsideration and denunciation of the secret treaties concluded by the Tsarist Government with Allied states, and should be guided in its future foreign policy solely by the interests of the labouring population of Russia and the interestst of the democracy of the whole world.

„4. Believing that the fulfilment of these tasks is possible only on an international scale and by the united efforts of the labouring masses of all belligerent states, the conference of the S. R. P. categorically rejects any separate peace or separate armistice as fundamentally in conflict with the methods of international action.

„5. Condemning the irresponsible propaganda of the chauvinist press in favour of an advance at any cost — which, in view of the inadequacy of the organisation of the revolutionary army, might lead to disastrous adventures with consequences most dangerous to the whole cause of the Russian Revolution — and seeing in this newspaper campaign an attempt to dodge the question of war aims, the third conference of the S. R. P. nevertheless regards as inadmissible the introduction into the Army of an agitation against any move forward from the trenches and the refusal to obey the orders of the revolutionary Government, and believes that both the one and the other can only obstruct the creation, growth

and strength of a new revolutionary army capable of proving a trustworthy support for the entire new foreign policy of Revolutionary Russia.

„6. So long as the War continues, revolutionary Russia makes concessions to the necessity of a strategic unity of front with the Allies, and at the same time lays stress on the necessity of a unity of political front, holding these two necessities indispensable factors in the same problem, namely that of opening a road to peace on the principles of the self-determination of nationalities and the abandonment of the policy of annexations and indemnities.

„7. While insisting that the campaign for a general peace should be carried on with all energy, the conference of the S. R. P. at the same time, in the interests of that very peace campaign and in the interests of the defence of the Russian Revolution and its political and social gains against attacks, whether from within or without, considers it necessary that the Army should be brought into a condition of full military preparedness, and that in it forces should be created capable of active operations for the fulfilment of the tasks of the Russian Revolution and its people's policy“.

Relationship to the Provisional Government.

„In the creation of a coalition Provisional Government, the conference of the S. R. P. sees, on the one hand, fresh evidence of the growth of the strength of the labouring democracy of the towns and villages, and, on the other hand, an inevitable step in the urgent struggle against the menacing danger of a complete ruin of Russia — a struggle necessary to strengthen the new revolutionary Russia, this first citadel of the 'third estate' in contemporary Europe.

„At the same time, it expresses the firm conviction that only a further growth in the country of the organised public forces of the socialist democracy can change still further to the advantage of the socialists the balance of power in the Provisional Government.

„Believing the fundamental political tasks of the moment to consist in the reorganisation of the local authorities on the

principles of the organic authority of the people, and in the preparation of the elections for the Constituent Assembly, the conference of the S. R. P. rejects and condemns everything that might obstruct or delay their fulfilment by adventurist attempts to seize power, either locally or in the centre, and all irresponsible agitation in this direction.

„The third conference believes that only a firmly united socialist group inside the Provisional Government, subordinating all the actions of individual ministers to the general line of policy adopted by it, and working under the control of our workmens preliminary parliament, as constituted by the soviets of soldiers' and peasants' deputies and the responsible socialist parties, can cope with the urgent problems of utilising the strength of the workmen's democracy to extend the gains of the Revolution during the period of transition, in which politically privileged Russia is no longer in a position to deal with vital and pressing questions, while the socialist party is not yet compelled to take power into its own hands.

„So long as, by the decision of the socialist democracy, the group of socialist ministers remains in the Provisional Government, and through it asserts the will of this democracy and its control over the entire internal and external policy of the Government, the latter is assured the most energetic support in the carrying out of its measures against all the elements of disruption and disorganisation. And the conference of the Party believes that, in taking this path, the Socialist-Revolutionary Party will combine the two tasks of participating in the present work of construction and making ready for the future and thus preparing its triumph in the Constituent Assembly, and, at the same time of fulfilling the great international task of the Russian Revolution, namely the termination of the War by the forces of the workmen's International, resuscitated by the Russian Revolution.

The Third Conference considers it necessary that the Socialist-Revolutionary Ministers should take as the basis of their activity the resolutions adopted by the supreme Party organ, that is to say, by the present fully-authorised assembly of representatives of the Party organisations.

„The International.

„I. The Third Conference of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, guided by the views expressed in the resolutions which it has adopted as to the present juncture and the War, decides to send its delegates:

„1) To the international socialist peace conference convened on the initiative of the soviets of workmen's, peasants' and soldiers' deputies.

„2) To other preliminary conferences, including the third Zimmerwald Conference, the task of which is an exchange of views among the labouring democracies of the whole world.

„3) The Conference commissions the Central Committee to nominate with this object suitable delegations“.

The S. R. P. took part in the drafting of the famous appeal to the working classes of all nations (March 14, 1917), issued by the Petrograd Soviet of Workmens' Deputies, in which, in conjunction with the Social-Democratic Mensheviks, it had a majority.

In harmony with this attitude, the Party took an active share in the preparation of the Stockholm international conference, for which it sent N. Rousanoff abroad in 1917. It will be remembered that this conference did not take place, for the Entente governments refused to give the delegates of the socialist parties of their countries the necessary passports.

In April—May, 1917, the S. R. P., as well as the Social-Democratic Workmens' Party, decided to send representatives into the Provisional Government, the president of which was at first Prince G. B. Lvoff, but afterwards A. F. Kerensky. The Bolsheviks still accuse the S. R. P. of „betraying the proletariat“ and allying itself to the bourgeoisie. In reality, the Party entered the Coalition Cabinet at that time in order to save the new-born and still weak democratic regime from possible pressure of the counter-revolution. At that date, the socialist parties, which had just emerged from underground, had not yet succeeded in organising themselves, and had to support themselves on the masses of the workmen just liberated from the yoke of three generations of servitude, could not take the plenitude of power into their own hands.

The revolution developed during a war with a most powerful enemy, and the Government was confronted by the exceedingly complicated and dangerous problem of carrying out the necessary changes without upsetting the front or destroying the national economic life, and at the same time of conducting with the Allies negotiations for stopping the War according to principles acceptable to all. Civil war at that moment would have been excessively dangerous and would have risked the loss of national independence, or at any rate such a weakening as might have brought to nothing all the conquests of the Revolution and made restoration possible.

Consequently the S. R. P. tried to conclude an agreement with the left and democratic parties of the bourgeoisie, in order to compel the reactionary nobility, and also the right and imperialistic parties, to submit to the revolutionary nation.

However this agreement was not attained. The bourgeoisie, in its mass terrified of the Revolution, preferred to go with the nobility and not with the working class, to take sides with the monarchy against democracy and the republic. Bourgeois members of the Cabinet raised all sorts of obstacles to revolutionary changes and sabotaged the cause of the Provisional Government. Prominent leaders of the bourgeoisie, who had at one time associated themselves with the Revolution, began to conspire with military counter-revolutionary circles. (This led to the memorable action of General Korniloff against the Provisional Government).

The Coalition Government experienced several crises. The S. R. P. continued to participate in the Government, but made its cooperation dependent on definite conditions, one of which was an active foreign policy directed to the earliest possible conclusion of a general just peace. With this object, the Party insisted on the summoning of a conference of the Allied States, at which the standpoint of revolutionary Russia would be expounded, and on the convening of the Stockholm socialist conference. The Central Committee of the Party did not consider it possible for the socialist parties to take power entirely into their hands on the eve of the elections to the Constituent Assembly. It held that only

this body could definitively settle the state structure of Russia and appoint a „legal“ Government responsible to the Constituent Assembly. On the very eve of the convention of the Constituent Assembly, the Bolsheviki effected their coup of October 25, 1917, and at once began to put into force the regime of terroristic dictatorship.

The Party condemned this seizure of power, but did not refuse to negotiate with the Bolsheviks as to the possibility of a compromise for the formation of a purely Socialist Government. Such a compromise proved to be impossible. With support of armed force, the Bolsheviks wished merely to dictate their own will. The S. R. P. decided to transfer the struggle to the field of the elections to the Constituent Assembly, on the convention of which the Bolsheviks at first strongly insisted, but which they repudiated when they saw that the S. R. P. had received a majority in the elections.

The Fourth Conference of the Party (December, 1917) expressed itself against coalition with the bourgeois parties, and even condemned the policy of the Central Committee, which, in the opinion of the gathering, had unnecessarily prolonged the coalition experiment. Here is the resolution of that meeting:

„The Conference of the S. R. P. is compelled to point out: 1. That the Central Committee in the course of its six months work has not always acted in correspondence with the terms of its appointment to be the organ managing the activity of the Party. The Conference is of the opinion that the Central Committee has not in due measure fulfilled its duties of controlling the activity of the members of the Party occupying the most responsible positions in organs of State administration and managing organs of the democracy. Thus the Central Committee has made the Party responsible to the labouring masses for a policy not sanctioned by it, for events as to which it was not even kept informed, for actions in harmony neither with the Party's programme nor its collective will. In this way the Central Committee has involuntarily contributed to the masses' loss of faith in the Party, its watchwords and its workers“.

Another resolution of the same Conference runs:

„The present Russian Revolution is popular and artizan in character, and is making the first breach in the stronghold of bourgeois property and bourgeois law. It opens the transitional historical interval between the epoch of the full bloom of the bourgeois system and the epoch of socialist reconstruction. This truth was not sufficiently appreciated by the managing sections of our socialist democracy, and in consequence of this our Revolution has not yet found for itself a proper and permanent track.

„It was necessary for the socialist democracy to go through the experiment of a mixed government with elements from the old privileged classes. This experiment had completed its work so soon as it had made manifest to the whole nation that the old privileged elements cannot reconcile themselves with a solution for the benefit of the labouring people of those broad problems which have been raised by our revolution, especially in the sphere of an immediate and radical rearrangement of our agrarian relationships. From that moment, a repetition and prolongation of these experiments with the coalition had as their results merely that the creative work of the revolutionary power was stopped, the struggle for a democratic peace was conducted with insufficient energy, and the attempts to meet the urgent demands of the country for a firm authority, not being accompanied by a simultaneous satisfaction of the burning needs of the labouring population, remained without success and caused discontent.

„Unfortunately our Party did not show sufficient determination at difficult junctures, and did not take power into its own hands at the right moment, but left it till the end in the hands of a weakened and colourless Government, which had lost its popularity and fell an easy prey to the first conspiracy“.

„The Party is bound“, says the last paragraph of the Conference's resolution, „to concentrate on the maintenance of all the rights of the Constituent Assembly and to organise forces sufficient, in case of need, to take up the fight with criminal attacks on the supreme will of the people, whatever may be the source of these attacks and the watchwords by which they are disguised.“

In the elections for the Constituent Assembly, the S. R. P., as we have already said, received an overwhelming majority. There voted for the Socialist-Revolutionaries 20 893 734 electors (52%), for the Bolsheviks, 9 023,963 (25%); for all the bourgeois parties together, 4 130 376 (less than one seventh).

We will not here dwell on an interpretation of the events connected with the first and only sitting of the Constituent Assembly, which was elected by universal suffrage under an electoral law prepared by the Provisional Government of Kerensky. But, in order to put an end to the calumnious inventions of the Communists, it is necessary to adduce the actual text of resolutions adopted by the Socialist-Revolutionary majority of the Constituent Assembly on January 5, 1918, under the presidency of Victor Tchernoff. We have already cited the first ten clauses of the Agrarian Law. We now reproduce the resolution as to peace and the law as to the Federative Constitution of Russia.

„In the name of the peoples of the Russian Republic, the all-Russian Constituent Assembly, expressing the inflexible will of the nation that the War should be terminated at once by the conclusion of a just general peace, addresses itself to the States allied to Russia with the proposal that they should join in the determination of precise conditions for a democratic peace, acceptable to all the belligerent nations, in order that these conditions may be submitted in the name of the whole coalition to the States carrying on war against the Russian Republic and its Allies.

„The Constituent Assembly is filled with unshakable confidence that the efforts of the peoples of Russia to put an end to the disastrous War will awake an unanimous echo in the peoples and Governments of the Allied States, and that their efforts will speedily bring about a peace guaranteeing the welfare and honour of all the belligerent peoples.

„Expressing in the name of the peoples of Russia its regret that the negotiations with Germany, begun without preliminary agreement with the Allied democracies, have assumed the character of negotiations for a separate peace, the Constituent Assembly, in the name of the peoples of the Russian Federative Republic, prolongs the truce that has been establis-

Les défenseurs étrangers en procès de Moscou.
Die ausländischen Verteidiger im Moskauer Prozeß.



E. Vandervelde - Э. Вандервельде



K. Rosenfeld - К. Розенфельд



Th. Liebknecht - Т. Либкнехт



A. Wauters - А. Вотрепс

Foreign counsel at the Moscow trial. — Иностранные защитники на Московскомъ процессѣ. — Zahraniční obhájcové na moskevském procesu.

Nous avons quitté Moscou pour mieux défendre ceux qu'on y accuse. Nous portons la cause des S. R. devant le tribunal suprême de l'opinion socialiste; et, des à présent, nous donnons à tous les travailleurs ce mot d'ordre:

Pas de condamnation à mort au procès de Moscou. Ce seraient des assassinats politiques. Emil Vandervelde

Wir haben Moskau verlassen, um besser die zu verteidigen, die dort angeklagt sind. Wir übertragen die Angelegenheit der Sozialrevolutionäre vor das höchste Gericht der sozialistischen öffentlichen Meinung; und unverzüglich geben wir allen Arbeitern die folgende Parole: Es sei niemand im Moskauer Prozeß verurteilt! Es wäre sonst ein politischer Mord. Emil Vandervelde

We left Moscow better to defend the accused. We appeal to the Supreme Court — the Socialist Community. On the spur of the instant we deliver this parole to the workers of the world: let there be no death sentences at the Moscow trial! It would be political murder. Emil Vandervelde

Мы оставили Москву, чтобы лучше защитить тѣхъ, кого тамъ обвиняютъ. Мы переносимъ дѣло социалистовъ-революціонеровъ на высшій судъ социалистическаго мнѣнія; и немедленно же мы даемъ всемъ рабочимъ слѣдующій пароль; — да не будетъ осужденій на смерть въ Московскомъ процессѣ! Это было бы политическимъ убійствомъ. Эмиль Вандервельде

Opustili jsme Moskvu, abychom lépe obhájili těch, které tam obviňují. Přenášíme věc socialistů-revolucionářů před nejvyšší soud socialistického mínění a okamžitě jsme všem dělníkům dali toto heslo: „Nechť v moskevském procesu není rozsudků smrti!“ Byla by to politická vražda. Emil Vandervelde

hed, and takes upon itself the further conduct of the negotiations with the enemy States, in order, while defending the interests of Russia, to obtain, in harmony with the will of the people, a general democratic peace.

„The Constituent Assembly declares that it will show every possible cooperation in the initiative of the socialist parties of the Russian Republic for the immediate convention of an international socialist conference with the object of bringing about a general democratic peace.

„The Constituent Assembly resolves to choose from its membership a plenipotentiary delegation to conduct negotiations with representatives of the Allied States, and to submit to them representations as to a joint clearing up of the conditions for an early conclusion of the war, and also to put into force the decision of the Constituent Assembly on the question of peace negotiations with the states carrying war against us.

„Under the direction of the Constituent Assembly, this delegation will proceed immediately to the fulfilment of the duties laid upon it.“

FUNDAMENTAL LAW AS TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION OF RUSSIA.

„In the name of the peoples forming the Russian State, the all-Russian Constituent Assembly resolves: The Russian State is proclaimed a Russian Democratic Federative Republic, uniting in indissoluble alliance the peoples and areas sovereign within the boundaries laid down by the federative constitution“.

After the Constituent Assembly had proclaimed these laws, the Bolshevik sailors, by Lenin's orders, dispersed it for alleged „betrayal of the proletariat“ and alliance with the estate-owners, bourgeoisie and monarchy. The ignorant and deluded sailors, excited by conscienceless demagogues, really „knew not what they did“.

Simultaneously other sailors fusiladed in the streets a peaceable demonstration of workmen, killing the S. R. deputy Loginoff, the woman Socialist-Revolutionary Gorbachevskaya and others.

After the violent dispersal of the Constituent Assembly by the Bolsheviks, the S. R. P. decided to try to carry on within legal bounds a political struggle for its interpretation of the tasks of the Revolution. But it very soon became apparent that the Bolshevik Government would not tolerate any kind of free criticism, and, in order to maintain its authority, was prepared to have resort to the worst forms of violence, not even stopping short of infractions of its own „soviet“ constitution. The Socialist-Revolutionaries' papers were ruthlessly suppressed, their printing works were closed, the socialist organisations were broken up, elections to the soviets were carried out in an atmosphere of unparalleled administrative pressure, and soviets with a strong socialist opposition were systematically dissolved. By degrees, the soviet workmen's selfadministration was abolished and replaced by a hierarchical, centralized beurocracy, which merely bore the name of „soviet system“, but in reality had nothing in common with it. International socialism is now sufficiently acquainted with the bankruptcy of the Bolsheviks' Communitistic experiment, with the destruction of industry, with the ruin of the villages, with the disappointment of the masses with Bolshevik demagoguery, and with the struggle which the Bolsheviks are waging against the nation for the maintenance of their own unrestricted power. As is well known, they maintain themselves only with the help of terror, violence, the ruthless suppression of any kind of opposition, an unexampled political yoke, under which the nation is condemned to live in apathy, to sink slowly, and to perish of hunger and epidemics, interspersed with elemental tumults and revolts, the blind outbreaks of the hungry, oppressed and tormented masses.

In the summer of 1918, the conflict of the Government against the people assumed the form of civil war. The S. R. P. was on the side of the people. On the Volga and in the Urals, it organised peasant's and workmen's regiments, which fought against the Bolsheviks on the so-called Front of the Constituent Assembly. They were helped by the Czecho-Slovak legions, formed from war prisoners, which Trotsky had tried to disarm on the demand of imperial Germany. At that time, the Bolsheviks, who had signed the disgraceful se-

parate peace of Brest-Litovsk, had already invited German capitalists to Russia, returned them their confiscated property, granted them fresh concessions, and in general coquetted with the German imperialists. Count Mirbach was in Moscow, and the representative of the Soviet power in Berlin, Joffe, secured an audience of Kaiser Wilhelm.

The Ukraine, the South of Russia, Poland, Finland, the Baltic Provinces, were in the hands of the Germans. Politically and economically, the independence of Russia had received a severe blow, and a victory of imperial Germany threatened the whole future of our country, threatened the complete destruction of all the attainments of the Revolution, a restoration of the old monarchy and the return of the estate-owners.

The attitudes of the S. R. P. on the position of Russia and Europe was expressed at that time in a declaration of the Central Committee, in which it was pointed out that the S. R. P. had begun a struggle for the overthrow of the Bolshevik dictatorship and for the cancelling of the disgraceful Brest-Litovsk peace, which had sold Russia into slavery to imperialistic Germany. With that object, the Party intended, on the reestablishment of the sovereignty of the people, to renew the war against Germany „in agreement with the peoples“ of France, England, Italy and America.

The S. R. P. suffered failure in its struggle for a reestablishment of a democratic Government, for in its rear counter-revolutionary bourgeois-monarchical groups prepared a conspiracy, and simultaneously with the Bolsheviks attacked the democracy, which had begun to organise itself round the banner of the Constituent Assembly on the Volga and in Siberia. Later, when the fight of the Bolsheviks against Denikin was already going on, the S. R. P. suspended its armed struggle against the Bolsheviks, in view of the danger of a restoration of the old regime, and concentrated all its forces on the struggle against reaction. We append the corresponding resolutions of the Ninth Council of the Party, which met clandestinely at Moscow in June 1919.

COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY DANGER.

„Confronted by the terrible danger threatening all the attainments of the Revolution, half of which have been sacrificed by the Bolshevik reign of terror and by the hands of Kolchak, Denikin, Youdenitch and others representatives of internal and external reaction, and taking into consideration the actual balance of forces, the Tenth Council of the S. R. P. approves and confirms the decision, come to by all properly authorised Party organs, that for the present the armed struggle against the Bolshevik Government should be suspended and replaced by an ordinary political struggle.

„In view of the utter incapacity of that Government to rise above its narrow party interests, and, in the name of the safety of the Revolution, to make concessions with the object of the creation of a general socialist and revolutionary front, the S. R. P. is at the present time deprived of the possibility of combining its struggle against the attempts of counter-revolution with the struggle against the Bolshevik authority, and must transfer the centre of its struggle against Kolchak, Denikin and the rest to the territory of these, and, undermining their cause from within, fight with all the weapons used by the Party against the autocracy in the front ranks of the revolt against political and social restoration.

„The S. R. P. lays all responsibility for a possible success of the counter-revolution on the suicidal policy of the Bolsheviks, who, by breaking the unity of the political front of the democracy, have sapped the possibility of a united military front of the democracy against counter-revolution. At the same time, the Tenth Council of the S. R. P. considers it necessary to open the eyes of the labouring people to the real character of the regime which the reaction of Kolchak, Denikin and the others is bringing with it.“

At the same time, the following resolution as to intervention was passed:

INTERVENTION.

„The Ninth Council of the Party recalls the solemn declaration of the Eighth Council, that within the Party ranks there are no tendencies to seek support for the internal re-

naissance of Russia outside the country's own material, intellectual and social resources."

Thus even then the Party rejected all idea of allied intervention, that is to say interference in our internal affairs. In view, however, of the task of annulling the Brest peace and reestablishing the Eastern Front, the Party regarded the appearance of Allied forces on Russian territory admissible, though only on the same footing on which Russian auxiliary troops had fought in the ranks of the Allied Armies on French territory.

„Maintaining its negative attitude to intervention, the S. R. P. could not but admit that, after the victory of the Allies and the collapse of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, grounds for the further presence of the Allies on Russian territory no longer existed.

„Moreover, taking into consideration the melancholy experience of recent attempts at Allied intervention, which have degenerated into experiments for transforming whole districts of Russia into objects of colonial policy and dominions of the forces of restoration, the Ninth Council of the Party expresses an emphatic reprimand to all Party comrades abroad who, in spite of repeated decisions to the contrary, advocate or request intervention, and lays upon them the obligation to suspend such activity as inconsistent with their further membership of the S. R. P.

„The Ninth Council charges the Central Committee to take most energetic steps to induce the socialist parties of all countries to compel the imperialistic governments to stop the predatory raids on Russia, the blockade, and military and material help to the Russian counter-revolutionaries.

„At the same time, the Council of the Party thinks it necessary to declare that it would regard a recognition by the Allies of the Kolchak Government as an act of hostility to the Russian democracy“.

On the question of the international, the same Council adopted the following resolution:

The International.

„The settlement after stupendous mundane catastrophes like the World War inevitably brings with it a vast social

dislocation, shaking in a number of countries the very foundations of the old agrarian and plutocratic order.

„In this new era of revolution, an intensified organisation of counter-revolutionary forces is taking place all over the world, and is basing itself on the present governments of the European victor countries, which are trying to transform the League of Nations into a screen for a new 'Holy Alliance of the Bourgeoisie', into a new form of hegemony of Ally imperialism.

„In this connection, the Ninth Council of the S. R. P. regards the immediate reestablishment of the International as the chief task of present day socialism throughout the world.

„This reestablishment must be not merely a formal revival of the connection between all the national socialist parties, estranged, and in some cases disorganised, by the War, but a more intrinsic renaissance and renewal of socialism, and its transformation into a real world force, capable of steering a course towards revolution and opposing the dangers of organised world reaction.

„The first test of the effectiveness and fighting efficiency of the revived International must be its irreconcilable struggle against the attempts of the victor countries to impose on the vanquished countries such conditions of peace as will only arouse in the latter an unassuageable thirst for revenge, and therefore contain in themselves the germs of fresh wars. The means for effecting this are the utilisation of all favourable tendencies in the League of Nations, and the exercise of an energetic pressure on that body by the effective manifestation of the disapproval of the masses of the nations.

„The watchword of the agitation among the masses must demand the overthrow of those governments or cabinets which, through their acquisitive nationalistic appetites, place themselves in opposition to the intense thirst of all nations for a durable peace. At the same time, the Ninth Council of the Party emphatically condemns the policy of creating a third Communist International, which it regards as a manifestation of sectarian policy, objectively directed to a breach of the unity and to a disorganisation of the socialist movement.“

For an appreciation of the position of the Party at the present time, reference must be made to the resolutions of the Tenth Council (July, 1921), and the declarations of the Central Committee:

1. THE PRESENT JUNCTURE.

„The World War, intensifying and revealing all the class antagonisms and the profound antitheses hidden in bourgeois society, placed before the labouring masses in its full scope the question of a radical reconstruction of that society, which concealed in itself a permanent menace to the progress of the human race and to the most vital interests of the labouring classes.

„At the same time, the War, which has revolutionised the labouring masses and facilitated the conquest of political power by them, especially in the defeated countries, exhausted to the utmost limits the productive forces on both sides of the fronts, and has called forth a general crisis in the economic life of the world, and in this way has very much restricted the possibility of immediate material gains from the Revolution.

„All this justifies the assertion that, independently of its forms, the direct struggle for socialism, into which the world has entered as a result of the War, will be prolonged and stubborn, and that in its process the labouring masses will be involved in a number of conflicts for the extension of their rights in the administration of production and exchange, and for the enlargement in these spheres of collective rights at the cost of the rights of individual enterprise.

„Confirming the accuracy of this repeatedly promulgated analysis of the essential character of the present historical epoch, the Tenth Council points out that the Bolshevik Government, by four years of policy disastrous to the cause of Russian and international revolution, has placed Russia in the immediate danger of imperialistic intervention, and has extraordinarily complicated the struggle of international democracy for socialism, without, however, in any degree making this struggle less urgent, or changing the general perspectives of the present epoch.“

In its characterisation of the policy of the Bolsheviks, the Council states:

„While thus recognising the necessity and inevitability of the coming revolutionary movement, the Party must bear in mind that the numerous risings of the labouring masses and country populations against the Bolshevik dictatorship have always suffered defeat through their complete lack of organisation and the imperfect political maturity of the masses, who, in their struggle against the Bolshevik Government, have so far been unable to rise to an appreciation of general national problems and of the methods necessary for this struggle.

„The disintegration of democracy in town and country, its psychological weariness, its profound disillusionment in its hopes, its demoralisation, and the remarkable change of class by wide sections of the labouring population in consequence of the monstrous experimentation of the Bolsheviks — all these things constitute a most serious menace to the cause of the Revolution, and are, in fact, the submerged rock on which it may ultimately be wrecked for a long time to come

„Therefore the first and fundamental task of the Party for the immediate future is the work of organising the active forces of town and country, and the crystallization of the ideas of the broad masses of the labouring class.

„In this work, the Party must put forward its fundamental watchword — the demand for a consequential system of government by the people, as the only political system guaranteeing the development of popular self-help, this condition essential to the victory of the revolution and the socialist system.

„Without, none the less, failing to take advantage of any opportunity of open work in those public organs which, under the pressure of vital necessity, the Bolsheviks have created, or will be compelled to create, the Party must expose the class contradictions contained in them, and emphasize its position as the „Third Estate“, the estate of the labouring democracy.

„As in the first preparatory period, so also in the further struggle, the Party must strictly keep at a distance all elements of the Right, and refuse to take part in any coali-

tion with the bourgeoisie, even though it should be only temporary or tactical.

„In this connection, the managing Party organs must adopt the most decisive measures to frustrate all future attempts to impose on the Party methods and aims which it has rejected, and to prevent the mere possibility of a separate policy on the part either of individual comrades or of entire organisations.“

The resolution of the Tenth Council on the International runs:

„Confirming the message sent by the Central Committee on April 23, 1921, to the Vienna Bureau of the International Confederation of Socialist Parties, the Tenth Council of the S. R. P., for its part, instructs the Delegation to Foreign Countries to take the most energetic steps to put it into force. At the same time, the Council charges the Central Bureau of the Party, elected by it, with the conduct of all negotiations in the name of the Party for the reestablishment of a militant revolutionary-socialist International“.

Special interest attaches to the declaration on the general policy of the Party drawn up and signed in prison by the leaders of the Party and members of the Central Committee, now condemned by the Bolsheviks to „conditional capital punishment“.

In a letter to the new Central Bureau of the Party with reference to the resolutions of the Tenth Council, they write (September 5, 1921):

„Dear comrades!

„We are delighted to hear of the successful issue of the Tenth Council of the Party.

„This tremendous victory, both moral and political, of our Party shows beyond any doubt that the brutal hunting-down and persecution which have lately descended on the Socialist-Revolutionary Party have been powerless to break its moral spirit and quench its revolutionary enthusiasm. Hunted underground, swept from the open arena of political conflict, chased out of all legal organisations, persecuted by the Government with unparalleled cruelty, crucified and reviled with calumny and dishonouring falsehoods, the Socialist-Re-

volutionary Party has never for a moment loosened its grasp on its glorious old banner, or abandoned its revolutionary post, but, in the name of revolutionary socialism and democracy, has ever fought in the front ranks of the working class, both in the days of revolutionary storm and in the days of calm. To what foul devices, to what unworthy methods, to what dishonourable means has the Government not had recourse in its struggle against the Socialist-Revolutionary Party? From calumny to provocation, everything was mobilized and thrown into that front by the Bolshevik Government. And not only to enemies, but also to fainthearted friends, it sometimes seemed that the Party would not weather the storm of persecution, would not stand up under the blows showered upon it, but would fall crushed by their weight, bleeding, torn to pieces, and scattered in the dust.

„The tenth Council is the best and most eloquent answer both to enemies and faint-hearted friends. The very fact of the convention of a numerous Council at the very height of the Bolshevik terror throughout the area of Soviet Russia, is irrefutable evidence of the tenacious vitality of our Party. To the destruction of the Central Committee, the Party replied not with confusion and panic but by drawing still closer its thinned ranks, and by a fresh mobilization of workers among the proletariat and the labouring peasantry“.

Describing the position of the country they say:

„Two paths were open to the Bolshevik Government, two possibilities lay before it. It could break abruptly with the old methods of dictatorship rule and with the old devices of uncontrolled party-monopoly administration, return to democracy, extend its hands to all socialist parties, in order, by joint efforts, supported on the liberated independent initiative of the labouring classes themselves, to save from shipwreck everything that it was still possible to save out of the gains of the revolution by the free and heroic efforts of the will of the labouring classes.

„Or it could capitulate to foreign and native capital, and, with ashes on its head and a rope round its neck, proceed to a capitalistic Canossa. The Bolshevik Government was called to the first path by the thunder of the Kronstadt guns and by innumerable voices of Petrograd and Moscow prole-

tarians, by the more intelligent portion of the labouring peasantry, which, disillusioned by partisan warfare and revolts, hungrily sought an issue from its agonizing dilemma, and by the socialist parties, who were merely reflecting accurately the feeling of the working class.

„But the Communist Party, obsessed by the single idea of keeping power, whatever might happen and at whatever cost, rather than make terms with the socialist democracy and effect a reconciliation with the working class, preferred the path of capitulation to native and foreign capital, the path of agreement with the international and its own new and old bourgeoisie.

„In this is the whole meaning of the Bolshevik 'new economic policy', so loudly proclaimed by Lenin, and advertised by the corrupt pens of venal official publicists as a 'wise strategic manoeuvre', as 'a deep thrust at the rear', as a cunningly devised turning movement', which through the blossoming out of petty industry, credit, and banking, through the restoration of the tenth volume of the Code of Laws and the reestablishment of the right of private property, through the consolidation of the foundations of the bourgeois system, will eventually lead to communism.

„But the Bolshevik Government, with one hand restoring the economic relationships of the bourgeois system and with the other smothering with ever greater ruthlessness the independence and expression of will of the labouring democracy, is preparing for itself a successor in the bourgeois reaction“.

Characterising the policy of the Bolshevik Government as a „Bolshevik Thermidor“, the authors of the letter say:

„The Tenth Council is quite right in declaring in its fundamental resolution that the main central task brought imperatively to the front by the recent development of events is the overcoming of the dictatorship of the ruling party, the political struggle with the autocracy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.. In this lies the fundamental essence, the vital nerve, the supreme content of the present juncture.

„But for this reason, that point of our platform must be formulated with the utmost clearness. In the past, the So-

cialist-Revolutionary Party,' as impersonated by its Central Committee, has more than once declared that, although the termination of the Bolshevik dictatorship is the fundamental object of all the political efforts of the Party, it would be far from welcoming every such termination, and would not support every struggle against this dictatorship. Repudiating in the most emphatic manner the idea of a coalition with bourgeois groups, the Central Committee thereby definitely emphasised that the only acceptable termination of the Bolshevik dictatorship would be one brought about in the name of the democracy and by the forces of the proletariat and the labouring peasantry.

„Dissipating the illusion of the possibility of a peaceful democratic evolution of the Bolshevik dictatorship, the Socialist-Revolutionary Party must fix the special attention of the masses on the danger of the replacement of the Bolsheviks by reaction, and on the necessity for the proletariat and the labouring peasantry, at the decisive moment, not only of establishing the authority of the people in the place of the Bolshevik dictatorship, but also of defending it against any attacks by reaction.

„Precisely for this reason, the Central Committee indefatigably emphasised that in its irreconcilable struggle against the Bolshevik dictatorship it thought possible to call the labouring classes only to those methods of struggle which perhaps do not promise decisive success, but, on the other hand, in the very process of struggle, favour the solidarity, the organised unity and the intellectual consolidation of the working class. Starting from this standpoint, the Central Committee has consistently rejected the methods of partizan warfare and revolts, as breaking up the unity of the workers, fruitlessly squandering the strength of the people, dissipating the revolutionary energy of the working class in a number of detached outbreaks, and thus rendering it impotent.

„We do not doubt that the Council was in favour of the main features of the policy sketched out by us above. In this belief we are confirmed by those points of the resolutions in which the Council decisively condemns the replacement of a class revolutionary socialist policy of the labouring masses

either by the amateur political schemes of separate groups abroad, who, against the clearly-expressed will of the Party, are again trying to inveigle it into the path of fruitless agreement with bourgeois elements, and merely retarding its work among the artizan classes of Russia, or by the adventures of individual 'cells' which have broken off from the parent stem of the Party, and, at their own risk and expense, have recourse to detached insurrectionary movements. But precisely for that reason, we consider it necessary to point out a certain ambiguity of formulation in that part of the resolution where it is stated that the question of a revolutionary overthrow of the dictatorship of the Communist Party becomes the order of the day with all the force of vital necessity. In order to avoid inconsistency with the whole spirit of what has been set forth above, 'revolutionary overthrow of the Bolsshevik dictatorship' must be understood to mean only the termination of that dictatorship by the forces of the revolutionary labouring masses, brought about by the independent political action of these masses, without any kind of alliance with groups with class hostility to the working class. Clearly it would be the greatest mistake to put into this formula any kind of implied recognition of the methods of partizan warfare and revolt. We fear that ambiguous and confused formulation of this point may generate some uncertainty in the minds of inexperienced and politically untried comrades.

„The disintegration of the working class, the lack of direction ruling in its ranks, the absence of strong class organizations of the workers, the profound dissensions sown by Bolshevik policy between the workers of town and country — all this compels the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, in the existing internal and external situation, to take as its primary and fundamental task, the drawing together of the labouring masses in party organisations and class associations for the process of strenuous propaganda, agitation and organization work'. All the energies of the new managing organ of the Party, elected by the Tenth Council, should now be applied to the solution of this problem. Any undertaking of the workers independent of this organ will inevitably prove premature, and will only lead to the fruitless squandering of the

living manoeuvring force of the Revolution — the working class.

„But this momentary renunciation of the method of armed conflict, at a time when the disintegration of the labouring masses keeps victory out of the hands of the revolutionary democracy, which took its principles already from the Ninth Council of the Party, by no means implies a weakening of the political struggle that the Socialist-Revolutionary Party has carried on and will carry on for the termination of the Bolshevik dictatorship. With you, we are inclined to regard the Tenth Council as a rallying cry for all the dispersed Party forces, and as a signal for the mobilization of new workers to take the places of those torn out of the ranks of the Party by the terror of the Bolshevik Government“.

Welcoming the decision of the Tenth Council to join the Vienna International, they add:

„We hope that you will remind the Partys' Delegation to Foreign Countries how great is the responsibility of the task at present before it. In connection with the enormous weakening of the forces of the Republic caused by the famine, certain imperialistic governments are again considering plans for military intervention, by which the Bolshevik Government could be crushed with armed force and the whole Russian Revolution put into irons. The Delegation to Foreign Countries must avert this new danger by an energetic campaign among the western proletariat against the interventional schemes of their Governments. It must, however, just as decisively take action also against hidden forms of intervention under the guise of relief for the starving population of Russia. When we call to all classes of America and Europe to save the lives of millions of our citizens — we are asking from them bread and only bread.

„Dear to us as are the ideas of the Constituent Assembly, democracy and government by the people, we emphatically repudiate any interference of foreign Governments in our struggle against the dictatorship of the Communist Party. These ideas must be realized by the working people, and not introduced into Russia on the points of foreign bayonets or bartered for by foreign governments as a condition of relief for the starving.

„At the Tenth Council the sentries who have fallen from the ranks were replaced by fresh ones. And, handing over to you now the responsible post in which you are called to uphold the old revolutionary traditions of the Party and its glorious old flag, we must also hand on to you our parole and watchword:

„Socialism and democracy' — such is our watchword.

„Union of the labourers of town and country in the struggle against the Bolshevik dictatorship, in the name of the political enfranchisement of the working class — such is our parole“.

The following persons signed this letter: Members of Central Committee of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party: A. R. Gotz, M. Y. Gendelmann, M. A. Vedeniapin, D. D. Donskoi, M. A. Lichatch, C. V. Morozoff, D. F. Rakoff, E. M. Ratner, E. M. Timofeyeff, M. S. Tsetlin.

Such in broad general lines is the political position of the S. R. P. We cannot, of course, give in a short article an exhaustive illumination of the role of the S. R. P. in the Revolution, but what we have said here will suffice to dissipate the calumnious inventions which have been circulated abroad against the Party by Bolshevik agents.

S. R. P. Delegation to Foreign Countries.



Götz, à l'époque où il purgeait 10 ans de bagne, sous le tsarisme.
Götz während der 10jährigen Kerkerstrafe unter dem Zarismus.



Le président du tribunal révolutionnaire lit la sentence de mort.
Der Vorsitzende des Revolutionstribunals verliest das Todesurteil.

