

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

EDITOR :: WM. PAUL

Volume 4

JULY 1923

Number 3

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

HOME—SINGLE COPIES		ABROAD—SINGLE COPIES	
SIX MONTHS	- 3s. 9d. POST FREE	SIX MONTHS	- 3s. 6d. POST FREE
TWELVE "	- 7s. " "	TWELVE "	- 6s. 9d. " "

HOME AND ABROAD—BUNDLE ORDERS

13 COPIES FOR 5s. 3d. POST PAID SALE OR RETURN

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

RUSSIA PAYS FOR OUR COWARDICE

WHEN the Hamburg International refused the offer of the Communists to form an international united front to fight to defend Soviet Russia, the imperialists were directly encouraged to go on with their plans to try and destroy the Workers' and Peasants' Republic. Although the Hamburg International passed a resolution declaring its determination to prevent any imperialist attack upon Russia, *it did not outline any plan to enforce its pious sentiments*. Indeed, in its resolution there was a section which showed that the new international does not seriously intend to defend Russia. How the imperialists viewed the Hamburg resolution may be seen by the fact that Lord Curzon sent new and greater demands to Moscow.

In Britain the official Labour movement has handled the Curzon demands in a most disgraceful manner. No attempt has been made to organise *the one thing* that the Government fears—the "all in" Council of Actions and manipulated from a general centre. Lord Curzon has seen nothing but a series of resolutions: a few enthusiastic demonstrations and some bold platform gestures. These have no effect upon him and the predatory gang he represents. He has seen no serious attempt made by the official movement *to create any instrument to enforce the resolutions* that have been passed. Until he sees that the leaders are in *earnest* and that they really mean to *act* he will continue to bluster and to send ever more impossible demands to Moscow. The struggle between British Imperialism and the Soviet Republic is not at an end. Curzon and his kind shall make new attempts to strangle Russia by adopting other methods. But the event of the past few weeks have taught us many things.

The ten-days ultimatum to Russia revealed the impotence of the British Labour movement. It revealed, despite all the talk about preventing war and so forth, that the officials had no organisa-

tion that could immediately *act*; it revealed that the leaders had neither a policy nor even the faintest idea how a war maniac like Curzon could be held in check. If our leaders knew their business they should have been able to have set in motion such machinery throughout the whole political and industrial movement that would have driven Lord Curzon from office; and they should have insisted upon the British Government recalling the Curzon note. This, some might say, would have created a political crisis. Certainly! But such a speedy and effective line of action would have shewn to friends and foes alike that the Labour Party was the real political dominating force in this country. Such an exhibition of political initiative would have been the most effective reply to the "die-hards" who are continually wanting to know whether Labour is fit to govern. The ability of a group to govern, let us repeat for the thousandth time, does not depend upon the number of people who vote for it once in five years; the test of governmental ability is determined by the alertness, courage and ability *to act* in such a speedy way as to confound and defeat opponents.

The Curzon ultimatum to Russia gave the British Labour Party a greater opportunity to rise to power than it will get by contesting twenty general elections. The failure of the Labour Party to act compelled the Soviet Government to grant concessions which it need never have yielded to our imperialists. One of the most damning things in the whole of history is to hear people like Snowden and MacDonald chiding the Moscow leaders because they are compelled to concede concessions to capitalism. These blind fools cannot see that the reason why the Russian Soviets must compromise is precisely because the MacDonalds and Snowdens are too cowardly to lead any real attack upon their own imperialists. The Soviet Government is compelled to pay in concessions to the capitalist States because the moderate Socialists are afraid to fulfill their international obligations to the Russian workers and peasants. Philip Snowden does not view the struggle of the Russian masses as a part of the great international conflict between the proletariat and their masters. No! This I.L.P. "international" pacifist uses a venal pen to attack the Soviets and to say that they are seeking to humiliate Britain in the eyes of the world. Here we get the identical language used by a Curzon and the other imperialists; here we get the Union Jack blue-blooded Jingo who is anxious about the reputation of some geographical entity called Britain. There are some proletarian I.L.P.-ers who are honest and intelligent enough to know that international Socialism is something of greater importance than the geographical areas upon which the imperialist robbers have planted their national flags. But the ideas of those straightforward workers are miles apart from the counter-revolutionary policy regarding Russia which has become the obsession of Mr. Philip Snowden, who has worthily earned the high distinction to bask in the smiling presence of His Majesty the King.

Those who desire to help the Russian workers to maintain peace to carry on their magnificent work of reconstruction, let them, in every district throughout the land, set up a united front of all Labour groups, and prepare the machinery of the Councils of Action. And let us remember that the Russian workers have to pay in blood and sweat, to our imperialists, for our shortcomings.

THE HAMBURG INTERNATIONAL

SO, at long last, all the elements of the Second International are united once more. No! Not really united. They have merely come together. For the New International contains a greater collection of heterogeneous and hostile groups than it did prior to the date of its inevitable breakdown in the bloody days of August in 1914. There are as many different policies, all pulling in different directions, within the Hamburg International as there are different groups represented in it.

Everyone knows that in 1914 the capitalist reactionaries were only able to plunge the world into war because the Second International was led by leaders who were more interested in the national interests of their capitalists than they were in the international interests of the working class. In 1914 History put these leaders to a severe test; they showed themselves to be a bunch of craven cowards, and they allied themselves, in every country, with the enemies of the exploited masses. Thus, during the war, the leaders of the Second International were utilised by the imperialists to hound on the workers against each other. In Germany the important leaders were taken inside the Government because the Junkers required them as agents to mislead the wage-workers of that country. In Belgium, the great dramatic artist, Vandervelde, was given a seat beside his royal master. In France, Albert Thomas was used to crush the munition workers. In Britain, the Hendersons, Clynes, Thomases, Shaws, etc., outdid the most rabid jingoes by their hysterical and patriotic orgies; not even the I.L.P. "pacifists" in Parliament could screw up courage to vote against the war credits. The collapse of the Second International was as treacherous as it was complete.

Although the Second International had gone down in the most disgraceful defeat ever experienced by a political organisation, there was a heroic nucleus that sought to rally the masses against the war in every land. In Germany Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Klara Zetkin, and Mehring boldly stood for international working class solidarity. In France men like Rosmer, Monatte, assisted by Trotsky and others, hurled themselves against their imperialist masters. In Britain the real struggle against the war was started and extended in the workshops by a small party which had always refused to acknowledge that the Second International was a Socialist organisation. In other lands, such as Switzerland, Lenin, Zinoviev, and other Russian Communists were active in trying to gather into an international group all those who were valiantly fighting the imperialists. Thus from the shame and wreckage of the old International a new world force of bold spirits was in the making.

This new force was soon to be tested. In 1917 the Russian masses east aside their royal puppet. They smashed the outworn political forms of their masters, and seized the State power which they have wielded triumphantly for over five years. In Germany the workers chased the Kaiser from his throne. All over Europe the new international revolutionary organisation was gathering strength, and was showing real courage and leadership. The daring of the new leaders, combined with the clearness of their policy, brought new hope to the revolutionary masses of the world. This new international that was consolidating the revolutionary workers and which was encouraging them to throw themselves into the struggle against the imperialist States, all of which were exhausted by the war—this fearless organisation was the Communist International.

The impact of the Russian Soviet revolution reacted upon the European masses. In Germany, in Finland, in Austria and Hungary the workers were in a revolutionary mood. As in 1914, when the leaders of the Second International rushed, in each country, to the assistance of their imperialist master, so in the revolutionary days following the war, when the workers were only waiting to be led against capitalism, it was the same leaders who again saved the propertied system by acting as its bulwarks against the revolutionary surge of the proletariat. The result of this new act of treachery so disgusted the best rank and file fighters in the working class movement that they turned away from the Second International to the new leaders now springing up in the Communist International. But even here the workers were confronted with an element of confusion at once deliberate and treacherous. Had these masses joined up with the Communist International and come under its leadership, a great struggle would have been organised against the capitalist governments. But the workers were cunningly misled. Across their path was drawn the evil-smelling red-herring of the Two-and-a-half International. The promoters of this shoddy and stop-gap organisation clearly saw that an all-powerful Communist International meant the end of the Second International. The Two-and-a-half International was organised, deliberately, to mislead the workers and to keep them marking time until the moment came when it would be both safe and possible to attempt to rehabilitate Schiedemann, Vandervelde, Henderson, and the other lick-spittles of capitalist imperialism. This is what was done at Hamburg. In these notes, writing in 1921, we said:—

“Slowly and surely the true function of the Two-and-a-half International is unfolding itself. Its organisers . . . have set up their new movement in order to allow the distinguished traitors of the Second International to retreat . . . into a new camp specially prepared for them by Longuet, Adler, and Wallhead.” (Page 4, Vol. ii., COMMUNIST REVIEW.)

The COMMUNIST REVIEW does not pretend that this correct forecast was a piece of brilliant political prophecy. It was inevitable. We knew the fibre-less types who made up the Two-and-a-half group. Anyone could see that errand-boys like Wallhead ultimately had to knuckle under to the more clever and ambitious people such as Henderson and J. Ramsay MacDonald.

The coming together of all the anti-Communist elements into one group considerably helps to clear the political atmosphere in the international Labour movement.

UNITING TO SPLIT

IT is not necessary to show, at any great length, that the new anti-Communist International contains so many conflicting groups that at any moment of crisis, when decisive action becomes necessary, the various elements will stand in each other's way and make such action impossible. Before the Hamburg unification had taken place, it was possible to see how conflicting were the views regarding every aspect of working-class policy.

We shall give one example. We all know with what reverence our Labour Party and I.L.P. dupes view the League of Nations. On every international matter of vital importance our Hendersons, Clynes, and MacDonalds have but one solution—to refer it to the

tender mercies of the League of Nations. Some of the Labour members are the official propagandists of the League. It is interesting to note, therefore, what other groups in the Hamburg International think of this famous League. Even such a timid and moderate Socialist as Otto Bauer denounced it in a speech delivered during the Congress. According to the *Manchester Guardian* (31/5/23) we read:—

Bauer, who held office as Foreign Secretary after the war, enumerated the main hotbeds of European reaction, of which, he said, there were five—the German counter-revolutionary movement, French Imperialism, Italian Fascism, the Hungarian White Terror, and, finally, the League of Nations. No one expected to have the League of Nations coupled in that sense with Horthy, Ludendorff, and Mussolini. It is true that many people in Germany are sorely disappointed with the League. But the Congress, as a whole is by no means antagonistic to the League, and Bauer himself is a genuine friend of it. But he complained that since the intervention of the League reaction has grown a new head in Austria.

When the League of Nations discussed the question of Austria at Geneva last October, voices were raised which demanded an armed intervention that should cut the claws of the Austrian proletariat. An English general was apparently more merciful and only advocated the establishment in Austria of an international gendarmerie. I think it was mainly the opposition of Dr. Benes which brought these mischievous suggestions to naught. But Bauer asserted that “the golden ring has been as effective as the iron chain.” Since the League of Nations has undertaken the financial restoration of Austria, and especially since the Commissary of the League has taken up his residence in Vienna, reaction has increased dangerously and visibly. . . . Bauer did not give in his speech any details to support this complaint. But in conversation he told me that many of the social achievements of the Austrian revolution are being gradually suppressed on the pretext that they stand in the way of financial recovery. While the revolution, for instance, transferred the burden of taxation upon the owners of large properties, they are now being favoured and the mass of the people made to bear an excessive share of the financial burdens of the country. Again, under the same pretext, many provisions for guarding the workers against excessive work or inadequate pay are being either quietly disregarded or openly curtailed. Finally, as another instance, he mentioned the fact that the old officer caste, who are a serious danger to the republican idea, and who for that reason have been hitherto kept under strict observation by the workers, are now again and increasingly dominating the military machine. He claims that that is a direct result of pressure exercised on the Executive, on the ground that reconstruction was not possible without order, and that order was not possible without a strong army. . . . He strongly maintained that what is happening is going far beyond what may have been necessary to meet the difficulties of the moment, and that the control of the League has become an undoubted channel for the reactionary desires and activities of the financiers and industrial magnates. The result is, concluded Bauer sadly, that a feeling that the League of Nations is a mere instrument in the hands of exploiting Governments and individuals is taking root among the working masses of Austria.

Bless his innocent and lamblike mind! He is only beginning to discover in 1923 what the Communists proclaimed to the whole world several years ago. The Communists denounced the League of Nations during the days when the international reactionaries were fashioning it. But Otto Bauer refused to believe the Communists. Like so many more clever people, the real nature of the League only dawned upon him *after* it had accomplished the best part of its reactionary work under his nose. He is, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, “still a genuine friend of it.” We are prepared to believe he is. The wierd and counter-revolutionary things that Otto Bauer can fold to his bosom is one of the wonders of the world. It is this gift that explains why he organised the Two-and-a-half International in order to enable Schiedemann, Ebert, Vandervelde, Henderson, etc., and the other bulwarks of imper-

ialism to rehabilitate themselves in the eyes of the masses of the world.

However, Bauer's declaration upon the League of Nations brings into bold relief one of the thousand things that is destined to show that the Hamburg International is divided upon vital matters. Like the dead and damned Second International, it contains all the elements of self-stultification. This explains why it began its career by refusing to face important problems which were crying out for decisive action.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

IT is only when the raw edge of reality is drawn over the sentimental pates of our emotional Hamburgers that they sit up and take notice of what is actually taking place in the political world. Although Otto Bauer, and his timid friends in the British Labour movement, have had several years in which to study the reactionary rôle played by the League of Nations, it is painfully evident that, even now, they do not understand why the League was created. A few glances at it are sufficient to prove, to any sensible person, that the League of Nations is the international tool of the triumphant imperialist States: it is the headquarters of the international robber gang at which they keep a catalogue of their swag and a list of their weapons.

But the League of Nations is something else besides.

In the struggle of the working class for the conquest of power one or two things stand out most vividly. In the old days, before the workers began to act politically as a class, the local administrative bodies had a great many powers relating to the calling up of the army in the event of trouble; and they had some control of the police, etc. This was very noticeable in Italy, France, America, and, in some measure, in Britain. As the workers began to get many of these local administrative bodies under their control there grew up a tendency for the capitalist governments gradually to withdraw certain powers from the localities and to centralise these more directly under the auspices of the State, which as yet was not menaced by any proletarian party. In France, and other European countries, it was a common thing for a socialist town council to find itself superseded by the direct intervention of the centralised government. Thus, as the workers gradually gained political control in the *localities*, the capitalists gradually consolidated all their sovereign powers *nationally*. This was one of the most interesting political problems prior to the war. But after the war a change had taken place! The workers in Russia had made an onslaught upon the powers of the capitalist State and succeeded in wresting national control out of the hands of the propertied interests. In Russia the masses stood defiantly triumphant, wielding the army and all the instruments of force which makes a State a State. In Germany, in Austria and Hungary, in Italy, and many other lands the masses were seriously stretching forth their hands to dominate the State. In Britain a government by Labour was a political possibility. Within such an atmosphere the capitalists cleverly created a new weapon—the League of Nations. Just as the political success of the workers in the *localities* compelled the capitalists to concentrate their political State powers *nationally*, so the possibility of the masses triumphing *nationally* has compelled the imperialist propertied interests to concentrate their State forces—

armies, navies, loans, etc.—upon an *international* basis. The League of Nations is the international organisation of the triumphant imperialist States; it represents the highest expression of the organised capitalist class attempting to defeat the political triumph of the revolutionary working class.

The lop-sided emotionalists of the Second International believed that the League of Nations was a new and wonderful instrument specially created in the interests of sweet democracy. Our open-mouthed Labourists will swallow anything if only the cunning imperialists attach to it that blessed word—*democracy!* So reactionary has the League of Nations proven itself that even the I.L.P. leaders, who have sworn by it for four years, are getting troubled in their minds about it. Of course, no one expects the I.L.P. to come into the open and struggle against the robber League. Our I.L.P. friends always insist upon washing and polishing up capitalist dirt as a preliminary to the Communists throwing it out.

Otto Bauer, with all the stupid simplicity that stamped him and his infantile comrades of the Two-and-a-half International, attempted, as we have seen, to enumerate *five* sources of world reaction—"the German counter-revolutionary movement, French Imperialism, Italian Fascism, the Hungarian White Terror, and, finally, the League of Nations." But in reality these forces of reaction are actually *one*—the capitalist offensive against the world masses.

And it is because these may be reduced to *one* root, and to *one* enemy, that the Communists are able to expose the hypocrisy of Otto Bauer and his companions who refuse to create *one* international proletarian front against the common enemy.

LABOUR AND THE CROWN

Although the League of Nations is a most important capitalist weapon in the international class struggle, we must not overlook the reactionary national organisations that are being set up within each of the imperialist states to combat the Labour movement. In this country one of the most noticeable developments in recent years, has been the intensified propaganda conducted by the propertied interests to popularise the royal family. The monarchy is now playing a more influential part in politics than it did several years ago. The middle-class Radicals of the late Victorian days, men like Bradlaugh, Chamberlain, etc, were enthusiastic republicans. Mr. L. Strachey, in his splendid study on the Victorian period, miraculously senses the political hostility towards royalty that floated in the atmosphere of those days; one can feel the contempt rising from the pages of his book. A further illustration of the growing political importance of the monarchy was furnished, a few weeks ago, when that eminent and old-fashioned artist, Mr. Max Beerbom, withdrew certain cartoons on the royal family from his recent exhibition. This artist, who spends the greatest part of his time outside of England, had not noticed during his years of residence in Italy that the royal family in Britain was no longer a sort of standing joke, but had in reality become an important and serious factor in British politics. The capitalist press sharply reminded him that the residents of Buckingham Palace were no longer subjects for cartoons. The press in demanding the with-

drawal of the offending pictures, made certain references to the growth of new and dangerous factors in the political world.

During the reign of Edward VII. there began the first real attempt of the modern imperialists to make the monarchy an important factor in reactionary politics, and to make the royal family popular with the masses. But during the war the reactionaries had their chance and took it. The needs of the country and of the King were shown to be identical. Indeed, it was even put stronger than that. It was:—"Your King and country needs you." After the war a royalist organisation, the British Legion, was formed. The true Fascisti character of this organisation is hidden, at present, from its proletarian members, by a camouflage agitation on behalf of discharged soldiers. At a recent conference of the Legion, Earl Haig crudely exposed the true function of the movement by showing that its aims of "Fear God and honour the King" meant a struggle against the Bolsheviks in this country!

Part of the campaign to raise the political prestige of the monarchy may be seen in the overwhelming efforts exerted to popularise such persons as the Prince of Wales who is closely identified with the reactionary military clique that runs the British Legion. His tours in Canada and India were organised by the predatory imperialists, who feel their colonies and dependencies slipping from their grasp. The propertied interests have boosted this young man, and his smile, in the hope that he may act as a rallying centre for all counter-revolutionary elements in case of any serious and determined political action by the working class. Unfortunately for the enemies of Labour, the Prince of Wales scarcely looks as though he had been cast for the part of a heroic defender of the throne.

The crown occupies a much stronger position in the constitution of the land than the Labour Party, with their one-eyed devotion to democracy, seem to realise. Apart from the control which the King wields through the Privy Council, etc., we must not forget that the oath of allegiance which every soldier and sailor takes, is one that demands loyalty to the King, and *not* to the particular government which happens to be in power. It is these various constitutional and legal powers, controlled by the King, that explains why, in these days of ever-increasing class conflict, the propertied interests are carrying on such a skilful campaign to make the royal family one of the factors in the coming struggle of the Labour movement for political power. A popular monarch could easily intervene to save the realm from the control of "wicked agitators."

The British Labour Party has not made it part of its political task to undermine such a feudal institution as the monarchy. On this question, as on all others, the leaders have taken their cue from the politicians of the master class. To see the Snowdens, Clynes and Hendersons cringing before the puppet of Buckingham Palace, is an example of servility. It also demonstrates with what success the British "black hundred" have done their work in transforming the crown into one of the most powerful political weapons in the country. Reaction may be strongly represented when the land is ruled by His Majesty's Labour Government! Some of our prospective royalist Labour premiers have all the characteristics which distinguished Mussolini a few years ago.

W. PAUL.

The Baldwin Ministry

BY J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD, M.P.

WHEN in the autumn of last year the Tory "Die Hards," at a meeting at the Carlton Club, their Party headquarters, overthrew the Coalition Ministry and compelled Lloyd George to make way for a Conservative Government, the man whom they selected as their leader, Bonar Law, was only a stop-gap. He was to act as leader during the period of transition from rule by a continuation of the whole of the forces of big property in land, finance and industry, to rule by the forces of passive capitalism in league with the landed aristocracy and the clique around the King. When Lloyd George resigned office, there went with him those Conservatives who stood for a more aggressive imperialist policy consonant with the interests of British industry and commerce, rather than for a reactionary ascending policy, defensive of the class rule of the old governing classes of Europe and of America. Bonar Law, *persona grata* as he was with American high finance, was not so friendly disposed towards the imperialist assertiveness of France under its militarist-monarchist leadership. He was a Scottish-Canadian, and, as such, had about him a lingering atmosphere of that Liberalism which he inherited from his Scottish emigrant parentage mingling with his colonial bias towards a Britain imperial rather than merely insular or European in its outlook. He was comparatively acceptable to the newly enriched land speculators, mining engineers, and railway contractors around Lloyd George. They and the supporters of Bonar Law had made Lloyd George Prime Minister of Britain. Bonar Law continued to perpetuate within the new Tory Ministry something of the *nouveau riche* imperialist tradition of Lloyd George.

He and the Marquis Curzon stood for British self-assertion against France in all that affects the iron and steel trade, and for assertiveness against France and everyone else who challenges British expansion in Asia.

The Marquis Curzon, an impoverished aristocrat until his cynical marriage with an American heiress, owed his advancement to his peculiarly intimate knowledge of the Middle East, particularly Persia. His oriental scholarship and remarkable personal capacity obtained for him the chairmanship of the Imperial Bank of Persia, a British banking company, incorporating a syndicate of creditors of the State of Persia, who, in turn, owed their opportunities in that quarter to the fact that the two principals amongst them were court favourites and financial friends of the late King Edward, viz. :—Sir Edward Sassoon and Baron Reuter.

Curzon relinquished his directorship of the Imperial Bank of Persia when he became Viceroy of India. Every high-placed Indian bureaucrat has friends in high financial circles and the Marquis Curzon has never been without his share of these useful aids to political advancement. At once, a man of brilliant attainments, of aloof disposition and of boundless ambition, he has been elevated from rank to rank in the peerage until now he stands at a level to which no other tool of the imperialists, not even Milner or Balfour or Reading, has been raised. He is a Marquis. There is only one honour that he has yet to gain—a Dukedom.

To whom does he owe his advancement and for what services were his dignities conferred? He owes them to a King, personally and devotedly attached to his cousin, Tsar Nicholas and his Aunt, the ex-Empress Dowager, fearful above all things of the spread of Bolshevism, never happy unless surrounded by his troops or escorted by our potential Fascisti, the British Legion, *i.e.*, a monarchist organisation of ex-servicemen whose motto is—"For King and Empire." There is an inner circle of ex-officers amongst these, one of whom, there is reason to believe, is that Captain of the King's Life Guards, Fitzroy, who, as Deputy Chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons, recently ordered me to leave the Chamber.

The Foreign Secretary has had his vanity satiated by his King in order to make him the more willing to serve as a mask behind which the King, the Queen-Mother, the ex-Empress, and all the court clique of generals, admirals and flunkies can carry on manœuvring opposition to the recognition of Soviet Russia. In this country, the constitutional theory is that the King is not responsible for his actions. It is notorious that the actions of ill-will to Russia are those of the King and the Court, but the responsibility is the Marquis Curzon's.

The Marquis Curzon stands in our political life for unmitigated reaction abroad and at home. He stands for the patronage of Mussolini and the prosecution of relentless hostility to Sovietism or Socialism in any form other than that of the craven and treacherous opportunism of Snowden, Clynes and Thomas.

The menace to the British governing class and the whole property system is not, however, as yet sufficiently grave to make it wise for the King at this juncture to appoint his mask as his Prime Minister.

The more immediate task is to practise economy in the public finances and to maintain British imperialist prestige whilst not provoking the active opposition of either France or the United States. The French or the American imperialists would not, it is the guilty fear of the British imperialists, be averse to permitting Soviet Russia and nationalist Turkey to raise the East against them. The British imperialists are very conscious that they have no supreme navy, no adequate air force, and, certainly, no goodwill in the non-British world.

The King and the collection of *émigrés* and sycophants who crowd the Court (in contradistinction to the corrupt but very clever financial wirepullers who were the bosom companions of his gay old *roué* of a father) may desire to launch the diplomatic prestige and the strained man-power of Britain, at Moscow and Angora in an endeavour to restore the Danish brood to thrones and dignity in Russia and Greece. But the British bourgeoisie has no such intention of allowing its substance to be dissipated and its mastery over the masses to be shaken on a fool's errand of that character.

Therefore, whilst they may approve the King's patronage of Sir Benito Mussolini and are willing to exploit his inveterate hatred of the "Reds" to cajole Soviet Russia into making more and more concessions to Leslie Urquhart or that other syndicate with which the name of Sir Reginald Hall, the Tory Party organiser, has been linked—and which is opposed to the Russo-Asiatic group, the

British banking and mercantile class has no desire to raise a hornet's nest throughout the entire East by breaking with Russia.

They may be pressed into doing so by their King, or fooled into doing so by agencies operating in the Press, whether consciously or unconsciously, on behalf of Standard Oil or the Banque de Paris. These latter would, as Sir Allen Smith, the head of the engineering employers, showed in the House of Commons, referring to America, utilise a break-off of relations between Britain and Russia as an opportunity themselves to take Britain's place in Moscow's good graces.

The British bourgeoisie, therefore, has demanded—not Curzon, but Baldwin, as Prime Minister.

Mr. Stanley Baldwin, was, until he became a Minister of the Crown, a Director of Lloyds Bank, of the largest railway company in Great Britain and of the family firm of Baldwins, Ltd. His father and grandfather before him had been successful ironmasters in the Midlands industrial area to the west of Birmingham. They had been pioneers in the manufacture of Siemens and Gilchrist Thomas steel in South Wales, and had added to their iron and steel works great colliery properties. They had amassed an enormous fortune and become influential railway and banking magnates. In the three generations they have been the equals and, at the same time, the rivals of the Chamberlain family for economic and political pre-eminence in the Birmingham area.

The Chamberlains were to them as, in a sense, the Krupps to the Stinnes. The Chamberlains specialised in finished products, the Baldwins in the handling of the raw material of the finished article. In the same way, the Chamberlains were Liberal Unionists allied with, overpowering and, finally, dislodged from the leadership of the Conservative Party. The Baldwins were, all the time, Conservatives.

Stanley Baldwin has been more associated with the financial manipulation of his family's economic power. Politically, he has been an attaché of Bonar Law, himself an attaché of Joseph Chamberlain and the rival of his son, Austin Chamberlain.

Austen Chamberlain was ousted from the position of leader of the Conservative Party by the more purely Conservative elements utilising the services of Bonar Law, and the reversion of his leadership has now been secured by one of the Conservatives themselves in the person of Baldwin.

The latter has now no active share in the control of the business that bears his name. He has nothing to do with its direction and it is doubtful whether he is to any extent interested in it unless in the capacity of a holder of debenture and preference shares yielding an unvarying income alike in times of depression and prosperity. He and his family have joined economically the passive class of *rentiers*, of international investors, of landed proprietors.

It will have been observed that he did not include in his Ministry Sir Robert Horne, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer under Mr. Lloyd George. Sir Robert Horne, there is reason to believe, was asked and refused to take office. The excuse he gave was that his business undertakings would not allow him to do so. Sir Robert Horne was, and is, a lawyer who owes his advancement in the world of politics to the fact that his father was the parish church minister in a mining area (Samannan), where the all-powerful magnates were

the most influential firm of Scottish iron and coal magnates, the Bairds of Coatbridge, in Lanarkshire. He was known in business circles in Glasgow, prior to becoming a member of parliament, as "Baird's man Friday." Lloyd George promoted him from office to office until he became his Chancellor of the Exchequer. Horne was, and is, a Unionist.

In 1920, a syndicate of investment bankers, acting for a group of shipowners and shipbuilders, entered into an arrangement to buy Baldwins, Ltd., for a very large sum. Just as the engagement was being made an acute depression ensued on a period of feverish prosperity. The banking syndicate repudiated the transaction. Baldwins, Ltd., took them into the law courts, whereupon the banking syndicate made a surrender out of the court, £750,000 damages for breach of contract, and agreed to complete the purchase.

Meanwhile, the banking syndicate in question had come under the control of another banking syndicate, viz., Kleinwort, Sons & Co., a firm which has made enormous profits out of the exchanges, is the agent in London of Mendelsohn & Co., of Berlin, and is, also, providing heavy credits to Krupp. The same group is also standing behind Leslie Urquhart's concern, the Russian-Asiatic consolidated Co., Ltd., and of the Imperial and Foreign Corporation, Ltd., a concern of which Austen Chamberlain was the first chairman, and which was established to exploit Russia, Mesopotamia, and the middle East. In this same group is, also, Lloyds Bank, Ltd.

Sir Robert Horne is, now, chairman of the reconstructed firm of Baldwins, Ltd., and a director of Lloyds Bank. His group of interests desires a settlement of the Reparations question and a favourable conclusion to the negotiations in connection with the Russian Trade Agreement. He and they are shrewd enough to realise the foolishness of breaking off relations with Russia, and, at the same time, to understand the value of such a threat in making a bargain with Russia.

Stanley Baldwin is, like Lord Derby and other Conservative leaders, notoriously friendly towards France, and desires a closer political *rapprochement* which, of course, means an understanding whereby British and French interests shall jointly take over and exploit the Ruhr in lieu of the payment of impossible Reparation claims. As is everywhere always the case, the *rentier* and other passive elements of the property class are willing here in Britain to enter into negotiations with the foreign banking interests of Paris in order to drive a better bargain with the industrial and commercial interests of their own country. Sir Robert Horne stands for a prominent British industrial control in an international consortium to exploit the Ruhr. Poincaré stands for a prominent French industrial consortium to exploit the Ruhr.

Stanley Baldwin—and, probably, Loucheur—stands for a 50/50 British and French interest in an international consortium to exploit the Ruhr. Since Lloyd George, the Earl Balfour and their colleagues were sent out into the political wilderness and aggressive British imperialism yielded place to an attitude of "tranquility" in foreign relations, there has been visible a distinct orientation of American and British imperialisms towards each other and against France.

In the near East, France, which was the friend of the National Government of Turkey, has been losing influence in that quarter where her economic claims were being countered by those of the

American concessionaire, Admiral Chester. Behind him was, denials notwithstanding, the Standard Oil Company. Under the pressure of other circumstances connected with the British debt to the United States, the Government of the latter was able to induce the British to make concessions of a political character, affecting the financial administration of Persia and to allow the Standard interests a participation in oil tracts in that country.

Meanwhile, Stanley Baldwin has been to America and has arranged a settlement of the British Treasury's debt to the United States Treasury and to the bankers of New York. When the United States Treasury has issued script to the New York bankers to the amount of the United States' claim on the British Treasury, the said bankers will sell these to the investing class of the whole world, and the bondholders will have secured a sixty years' claim on the British taxpayer guaranteed by the United States Government, a claim to be settled, not in £ sterling, which may depreciate very rapidly "when Labour rules," but in gold dollars.

Baldwin has made a contract with American high finance, agreeable not only to the latter, but also to Baldwin's own class, the British section of the international bondholding fraternity. Baldwin has, it is most important to observe, asked to become his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Reginald McKenna, the chairman of the largest of all the British joint stock banks, the London Joint City and Midland Bank. Mr. McKenna has been to America just after Lord Balfour wrote a very displeasing note concerning the British debt to America. Immediately on his return to England, this life-long Liberal, formerly Chancellor of the Exchequer in Mr. Asquith's Ministry, went upon the platform of a political meeting addressed by Mr. Bonar Law in the City of London.

Now, passing over the Conservative Austen Chamberlain, Baldwin has invited and secured as his second in command Mr. McKenna.

Baldwin and McKenna, the two men who negotiated the contract with the American creditors, are to be the two men to administer "tranquility" in such a way as to assure "economy," and to make sure not only that the creditors get their money, but that British finances are so re-organised as to ensure that the debtors have the best of the bargain so long as the British bourgeoisie maintains control of the British Government machine. By concerted action alike on the economic and the political planes, the banking oligarchy of this country, who temporarily lost control of the state apparatus at home and the monetary supremacy abroad during the war period, when Canadian speculators and Lloyd George captured the helm of government, has been winning its way back to its former pre-eminence in the financial City of London and the governmental City of Westminster.

The banking oligarchy is determined to consolidate its power at home and to prepare to assert once more its prestige abroad. Stanley Baldwin is orienting the policy of Britain towards France. This does not mean that either the problem of the Ruhr or the question of the straits and of Mosul is near to a settlement. What it does mean is that the triangular contest between Britain, France, and the United States for the mastery of steel, coal, and petroleum is entering upon another phase. France is in financial difficulties. She is being pressed by her creditors, *i.e.*, by the United States. American steel capitalism has no intention of permitting French

high finance to unite the iron ore of Normandy and Lorraine with the coking coal of the Ruhr unless American big business is permitted to enter as a participant.

British high finance knows this, and knows that French high finance also knows it. Severally, they are each weaker than the American high finance. Together, they are, if weaker in volume of money, stronger in the experience of handling in conjunction money power and state power.

Already in the near East, a British group comprising Rothschild (the ally of "Shell" oil), Schroeder (the ally of Anglo-Persian oil), and Lloyds Bank (the ally of big Indian interests), has acquired from a Swiss bank the reversion of certain German interests in the Anatolian (*i.e.*, Bagdad) Railway, which should, normally, have passed to France.

Following upon this, Venizelos, the political catspaw of Anglo-Hellenic capitalism, has come to an understanding with Ismet Pasha. The latter has waived the Turkish claim to an indemnity.

Britain and France are drawing together in the East. Britain and France will draw together in the Ruhr. Baldwin and McKenna are preparing to keep faith with the United States—just as long as it pays them to do so!

The Anti-Communist International By R. Page Arnot

THE Conference at Hamburg in the last week of May, by which the Second International and the Vienna Union (or Two-and-a-half International) were fused into a single body, is of great importance in the development of the working-class struggle. It is of importance, but not for the reason given by the fusionists. To them Hamburg is the ending of the divisions in the Socialist movement caused by the great war; to us it marks the formation of a definitely anti-Communist *bloc*, the clearing away of the confusions caused by the wavering centre parties, the paving of the way for fascism in every country.

By all accounts, this Hamburg Conference was very touching. Emotion was generated in great quantities. The leaders of the Second International, long ago forgetting the quarrels they had had as patriotic supporters of the Kaiser on the one hand, and of the Entente bourgeoisie on the other, had been sorely vexed by the revolt of their pacifist sections during and immediately after the war. The faith of Clifford Allen in the wise leadership of Henderson had been badly shaken: the faith of Hilferding in Noske had almost entirely disappeared. But now the Second International could use the words of Shakespeare, and say magnanimously of Hamburg that it did "unthread the rude eye of rebellion and welcome home again discarded faith." On its side the Vienna Union, rising to even greater heights of magnanimity was prepared to welcome out of the abundance of its pacifism those who had driven the workers by millions to be killed. The Holy Spirit moved on the face of the waters of the Alster,* and everybody was forgiven by

* The river of Hamburg.

everybody else until seventy times seven: there was complete tolerance.

Nevertheless this complete tolerance was rather like the complete religious toleration accorded by Cromwell's Puritans to all religions — "except athiests and Catholics." In the same way the complete tolerance of the Hamburg Conference does not apply to the Communists, and the rules of the new organisation have been very carefully drafted so as to secure that they shall never be applicable to Communists.

The differences which divided the pacifists and the Second International were only apparent: the real difference was between the Communist International and all the others. Thus, the significance of this Hamburg Conference is its formation of a definitely anti-Communist International: everything else is mere words.

The account of the sessions of the Conference and the preliminaries bears this out. First the conditions of summons were such as to exclude the Communists. Only those Parties were invited to attend which accepted the following conditions:—

(1) The principle of the economic emancipation of the workers from capitalist domination as their object, and the independent political and industrial section of the workers' organisations as the means of realising that object;

(2) The unity of the International Trade Union movement of Amsterdam as an absolute essential for the realisation of that emancipation;

(3) The resolution of the Hague World Peace Conference, 1922, on "The Mission of organised Labour in the movement of World Peace," as the present basis in all action when there is imminent danger of war, and recognise the necessity of adopting a clear and definite policy to be pursued by the workers' movement in case of war;

(4) Recognise the Labour and Socialist International, not only as an effective instrument in peace, but an absolute essential during war;

(5) Agree after the formation of a Labour and Socialist International not to affiliate to any other political International.

Clause 1 means anything or nothing. Clause 4 is the sort of death-bed repentance that pleases priests; as the song goes, "When the devil was ill, the devil a monk would be." Clauses 2 and 5 are directed against the Communist International, and in so far as a reference in Clause 3 to the farcical Hague Conference of last year has any meaning at all, it is to debar the Bolsheviks because they will not stop exposing it as a farce. Not only were the pre-conditions of the Conference thus mainly aimed at the Communists, but out of all the discussions the one that was marked by a note of passionate sincerity was that in which the Communists were cursed, damned, and excommunicated. It is impossible, reading the fragmentary accounts of the Conference, not to be struck by the whole-hearted sincerity of the hatred shown to the Communist International. It contrasts with the insincerity of the fundamental paragraph of the new Constitution, which is as follows:—

"The Labour and Socialist International (L.S.I.) is a union of such parties as accept the principle of the class struggle for the economic emancipation of the workers from capitalist domination and the establishment of the Socialist

Commonwealth as their object, and the independent political and industrial action of the workers' organisations as a means of realising that object."

"Such parties as accept the principle of the class struggle." How does this square with the repeated declarations of the Labour Party that it is not a class party, or with the repudiations of Marxism by its best known leaders? In its total abstention from the class struggle at home, and its swallowing the formula of the class struggle during its week-end at Hamburg the Labour Party is like some Scotch teetotallers of my acquaintance, who, when at home in Glasgow "Never touched it," but were perfectly willing to tipple at Brodick Fair. The significance of this Hamburg Conference, then, emerges in its anti-Communist character. But to have said that is not an explanation. It is necessary to discover how it should be anti-Communist, how the many divisions in the Labour movement have gradually disappeared or been stopped up, leaving the one big gulf between the Communists and the anti-Communists.

To get this, we must go a little further back than the emergence of the Vienna Union. The question is that of the most fundamental division first showing itself in debate, and secondly in Party organisation. It is the difference between those who believe in co-operation, however partial, however temporary, but still co-operation, with the bourgeois State and those who will have nothing to do with the capitalist State. That difference emerged at the International Socialist Congress held at Amsterdam in 1904. A well-known French socialist had taken part in the formation of a French radical cabinet. He claimed that his action was perfectly consistent with a socialist standpoint, or (since the word Socialist is now used to justify any and every activity) let us put it that he frankly endeavoured to justify his action on the ground that it was in the true interests of the proletariat. The matter was debated in France in 1903; it was brought up at the International Socialist Congress in 1904. Jaures, Bebel, Kautsky and all the others discussed it, and in the end it was decided that the action of that French socialist was opposed to the interests of the working class. The name of that French Socialist was Alexandre Millerand: he is now head of the capitalist State in France.

Further, it was laid down that no socialist must enter a coalition with the bourgeois parties. But the decision went deeper than the mere question of joining this or that ministry. It was the division between those who believed in working with the capitalist state and those who, believing the State to be the Executive Committee of the capitalist class, would have no truck with it. It is true that the poison within the Second International was even then at work, the poison which consisted in adding clause after clause to resolutions until they became perfectly meaningless, and so could not possibly offend anyone. Therefore this decision was hedged about with clauses which allowed for exceptions, but the actual decision does not matter: the important thing is that the two fundamentally conflicting conceptions of socialism were brought to an issue.

It was therefore but as a pendant to this resolution on working class independence that the Congresses of Stuttgart (1907), Copenhagen (1910), and Basle (1912) passed and repassed the resolutions defining the attitude of the Socialist parties in the case of a European war. The outbreak of the war, however, concealed for a time the fundamental differences. The line of cleavage was between those

who supported their Governments, making timely use of the exceptional clauses in the 1904 resolution in order to enter coalitions, become ministers and effective recruiting agents on the one side, and on the other those who being tinged with Cobdenite pacifism would not support their Government in a war, together, of course, with the minority who remained faithful to the resolutions of the International capitalist resolution and would have no truck with the bourgeois on any action. The lines of division occurring in this manner it was some little time before the true differences began to appear. At the Zimmerwald Conference of September, 1915, the cry was not for peace through socialism and social revolution, but simply for peace, peace without annexations and without indemnities, peace at once and peace at any price. The succeeding Conference of anti-war socialists held in April, 1916, at Kienthal made the distinction plain. The language of the resolutions is clear. Not only are the patriotic socialists denounced, but the futility of bourgeois pacifism is exposed, and the hope of any real peace under capitalism is declared to be an illusion; the only peace that endures will come with the triumph of socialism. The triumph of socialism is, therefore, the only urgent question.

Already we see the outlines of the Third International gleaming; already the complete betrayal of the workers by the chiefs of the Second International has made it clear that the new International, if it is to start clean and honest must not include any of these discredited traders and bankrupt merchants.

At the same time as the Versailles Conference, a Socialist Conference is held at Basle: that Conference is like the marionette players. The Entente Socialists raise the question of Germany's guilt at the same time as Monsieur Clemenceau and others are preaching on the same subject at Versailles, and the German Social Democratic Party replies to the same purpose as, a few months later, did Count Brockdorff Rantzau at Versailles. In the best manner of the Big Four dictating to the defeated Central Empires, it was laid down that future congresses should have as a main item on their agenda the question of the responsibility for the war; the second main item which it was decided should be discussed was the question of Democracy. A resolution was passed which contained the telling phrase:—

“A society more and more permeated with socialism (the Fabian touch) cannot be realised, much less permanently established, unless it rests upon triumphs of DEMOCRACY and has rooted in the principles of liberty.”

We are back again it is clear to the year 1776, and the American Declaration of Independence that preceded and guaranteed the white terrors of capitalism of the United States. To the resolution on Democracy the answer was given in the next month, March, 1919, in the “Thesis on Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship,” the first pronouncement of the newly-formed Communist International. The ambiguities of the pre-war International were past; the possibility of contradictory views existing in the same organisation no longer survived: it had led to the bloodshed of 1914. Against those who had insisted on fulfilling the 1904 resolution against co-operation with the bourgeoisie, there was uttered the shibboleth of Democracy and liberty by the war-mongers, who (to do them justice), never failed to say that it was for these things they were fighting or inducing others to fight. The challenge was

taken up, and the nature of bourgeois democracy and bogus liberty, examined and exposed. It is no wonder that the jingo Socialists have now formed an anti-Communist International.

The call of the Third International was at once responded to. Movement was felt amongst the workers, everywhere the leaders were forced to make the appearance of a move towards the new International. Inside such parties as the French Socialist Party, the German Independent Socialist Party, the I.L.P., the response of the working class elements was unmistakable. The leaders, however, hesitated. They stated that they were anxious to have a re-constructed international on a wider basis than that laid down in the Manifesto of the Third International. They wanted something, as the I.L.P. put it, which would leave the national sections complete autonomy, by which I understand it meant liberty to accept the class-struggle in international congresses and to repudiate it at home. In Germany, in France, and in other countries during the next eighteen months the majority of the parties, including nearly all the working class elements, went over to the Communist International.

It might have been thought that the adherence of the majority of these parties to the Communist International settled the question. No, curiously enough, it was immediately after the adhesion of the majority of these parties that the remainder set themselves to build up an International which would neither be the Second International nor the Third International, and which approximately received the name of the Two-and-a-Half. Before they began it was predicted that they were a sort of astral body, temporarily detached from the Second International, and that while this astral body might roam for a time through the ether in quest of its ideal of cosmic unity, it was bound sooner or later to return to the *vile corpus*, from which it was but an emanation. They carried on this spiritualistic trickery for a couple of years, at the end of which, they suddenly re-united with the jingo Socialists, crying as they did so, "At last we have the one united International."

No doubt some of them really deceived themselves. Socialists brought up in the atmosphere of Imperialistic Britain are naturally adepts at the art of self-deception. One can imagine Charles Buxton, or better still, Clifford Allen, as Sir Galahad in search of the Holy Grail of International Unity. Again and again they cross the misty seas, again and again they return defeated, but still hopeful. At last one fine May-day, in the year of our Saviour nineteen-hundred-and-twenty-three, they come sailing over the sea from Germany and spread the glad tidings that they have found the Holy Grail: and the faith and fervour of Sir Galahad is so strong that no one has the courage to break it to him that what he has got is not the Holy Grail of Joseph of Arimathea, but simply a battered old pint pot from the tavern of the Second International.

The object of spiritualists, like other charlatans, is to fool the populace, and holy legends, like that of Sir Galahad, have often bemused a people in the past and helped to keep it from revolt. Here it is that we find the reason for the existence of the Two-and-a-Half. After the war, within a few short months, as the workers began to realise their conditions, the chiefs of the Second International with their policies and reformist illusions, were hopelessly discredited. For nearly three years after the armistice the masses

were still in a revolutionary mood. What is more, that mood was growing and spreading ever wider. At the beginning large numbers of the workers were sunk in slumber, lulled by the promises of the Second International, made when they were members of Governments and Royal Ministers; with the end of the war, and even before it in some cases, the trustfulness of the masses passed away. Very quickly it became clear that nothing would hold them back from following a revolutionary lead, or at any rate, from following those who spoke in revolutionary phrases, whether they meant it or not. The old magics were stale: reformism was seen through as an illusion: the overthrow of capitalism was recognised as the only solution that would be lasting. It was at this point that the Centre Parties, the Parties whose leaders afterwards formed the Two-and-a-Half, began to talk wild, began to pass most revolutionary resolutions, began to invent special red pigments and paint themselves all over. The German Independent Socialists in December, 1919, at their Leipzig Congress, declared for Workers' Councils and also for the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was all camouflage, of course, but the workers were not to know that. Nothing could be more scathing than the references of some of the Two-and-a-Half people to the Second International. They referred to it with opprobrious epithets, and even as late as December, 1920, the manifesto of the preliminary meeting of the Two-and-a-Half referred to the "so called Second International" as the "only obstacle to the unity of the working class." More than that, the I.L.P. set about revising its obsolete constitution, and in proof of its modernity called in Mr. G. D. H. Cole to help. The months from the signature of the Versailles Treaty to the spring of 1922 were passed in the most desperate and revolutionary manner. Swashbuckling speeches were made by the Centrists, and in return for the swashbuckling speeches the bourgeois Governments handed out some transient concessions. The working class, or parts of it, stilled by these concessions, rejoiced that they had followed the tactics of the Two-and-a-Half and not run after the men of Moscow, who were so dangerous, so divorced from common sense, so unaware of political conditions in this country (whichever country it was), so narrow in their views.

When the tide turned, when the capitalist offensive began, their work was finished. First their tone changed into one of much greater conciliation; secondly, the concessions they had won were taken away again by the capitalists (for example, Trade Boards Extension, Mines Act, etc.); and finally, under the stress of the capitalist offensive, the revolutionary mood of the workers and the concessions that bought off that revolutionary mood having both disappeared, the Two-and-a-Half International quietly disappeared also. It was gathered to its forefathers, its forefathers of the Second International. Deceiving or self-deceived (it does not greatly matter which) it had served the capitalists in their hour of need. This was the historic rôle of the Two-and-a-Half International.

But the importance of the recent Conference was not so much in its organisation of the anti-Communist forces within the working class as such, or in the fitting ending that it gave to the meteoric career of the Two-and-a-half, but in its relation to the menace of

the capitalist offensive. It is by its alteration of the factors in the class struggle that the Hamburg Conference is really important.

Let us for a moment consider the position of the enemy. The Bourgeoisie, like the socialists of the Second International, has for five long years hoped for normalcy, for tranquillity, for a return of the good old peaceful days and so on. Every disturbance, every uprising, everything that would tell an experienced observer that he was on the verge of a volcano, tells them simply nothing. All these things are so many isolated instances, and to none more so than to the journalists and pundits of the new Labour and Socialist International. "If only Monsieur Poincaré were defeated," they sigh, or, "If only the President of the U.S.A. would authorise a billion credits to Europe," or, "Now that Mr. Lloyd George has gone, if only Lord Robert Cecil would"—; so they go on. But after five years of these hopes, some amongst the bourgeoisie are beginning to doubt if the world can be set right so easily. The times are rather out of joint, they feel, and drastic must be the remedy. They find on the one hand an anarchy of production which has led to the crisis of unemployment that continually threatens future wars, struggles for the markets and "yards of mud between two blades of grass." Against this they have no remedy. Their spells and incantations, their armed forces and their aeroplane squadrons, their hoarded gold and their printing presses are all of no avail. On the other hand they feel that their trouble comes from the movements and uneasy stirring of the subject classes against them. If the weapons of persuasion, religious dope, class education and newspaper propaganda have no effect, then repression must be used. Is not repression used already? it may be asked. Indeed it is, but legal repression in these days is not enough. The learned professors read in their books that the repressive laws of the Spartans against their Helots were not enough to ensure the safety of the State, and that therefore divers of the Lacedaemonian young men were licensed to walk abroad and put to death any Helot they might find. A lesson like that can be very easily applied: and Fascism is the result. It has begun in Italy; it has spread to Poland and Hungary and Yugo-Slavia; there are signs of it in France, and it has its backers in this country. It has sprung up in various forms in America, and even in Japan, where there might seem but little need of it—so complete is the domination of the ruling class. It has begun. Before the next election in France, Fascism will be tried, while the whole policy of the Entente towards Germany is to destroy the "Jew Republic," as they call it, and introduce a monarchist, Fascist, re-action to seize power. Exit the new German State and the pale shadow of socialisation, of which the Second International was once so proud.

As Fascism spreads, everything gets ready for a grand final assault on Soviet Russia. Even as I write, the news comes through that sixty Japanese Communists have been arrested on a charge of "conspiring to set up a Communist Party." As Marcel Cachin was arrested by the Ruhr-monger Poincaré, so the arrest of these Japanese Communists will be utilised to prevent a Trade Agreement between Japan and Soviet Russia. The European situation is black; the world situation is blacker still.

The formation of the Labour and Socialist International paves the way to Fascism. Firearms Acts may be put in force against the workers: nothing disarms the workers so completely or heartens the ~~would-be~~ Fascists so much as the Labour and Socialist International

Do we see any sign of it in this country? The answer is in the affirmative. In the spring of this year there was every sign of a Labour revolt. The mood of despair amongst the workers was passing away. *The Times*, which knows its England, was saying gloomily that the country was in for the biggest industrial struggles it had ever faced. The builders, the agricultural workers, the miners, the shipbuilders, all these, and many more, were on the move. Where is that revolt now, what has smothered it? Everyone has forgotten the gloomy anticipations of the governing class, and what has smothered it? It was the combination of the Labour machine with the bourgeois machine: the sleeper was awakening, everything had to be done to keep him quiet. Thus, while Fascism is being prepared behind the scenes the stage is set for Fascism by the complete organisation of the Labour forces of Western Europe under the constitutionalist banner. It effectually does disarm the workers. Apart from those led by the Communists, the workers put up no resistance, physical or moral. When the British Mussolini is given his cue and steps on to the stage, he will be able to say that it was "a bloodless revolution."

Trotsky ■ By Karl Radek

HISTORY has prepared our party for various tasks. However defective our state machinery or our economic activity may be, still the whole past of the party has psychologically prepared it for the work of creating a new order of economics and a new state apparatus. History has even prepared us for diplomacy. It is scarcely necessary to mention that world politics have always occupied the minds of Marxists. But it was the endless negotiations with the Mensheviks that perfected our diplomatic technics; and it was during these old struggles that comrade Chicherin learned to draw up diplomatic notes. But we are just beginning to learn the circle of economics. Our state machinery creaks and groans. But in one thing we have been eminently successful—in our *Red Army*. Its creator, its central will, is comrade L. D. Trotsky. Old General Moltke, the creator of the German army, often spoke of the danger that the pen of the diplomatists might spoil the work of the soldier's sabre. Warriors the world over, though there were classical authors among them, have always opposed the pen to the sword. The history of proletarian revolution shows how the pen may be re-forged into a sword. Trotsky is one of the best writers of world socialism, but these literary advantages did not prevent him from becoming the leader, the leading organiser of the first proletarian army. The pen of the best publicist of the revolution was re-forged into a sword.

The literature of scientific socialism helped comrade Trotsky but little in solving the problems which confronted the party when it was threatened by world imperialism. If we look through the whole of pre-war socialist literature, we find—with the exception of a few little-known works by Engels, some chapters in Anti-Dühring devoted to the development of strategy, and some chapters in Mehring's excellent book on Lessing, devoted to the war activity of Frederick the Great—only four works on military subjects: August Bebel's pamphlet on militia, Gaston Moch's book on militia, the two volumes of war history by Schulz, and the book by Jaurès, devoted

to the propaganda of the idea of the militia in France. With the exception of the books of Schulz and Jaurès, which possess high value, everything which socialist literature has published on military subjects since Engel's death has been bad dilettantism. But even these works by Schulz and Jaurès afforded no reply to the questions with which the Russian revolution was confronted. Schulz's book surveyed the development of the forms of strategy and military organisations for many centuries back. It was an attempt at the application of the Marxian methods of historical research, and closed with the Napoleonic period. Jaurès' book—full of brilliance and sparkle—shows his complete familiarity with the problems of military organisation, but suffers from the fundamental fault that this gifted representative of reformism was anxious to make of the capitalist army an instrument of national defence, and to release it from the function of defending the class interests of the bourgeoisie. He, therefore, failed to grasp the tendency of development of militarism, and carried the idea of democracy *ad absurdum* in the question of war, into the question of the army.

I do not know in how far comrade Trotsky occupied himself before the war with questions of military science. I believe that he did not gain his gifted insight into these questions from books, but received his impetus in this direction at the time when he was acting as correspondent in the Balkan war, this final rehearsal of the great war. It is probable that he deepened his knowledge of war technics and of the mechanism of the army, during his sojourn in France (during the war) from where he sent his brilliant war sketches to the *Kiev Thoughts*. It may be seen from this work how magnificently he grasped the spirit of the army. The Marxist Trotsky saw not only the external discipline of the army, the cannon, the technics, but he saw the living human beings who serve the instruments of war, he saw the sprawling charge on the field of battle. Trotsky is the author of the first pamphlet giving a detailed analysis of the causes of the decay of the International. Even in face of this great decay Trotsky did not lose his faith in the future of socialism; on the contrary, he was profoundly convinced that all those qualities which the bourgeoisie endeavours to cultivate in the uniformed proletariat, for the purpose of securing its own victory, will soon turn against the bourgeoisie, and will serve not only as the foundation of the revolution, but also of revolutionary armies. One of the most remarkable documents of his comprehension of the class structure of the army, and of the spirit of the army, is the speech which he—I believe at the First Soviet Congress and in the Petrograd Workers' and Soldiers' Council—on Kerensky's July attack. In this speech Trotsky predicted the collapse of the attack, not only on technical military grounds, but on the basis of the *political* analysis of the condition of the army. "You"—and here he addressed himself to the Mensheviks and the S.R.'s—"demand from the Government a revision of the aims of the war. In doing so you tell the army that the old aims, in whose names Tzarism and the bourgeoisie demanded unheard of sacrifices, did not correspond to the interests of the Russian peasantry and Russian proletariat. You have not attained a revision of the aims of the war. You have created nothing to replace the Tzar and the fatherland, and yet you demand of the army that it shed its blood for this nothing. We cannot fight for nothing, and your adventure will end in collapse." The secret of Trotsky's greatness as organiser of the Red army lies in this attitude of his towards the question.

All great military writers emphasise the tremendously decisive significance of the moral factor in war. One-half of Clausevitz's great book is devoted to this question, and the whole of our victory in the civil war is due to the circumstance that Trotsky knew how to apply this science or the significance of the moral factor in war to reality. When the old Tzarist army went to pieces, the minister of war of the Kerensky Government, Verchovsky, proposed that the older military classes be discharged, the military authorities behind the front partly reduced, and the army reorganised by the introduction of fresh young elements. When we seized power, and the trenches emptied, many of us made the same proposition. But this idea was the purest Utopia. It was impossible to replace the flying Tzarist army with fresh forces. These two waves would have crossed and divided each other. The old army had to be completely dissolved; the new army could only be built up on the alarm sent out by Soviet Russia to the workers and peasants, to defend the conquests of the revolution.

When, in April, 1918, the best Tzarist officers who remained in the army after our victory, met together for the purpose of working out, in conjunction with our comrades and some military representatives of the Allies, the plan of organisation for the army, Trotsky listened to their plans—I have a clear recollection of this scene—in silence for several days. These were the plans of people who did not comprehend the upheaval going on before their eyes. Every one of them replied to the question of how an army was to be organised on the old pattern. They did not grasp the metamorphosis wrought in the human material upon which the army is based. How the war experts laughed at the first voluntary troops organised by comrade Trotsky in his capacity of Commissary of War! Old Borisov, one of the best Russian military writers, assured those Communists with whom he was obliged to come in contact, time and again, that nothing would come of this undertaking, that the army could only be built up on the basis of general conscription, and maintained by iron discipline. He did not grasp that the volunteer troops were the secure foundation pillars upon which the structure was to be erected, and that the masses of peasants and workers could not possibly be rallied around the flag of war again unless the broad masses were confronted by deadly danger. Without believing for a single moment that the volunteer army could save Russia, Trotsky organised it as an apparatus which he required for the creation of a new army.

But Trotsky's organising genius and his boldness of thought are even more clearly expressed in his courageous determination to utilise the war specialists for creating the army. Every good Marxian is fully aware that in building up a good economic apparatus we still require the aid of the old capitalist organisations. Lenin defended this proposition with the utmost decision in his April speech on the tasks of the Soviet power. In the mature circles of the party the idea is not contested. But the idea that we could create an instrument for the defence of the republic, an army, with the aid of the Tzarist officers—encountered obstinate resistance. Who could think of re-arming the white officers who had just been disarmed? Thus, many comrades questioned. I remember a discussion on this question among the editors of the *Communist*, the organ of the so-called left Communists, in which the question of the employment of staff officers nearly led to a split. And the editors of this paper

were the best schooled theoreticians and practitioners of the party. It suffices to mention the names of Bukharin, Ossonski, Lomov, W. Yakovlev. There was even greater distrust among the broad circles of our military comrades, recruited for our military organisations during the war. The mistrust of our military functionaries could only be allayed, their agreement to the utilisation of the knowledge possessed by the old officers could only be won, by the burning faith of Trotsky in our social force, the belief that we could obtain from the war experts the benefit of their science, without permitting them to force their politics upon us; the belief that the revolutionary watchfulness of the progressive workers would enable them to overcome any counter-revolutionary attempts made by the staff officers.

In order to emerge victorious, it was necessary for the army to be headed by a man of iron will, and for this man to possess not only the full confidence of the party, but the ability of subjugating with his iron will the enemy who is forced to serve us. But comrade Trotsky has not only succeeded in subordinating to his energy even the highest staff officers, he has attained more: he has succeeded in winning the confidence of the best elements among the war experts, and in converting them from enemies to Soviet Russia to its most profoundly convinced followers. I witnessed one such victory of Trotsky's at the time of the Brest negotiations. The officers who had accompanied us to Brest-Litovsk maintained a more than reserved attitude towards us. They fulfilled their rôle as experts with the utmost condescension, in the opinion that they were attending a comedy which merely served to cover a business transaction long since arranged between the Bolsheviki and the German Government. But the manner in which Trotsky conducted the struggle against German imperialism, in the name of the principles of the Russian revolution, forced every human being present in the assembly room to feel the moral and spiritual victory of this eminent representative of the Russian proletariat. The mistrust of the war experts towards us vanished in proportion to the development of the great Brest-Litovsk drama. How clearly I recollect the night when Admiral *Alwater*—who had since died—one of the leading officers of the old army, who began to help Soviet Russia not from motives of fear, but of conscience, entered my room and said: "I came here because you forced me to do so. I did not believe you; but now I shall help you, and do my work as never before, in the profound conviction that I am serving the fatherland."

It is one of Trotsky's greatest victories that he has been able to impart the conviction that the Soviet Government really fights for the welfare of the Russian people, even to such people who have come over to us from hostile camps on compulsion only. It goes without saying that this great victory on the inner front, this moral victory over the enemy, has been the result not only of Trotsky's iron energy which won for him universal respect; not only the result of the deep moral force, the high degree of authority even in military spheres, which this socialist writer and people's tribune, who was placed by the will of the revolution at the head of the army, has been able to win for himself; this victory has also required the self-denial of tens of thousands of our comrades in the army, an iron discipline in our own ranks, a constant striving towards our aims; it has also required the miracle that those masses of human beings who only yesterday fled from the battlefield, take up arms

again to-day, under much more difficult conditions, for the defence of the country.

That these politico-psychological mass factors played an important rôle is an undeniable fact, but the strongest, most concentrated, and striking expression of this influence is to be found in the personality of Trotzky. Here the Russian revolution has acted through the brain, the nervous system, and the heart of its greatest representative. When our first armed trial began, with Czechoslovakia, the party, and with it its leader Trotzky, showed how the principle of the political campaign—as already taught by Lassalle—could be applied to war, to the fight with “steel arguments.” We concentrated all material and moral forces on the war. The whole party had grasped the necessity of this. But this necessity also finds its highest expression in the steel figure of Trotzky. After our victory over Denikin in March, 1920, Trotzky said, at the party conference: “We have plundered the whole of Russia in order to conquer the Whites.” In these words we again find the unparalleled concentration of will required to ensure the victory. We needed a man who was the embodiment of the war-cry, a man who became the tocsin sounding the alarm, the will demanding from one and all an unqualified subordination to the great bloody necessity.

It was only a man who works like Trotzky, a man who spares himself as little as Trotzky, who can speak to the soldiers as only Trotzky can—it was only such a man who could be the standard bearer of the armed working people. He has been everything in one person. He has thought out the strategic advice given by the experts and has combined it with a correct estimate of the proportions of social forces; he knew how to unite in one movement the impulses of fourteen fronts, of the ten thousand communists who informed headquarters as to what the real army is and how it is possible to operate with it; he understood how to combine all this in one strategic plan and one scheme of organization. And in all this splendid work he understood better than anyone else how to apply the science of the significance of the moral factor in war.

This combination of strategist and military organizer with the politician is best characterized by the fact that during the whole of this hard work Trotzky appreciated the importance of *Demjan Bedny* (communist writer), or of the artist *Moor* (who draws most of the political caricatures for the communist papers, posters, etc.) for the war. Our army was an army of peasants, and the dictatorship of the proletariat with regard to the army, that is, the leading of this peasants' army by workers and by representatives of the working class, was realized in the personality of Trotzky and in the comrades co-operating with him. Trotzky was able, with the aid of the whole apparatus of our party, to impart to the peasants' army, exhausted by the war, the profoundest conviction that it was fighting in its own interests.

Trotzky worked with the whole party in the work of forming the Red Army. He would not have fulfilled his task without the party. But without him the creation of the Red Army, and its victories, would have demanded infinitely greater sacrifices. Our party will go down to history as the first proletarian party which succeeded in creating a great army, and this bright party in the

history of the Russian Revolution will always be bound up with the name of *Leo Davidovitch Trotsky*, with the name of a man whose work and deeds will claim not only the love, but also the scientific study of the young generation of workers preparing to conquer the whole world.

The Crisis of the French Communist Party

BY P. VAILLANT-COUTURIER

[In this country it is almost pathetic to read the statements, written by J. Longuet, regarding the collapse of the French Socialist Party. Like other white-washers of the Second International, Longuet attempts to explain away the cowardice and ineptitude of his own Party by blaming the Communists for having wrecked it. The following article explains not only the weakness of such persons as Longuet; it also shows why the French Communist Party had to deal with certain elements which entered it, and who were unable to divest themselves of what has always been the prevailing weakness of the French Labour movement.—ED. OF COMMUNIST REVIEW.]

PRE-WAR SOCIALISM.

TO understand well the extent and gravity of the present crisis,* one must go back a very long way, even to the origin of the French Movement. One must re-examine piece by piece, stone by stone, this astonishing mosaic of parties and doctrines which from Gracchus Baboeuf to Jean Jaurès has constituted the under-structure of the Communist Party.

First of all let us affirm once more that the whole of the French revolutionary tradition is essentially bourgeois. Thus, the word *revolution* finds in the French Party, more than elsewhere, contradictory interpretations, and enthusiasms of varied qualities.

Side by side with the scientific Marxist assertions of the "Manifesto" we have the survival of Utopian Socialism dimming the notion of *class*, we have men of the International brought into power by a Nationalist Commune which founders in the most sympathetic and powerless humanitarianism, we have Blanquism disconcerting violence because of the check to its own adventures, and we have the proletariat and the petit bourgeoisie disputing over the conquest of Parliamentary places, a whole gamut of socialist sects from the "possibilistes" to the intransigent Guesdists, and we have finally the ministerialists provoking by the excess of their immodesty the awakening of anti-Parliamentary syndicalism.

* N.B.—The article from which these lines are adopted was written at the end of November. Shortly afterwards the Fourth Congress formulated the means of solving the Party Crisis, and the Executive decisions were adopted unanimously by the Delegates of all the fractions at the Congress, and later by the National Council of the Party. A few freemasons and bourgeois intellectuals "resisted," but were either expelled or resigned. These included Frossard. The purging of the Party of these elements has now definitely ended the crisis.—*Translator.*

With the unity of 1905 the Socialist Party became the conflux of all these different elements. It was the confusion of all these currents, streams or rivers into a vast democratic morass infested with the spirit of Jacobinism, banded together for electoral successes, and which would have appeared no more than a badly-welded combination of various fractions, had it not been for the moral force of Jaurès. The subtle and constantly renewed genius of Jaurès amalgamates these elements, moulds them, directs them. In contradiction sometimes with some of them, he speaks in the name of all. The force of his personality is imposed on the spirit of the whole party. The party, it is Jaurès, and his radiation allows only wavering flames to exist around him. Engulfed in democratic Socialism, Vaillant succumbs, in spite of his formulæ resounding with the equivocations of social peace. Guesde, embarked on reformism, is already far away from his controversy on the two methods . . . Hervé has evolved. . . . The party, a prisoner of Jaurès' genius, becomes thoroughly parliamentarised; Jaurès does not escape the bourgeois influence of the French revolution. His is the last and most vivacious kick against it. *It is the very feebleness of the bourgeois resistance which makes this possible.* The sickly bourgeois degeneration indeed contaminates Socialism to the very marrow attaining its most proven leaders.

Internally it is a question of conciliating the class struggle with the exigencies of the great republican family. They try to make a good republic to suppress abuses, to realise Socialism from day to day. Constantly in diplomatic relations with the anti-clerical parties, Socialism—about which Millerand, when he was its uncontested leader, remarked, "It should be afraid to have fear"—appeared nothing more than the left appendix of bourgeois democracy, the pendulum necessary for the Parliamentary equilibrium of the presidents of the council. Externally, it is a question of conciliating the International with the exigencies of national defence. Jaurès, the inspirer of the foreign policy of the French Party, while denouncing "these honest prettexts" which the imperialists would use like fig-leaves to hide the shame of the reasons for their war, writes *The New Army*, congratulates the Franco-British and Anglo-Russian ententes as a victory for peace, maintains in spite of the sceptical jeers of Sembat, the distinction between offensive and defensive wars. . . . Rosa Luxemburg preaches in front of him in the desert. The Second International divided between its internationalism and the particularism of its sections, was preparing its own failure. Jaurès, in a world bristling with the bayonets of rival trusts, has faith in human idealism, in persuasion, in the triumph of the just cause, in arbitration. . . . Jules Guesde, who some time before said: "In defending bourgeois civilisation you do the work of Penelope." Jules Guesde, who wrote à propos the Fourth Peace Congress: "It is a congress of madmen!" Jules Guesde associates himself with the politics of the Socialist group. It is the débâcle of revolutionary Marxism. A hundred Socialist deputies elected in 1914 bear down on the Palais-Bourbon like hornets on a promising hive. It is just this "practical orientation of French Socialism" that M. de Bulow, overwhelmed by its compliments, carries off. The party wishes for peace and social justice, but there is no way of imposing them other than the bourgeois Parliament.

G. Sorel, examining in his "Reflexions sur la Violence," the situation of the unified party already wrote in 1906:

"It seems that two accidents are alone capable of stopping this movement. A great foreign war which could retemper the energy, and which in any case would doubtlessly lead to power men having the will to govern, or a great extension of proletarian violence which would make the bourgeois understand revolutionary reality—and make them disgusted with humanitarian platitudes. . . ."

FROM WAR SOCIALISM TO THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

These two conditions were precisely realised during the period 1914-1917. Jaurès is assassinated while endeavouring by visits and oburgation to stop on the brink of a dangerous slope the already commencing war.

The party, quite prepared for the Socialism of collaboration, throws itself headlong into the "Défense Nationale." The syndicalism of Jouhaux follows hurriedly in its footsteps. Malvy sacrifices his "Carnet B," whose existence is no longer justified. The idea of class remains without force in front of the democratic sacred Union. Deprived of Jaurès' genius, Jaurèsism continues, becoming confusionism. The "infimes" of whom Raymond Lefebvre spoke, were to "execute a military marking-time around his tomb." One night, the 4th August, class antagonisms are brought about and it is the proletariat that is duped. . . . All the old stories of the revolutionary terminology of '93 come into fashion again in this "country in danger." The language of the Socialist sections is that of the Club des Cordeliers. The report of the Parliamentary group at the 1916 Congress commenced with the epic words: "Since by the criminal will of the Central Empires, Europe has been inundated in torrents of blood, the French Socialist Party is about to unite in congress for the second time." The insignificant lawyers of the house ape the procurators of the convention. . . . Shut up in the Parliament, with their ministers participating in the Government, the Parliamentary Socialists formulated the laws in a rump party. The moral preparation of the war by the capitalists has fully succeeded. Nationalism and Chauvinism, which are masked in general terms, ravage the party from top to bottom, induce its masses to resign themselves to massacre, dishonour the leaders by associating them with the crime, and with its diplomatic extension; official Socialism becomes the accomplice of the mighty Government. Militarism, censorship, courts martial, it accepts them all.

Alone, in the background, a tiny group of men resist. Coming from all shades of Socialism and syndicalism, they group themselves around Monatte at the Quay Jemmapes. There Merrheim elbows Rosmer, and Raymond Lefebvre meets Trotsky.

Around the nucleus of the *Vie Ouvrière* is organised the "Committee for the Resumption of International Relations" movement.

Hunted down by the leaders, threatened with exclusion at every Socialist Congress, Zimmerwaldians and Kienthalianians organise clandestine propaganda, at the same time pacifist and revolutionary.

The engineering and metal workers' unions, in which are accumulated men released from the front, are won over. The front itself, exasperated by the length of the war, takes to pacifism, and in May-June, 1917, even partially rebels against the strong Government.

Trotsky, expelled, after a voyage in Spain and America, returns to Russia with the first revolution.

Over there, at the same time as the French Party, which had united, mixed the best with the worst, seasoning it with insipid

democratic sauce, in 1917 the left wing of the Russian Party had learnt some decisive precepts in the revolutionary experience of the Winter Palace.

In 1914 the Bolshevik Party had plainly refused to associate itself with national defence.

In a country where the bourgeois democratic contagion had still only feebly penetrated, Russian Marxism was able to preserve all its intransigence. Reacting against Socialist inertia and its conception of automatic revolution, it had assimilated the best of the new syndicalist school. It was a party without compromise, knowing how to express clearly what it wanted, and recoiling before no methods of execution. This immediately brought it a front-rank position in the esteem of the masses, in the face of the Social Democrats after 1917.

The October revolution, the overthrow of the "good" Kerensky, the dissolution of the pre-parliament, the decrees and the peace negotiations of Brest-Litovsk, threw disorder and shame into the ranks of the Parliamentary Socialists of the whole world. *It was the extension of proletarian violence that was making an appearance.* It was not in the rules of the game. They had foreseen national victory, the extension of democracy, but since the war they had never considered but with horror the revolution before the enemy!

THE NEW SPIRIT.

From the Russian revolution was born the Third International. Between it and the Second International had passed the war. In five years capitalism had become obsolete by a century. In basing itself on Marxist doctrine the Third International met new situations with new tactics and new methods of action.

Benefiting by the popularity which this revolution—which had been able to end the war—met among the fighting masses, the Communist International found fervent adepts in the mobilised proletariat. Only too often we would have liked to return to Paris to disperse with machine-gun fire our masters of the Rue St. Dominique, of the Comité des Forges (steel trust) and of the Palais-Bourbon (Socialists included), so as not to be beaten at the outset by the Russian Bolsheviks. Violence had got hold of the world. Legality was dead. The feeling of having been betrayed for so many long years, and especially in 1918 by men who spoke in the name of the proletariat, exasperated us. We understood perfectly well all that the presence of Albert Thomas in the bosses' camp signified, and that it was the final rupture with a whole tradition that was about to be consummated. Thousands of young men, only just demobilised, generally ignorant of doctrine, often more pacifist than communist, penetrated into the Socialist Party.

But their war-pacifism, differing from that which had preceded it, no longer counted on the arbitration of Parliaments, nor on the force of persuasion. . . .

The breath of Jaurès only passed into it together with that of the eternal that it could contain.

War-pacifism was violent in its essence like the very period in which it had evolved.

I can only recall these heroic times with emotion. We hated the Parliamentary group, and, strong with an audacity of the devoted, henceforth ready for any revolutionary sacrifice, we solved everything with a success only equal to our imprudence. In front of us,

side by side with the Pacifists, Socialists, and Opportunists, for whom our culpable indulgence was to blame, the Nationalist-Defence Socialists, those who had voted war credits to the very end, consolidated themselves without reticence for the resumption of their old methods. . . .

And the conflict crystallised on the young and on the old. The old! I see them once more, just like an old sitting-hen before the plumage of the young ducks she has brooded. I see them again, the chevronned Socialists of whom the old struggles and often admirable life of devotion and poverty we had been taught, I see them once more, trying at first to convince us with disused arguments, then proving the plight of their age in some times agonising appeals, these old men, who did not understand, these old doctrinaires who thought in 1919 just as they did in 1914, who had learned nothing and forgotten nothing, and who, despairing of ever being able to convert us, finished by fulminating with us no more, except against our youth, in deriding tones where injury took the place of reason. As for us, the young ones, we brandished from end to end of the battlefield, the Russian revolution and the Communist International. We had too deeply felt in our spirit and flesh the horror of bourgeois or socialist nationalism to have not acquired the inextinguishable desire to wipe out even our ethnographic differences in an International that would be no more than an immense united revolutionary party. It was this great task of human unity that Raymond Lefebvre claimed in a hundred speeches and twenty articles; and all our generation with him. Here was much more than an internal party struggle. It was the conflict between two civilisations. Convalescents in an epoch of murderous decadence, abdication, and disorder, we had absolute need of order and healthiness.

(Translator—E. VERNEY.)

RUSSIA IN 1905*

BY G. H. ALLEN

THIS book is not a complete history of the 1905 Russian Revolution. Such a history would occupy many volumes. But, as Trotsky points out in his preface, the book gives the pith and marrow of the Revolution, the most significant happenings of the Revolution, from the point of view of the Russian working class and the International. Which means that it is largely a history of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies. Only when there are important revolutionary outbreaks elsewhere—for instance, the mutiny in the Black Sea fleet, the agrarian revolts, or the fighting in Moscow in December—does Trotsky turn aside from his narrative of the movement of the working masses of Petersburg.

The immense importance of 1905 is that it is the first detailed Marxist history, and analysis, of the revolutionary movements in Russia of that year, to be made generally available in Western Europe. A history, too, written by one who played a leading part in the events he describes and analyses. First written in German, in 1908-1909, and based on an earlier Russian work of Trotsky's,

* "1905." By L. Trotsky. Librairie de l'Humanité, Paris. 15 frs.

the present edition has been translated from a revised and augmented Russian edition published in the early part of last year.

The first fifty-odd pages of the book are occupied with an analysis of Russian social development, which is a masterpiece of compression and lucidity. There are four chapters, entitled respectively "The Social Development of Russia and Tsarism," "Russian Capitalism," "The Peasant Class and the Agrarian Question," and "The Motive Forces of the Russian Revolution." Trotsky touches on the familiar theme of Russian economic backwardness—primitive peasant agriculture—coupled with the most modern and highly concentrated machine industry, and quotes some extremely interesting comparative statistics of Russian, German, and Belgian industry. To give one example, alone, it appears that there were approximately the same number of large factories in Russia and Germany (employing over 1,000 workers), but that, while the number of workers employed in these large factories was in Germany only 10 per cent. of the total factory working population of the country, in Russia it was 38 per cent.; and the average number of workers per large factory amounted in Russia to 2,400, as against the German 1,900. The significance of the agrarian question is summarised by Trotsky in a sentence: "The crisis of agricultural economy, and the impoverishment of the village narrow more and more the basis of Russian industrial capitalism, which has to depend in the first place on the *internal* market." The first step towards settling the agrarian question could be summed up in one word—expropriation.

"By the direct and immediate task which it sets itself, the Russian Revolution is properly bourgeois, for its aim is to free bourgeois society from the trammels and chains of absolutism and feudalism. But the principal motive force of this revolution is constituted by the proletariat—and that is why, by its method, the revolution is proletarian. This contrast has appeared unacceptable and inconceivable to numerous pedants who define the historical rôle of the proletariat by means of statistical calculations or by apparent historical analogies. For them, the providential leader of the Russian Revolution must be the bourgeois democracy, whilst the proletariat which, in fact, marched at the head of events during the whole period of revolutionary enthusiasm, ought to allow itself to be tight bound in the swaddling clothes of an unsound and pedantic theory. For them, the history of one capitalist nation repeats, with more or less important modifications, the history of another. They do not see the process, unique in our time, of world capitalist development which brings together all the countries to which it extends, and which, by the union of local conditions with general conditions, creates a social amalgam of which the nature cannot be defined by searching for historical commonplaces, but only by means of an analysis on a materialist basis." Here we have the outlook of the Russian liberals, the *intelligentsia*, the progressive capitalists, the professional classes; in short, the "bourgeois democracy," admirably exposed. And "an analysis on a materialist basis" revealed in Russia the social weakness, the political and economic insignificance of those classes, the *intelligentsia* and the petty bourgeoisie, which are historically the basis of "bourgeois democracy." Russia was ripe for a bourgeois revolution; over-ripe, in fact. The trend and extent of Russian capitalist development, as an integral part of world capitalism, made ready the objective conditions for a telescoping of the bourgeois and prole-

tarian revolutions. This finally happened, of course, in 1917; and it could be clearly foreseen in 1905—right through this book Trotsky foresees it. The liberals, and the doubting Thomases of Menshevism, who thought that the Revolution “ought” to stop (at any rate, for the immediate present) at the bourgeois democratic stage, were merely trying to hold back history. And history, in Trotsky’s flaming phrase at the Soviet Congress on the eve of the seizure of power in November, 1917, duly flung the liberal-Menshevik “garbage” on to its “rubbish heap.”

The criticism of the liberals, weak, vacillating, and futile as they and their policy inevitably were, is handled in this book in masterly fashion. It is done, too, in the most irrefutable way—by letting history itself perform the task. The pathetic hopes of the semi-liberal regime of Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky, the silly sneers at the January demonstration of the Petersburg workers (“Bloody Sunday”), the support of the political General Strike in October until the “constitutional” manifesto of 31st October, and then the nervous attempt, Canute-like, to command the rising tide of revolution to retire—Trotsky’s keen analysis of the historical development of the revolution is the most dispassionate, and at the same time most impressive, exposure of liberalism and political opportunism that the present reviewer, at any rate, has yet read. And the criticism of Menshevism goes hand in hand with the criticism of liberalism. Could the position of the moderate, opportunist, “Socialists” and Labourists, be better put than in this passage: “In periods when allied and opposing social forces, by their antagonism as by their mutual reactions, bring a flat calm in politics; when the molecular work of economic development, actually reinforcing the contradictions in society, instead of breaking the *political* equilibrium, seems rather to affirm it provisionally and to assure to it a kind of permanence-opportunism, devoured with impatience, seeks around itself ‘new’ ways and ‘new’ methods of realising its aims. It spends its strength in complaints of the insufficiency and uncertainty of its own forces, and looks for ‘allies.’ It flings itself hungrily on the dunghill of liberalism, which it conjures, to which it appeals, and for whose use it invents special formulæ of action. But the dunghill only exhales its odour of political decomposition. Opportunism then cribs from the heap of dung a few little democratic pearls. It needs allies. It runs to right and to left trying to grab them by the tails of their coats at every street corner. It addresses its faithful followers, and exhorts them to show the kindest attention towards any possible ally. ‘Tact, again tact, and always tact!’” It suffers from a certain disease which is the mania of prudence towards liberalism, *the rage for tact*—and, in its fury, it deals blows to and wounds the men of its own party.” After an examination of the views of Plekhanov, the extreme right-winger, Trotsky exclaims in a stinging phrase, which would make a splendid motto for the *New Leader*: “There is here neither theoretical analysis, nor revolutionary politics; one only sees the importunate annotations of a marginal commentator in the great book of events.”

It is impossible here to do anything like justice to the broad sweep of Trotsky’s narrative of the events of 1905; the composers’ strike developing into a general strike, a general *political* strike, the formation of the Soviet—as an organ for uniting the working class, irrespective of party or union, in the struggle with the Tsarist State

power—the “abdication” of absolutism with the Manifesto of the 31st October, the using of the new-won “liberty,” especially the liberty of the Press, to the utmost—as we read Trotsky’s pages, the whole turmoil of the revolutionary struggle passes before us. The beginnings of counter-revolution, the organisation of pogroms by the Government, the consequent arming of the workers in self-defence, the mutiny at Cronstadt and the application of martial law in Poland, followed by the general strike of November—a protest strike, largely a demonstration of solidarity of the working masses with the mutineers—the peasant revolts, chiefly in the land hungry central provinces, the arrest of the Soviet in December, and the few days’ fierce street fighting in Moscow—all these happenings are related with a vividness and a power of analysis that recall the immortal pages of the *Civil War in France*.

The “Constitution” of 31st October, forced on Tsarism by the mass action of the workers, was a fraud; as Trotsky calmly told some petty bourgeois radical friends of his, “It is only the prologue to martial law.” Count Witte, the pseudo-liberal, was Prime Minister; but the autocracy subsisted. The Cossack’s whip was still the reality of government, even though it was discreetly wrapped round with a scrap of paper called a Constitution. The general strike had changed nothing in the power of the Government: it had led to much disorganisation, but when it came to its inevitable end, the Government was able to repair damages quite easily, and get the old machine going again. “In the struggle,” says Trotsky, “it is extremely important to weaken one’s adversary: that is the task of the strike. At the same time, it sets on foot the forces of revolution. But neither of these results constitute in themselves a *coup d’etat*. It is still necessary to seize power from those who hold it, and hand it over to the revolution. That is the essential task. The general strike creates the necessary conditions for this task to be performed, but it is, in itself, inadequate to carry it through successfully.”

The chief support of the Tsarist State lay in the army and the apathy of the peasants; and the days of the October strike emphasised the vital importance of the question, on which side will the army be? They also showed that the revolutionary town had no common policy with the countryside, where revolts, if they took place, lacked any conscious direction—were merely instinctive. The weakness of the Soviet was the weakness of a purely urban revolution. The task of the working class became clear: to organise the countryside and unite it with the town; to create a strong liaison between itself and the army; and to take up arms. The forces of reaction won because “the revolutionary strike, while laying down the hammer, had not yet seized the sword.”

The historic significance of 1905 was that it made these things clear to the Russian workers, and in particular to their most advanced section, the Bolshevik fraction of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. The victory of reaction in 1905-6 and the following years, served but to harden the temper of the masses. The liquidation of the revolution was only temporary. 1905 had resulted from the collapse of Tsarism in an imperialist war: and in his concluding sentence, Trotsky prophetically wonders whether the fate of Tsarism will not be finally sealed till after it has a second time suffered military collapse.

With the outbreak of war in 1914, the issue was still further clarified: in 1915 Trotsky wrote, in answer to a pamphlet by Axelrod, Martov, and other Mensheviks, that "It is not simply a question of a 'provisional revolutionary government'—an empty formula to which events will take upon themselves to give content—but of a *revolutionary workers' government*: it is a question of the conquest of power by the Russian working class . . . power—not in its *State form* (Constituent Assembly, Republic, United States), but in relation to its *social content*. The formula of the Constituent Assembly or of the confiscation of landed property has not, actually, an immediate revolutionary significance if the working class is not disposed to struggle for the conquest of power. For if the working class does not tear away power from the monarchy, no one else will be able to accomplish this task."

The second part of this book forms a whole independent of the first part: it contains the story of the trial of the Soviet—including Trotsky's speech to the tribunal, in which he tore the indictment to shreds, even on its own "legal" grounds—and of Trotsky's deportation to Siberia, together with a most thrilling account of his escape, and flight many hundred versts in a sleigh drawn by reindeer. This is as good as any adventure story we have read; and it is to be hoped that the translation of this story of Trotsky's escape, which the Y.C.L. had in hand some time ago, will soon be made available.

Our comrades of the French Party, who are responsible for running the *Humanité* Bookshop, are to be congratulated on their publication of this stately large-octavo book of nearly 400 pages. The printing and general get-up are satisfactory. Of the illustrations, the photographs vary—some very poor, some quite good—but the reproductions of contemporary pencil and crayon sketches are distinctly pleasing. A word of praise must also be given to the translation, which is the work of Comrade Parijanine.

Where Labour Rules

By J. FINEBERG

THERE has just concluded in Moscow a competition which for its character is unique. It was a competition in which workmen publicly passed judgment on their factory managers. Such a competition could only take place in a land where labour rules.

Sometime ago *Pravda*, the official organ of the Russian Communist Party, announced an essay competition on the best and worst factory managers. The workers in factories all over Russia were invited to submit essays describing the abilities or the defects of the managers of their respective factories; their achievements in improving the organisation and output of the particular factory, their attitude to the workmen, and what they had done to improve their conditions.

A panel of judges was appointed consisting of a representative of the Supreme Economic Council, one representative of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, two representatives of *Pravda*, one representative of *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn*, the official organ of the Council of Labour and Defence, two representatives of the Central

Committee of the Russian Communist Party, and also one from its Moscow Committee. In addition there were three workers representing an engineering works, a textile mill, and a wood works respectively. The terms of reference to the judges were: to indicate the factory managers that were worthy of bearing the honourable distinction of being the best, and those deserving the unenviable distinction of being the worst factory managers in the country.

The competition met with an immediate response and roused interest all over the country. Essays came streaming in from all the industrial districts—Moscow, Petrograd, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Tula, the Don, Kharkoff, and from the remote Urals. During the course of several months a whole page of *Pravda* was devoted every day to the publication of these essays. Some were signed by individuals or groups of individuals, some by works' committees endorsed by the Communist nuclei, while others had been submitted to general meetings of the workers and bore their collective endorsements.

Many of these essays gave rise to discussions in the columns of *Pravda*. Objection would be made to the fact that the virtues of a particular manager had been exaggerated. Others would point out that while what was said in praise was true, the bad points of the man had not been referred to, and, therefore, his character had not been presented in a true light. Letters would appear from unfortunate "bad" managers who had been dragged into the light, or from their friends repudiating the charges made against them.

Of course, it could not be expected in such a competition that every essay would be entirely free from error, or even interested bias. Perhaps some found it a ready means of settling some private account with someone of whom they had fallen foul. But every disputed case was investigated and the opinion of the judges as to the correctness of the statements made was published.

This competition was a review of the officers—the "captains" of industry—by the troops!

It was more. The guardians of the economy of the republic were called upon to render an account of their trust before the Tribunal of Labour.

This could only take place in a State where the purpose and method of organising industry is other than that prevailing in capitalist countries. Where the industries belong to the nation, those who have been placed in charge of them are the servants of the nation. And where labour rules, the workers themselves are vitally interested in the good management and development of the factories in which they work. This is the case in Russia.

Industry in Russia is owned by the Labour State and is run for the purpose of satisfying the needs of the producers. Every factory kept going, every new factory opened, any increase in output, and improvement in transport and distribution, means an increase of the national wealth, which will be shared by those who have helped to produce it.

This has been demonstrated, objectively, to the workers in Russia. During the civil war industry was brought almost to a standstill, and the conditions of the workers were appalling. During the brief respite industry has been gradually set going, and already the workers' conditions are approaching the normal. With the exertion of the best efforts and the best employment of resources, that point will be reached, and then will commence the striving towards

a higher economic and cultural level. Hence the interest in this competition.

In passing, the competition gives us an insight into the economic and social life of Russia to-day.

One hundred and thirty-two essays were sent in. The great majority of the men described were former workmen at the bench. These had fought in the class war before the revolution. Many of them had fought and risen to commanding positions in the revolutionary army. *The results of their abilities there, we know.* On the coming of peace and the period of construction they had been given commanding positions on the economic front. There they have shown organising ability, initiative and resource more than equal to that of the former capitalist specialist. There are, it is true, exceptions. These have been dragged into the fierce glare of public criticism. Among these workmen managers are Communists and non-party men, but the "good" non-party manager is not inferior to the "good" Communist manager; both loyally serve their class. The list includes former specialists, the "spetz" as they are called. Some of these are just hanging on—waiting, waiting—for what? Others have broken with the past and either out of loyalty to the republic or sheer disinterested devotion to their work, are giving of their best. Also there are former owners of enterprises who have managed to secure positions as managers in the enterprises they formerly owned. These are invariably bad.

Below we give a brief summary of a few of the essays sent in:—

S. J. Podanitsin: Liseva Mechanical Works, in the Urals. Elementary education, factory worker. Took active part in the working class movement prior to the revolution. Joined Russian Communist Party in 1917, was elected to workers' factory committee in 1918, and subsequently appointed to Board of Management of factory. Here he revealed considerable organising ability and was subsequently appointed chairman of the board.

In December, 1918, the district was captured by Kolchak. Podanitsin escaped and joined the red army.

After the defeat of Kolchak he returned to Liseva. The works were in a state of ruin. The best machinery had been carried off by Kolchak. Not a single engineer was on the place. He set to work to re-organise works; recruited the staff; drew up the programme of output. All this was done amidst the difficulties caused by shortage of funds and food. Yet he managed to stock enough raw materials and fuel for the whole of 1922 and 1923. Now production approaches to pre-war standard and works employ 3,140 workers.

His attitude to the workers is that of a comrade. He organised technical schools at the works, helped to publish and edited local newspapers, organised co-operative stores, clubs, schools, etc.

This essay concludes: There will be no need to surrender the Liseva works to the capitalist sharks. It will be protected by the workers themselves under the guidance of their Red manager, comrade Podanitsin.

A. V. Arkhangelsky: (Prizeman) Mikhailovsk Textile Mills, Moscow. Mills almost at a standstill during years of revolution. Arkhangelsky was appointed manager and within ten months, by precept and example, "inspired" the workers to bring output to 121 per cent. pre-war. At the same time he improved condi-

tions of the workers, repaired workers' quarters, constructed baths, etc. He allocates considerable sums for educational work, and himself lectures on industrial and technical subjects. He is a Communist, and spent most of his life from the age of 17 in Czarist prisons.

R. K. Aichmann: (Prizeman) Derbanovsk Dye Works (the largest in Russia). Specialist, university education, non-party. He concentrated his attention on perfecting production. Introduced the production of phenol in Soviet Russia. Brought works to pre-war capacity. Under his management the works have always fulfilled the output programme and has continually expanded production. He maintains good conditions of labour, and devoted considerable time and means to cultural work among the workers.

Onufriev: Manager, Tzaritzin Section, South Eastern Railway (one of the worst). Was manager prior to the revolution, but was hounded out by the workers on the outbreak of the revolution on account of his brutal conduct towards them. When specialists were invited by the Government to return to work he came back to his former post. He found pretexts for dismissing those who had taken part in his expulsion and resumed his former attitude to the workers. Since his reinstatement the working of his section of the line has deteriorated. Excess of fuel consumed amounts to nearly 3,000 tons, and the number of sound engines has been reduced 25 per cent.

The competition is now over. Of course, not all the economic administrators of the Proletarian State passed under review, but a sufficient number did so to give us an idea in whose hands the economic future of the country lies. On the whole, the picture is encouraging. Labour is managing industry, and labour is interested in managing it well.

Of the "good" managers the judges selected twelve as deserving the distinction of being described as the "best factory managers." *Pravda* is making application to the All-Russian Executive Council to award these men the Order of the Red Flag, the award given for distinguished service on the military and economic fronts. These men will stand out as examples to be emulated by all those who are loyally striving to raise the economic level of the country. In addition, 23 others were marked out for special mention.

Of the bad ones, three were branded as the "worst." These, too, will get the award they deserve. Incompetence and malicious sabotage is as fatal on the economic front as on the military front, and those found guilty of this must, and will, be removed.

Thus we get a sidelight on the working of proletarian democracy. Freedom and scope for initiative are given to those who are given a certain task to perform. But they must achieve results; they must make some contribution to the well-being of the State. With ability and goodwill they can secure the co-operation of all those whose labours they have to guide; for all are interested in achieving the goal.

Those who place self-interest above that of the whole, may for a time feather their nests; but ultimately the glaring searchlight of proletarian vigilance picks them out, and their night of gladness comes to an end.

Thus does Labour's will prevail where Labour rules.

THE SOVIET AND THE PEASANT ❁ By D. Ivon Jones

(THE DECREE ON THE UNIFIED AGRICULTURAL TAX.)

EVERY day the Moscow newspapers give reports of the prospects for the next harvest, which appear to be increasingly favourable as the summer progresses. This year's harvest is being produced under altogether new conditions. A new spirit pervades the village. New relations are created between the city and the country, between the town proletariat and the peasantry.

It was Lenin himself who at the beginning of the year first pointed out how the link between the proletariat and the peasant could be strengthened. He proposed that every branch of the party in the towns should take over responsibility for the cultural needs of a village or volost. This idea has since been taken up on a very wide scale, and not only Party branches, but factories have also "adopted" villages, supplying not only books, newspapers, and propaganda material, but mending the ploughs and harrows of the village. "Smeichka" (Lenin's word for "Link" or bond with the peasantry), has become a general slogan. And now when workers are everywhere going off to the country for their annual holidays, they go armed by their Branch secretary with propaganda material and information about the New Unified Agricultural Tax.

Trotsky not long ago referred to the difficult situation of the peasant owing to the low price of bread compared with the prices of industrial products. He said that the ideological "smeichka" must have an economic basis. This economic basis has been enormously strengthened by the recent decree on the unification of all the taxes on the peasantry into one annual agricultural tax.

Up to the Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party the peasants, in addition to the tax in kind, were levied a series of other taxes for local and central needs. The peasants complained that harvest came only once a year, but the tax collector called in and out of season. And this caused them considerable inconvenience and no little irritation.

The Party Congress adopted the principle of the One Unified Tax; and the Government Decree has since been issued. The peasant will pay a tax once a year only from his harvest. All other payments which the volost or the village may require for local needs rank as "collections" only. All taxes on the peasantry, except the Unified Agricultural Tax, are declared illegal. Percentages will be retained by the Provincial Soviets for schools, hospitals, bridges and roads.

The new tax has ceased to be essentially a tax in kind. The right is given to every peasant to pay in money according to the official prices fixed for wheat and rye units. But the tax is nevertheless fixed in units of wheat and rye, according to the prevailing crop in the locality. Certain areas will be marked out where the tax will be payable only in cash; that is, in industrial provinces where the peasant can quickly realise on his harvest. Other provinces will pay partly in cash and partly in kind. Thus the transition is begun of a general cash payment of taxes. Meanwhile the payment in kind is still necessary for the convenience of many peasants, and also in order to supply the needs of the Red Army and the Children's

Homes, thus saving the Government from having to compete in the market for prime necessities.

The tax in kind imposed a certain amount of compulsion on the peasant to produce the specific products required by the Government. The new decree removes the last vestiges of compulsion. The peasant is given full freedom to choose the crop which appears to him the most lucrative.

“ ABILITY TO PAY.”

In the Decree on the Unified Tax the principle of “ ability to pay ” is given ideal form. No less than 396 categories of taxpayers have been fixed according to their ability to pay. This looks very complicated. But the principle is so simple that every peasant can see from the table to what category he belongs.

First of all, the decree starts off with the number of “ eaters ” in a family. That is, the tax is less as the number of “ eaters ” per dessyatin is more. Thus we have *nine* grades of taxability, starting with farms of a quarter of a dessyatin per “ eater ” up to farms with three dessyatins and over per “ eater.”

Then we have *four* vertical divisions. Poor peasants without working animals or horned cattle must obviously pay less. So column one shows taxpayers without horned cattle; column two, those with one cow, and so on. Thus we have a table with 36 (9 x 4) categories of taxpayers.

But suppose the harvest is poor. Or suppose that it is a very good one. Obviously you cannot take so many poods of wheat off a dessyatin of bad harvest and good harvest alike. So we are given *eleven* grades of crops, starting from crops up to 25 poods per dessyatin, up to crops of over 101 poods per dessyatin.

And so the above little table of 36 categories is repeated eleven times, making 396 arguments against the tyranny of formal democracy.

For example, one sees at a glance that a family without cattle, with half a dessyatin of land per eater, and less than 35 poods of crop per dessyatin, pays no tax at all. And a similar family with a quarter of a dessyatin of land per eater is exempted from tax right up to a crop of 45 poods per dessyatin; and even when it has a crop of 50 poods per dessyatin it only starts paying at the rate of ten pounds of rye per dessyatin; whereas its neighbour with a similar crop having more than four cows and more than three dessyatins per eater, pays a tax of 13 poods, 25 pounds, per dessyatin.

Looking down the columns, we see that the highest amount paid by the poorest category is five poods per dessyatin. That occurs when it has a crop of more than 100 poods per dessyatin. With a crop like this the highest category pay a tax of 25 poods, 10 pounds, per dessyatin—about a quarter of the crop.

Of course, it must not be forgotten that this includes not only tax, but actually rent of land, which belongs to the people as a whole. In fact, here we have the Single Tax for the first time applied, not as a panacea for all the ills of society, but as the partial measure that it really is.

THE THIRD COVENANT.

Kamenev has called this new Unified Tax the Third Great Covenant of the proletariat with the peasantry. The first was the October Covenant socialising the land. Then came the 1921 covenant inaugurating the New Economic Policy with the Tax in Kind, and now

the Unified Agricultural Tax, abolishing the last vestiges of expropriatory measures towards the peasants.

To those whose minds are still dominated by Utopian conceptions of Socialism, these three covenants represent stages through which the tide of revolution has rolled backward. To the petty bourgeois Socialist, whose class is pressed down by the money-lender, money is naturally the root of all evil. And the transition of Soviet economy from simple barter and transactions in kind seem to them and to the uninitiated bourgeois to be steps backward from Socialism.

But the first period of the New Economy Policy has taught the Communist that the money system, when controlled by a Proletarian State, is one of the most useful devices known to social science. Without it no adequate system of accounting and control can be thought of. And if money, with all its concomitants of banking, taxation, etc., becomes, under a capitalist government, the agent of capitalist accumulation, leading to vast combines controlling the lives of millions for private profit; so under a *proletarian regime* this same money, hitherto so much maligned, through Soviet industry, Soviet banks, and Soviet taxes, becomes the agent of *Socialist* accumulation, leading all surplus wealth into the service of the proletariat.

The writer met a comrade the other day who belonged to an agricultural commune somewhere over towards Siberia. He was one of a deputation to the Commissary of Lands, and was in cheerful mood. This deputation bore documents from the Provincial Soviet showing that the Commune had stuck together through the supreme test of the Great Famine. The Commissary of Land had on the strength of this given a cheque on the State Bank for a loan to the commune—secured on the movable property—to build an irrigation system which would increase the prosperity of the commune five-fold. This is one of the many ways in which Soviet finance is helping the growth of Socialist production.

IS THE LAND REALLY SOCIALISED?

The question that most often arises in the mind of the Communist abroad is: How far is the principle of the Socialisation of the Land a real one; or how far has this principle been made merely nominal by the inveterate private property instincts of the peasants?

Answers to this question crowd upon the mind as one reads the handbook on the Land Code, recently issued by the Land Department in the form of simple questions and answers for the peasants.

The Henry George theory of the Single Tax, which sought to prove that free land was the only remedy for social inequality, has been concretely disproved in Russia. The Russian peasantry has free land. But free land has not abolished classes within the peasantry, and a state of friction exists between the various strata of poor, middle and "kulak" peasants. The vital difference between them is not in the area of land they occupy, but in the movable capital, implements, horses and cattle which they own. The "horseless" peasantry is a term often used for the big mass of poorer peasants standing solidly behind the Soviets. Recently there was a congress of these propertyless peasants in the Ukraine organised by the Party.

While the Soviet Government has to allow the conditions causing this economic struggle (free trade and exchange, even the right of the "kulaks" to hire labour, etc.) in order to develop production,

it at the same time takes part in this struggle on the side of the poorer peasants by mobilising them into political activity, urging them on by propaganda and stimulative legislation to stand up, organise, co-operate, unite against the same "kulak" class which the Soviet must perforce allow to exist by the very character of the money system.

And what is the grand weapon at the command of the poorer peasantry in this struggle? The Social ownership of land. And the struggle leads directly towards the *social use* of land as its inevitable solution. The hope of the poorer peasantry is in communal production. And for this the whole machinery of the Government, its finances, banks, co-operatives, organisers, are at their disposal, as soon as they can muster up sufficient spirit of organisation and co-operation to break with their old individualistic form of production and march forward. The Kulak class is strongest in the Ukraine. A report in the *Pravda* in March mentioned the enormous growth of collective farming in that area, and placed the number of agricultural collectives at no less than four thousand.

ONLY PROLETARIAT CAN FREE THE LAND.

But free land is a mere day-dream without the dictatorship of the proletariat. In a government of bankers, or even in a government of peasants, "free land" can only mean freedom to sell to the highest bidder or mortgage up to the biggest money-lender.

Marx's "Eighteenth Brumaire" describes how the peasantry of France had been wholly mortgaged up to Paris finance, and therefore did what Paris finance bade them to, namely, to vote the third Napoleon into power.

Encompassed by capitalist states, it is clear that the peasant can only remain a free peasant by leaning upon the proletariat, by supporting a regime which denies the very principle of peasant economy and all private property economy for its basis. The Land Code lays it down clearly for peasants and "nepmen" alike to understand that no one can sell, give, mortgage, or bequeath land and that all such acts are not only void but punishable.

Neither can any peasant having right to land as a member of a village community waive such right in anyone's favour for any valuable consideration whatsoever.

The new bourgeoisie would like to get its roots into the land as the one grand immovable security. In every transaction between him and the peasant involving the need for credit, the nepman is brought up against the Social ownership of land. No People's Court would recognise a bond on the land. Rather it would punish the bondholder. And there is a mass of young peasants and poor peasants too interested in their common right to the land to allow such a deal to go through unchallenged. Thus, the New Economic Policy has strengthened the principle of the Social ownership of land.

But the peasants' need for credit must be met. And the Proletarian Government is itself stepping into the place of the money-lender by the formation of Peasant Credit Banks with capital running into millions of gold roubles, in which the State institutions are the largest shareholders, drawing in also a certain amount of shares from the savings of the peasants and the "nepmen," who in this and other ways are made to feed the State Bank of the Soviet with their surpluses.

According to the Land Code, the land of a "dvor" or farm

belongs to every member of the family and not to the head of the family only. All ages and sexes have their share of the land, although they only enter into full rights of disposing of it at the age of eighteen. The name of the manager must be registered with the Village Soviet. It is not an immutable rule that the father of the family shall be the manager of the farm. If the other members of the family have reason to complain that the farm is suffering from chronic mismanagement, another member of the family of either sex may be appointed.

Three years' disuse of land means forfeiture of all right to it. A wife marrying into a family thereby acquires her right to a share of the land (relinquishing her portion in her old home, if any). There is no distinction of sex in any provision of the code. In fact, there is an explicit provision against any sex distinction in the apportioning out of land. It can be imagined what a powerful lever all this must be against the old patriarchal tradition of the peasant, even though it may remain for a while more or less unobserved. The Proletarian State, which enforces the principle of the Social ownership of land, standing on the side of the youth, and *furnishing financial credit* so sorely needed by the peasant, will sooner or later impose its whole morality upon the life of the Russian peasantry. "The ruling ideas of any age," said Marx, "are only the ideas of the ruling class." And the Soviet rouble, although the emblem "workers of the world unite," owing to the exigencies of trade agreements, no longer appears upon it, must inevitably be a powerful factor in spreading the Soviet ideal. The great ferment of change among the peasantry has undoubtedly begun.

THE KULAK AND HIRED LABOUR.

Other provisions of the Land Code which have a bearing upon the economic struggle, are as follows:—

Improvements, such as buildings, etc., belong to the land user.

Land may be rented by a Landholder (or user), where famine, lack of implements or death or mobilisation of the holder of the land warrants it. The renter must be capable of using the rented land with his own resources. The period of rent cannot be more than three or four years, according to the system of crop rotation in vogue. After which, if the original user does not return, it goes back into the common land fund of the village. This is called Labour Rent. The contract must be sanctioned by the Village Committee.

Movable property, such as cattle, etc., cannot be claimed for debt except where such debt has been contracted for the general interest of the whole farm, and not for the debtor's personal needs.

A peasant may hire labour. But only in case his whole family is working. The general principle of the Land Code is that the land is only for those who can use it.

There are a large number of provisions of a complicated character dealing with the various systems of land cultivation and land holding among the peasants, but all are calculated to increase productivity and to encourage the progress of the peasant towards more rational and co-operative methods of production, introducing tractors and modern machinery.

It may puzzle some why the Soviet Government allows the hire of labour on the land by the "kulaks." But it can only puzzle those who are still under the old single tax illusion that when a man has a plot of land he has all that is necessary for his well-being.

The "horseless" peasants have no horses and ploughs. The "kulaks" have horses and ploughs. How to bring the horses and ploughs and the labourers all together is the problem of communal farming. But the process of communalising all the means of production among millions of peasants in whom the instinct of individual production is inborn can only be a question of many years. Meanwhile the New Economic Policy allows the ploughs and the labourers to come together in the manner they know best in order that production may be stimulated. The capitalist class promotes wage labour by closing up every other avenue to the labourer except that of selling his labour power. The Soviet allows the hire of farm labour as an escape to the poor peasantry from the worst consequences of their lack of tools. But it also offers them the other alternative, of combining their forces into agricultural communes. In either case the Soviet power is strengthened: by greater production, by stimulating the propertyless labourers and peasants into action for the fuller utilisation of the principle of social ownership and as a pro-Soviet force against the kulak, and by the rise of communal agriculture as the solution of the whole difficulty for all concerned.

Bolsheviks, in spite of Lloyd George's taunt, can make tractors. And what is more, tractors are everywhere making Bolsheviks on the land in Russia. With the Bolshevik as driver, the New Economic Policy is ploughing up the old weeds of outworn peasant economy, and smoothly, humanely, by such prosaic means as Credits, Loans and Taxes, building up the foundations of a great Socialist economy.

THE FORUM

Under this heading readers are invited to state their personal opinion upon any question of vital importance to the working class movement.

SVERDLOV UNIVERSITY AND ITS LESSONS

By WINIFRED HERRABIN
(Hon. Sec., Plebs League).

I READ Com. Joss's article on the Sverdlov University in the May *Communist Review* with very great interest, because it contained matter that is extremely useful to all workers engaged in independent working-class education. While agreeing with much that he said, I could not help but disagree with the following sentence—" . . . the Plebs League and the Labour Colleges lack the driving force and impulse of a revolutionary political organisation, always on the alert, always challenging the present system and ever battling for the every-day needs of the masses. Marxism is emasculated when it remains purely theoretical and educational." It is not so much that I quarrel with our comrade's opinion of the Plebs League and the

Labour Colleges, as with the implication that revolutionary impulse is necessarily political. That this idea is wrong ought to be apparent to Com. Joss after his study of "non-political" efforts in Russia before the revolution.

Education towards revolution can never be purely theoretical when it is continually linked up to the workers' everyday struggle. I claim that that is the difference between Plebs and Labour College education and the arid type of Marxist class which met, said its prayers to whatever prominent Marxist star was in the ascendant, recited "I believe in the Materialist Conception of History, Class War without end, Amen"—and went home content. It is not true to say that our class work is theory and nothing else, though I grant that seed can fall on barren soil wherever it is spread.

I argue that any close reader of *Plebs* knows that we concern ourselves closely with the everyday struggle of the workers. To illustrate what I mean, I pick up at random the volumes 1921 and 1922 and find the following articles: "Revolutionary Tactics," "Geographical Footnotes to Current History," "Production and Politics," "Colonial and Imperialist Expansion," "Labour and the World Crisis," "Sea Power and the Pacific," "Get Ready to Administrate," "The Workings of Modern Capitalism," "A Syllabus on Revolution," "A Syllabus on Imperialism," "From Cromwell to Harding," and "What We Study and Why." A dozen articles showing the relation between the theory of the class struggle and current events, or linking historical events to the workings of the capitalist system—a dozen articles whose revolutionary educational value is unquestioned.

The *Plebs* has never stood for the study of theory as such, but the task of the *Plebs* in linking theory to practice has been made infinitely more difficult by types varying on the one hand from emotional red flag wagers, to hard-headed, one might almost say, solid-headed, pedagogic Marxists who saw value in nothing but the everlasting mental indigestion brought on by a strict diet of Dietzgen and the more theoretical writings of Marx and Engels.

It is the task of the Communist Party to *understand* all the forces that are working towards Communism, and by wise leadership and guidance to gain the respect of such organisations and the willing support of their individual members. Work in the movement shows us that there is no virus with which any organisation can inoculate its members and so preserve their zeal and enthusiasm for ever. We can only harness their revolutionary zeal by hard work, forcing them to face the facts and to translate their emotion into an understanding of all sides of the working

class movement.

In an article called "The Workers' Culture" in the *Plebs* of February, 1922, Com. Andrew Rothstein wrote—"From the illegal secret circles into which the revolutionary Marxian students of Russia for twenty years drew the workers in the factories and the villages, to the magnificent organisation—we speak in terms of working class, not bourgeois achievements, of the British Plebs League, crowned by the Labour Colleges, the same idea runs throughout. Equipment of the working class for battle, arming it with the weapons that experience proves to be useful, welding it into a single metallic battering-ram by intellectual as well as by economic tempering—these were the objects of independent working-class education wherever the teachings of Marx were adopted as the workers' chief guide to liberation." These are still our objects, but the leadership of the organised working class must be the work of others.

The Communist Party—I speak as a member of the Party—should strive to understand the whole of the working-class movement; to set itself to study every side and aspect of the work, and, above all, to co-relate and unify every section that is working towards Communism. The Labour movement has been rendered useless in past years because it has swung, like a pendulum, between "political" and "industrial" action—first one and then the other. The workers' party that first sets itself to understand the British movement *as it is* and not as it *ought* to be, and draws up its plans to embrace all sections—that party will come to represent the whole organised mass of workers on all fields, political, industrial, and educational.

Sverdlov University has lessons for us all, and not the least of its lessons from the past is the one which should teach us to recognise "revolutionary impulse," even when it is not labelled Communist.

INDUSTRIAL CO-ORDINATION AND THE NEW ORGANISATION

BY S. FRANCIS.

UNDER the old form of branch organisation the whole energies of the Party were thrown into propaganda and propaganda that in nine cases out of ten was never followed up, or backed by anything stronger. The unit of the Party was the branch, and the unit of the branch the individual, who, in carrying out his work, was dependent upon

his mental capacity. There lay the weakest spot. The party was a propagandist party, yet the work was left to a few specialists—speakers and lecturers—and those of mediocre talent could find expression only in the organisation of meetings and such like.

This was propaganda, admittedly, but it did not necessarily penetrate industry. It was a political expres-

sion of the Party's aims, but in England many people refuse to recognise that what they are used to call "politics" is but a reflex of the industrial situation. They do not recognise that "politics" begins in the workshop.

Propaganda meetings held under such conditions would have value, only when exceptional circumstances gave them prominence. Ordinarily, the attendance would be chiefly from among the already converted and the sympathisers. Much time was wasted and much energy expended in attempts to convert the converted, and members waxed enthusiastic over efforts to lead Anarchists, Pacifists, and the semi-enlightened into the right path.

Under such a system, there could be no co-ordination of industrial effort—for there was no real contact with industry. The Communist Party, which claims as its chief tenet of faith, government by industry, was in the false position of being entirely out of touch with the industrial activity of the British Isles.

With the establishment of the New Form of Organisation, provision was made for the establishment of industrial nuclei, both in workshop and in union. On paper, the scheme was as perfect as man could make it. Each nuclei, or fraction, had its leader; its periodic meetings, its reports upon union or industrial matters to go to the District. At the District were the group committees for each industry to co-ordinate individual activities, receive and act upon reports and consider the correct action in any given set of circumstances. Above these groups, again, was the industrial committee for the district which, with all the evidence before it, could issue instructions and decide upon tactics or submit to the Centre when necessary.

All the machinery is here for the conquest of industry—yet something is lacking. A multiplicity of instructions confuses the issue.

Members are urged that by far the most important work at the moment is the selling of the paper. Comrades in unions, or other industrial organisations are asked to do house to house canvassing and to sell the paper at their Trade Unions, etc. All channels of party activity are turned to this work; the energies of the Party are devoted to the sale of the paper.

Meanwhile, what of the industrial outlook? What of the Party members in the unions waiting for their lead? All around throughout the country, in industry after industry, the workers are being defeated—and

still the industrial committees remain half-formed; the nuclei are not co-ordinated. While other bodies in the Labour movement, assisted by the Communists, organise "Back to the Unions" campaigns, many Communists walk the streets selling a penny newspaper.

Control of industry is likely to slip through our fingers and yet to gain it we have but to tighten our grasp upon it; to establish our industrial nuclei.

Members in industrial organisations are not willing to give their time from their work there to go canvassing. They feel the need for exemption from this and similar local duties. On the other hand, many of those who do no work in the unions, yet make that work the plea to avoid local work. The localities have not learned to differentiate. They attempt to press all members into local activities, and there is a certain amount of unpleasantness when somebody refuses. There is still the feeling of resentment when one does more work than one's neighbour.

Again, in the localities there is a lack of understanding of these nuclei. The control from the centre is resented. The necessity of nuclei reporting direct to the District is not realised, even by members of the nuclei themselves. Confusion results therefrom, and reports valuable to the District Group Committees, useless to an isolated local, are given to area group leaders, or to local organisers.

The lack of personal initiative which the membership has so unvaryingly displayed since the New Form of Organisation came into force is a serious thing. But, were the industrial group committees in proper working order it would be of little moment. Instructions and suggestions could then be issued regularly which would tide members over until they had found both their feet and their heads, and could think and act for themselves.

The necessity for an effort towards the immediate establishment of these industrial committees upon a working basis, must be obvious to all Communists. Members who are invited to serve thereon, should, before refusing as in the past, consider the necessity for industrial co-ordination and control. Before us in the near future lies a great fight, and victory will be won and lost upon the industrial field. For when all has been said and done, all the points argued and driven home; the fact remains that no matter how bravely a man may conduct himself in battle, no

matter how many millions are spent upon armies and munitions, when the workers down tools, all is at a standstill.

It is not upon the barricades that the Communist Party will lead the way to victory, but upon the floor of the workshops.

THE NATIONAL UNION OF JOURNALISTS

BY JOHN S. WINTER.

ONE learns with regret that the National Union of Journalists have decided to withdraw their affiliation to the Trades Union Congress. The history of this retrograde step is trivial enough. Some few months ago, a ballot of the Union was taken to decide whether a levy should be imposed of twopence per member for the benefit of the *Daily Herald*. The proposal was lost. Since that date, as is well known, a change has taken place in the control of the *Daily Herald*, one effect of which was that the affiliation fee of the Trade Union Congress was increased by twopence, earmarked primarily for propaganda, part of which, it was no secret, would be used for the *Daily Herald* fund.

Some members of the N.U.J. appear convinced that this was none other than an elaborate trick devised for no other purpose than that of extracting from them the twopence that they had previously refused to give. Consequently at their recent annual delegate meeting a resolution was moved to immediately cease their affiliation. This was lost in favour of one instructing a ballot of the membership to be taken, the conference, however, recommending members to vote in favour of retention of affiliation.

As a result of the ballot, the Union

withdraws its affiliation, the votes being 943 to 802, more than 2,000 not voting.

In view of the wage reductions now being demanded by the N.P.S. at the present time, it is unfortunate that the N.U.J. should have selected this moment to throw away their strongest weapon.

As the weakest link in the printing industry, their sole strength was drawn from the fact that the employers realised that through their affiliation they could count upon the support of the trade union movement. Albeit on somewhat antiquated craft lines, the printing industry is better organised than the workers in any other industry. The united front was an effective argument that the employers fully appreciated, and this cleavage will certainly weaken the hands of the N.E.C. of the N.U.J. in dealing with the present demands for a cut in wages. A little pressure in this direction will probably convince the Journalists of the error of their ways, and we shall be indeed surprised if this serious step, taken on such trivial provocation, will not be quickly retraced. Happily for the united front movement, those sections of the workers that refuse voluntarily to follow the lead of the advance guard are usually kicked into line by their bosses.

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

STRUGGLE OF FRENCH C.P. AGAINST POINCARÉ

The Central Committee of the French Communist Party recently compiled the following material for the use of speakers at the numerous meetings held for combating Poincaré. An idea may be gained from it of the various arguments employed by our French comrades in their propaganda against the Ruhr adventure.—ED.

1.—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE RUHR OCCUPATION.

INDUSTRY.

CESSATION of the deliveries of coal and coke. Rise in prices of coal and coke. Standstill of the Lorraine blast furnaces. Dislocation of the whole metal production. Increased prices for metal products. The Lorraine ore, hitherto worked up to a great extent in the Ruhr area, cannot easily find a mar-

ket elsewhere. In order to replace it, the Germans have concluded contracts with Sweden which run till the year 1932. Depreciation of the franc in consequence of the uncertain political situation, in consequence of the necessity of buying coal and coke abroad, and in consequence of speculation in our money, of which large amounts are in foreign hands. Increased prices for textile goods, cotton, linen, which have to be imported and paid for in pounds sterling and dollars. General rise in prices of industrial products.

AGRICULTURE.

Higher prices for the industrial products required by agriculture: implements, machines, clothing, etc. Scarcity and dearth of manures. Cessation of German deliveries of sulphate of ammonia. Scarcity of

potash from Alsace Lorraine, as this is bought up by the Americans owing to the favourable rate of exchange of the dollar. Rise in the price of corn, in consequence of the increased price of the imported corn which has to be paid for in dollars. Scarcity of agricultural labour power as a result of the retention of the army class 1921 in military service. Prospects of poor sale of agricultural products as a result of increased prices and decreased purchasing powers of consumers.

TRADE.

Increase in the numbers of middlemen in consequence of the shortage of coal and metal products. Speculative holding back of goods. Speculation favoured by fluctuations in rate of exchange. Example: The recent speculation in sugar. Injury to small traders in consequence of higher prices and lessening of purchasing powers of the masses.

FINANCE.

Cessation of payments from Germany. The expenses of the Ruhr armies, the expenses of the retention of the army class 1921 under arms. Increase of state debt to England and America. For this debt, payable in dollars and pounds, increases in proportion to the depreciation of the franc. Decrease of taxation revenue as a result of high prices and dislocation of business life. Excessive military expenses in consequence of eighteen months' military service. Threatened fresh taxation. The deficit: several milliards in the regular budget; 15-20 milliards in the budget of "expenditure to be reimbursed by Germany." Continuation of the traffic in loans and treasury bonds. Uncertainty of state credit, damaging to small savers of the peasant and middle class.

RESULT.

In Germany, and all over Europe, the Ruhr occupation exercises the same effect, varying only in degree of severity. The closing down of the industrial apparatus of the Ruhr area robs Europe of 100 million tons of coal annually, and upsets its whole economics. High prices, unemployment, paralysis of business life, increased speculation, shattered finance, lessening of purchasing power among the masses; all this has an effect disadvantageous to the workers, to lesser officials, and to the middle class in town and country. The struggle for the immediate needs of the working class is bound to evolve into a struggle against the occupation of the Ruhr Valley. The peasants and the middle class must back up the proletariat, must join forces with the pro-

letariat to fight against Poincaré's imperialist policy.

2.—THE INTENTIONS OF THE RUHR POLICY.

ALLEGED OBJECT.

Germany has to pay. This is a capitalist lie. The French state is ruining itself for the purpose of rendering its debtor, the German state, insolvent and equally ruined.

REAL OBJECTS.

The predominance of French metal industry in Europe. The Ruhr occupation is a pressure medium in the interests of the French industrialists. These would like to secure for themselves the leadership of the future Franco-German companies by holding 60 per cent. of the shares. The German industrialists hold out for an equal share. During the war German industry wanted the iron of Briey; to-day it is French industry which wants the coal of the Ruhr basin. In both cases the real point has been the combination of the ore of Lorraine with the coal of the Rhineland. The lord of these two is the lord of European heavy industry.

TERRITORIAL AND MILITARY

ANNEXATION.

The intention is first to convert the Rhineland and the Ruhr area, by means of lengthy occupation, into independent states under French influence; annexation is then to follow. Under the pretext of the need of securities, France seizes upon the most favourable positions for the next war. The "Action Française" and the "Echo de Paris" admit this. They declare the fact of occupation creates the historical right to annexation.

THE DISMEMBERMENT OF GERMANY.

The French capitalist control of the Ruhr coal makes it possible to create antagonisms between the various German states requiring coal, and thus to further the disintegration of the realm. Hugo Stinnes, "the good German patriot," would no doubt be content to look on at the separation of North Germany from South, if he could receive as compensation an equal share in French industry. By the occupation of the Ruhr Valley, the coal bunker of Europe, French imperialism hopes to gain predominance over a Balkanized Europe.

ENDEAVOURS TO SURROUND AND CRUSH A POSSIBLE GERMAN REVOLUTION.

By depriving revolutionary centres of coal the spread of the movement all over Germany will be obstructed. The occupation of the Ruhr area is to crush the most dangerous seat of revolution beneath a military heel.

Revolutionary Germany is already being surrounded with enemies—by the French domination over Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, and Poland, by the Entente domination over Austria, and the domination of German Fascism in Bavaria. The Ruhr occupation closes this new cordon sanitaire. Whilst France's imperialist policy brings her into conflict with the other capitalist states, the occupation of the Ruhr area is a counter-revolutionary action on the part of France, undertaken in the interests of international capitalism. Poincaré's imperialism occupied the Ruhr area on the pretext of forcing Germany to pay. At the same time he is anxious to win public opinion for a policy of industrial despotism, or annexation, and of dismemberment of Germany. Poincaré, the head of international counter-revolution, therefore strives to prepare the defeat of the German revolution.

3.—THE RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC WAR IN THE RUHR AREA.

A capitalist understanding between France and Germany, at the expense of the Ruhr proletariat. Longer working hours and reduction of wages in the Ruhr area. The competitive effect of this cheapened labour power will reduce the standard of living of the whole European proletariat. In order to break the resistance of the proletariat, capitalism will attempt to destroy the proletarian organisations by force. England will demand her share of the spoil, in order to prevent the industrial predominance of France. Even if England receives her share, she remains the rival of France.

The internationalisation of the Ruhr area would have the same result. It would subject the Westphalian proletariat to the same shameful exploitation of which Austria is the present victim. A capitalist understanding, with or without England's participation, would signify: Strengthening of the Fascist danger in the whole of Europe, strengthening of the European capitalist offensive, the preparation of an imperialist war between England and France.

THE DANGER OF A FRANCO-GERMAN WAR.

The disclosures made by the *Rote Fahne* show that nationalist Germany

is secretly reconstructing its military power. The bloody collisions in the Ruhr area increase in frequency. They will become even more frequent if not prevented by the fraternization of French soldiers and German workers. The day may come when Germany's passive resistance and the economic war are transformed into real war.

THE POSSIBILITY OF A GERMAN REVOLUTION.

The growing misery of the German proletariat, further enhanced by the Ruhr occupation, may lead the masses to take up the fight for the workers' government, and thus to take the first step toward revolution.

4.—THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT.

Extension of the struggle against the capitalist offensive to a fight for the evacuation of the Ruhr and for the annulment of the Versailles Treaty. The French proletariat must demand of their rulers: "Out of Germany!" The power of French imperialism is to be shaken by agitation among the oppressed colonial peoples, so that the militarized black slaves may be prevented from permitting themselves to be used against the workers in social conflicts. The payment of the reparations is to be demanded from the capitalists of all countries, especially from French and German capitalists. The French state should seize the real values possessed by French capitalists, the German state the real values of the German capitalists, until the proletariat takes possession of the means of production by revolutionary action. Intensification of the struggle against the capitalist offensive and Fascism. Fight against every new imperialist war. The formation of a workers' government in Germany is to be striven for. In order to carry out these tasks, the united front of the international proletariat must be formed, and a European general strike prepared for.

No civil peace between proletariat and bourgeoisie. When the executioners fall out over the division of the booty, the victim has no part in their quarrel. The slave must utilize the strife between his masters to overthrow them, and to emancipate himself.