

The COMMUNIST REVIEW

EDITOR :: WM. PAUL

Volume 3

August, 1922

Number 4

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

| SINGLE COPIES | | BUNDLE ORDERS | |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| SIX MONTHS | - - 3/9 POST FREE | 13 COPIES FOR 5/3 POST PAID | |
| TWELVE " | - - 7/- " " | SALE OR RETURN | |

Review of the Month

THE RISING TIDE OF REVOLUTION

SO widespread is the economic chaos of Europe that it cannot do other than create revolutionary activity. The capitalists would would very much like, if they could, to clear up the mess that their system is in—but they are afraid. In all their deliberations they are haunted by Soviet Russia. Their class instinct tells them that to help Russia is only one way of stabilising the centre of world revolution. This means that they are compelled to shut 180,000,000 potential purchasers out of the world's market. By refusing to trade with Russia the capitalists are compelled to close down their mills and factories and throw millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed to starve and to become, through desperation, splendid material for social revolution at home. History has caught capitalism in a cleft stick. Either it must assist the Soviet government to establish its industry and to feed and clothe its revolutionary millions, or it must close down its own industry and starve its own masses and thus goad them on to revolution. This is the pitiless dilemma of international capitalism. And it is Soviet Russia that holds the key position.

A well-organised and determined offensive by the whole international Labour movement could use Russia as a revolutionary lever to overthrow capitalism. That this is not being done, at present, is due to the baseness of the Vanderveldes, MacDonalds, and Hendersons. These betrayers of working class unity, by their dishonest and unscrupulous attacks upon Soviet Russia, place themselves in the vanguard of the world's reactionaries. They are travelling the same road as that traversed by their one-time colleagues of the Second International—Millerand, Briand, Viviani in France, and Shakleton, Geo. Barnes, and Wm. Brace at home.

The leader and inspirer of the Second International's attack on Soviet Russia is Vandervelde, who signed the Treaty of Versailles as the most prominent Minister in the King of Belgium's government. Vandervelde is the political tout of the Belgium financial speculators who sank so much capital in Russian railroads under the Tsar's régime. Vandervelde's success as a statesman has dazzled Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, who simply stutters out what the

brilliant Belgian minister and renegade boldly proclaims. It was Vandervelde who influenced Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald in his advocacy of indemnities, in his hatred of Russia, and upon the many other points which are in direct opposition to the policy of the rank-and-file workers of the I.L.P. Mr. J. R. MacDonald, being strong only in his vanity and personal ambition, is very easily impressed by powerful political personalities like Vandervelde and Mr. Arthur Henderson. It is easy to see that both of these moderate Labour statesmen are encouraging Mr. J. R. MacDonald to continue his opposition to the proletarian current in the I.L.P. until he succeeds in smashing that organisation.

Mr. Henderson is a cunning opponent of the I.L.P. He was no doubt pleased when he heard that Mr. Snowden had actually proposed, in the inner councils of the party, that it ought to disband. The I.L.P. is breaking down because of its lack of a coherent and disciplined policy. There are several contradictory currents at work all cutting across each other. There is the struggle between the Rights and the Centrists, *i.e.*, between the Second and the Two-and-a-half Internationals; there is bitterness between the rapidly diminishing proletarian element which is unrelentingly opposed to the indemnity propaganda of Mr. J. R. MacDonald, to the increased production campaign of Mr. P. Snowden and to the scurrilous anti-Soviet conduct of both; and there is a most savage feud going on among the middle-class Parliamentary careerists, who are jealous of each other's ambitions. It will require more than a revival campaign to rehabilitate the I.L.P., and it will certainly need something more drastic than taking a journalist from a Liberal organ, *The Nation*, and placing him in charge of the *Labour Leader*. We do not wish to under-estimate the ability of Mr. Brailsford, who is a much broader-minded Liberal than the recent editor of that paper.

Uncle Arthur, in his own best P.S.A., snake-in-the-grass manner, has done his work, of smashing up the I.L.P., very well.

THERE are indications, on all sides, that the ferment of revolution is again rising. Not only has there been a wonderful revolutionary revival in Germany, which can only be compared to 1918, but conditions there are almost similar to those that existed after Armistice Day. Small wonder that the British section of the Second International, the Labour Party, did its utmost to crush the demand of the Communists for affiliation. For in almost every country in Europe the influence of the Second International is rapidly waning. During the past month the French syndicalists indicated their intention of approaching the Red International of Labour Unions. The Communist parties of the Danubian and Balkan countries are not sufficiently studied in this country. These groups have been powerful enough to withstand the murderous White Terror which has been in existence for the past four years against them and their governments have now been compelled to grant several important concessions to the Communists.

In America there is a fierce struggle being waged by the miners and the railway shopmen. When the history of this fight is written it will then be shown to have been one of the most determined battles ever put up by the American proletariat. The workers in "God's own country" are swiftly realising their international obligations, and we beg to draw our readers' attention to the plan adopted

by the American garment workers to assist Soviet Russia. (See page 215 in this month's *Review*.)

In Ireland there is civil war. The crushing of the Republicans is a much bigger task than either the British press or Mr. Churchill's assistant, Michael Collins, are prepared to admit. The military defeat of the Republicans will not end the agitation against the Griffiths-Collins middle-class government. This agitation will tend to become more of a revolutionary and proletarian character than it is at present under the leadership of Mr. de Valera. The conditions are rapidly coming into existence that Connolly foresaw; he contended that the real proletarian revolutionary movement would only rise after an Irish government was installed in Dublin. The political ferment of the masses would then be harnessed into a *class* struggle instead of a *national* struggle.

The Irish workers can expect little sympathy from politicians of the Griffiths' type. Even during the great Transport Workers' strike, which was led by Larkin and Connolly, Mr. Griffiths ranged himself against the strikers. Meanwhile, we wish to place on record the death of one of Ireland's most famous fighters—Cathal Brugha.

After the Armistice the upholders of capitalism, from the avowed reactionaries to the moderate Labour leaders of the Second International, imagined that trade would rapidly develop. Events have justified every prophecy made by the Communist International in 1918. The ruling class has been dumbfounded at the terrific and destructive havoc that the war has created in the capitalist system. Instead of the consolidation of Europe there has been nothing but a continual economic collapse which has created a series of political upheavals. The economic crises of the great industrial States have forced them into acute political conflicts in various parts of the world. Not only are the relations between France and Britain much more critical than the "kept" press dare admit, but the Hague Conference may even yet produce some surprises so far as these two countries are concerned. While Europe is drifting towards chaos, dramatic happenings have occurred in China, where Wu Pei Lin, the military protege of American finance, has crushed the hireling of Japan, Chang-So-Lin; even the democratic vassal of Britain, Sun Yat Sen, is in flight.

China is thus experiencing great periods of agitation. While the press draws attention to the military struggles among the various military adventurers, who are in the pay of the big industrial States, very little notice is taken of the class struggle. Soviet Russia, the Bolshevik revolution, has created a profound impression in the minds of the workers in the Far East.

The position of capitalism is extremely precarious. No one is more conscious of this than the financiers and statesmen themselves. A courageous and well-led united front of the international Labour movement could smash capitalism at any moment; but the MacDonalds, Hodges, and the other traitors of the working class are more concerned in denouncing Moscow than attending to the things that are vitally necessary to the masses. While MacDonald creates schisms internationally, it is left for the polished arch-faker of the Miners' Union, Hodges, to create dissension among the miners by an ungracious attack on Bob Smillie. We have criticised Bob Smillie in these pages on several occasions; we believe him to be

courageous and honest; his real weaknesses are the result of his unfortunate contact with such I.L.P. types as Mr. J. R. MacDonald and Mr. P. Snowden.

From the international Labour standpoint, the British masses are the most apathetic at the present moment. The Rathenau murder has stimulated revolutionary enthusiasm in Germany, but even here the social democratic leaders of the Second International do not wish to lead the workers to a contest for real class power; they are content to exploit the ferment of revolution to protect their parliamentary democracy, which is manipulated by the financiers. (This is ably demonstrated in the article on the The Crisis in Germany on page 185 of this month's *Review*.) The demonstrations of the past few weeks show that the masses are both able and anxious to break the power of the bourgeois, i.e., if only given a courageous lead. This lead will certainly not be given by the social democrats because their policy, as with all Second International leaders, is to hold back the masses until their anger and fervour has passed, and then to make a compromising agreement with the capitalists. The crises and revolutionary demonstrations in Germany are following each other very rapidly, and each new one is more violent than its predecessor, thus the historical conditions are rapidly coming into existence that will enable the Communists to lead the masses to the real struggle. The most significant thing about Germany is that the government, in yielding to the pressure of the masses, is forced to lean even more to the Left for support. Hence the social democrats themselves, in their desperate efforts to save the parliamentary and democratic republic without injuring the economic interests of Hugo Stinnes and Co., are indicating that the final struggle in Germany will be one between the Communist Left and the capitalist reactionary Right.

While events in Germany have been forcing the masses into revolutionary activity the same causes have driven the monarchists of Bavaria, Prussia, Hungary and Russia into desperate straits. These reactionaries understand that the moment the Communists in Europe capture power they will be speedily stamped out. They, therefore, feel that they must strike as soon as possible. Their activities are not the least part of the crises at present raging in Poland and the Balkan countries. It is no accident that Pilsudski—a moderate socialist who attacked Soviet Russia with French munitions in much the same way that J. R. MacDonald bespattered it with *Morning Post* mud—has been replaced by the more reactionary Korfanty, who is a ruthless White Army monarchist. While Korfanty is operating in Poland, his colleague, Wrangel—who led an army against Soviet Russia in 1920, and who was ably assisted by Mrs. Snowden's dear Georgian socialists—has been attempting a *coup d'etat* in Bulgaria. Wrangel, who is a Russian monarchist, is very keen to make another onslaught, with French aid, upon the Soviet Republics. Before he does this he would like to depose the Bulgarian government, at present led by Stambolusky, which is not even reactionary enough for Wrangel. He would also like to begin an open White Terror against the Bulgarian Communists who have been able, so far, to keep him in his place. The Communist movement in Rumania, Bulgaria, Jugo-Slavia, and Greece is growing very powerful, and deserves very close attention by all studious readers of the *Communist Review*. A. JOHN.

THE FAMINE IN RUSSIA

How the Capitalist States Helped

BY E. ROY

AN agonised Russian mother writes to the Moscow newspaper, *Pravda*, as follows :

“ I am a widow with four children, and no one in the world to help me. My oldest child is fourteen, the youngest seven. We have had nothing to eat for days, and I see my children growing weaker and weaker. There is no food to be had. The youngest lay sick in bed, dying. In the night my eldest child came to me and said that we must kill the little one for the sake of the rest, and give them something to eat. I told her it could not be, but then I saw the pinched faces of the three starving little ones, and I thought that in any case, the youngest must die soon, for we had no means to save her. I consented, and in the night my oldest girl and I went quietly while the others slept, and with a knife we killed and cup up the body of my youngest. Now there is food for the other children, but I cannot eat, knowing what it is. I write to you to ask if I have done wrong, and to offer myself for punishment.”

This is but one of a hundred similar instances occurring daily in the famine region of Russia, where for nine months hunger has raged, supplemented by bitter cold and virulent epidemics. Nineteen million people have been affected by this great catastrophe, which will rank among the worst in history. And, to add to the horror of hunger, cold, disease, pestilence and suffering of every description—cannibalism! A civilized people, once the gentlest, most laughter-loving and happiest in the family of nations, has reverted to barbarism. Mothers are secretly killing their children; families are feeding on the flesh of those who have died; human ghouls are digging up the frozen corpses that have been interred, to save themselves from death.

Who is responsible for these horrors?

The thousand-throated enemies of Russia will cry “ the Bolsheviks.”

But those who know the truth will reply, “ Capitalism.”

Let us not speak here of the causes of the famine. Careful historians will record the fact that seven years of warfare had depleted the labour, livestock and seed-grains of the richest grain-producing region of Russia to such a point that since 1918 crop-scarcities had produced a condition that threatened famine even before the withering drought of 1921 completed the havoc wrought by war and revolution. Let us rather speak of the reason why, in this twentieth century, with all the facilities of science and civilization at the beck and call of mankind; with telegraphs and wireless and railroads and swift ocean greyhounds ready to act as willing servants for transporting help from one world's end to the other, why is it that nineteen million people anywhere, be they on the banks of the Volga or of the Ganges, should be reduced to starvation and to cannibalism?

How is it that in the year of grace 1921, with the corn-bins of the most Christian countries full to bursting and with farmers going bankrupt for lack of a market to sell their grain; with the

factories of the world lying idle to relieve the glut of overproduction during the war, and as a result of this hundreds of thousands of unemployed men and women walking the streets of all the great metropoli in search of work; with great ships congesting every port and empty trains running across each continent; with Christian preachers thundering the Ten Commandments and proselytizing the heathen to worship their God of Love and Human Kindness—with all this, and more, how is it that starving Russia is not fed and supplied with the essential materials that will enable her next year to help herself? Truly, it is an enigma, since by so doing the paralysis of overproduction and unemployment that cripple the Christian world would find immediate relief.

“But who is to pay?” asks the twentieth century business man, who prays every Sunday in church for forgiveness for the week’s transgressions. “The Bolsheviks are bankrupt; they have abolished private property, and the famine is their punishment. Let them suffer until they change their ideas or their government.”

The capitalist governments consulted together when the call for help went forth a year ago—when there was still enough food to keep the terror-stricken population until relief should arrive; when the hot sun still shone on the blighted fields, and water and railways were open to transport all the help that could be sent. The Supreme Economic Council of the League of Nations deliberated; the Premiers and Presidents of the world’s great powers held weighty conclaves, and the sum total of their decisions was that neither help nor credit could be extended to a Government which repudiated its foreign debts.

Meanwhile, from Samara, the Urals, and the regions of the Volga, a migration of peoples set out blindly, as in ages past, towards north, east, south and west, searching for food. Those who remained were those whose little store of food still held out, or who believed that the promised help would arrive in time to save them before the winter snows. July, August, September dragged out their burning course, and the belated rains began to fall. The pitiful crops that had been garnered were already exhausted. October ushered in an early winter. Yet more people abandoned their homes and set forth in a desperate, instinctive search for regions of plenty. Already one-third of the population of the famine districts had been carried off, either by migrations or deaths from hunger and disease. People had begun to dig in the earth for roots. Those to whom a horse, a cow, dogs, cats or any domestic animal remained, killed them and ate, thankful for this ration. Those who had not hunted mice, rats, pounded the bark of trees, and gnawed at grasses. The weakest—old men and women, little children—sickened and died. Then came the killing frost; thirty degrees below zero, with no wood to warm the skinny bones that each day protruded further beneath the cracked skin of the starving.

Help came—first Russian help, given miraculously by those who themselves had nothing. Towns and villages contributed flour and potatoes; workers gave their labour; soldiers and civilians formed volunteer corps to work in relief stations; the whole population was mobilised by an energetic State to fight the famine, just as it had been previously mobilised to fight foreign invasion, counter-revolution, and the new economic crisis. Fifteen million poods of seed grain were sent immediately to the famine districts for the

fall planting to ensure the next year's harvest. Soup kitchens, hospitals, service trains, children's homes, receiving stations, were established in the stricken areas, and transportation provided for a part of the homeless and starving to the big cities, where they were cared for in State institutions. All government departments, the army, factories, workshops, and every organised group contributed their quota by maintaining homes for children or adults, by working extra hours in each week, by special contributions of food and clothing. All salaries and rations were taxed to pay a monthly contribution to the famine sufferers. Special days were set aside in industrial centres, in which the whole production went to the famine fund. All the tremendous propaganda and organising apparatus of the Soviet Government was brought to bear on the problem of relief to the stricken provinces, and long before the first train-load of food was sent from abroad the Russian Communist Party had measured the terrible need and had organised all the resources of the country to meet it as best they could.

Then came the Quakers, the Nansen Commission, and the American Relief Administration. The Quakers, who have maintained feeding centres for children ever since the Revolution, were the first in the field after the Russians. Their organisation has grown to such an extent that they are now feeding 83,000 persons, and they have raised a fund of £300,000. Then came the American Relief Administration, and everyone in Russia will remember the thrill of hope that went through the land when the news was published that the agreement had been signed at Riga, and the first American food train had crossed the Russian border twenty-four hours later. With a \$15,000,000 fund behind them, and their organisation perfected during war service, they show a record of 1,800,000 children fed up to January 31st, with a promise of 2,000,000 children and 5,000,000 adults by February 1st. The Nansen Commission for international relief work in Russia has raised up to the end of January £1,000,000, with 250,000 adults and children fed. The Committee for Famine Relief of the Far Eastern Republic had delivered, up to February 15th, 600,000 gold roubles and 100,000 poods of foodstuff, this amount including contributions from other Far Eastern countries such as China and Mongolia. The International Federation of Trade Unions (The Amsterdam International) and the Second International together have collected 704,000 gulden (414,000 roubles gold) out of this 75,000 poods foodstuff and 1,000,000 German marks worth of medicaments delivered. The Relief Organisation of the Third International outside Russia has collected and delivered to date 150,000,000 German marks, 200,000 poods foodstuff, besides automobiles, trucks, locomobiles, field kitchens, etc., and 52,100 persons fed up to November 1st. The Friends of Soviet Russia, working in the United States, collected, up to February 1st, \$330,000 and \$250,000 worth of wearing apparel. The American Mennonites have agreed to send \$50,000 and the Dutch Mennonites \$75,000, but, so far, nothing has been received.

Various private individuals and organisations of different character have contributed a total of 758,920 gold roubles, up to February 15th, of which the most generous was a fund of £20,000 raised by the *Manchester Guardian*.*

* Up to date the *Manchester Guardian* has collected £60,000.—(Editor).

The grand total of contributions to date from the various bourgeois governments, as distinct from individual or organisational donations, consists of 72,444,900 gold roubles and 300,000 poods foodstuff. The itemised list of contributions per government, which may prove of interest, is as follows:—

| | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|-----|------------|----------------------------|
| France | ... | ... | 6,000,000 | fr. (5,000,000 fr. in army |
| Italy | ... | ... | 6,000,000 | lire [stores) |
| Czecho-Slovakia | ... | ... | 30,000,000 | kr. |
| Norway | ... | ... | 1,500,000 | kr. |
| Belgium | ... | ... | 750,000 | fr. |
| Sweden | ... | ... | 500,000 | kr. |
| Denmark | ... | ... | 1,000,000 | kr. |
| Angora | ... | ... | 140,000 | poods flour and rice |
| Persia | ... | ... | 50,000 | poods flour |
| Afghanistan | ... | ... | 100,000 | poods flour |
| Switzerland | ... | ... | 100,000 | fr. |
| Esthonia | ... | ... | 10,000,000 | Es. mks. |
| Uruguay | ... | ... | 5,000 | pesetas |
| Far Eastern Republic | ... | ... | 10,000 | roubles gold |
| U.S.A. | ... | ... | 20,000,000 | dollars |
| American Relief | ... | ... | 15,000,000 | dollars |
| Bokhara | ... | ... | 6,000 | roubles gold |
| Luxemburg | ... | ... | 100,000 | fr. |
| Total | ... | ... | 72,444,900 | roubles gold |
| | | | 300,000 | poods foodstuff |

The total contributions from foreign individuals, organisations and governments to January 31st were:—

120,000,000 gold roubles.

4,500,000 poods foodstuff.

The bulk of this has come from the United States. At first glance the whole amount may seem generous, but when we consider the immense need, coupled with the fact that nine weary months have passed in the collecting of it, and that most of the money is still on paper with the food and essential materials it could buy still undelivered, it is clear why the famine conditions have become worse instead of better. Nineteen million people cannot be fed daily on even their present pitiable ration of $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of foodstuff, with the amount subscribed. Russia has, of course, provided the lion's share, and it is due chiefly to the herculean efforts of the Russian government and its people that Dr. Nansen was able to report that ten million people have been arranged for in the next three months, leaving nine millions unprovided for unless immediate help is forthcoming. Food is but one item, although a big one, on the long list of necessities, first among which rank seed grains for the fall planting and agricultural machinery to replace the horses and cattle carried off by the war and scarcity. Medicaments are a first essential in a region where famine has been supplemented by typhus, dysentery, scarletina, diphtheria, cholera, and tuberculosis. The sanitary trains, doctors, nurses, pharmacists, medicines, etc., which have been provided are too few to cope with the tremendous mortality resulting from the weakness and exhaustion of the inhabitants. There is an urgent need for beds, bedding, disinfectants, clothing, instruments, medicaments, medical literature, and cleansing soap.

In one district alone on the Volga, out of a population of 350,000 souls, 40,000 died of hunger from June to November.

Who, in the long run, is responsible for the set-back to civilisation that famine and death and cannibalism have brought to the Russian people? Is it the Bolsheviks, who have manfully set their shoulders to the wheel, undaunted by this staggering catastrophe, or is it capitalism, which, upon hearing nine months ago that nineteen million people must die of famine unless immediate help was sent, responded:—

“ A Government which repudiates its foreign debts cannot expect to receive credit.”

PACIFISM OR CLASS WAR

By E. VARGA

[In last month's "Review" we drew attention to the danger of certain pacifist tendencies at present developing in the Labour movement, particularly among the sentimentalists of the I.L.P. The following article is one of the most profound statements that has yet appeared on the question, and it deals with pacifism from every angle. During the war the Socialist opposition in this country was composed of the Quaker-I.L.P. type of passive resistance and the revolutionary anti-militarism of the Left Wing which reached its highest expression in the industrial revolts on the Clyde and in S. Wales. Comrade Varga clearly states the Communist viewpoint on the subject.—ED. of Communist Review.]

CAPITALIST PACIFISM BEFORE 1914

WE have witnessed of late a revival of pacifist ideology. It appears as if the fate of the world in future must be directed in the sense of pacifism. The Washington Conference and the refusal of the United States to take part in the Conference at Genoa on the ground that the restoration of Europe is impossible so long as the European States maintain large armies, have given pacifism a new actuality. The sentimental ideologists of the 2nd and the 2½ Internationals, after the great disappointment which was caused by the collapse of Wilsonism, hasten to make a new confession of pacifism. On the other hand, we see that earnest capitalist organs as, for example, the *Manchester Guardian*, pursue a consistent policy. It, therefore, appears to be necessary to inquire how far the new pacifism has a real foundation, and how far it can become a real factor in politics; or whether renewed collisions of the Imperialist Powers will follow upon this movement.

Now, pacifism is a somewhat complicated movement whose character is constantly changing. And it is not easy to make clear the class background of the various pacifist ideologies. We shall endeavour, first of all, to examine the development of pacifism before, during, and after the war. On the other hand, we shall endeavour to separate bourgeois pacifism from proletarian anti-militarism, although it is obvious that the opportunist direction of the reform Labour movement and its emotional pacifism is, as

always, limping at the tail of the bourgeois movement; it is sometimes very difficult to separate the one from the other.

Bourgeois pacifism, before the war, had two principal idealistic tendencies—the ethical and the economic tendency.

Idealistic-ethical pacifism was a purely ideological movement. Its principal standard-bearers, Lammasch, Forster, Fried, Forel, etc., are ideologists, who represent no definite class viewpoint. Thus with regard to the problem of war they are completely without understanding. They believe that war is the result of mankind's low level of ethical development. They conduct the struggle against war on the foundation of a universal morality. They are opposed to the use of violence on principle. Socially, they are counter-revolutionary, as they decisively reject the use of force for the purpose of freeing the oppressed classes.

As a representative of this tendency we may take Fr. W. Forster. He writes as follows in his book, *World Policy and World Conscience*:—

“The belief in methods of mechanical conquering can only be overcome by the quite consistent belief in the spiritual principle contrary to that of violence. He who believes that external war can only be overcome by internal war will live to see how quickly, from the justification of internal political violence, Imperialism directed outwards is born anew.”

It is, therefore, natural that Forster rejects the methods of the Communists. He writes very naively:—

“They, the Russian Communists, should not judge and treat all questions simply and solely from the standpoint of wholly definite class interest, in the belief that this interest is identical with that of humanity; no, they must practice justice and humanity quite contritely in relation to the hitherto existing leaders and organisers of the process of production. They ought not, by the schematic hardness of simple expropriation, without regard to all previous accomplishments, traditions and customs of life of the people concerned, range against themselves all the intelligentsia and the whole directing element of the previously existing system of society, and thereby split society into two opposing halves.” (*Welt politik und Welt Gewissen.* Munch 1919. Pages 147-148.)

The works of the other pacifists of this tendency are on a similar level. The Hague Peace Conference and the establishment of international arbitration courts may be considered as the highest practical result of this ethico-ideological tendency. The world war showed that this movement had no firm foundation.

That tendency of pacifism which endeavours to show that war is a bad business for a country, even in cases where the country in question is victorious, is somewhat more real. The most important spokesman of this tendency is Norman Angell. We may presuppose that our readers are in general acquainted with his book, the *Great Illusion*. The essence of the evidence he adduces is that modern States are so closely bound together by the bonds of commerce, credits and currency that the defeat of a State involves the most serious economic injuries to the victorious State. Without occupying himself with ethical motives, he represents the view that wars should be rejected because they are bad business even for the victorious State. It is no accident that this tendency originated in England, the country which is most dependent upon world economy. The fundamental error of the evidence he puts forward—altogether apart from the

fact that he quite rationally comprehends the causes of historical events and that he leaves out of consideration the inherited martial instinct—is that he conceives the question as if the *general interests* of the whole community in a country decides the question of war and peace. Were that the case every war would be undoubtedly injurious to every country, and perpetual peace would be assured. But at the present time it is not the general interest of the country which decides upon war and peace; it is the class interests of a *small group of powerful financiers, army contractors, militarists, etc.* And in spite of the great harm done by the world war, it is not all proved that even these financial dictators who dominate the democratic States have thereby done bad business. Nevertheless, this tendency of pacifism merits greater attention, as the momentary strengthening of the anti-war frame of mind in the victorious countries can, in many instances, be traced back to the train of ideas propounded by Norman Angell.

PACIFISM DURING THE WAR

Proletarian pacifism, before the war, and more particularly during the war, had two forms which were sharply opposed to each other: we may designate the first as passive and counter-revolutionary and the second as active and revolutionary.

Passive counter-revolutionary pacifism is in general bound up with opportunism.* The essence of opportunism is the I.L.P. belief that the transformation of society, from Capitalism to Socialism, will proceed without actual struggles, without class war, and, moreover, at such a distant epoch that at the present time it is not practical to think of methods of overthrowing the bourgeoisie on the whole, or even to begin preparations for that purpose. By a completely erroneous interpretation of Marxist teaching, that the transformation of the political superstructure must necessarily follow the alteration of the economic foundation, opportunism remains in passive expectation of the future, without seeing or wishing to see, that this transformation can only be achieved by protracted and tenacious class struggles; recent events show the capitalist class is preparing for civil war. As opportunism is of the opinion that the capitalist system of society cannot be overthrown by mass struggle, it has no sort of liking, therefore, for the revolutionary possibilities which the class war offers, and is pacifist on principle. This is consistent, for every war can only affect the working class injuriously if it is taken for granted that the working class will always remain an oppressed class within the capitalist system. The effects of this current are seen in the various pacifist resolutions at the congresses of the Second International. Many of these resolutions form—at least according to their wording—the transition to the active-revolutionary current of proletarian anti-militarists. The Stuttgart resolution of 1907 runs as follows:—

“If war should nevertheless break out, it is the duty of Socialists to work for its speedy ending, and to strive with all their might to use the economic and political crisis brought on by the war for arousing the

* The connection between opportunism and counter-revolutionary pacifism was made unmistakably clear and sharp in the articles written by Lenin and Zinoviev, which are now collected in the volume “Against the Stream” (published by the Communist International 1921). To those who are interested in this question we most urgently recommend a perusal of this book.

people and thereby hastening the abolition of the domination of the capitalist class."

The resolution of the Basle Congress of November, 1912, is still clearer:—

"The governments are not likely to forget that the Franco-Prussian war had as a consequence the breaking out of the Commune, that the Russo-Japanese war set in motion the revolutionary forces of the people of the Russian Empire. . . . The proletarians themselves are criminals to shoot one another for the purpose of enhancing the profits of the capitalists, or for the ambitions of dynasties, or for the higher honour of diplomatic secret treaties." (1)

The active revolutionary tendency in the proletariat can be traced back to Marx and Engels. To Marx and Engels wars were not the result of the ethical backwardness of humanity, as they are to pacifist theologians and Labour parliamentarians, but necessary consequences of a given class situation. Thus, Lenin as follows on November 1st, 1914:—

"War is no accident, no sin, as the Christian parsons and Labour opportunists believe who preach patriotism, humanity and peace; it is an inevitable stage of Capitalism, and is as equally a consistent condition of capitalist nature just as peace." (2)

But for revolutionary Marxists, wars are important factors of social development. Marx was totally opposed to passive pacifism. He pronounced for war on various occasions. For example, he wrote in 1849 that it was the duty of the German proletariat, after its victorious revolution, to begin an offensive war on Czarist Russia. And Kautsky wrote in 1910, in his book, *The Way to Power*, of the probability of the outbreak of the proletarian revolution during a war or after its conclusion.

We see, therefore, that the two tendencies in the proletarian criticism of war are sharply opposed to each other. The first is in essence opportunist, the second revolutionary. And it is therefore not to be wondered that at the actual outbreak of war the first tendency, which proclaimed in words the sharpest antagonism on principle to every war, bowed down and slavishly followed in the track of its own bourgeoisie.

Bourgeois pacifism also exhibited two different currents during war. The first ideological tendency continues its struggles against war on the same moral basis, and pronounces for a quick end to it, for a "peace of understanding," and, as before the war, without result.

In the Entente States, and particularly in Anglo-Saxon countries, a new current has come into being. It is characterised by the trite expression, "the last war." Germany should be conquered, but after the victory an organisation of all the nations should be formed which should, in an organised manner, prevent a future war: hence *the idea of the League of Nations*. Peace without annexations, the last war, the League of Nations, self-determination of nations—these elements can be comprised in the commonplaces of Wilsonian, and the famous Fourteen Points are the fundamental basis of this tendency. Wilsonism was taken up from Wilson himself, by a small circle of ideologists, and by the leaders of the social patriots, who sought some way of reconciling, in the eyes of the working masses, their treachery with their preaching for decades of opposition of war. But Wilsonism was, in

(1) Quoted from "Against the Stream," page 27.

(2) Quoted from "Against the Stream," page 6.

essence, a means of inciting real opponents of war in the Anglo-Saxon countries against Germany, and ideologically, of agitating for an active participation in the war.

Events in the camp of passive proletarian pacifism before the war are well known. All those spokesmen of the Second International who had protested their opposition to war for decades went over with flags flying to the camp of their own bourgeoisie—Plechanov, Henderson, Hervé, Kautsky, etc. The shameful collapse of the Second International and the desertion to the camp of the Social Chauvinists was proved in various ways. The Kautsky theory was originated that the proletariat of each country was bound to defend its own fatherland. On October 2nd, 1914, Kautsky wrote in *Die Neue Zeit*:—

“It is the right and the duty of all to defend their own fatherland; true internationalism consists in the granting of this right to the Socialists of all nations, amongst them also those which are waging war against any nation.”

But even these opportunists who did not pronounce so brutally for the mutual murder of the working class in the service of its own bourgeoisie did not find the way to the revolutionary utilisation of the given situation. Thus Max Adler wrote as follows in his pamphlet, *Principle or Romantic* (Nurnberg, 1915):—

“The foreign policy of Marxism can only be a pacifist one, but neither in the sense of the bourgeois peace movement . . . nor in the sense of the hitherto existing Socialist recognition of the peace idea . . . which was always looked upon as a secondary aim in the struggle for emancipation of the proletariat. . . . Now the opinion is much more relevant that all the internationalism of the Social Democrats will and must remain Utopian, if it does not make the peace idea the pivot of its programme of home and foreign policy. . . . Socialism after the war will be organised international pacifism or it will be nothing.” (1)

Zinoviev rightly remarks in connection with this that this is not a programme of Marxism but of petty-bourgeois opportunism. From this international pacifism it is only a step to international social chauvinism.

If we ask how it is possible that those people who had proclaimed for decades their opposition to war now became inciters to war, the answer lies in their erroneous fundamental conception of the class struggle of the proletariat. People who think that the proletariat will not free itself through class war, but who have in view a peaceful transformation, and that only in the distant future; whose policy is directed exclusively to the improvement of the position of the proletariat as a wage working class in capitalism, must arrive at the conclusion that the welfare of the proletariat is bound up with that of the bourgeoisie of its own country. We actually find this train of thought clearly pronounced by the most important representatives of social chauvinism—Lensch, Calwer, Henderson, and others. If the bourgeoisie of its own country is defeated, if it loses its colonies and the possibility of the export of industrial articles on a large scale, that means for the industrial proletariat of the country in question unemployment, low wages, and a lowering of the standard of living—a condition which, for the leaders, who are resolved not to wage a vigorous class struggle, is absolutely undesirable. This explains the apparently contradictory attitude of social democracy before and during the war—before

(1) “Against the Stream,” page 116.

the war they are enemies of war, because war makes the position of the workers worse; during the war itself they become social chauvinists, because the defeat of their own bourgeoisie would make the position of the proletariat worse during the continuance of the capitalist regime. The different attitudes of the leaders before and during the war is certainly no contradiction, but a logical result of their objection to the real struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.

Different in principle but relentlessly logical was the attitude of the active revolutionary anti-militarists during the war—above all of the small group which was formed round Lenin and which became the nucleus of the Third International. This group was resolved, from the very beginning, to change the Imperialistic war into a class war for the overthrow of capitalism. The case appears to me to be expressed very clearly as a programme in the following words of Lenin:—

“The war of our days is called a people's war. But it does not follow truth that we should swim with the people's stream of patriotism, but that in times of war, in war, and in the form of war the class antagonisms by which the peoples are lacerated continue and come to the surface. Refusal to serve, the military strike, etc., is simply stupidity, a lamentable and cowardly dream of a peaceful struggle against the armed bourgeoisie; a fancy of the abolition of capitalism without desperate class war or series of such wars. The propaganda of the class war remains even in war the duty of Socialists. . . . Down with clerically sentimental and foolish dreaming of peace at any price! We wish to raise the banner of class struggle.” (November 1st, 1914.) (1)

On this programme was built the strategy and tactics of the Russian Communist Party, which led to the victorious proletarian revolution.

PACIFISM AFTER THE WAR

The war, by the dreadful loss and desolation it caused, brought about a considerable strengthening of the bourgeois, moral-ideological tendency of pacifism, in all not very conscious intellectual, petty-bourgeois, and even proletarian circles. Pacifism, or to use a more suitable word, Wilsonism, suffered a most crushing and complete defeat in the peace negotiations. Keynes, in his book, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, describes very interestingly the courses of the negotiations of the Supreme Council: the way in which Wilson was pushed away step by step from the path of Wilsonism by Clemenceau and Lloyd George, and was forced to adopt the course of a peace of violence. Meanwhile, it is self-evident that this historic event cannot be explained by Wilson's personal inferiority, as a negotiator, to Clemenceau and Lloyd George. The truth is that Wilson-George represented the real interests of the capitalist class in their countries—though perhaps imperfectly comprehended. All the beautiful phrases of Wilsonism melted away, and his favourite idea, the League of Nations, became a bloodless and ineffectual thing of paper, about which to-day no man of understanding troubles himself. This development dealt ethical-ideological pacifism a very heavy blow.

On the other hand, the second form of bourgeois pacifism, the economic, was strengthened. The three years that have passed since the war ended have fully confirmed the conception of Norman Angell, that even a victorious war, in the present stage of capitalism,

(1) “Against the Stream,” page 6.

has disastrous effects for a country; and that under given conditions it is not only impossible to collect from the defeated country an indemnity corresponding to the war expenditure, but that the victorious countries are not able to accept such an indemnity without deranging capitalist economy, even if the defeated country were able to pay it. Almost all the consequences which Norman Angell predicted—the dislocation of international credit, chaos in currency, cessation of international exchange of goods, unemployment—have really come to pass. And to the overwhelming mass of inhabitants of the victorious countries practical proof has been brought home that war is really bad business. The huge mass of unemployment in the victorious countries, the bad business conditions, and the oppressive taxes supply a strong economic foundation for the strengthening of economic pacifism in these countries. This is the explanation why in capitalist circles, and, above all, British commercial capital, which is most sensitive to the dislocation of world economic equilibrium, are sincerely thinking at the present time along pacifist lines. For example, the *Manchester Guardian*, under the direction of Prof. Keynes, conducts an active pacifist propaganda. The two millions of unemployed, and the taxes which eat up 30 to 40 per cent. of the income, show only too clearly to certain groups of the British bourgeoisie how badly they have done through the war. And the case is similar with the bourgeoisie of the other victorious countries, but the nationalist ideology which was so immensely strengthened during the war prevents, for the present, clear self-consciousness in these countries.

Under the influence of the Russian Revolution, and of the revolutionary attempts in Hungary, Germany, etc., a third capitalist tendency in pacifism appeared after the war which we may call *bourgeois class pacifism*. The bourgeois politicians see much more clearly than the opportunists in the Labour movement that a lost war, and war generally, offers the best opportunity to the proletariat to get into its hands those weapons which are indispensably necessary for the overthrow of capitalist rule. The most prominent organ of British capitalism, *The Economist*, saw this possibility as early as the beginning of 1915. It said at that time:—

“Philanthropists give expression to the hope that peace will bring with it an international limitation of armaments. . . . But those who know what forces European diplomacy actually direct give themselves over to no such Utopias. The perspective which is opened by the war is the perspective of bloody revolutions and of bitter wars between labour and capital, between the masses of the people and the ruling classes of the Continent.”

After the victorious Russian Revolution and in the face of the revolutionary ferment that could then be observed in the working class all over Europe—in spite of the present period of depression in the revolutionary movement—this bourgeois class pacifism is gaining more ground. The great change in the proportion of power of the classes, and especially in the outlook of the proletariat, is best illustrated by the following facts: While, before the war, the ruling class could get the necessary armed force for the suppression of the proletariat (police, detectives, army, etc.) from the ranks of the proletariat itself, it is now obliged to organise *special class* troops for that purpose. All the state-protected organisations which we see, under different names, scattered all over Europe—Orgesch in Germany, Detachments in Hungary, Fascisti in Italy, Legion and

thugs in America, etc.—show that the ruling class is obliged to arm itself against the proletariat. This means, at the same time, that a new war, which necessarily demands the re-arming of the proletariat—that proletariat which must be *disarmed* after heavy fighting—would be a very dangerous undertaking for the ruling classes. Next to the unfortunate economic experience, the fear of the ruling class to put weapons again into the hands of the proletariat is the strongest support of bourgeois pacifism.

It is only natural to expect that the opportunists and parliamentary careerists in the Labour movement should place themselves, once more, fully and completely in the service of this bourgeois pacifism. A typical instance of this is a recent article by Hilferding in the *Freiheit*, in which he discusses the probability that collisions between individual Imperialist countries will be replaced by an organised adjustment of their interests. It is the Washington Conference, first and foremost, which leads him to this conclusion. We shall quote from his article a passage which plainly shows how completely Hilferding and the 2½ International are sailing in the fairway of opportunism:—

“ Nothing is so foolish as not to see that behind the new methods of world policy the strongest economic and political forces stand at present. The Communist fancy that ‘ hopes ’ every day for a new war, in which the world revolution will blaze forth, is in truth foolish and perverse. It is foolish, because it forgets the frightful emptiness of recent times. It was the tragic fault of Socialism that it came temporarily to power in the train of war and defeat, when subjectively the spirit of the working class was destroyed by nationalist-militarist influence, and objectively the possibilities of Socialism were immensely restricted by the devastation of war. It is perverse because of the abominable idea that the victory of Socialism, that is, the victory of true humanity and civilisation, can only grow out of the frightful barbarity and the inconceivable of a new war! If truly the victory of Socialism is to be expected, not from advancing knowledge, but from acute impoverishment, then indeed we must anxiously close our eyes before the new period for which the way is being prepared.”

We see here the passive counter-revolutionary pacifism of the pre-war period appearing in its purest form; not a determined class struggle, fought out and won in a moment, because the proletariat has power in its hands and the oppressive power of the capitalist class is weakened, but “ advancing knowledge ” shall bring about the victory of the proletariat, and, obviously, of course, at an immensely far distant date.

PROSPECTS OF THE NEW PACIFISM

The most important question now is: How strong is the new pacifist movement which set in after the war? The limitation of armaments which was agreed to at the Washington Conference is generally considered to be a result of this movement, but in our opinion it is very much over-estimated. The limitation of naval armaments has a double meaning. Firstly, it is obvious that if the United States decided to enter upon the rivalry of armaments with Britain and Japan, they must merge victorious from the struggle by reason of their undoubted economic superiority. Therefore, it was possible to *compel* the other naval Powers to limit armaments not by any pacifist means whatever, but by the threat of a future war. Secondly, the experience of the world war has shown that large warships will not play such a decisive rôle in a naval war, as was formerly believed. A year before the Washington Conference there

was a lengthy discussion in the British Press as to whether it would, on the whole, be expedient to proceed with the building of large expensive warships, or whether it would not be more expedient to concentrate the limited material resources of the country on the construction of submarines and light vessels. The limitation of armaments, as decided upon at Washington, was only the drawing of conclusions from the experiences of the last world war.

This will be clear if we call to mind the part played by France in the Conference. France peremptorily rejected the demand to restrict the building of submarines, and that despite the assertion of Balfour that to build these could only be considered as being directed against England. France rejected, in an equally summary manner, the proposal to have its armaments on land restricted in any way. We see then that from the experiences of the Washington Conference, the conclusion drawn by Hilferding, and the opportunist pacifists, are absurd. And we must not forget that the calling of the Washington Conference was preceded by a series of threats of war addressed by the United States to England (there was the petroleum question in Mesopotamia, the question of a cable in the Pacific Ocean, etc.) and that during the Conference itself threats of war were exchanged almost every day in the polite language of the Allies between England and France.

We can, therefore, sum up as follows: The experiences of the war have strengthened bourgeois pacifism—the sentimental and ideological pacifism. The fear of a proletarian revolution will certainly prevent the capitalist powers from lightly beginning a new war and arming the proletariat anew. But, on the other hand, however, it must not be forgotten that the fundamental crisis of capitalist economy is hurrying the world to a new war. There is no market for the products of the productive apparatus, of the United States, Britain and Japan, which was phenomenally developed during the war. The possibilities of the economic extension of capitalism in territories not yet opened up are very restricted. The United States are endeavouring to monopolise South America themselves. China, the largest territory, appears to be on the way to develop an independent capitalism of its own, and is offering an always growing and partly militarily organised resistance to the penetration of foreign capital; that is, China refuses to be degraded to the status of a colony. The restoration of Germany, Eastern Europe, and Russia is shattered by political opposition and internecine financial quarrels. France and Britain fears a re-invigorated Germany, not only politically, but also as a competitor on the world market. Russia seems to the capitalists to be a dangerous district so long as the proletariat possesses the State power. But without the restoration of Germany, Eastern Europe, and Russia, the world market is too narrow for the productive apparatus of the three victorious countries, America, Britain, and Japan, and in a lesser degree, also France. In such a situation there has always hitherto ensued an armed struggle among the Imperialist Powers interested, for the national monopoly of the world market because it is unable to absorb the total product of the various capitalist countries.

The tendency of avoiding a new world war through fear of the economic consequences and the possible proletarian revolution stands

opposed to the more powerful tendency of an armed struggle for the domination of the world market. It might seem frivolous to pass an opinion, at the present time, as to which tendency will gain the upper hand. Nevertheless, the experience of history speaks in favour of the view that the period of wars is not yet closed.

The CRISIS in GERMANY

Responsibility of 2nd International

BY WM. PAUL

GERMANY is passing through a most serious political and economic crisis. The attempt of the Social-Democrats, under the guidance of the Second International, to solve the problems in Germany by means of a parliamentary majority has disastrously failed, and is forcing the same measures upon them that were adopted by the Bolsheviks in Russia in 1917. The German crisis is the most dramatic illustration that history has ever witnessed in vindication of the correctness of the tactics of the Communist International; the crisis has at the same time struck a mortal blow at all the democratic posturings of the Second International and its short-sighted leader—Mr. J. R. MacDonald. At the very moment when he and his superficial champion, Mr. F. Hodges, were *talking* at the Edinburgh Conference against the proletarian dictatorship tactics of the Communists, and were refusing them admission to the Labour Party, *historic events* in Germany were forcing the adherents of the Second International in that country to put forward the following proposals against the Junkers:—

That the Government immediately forbid all anti-Republican acts or agitation by printed or spoken words;

The suppression of all Nationalist ex-soldiers' unions and Monarchist clubs;

The dismissal of all members of the army and of the judicial system who are known to have anti-Republican sympathies.

The establishment of an Extraordinary Supreme Court, with a majority of non-professional judges appointed by the President, to try all cases of treason;

And the establishment of an Extraordinary Executive to control the police, who shall have power over the Executives of the Federal States.

These dictatorship proposals were not suggested by German Socialists "who were the intellectual slaves of Moscow," but were imposed upon them by the sheer needs of a definite historical and concrete situation.

The leaders of the German Social Democratic Party have done everything that the MacDonalds and Hendersons would do if their party came into power in this country, and the sooner they are given an opportunity to test their parliamentary policy the sooner will the issue stand as clear here as it is in Germany to-day. Thus the lessons of the German situation furnish us with an example—and the parliamentary Labourists with a warning.

When the Second International became the nominal ruling power in the German Parliament its first act was to organise a White Terror, under Noske, against the Communist working-class leaders, which resulted in the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. Political hypocrites, like Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, are only troubled about Terrors which intimidate imperialist reactionaries and which consolidate the power of the Workers' State as in Soviet Russia. This was dramatically revealed at the recent Labour Party Conference which sent a resolution to Lenin demanding justice for Russian murderers subsidised by the European imperialists to destroy the Soviet Government; the Conference, however, sent no protest to Smuts, the imperialist, who holds thousands of the best fighting proletarians in his South African prisons. Nor did the Conference send any demands to the Social Democratic German Government to demand that the monarchist assassins of working-class leaders be brought to trial. According to a leading article in the *Manchester Guardian* (10/7/22) no less than four hundred Labour and Republican partisans have been foully murdered by the monarchists since the revolution. The majority of these murderers have been neither arrested nor tried, although they are known. The *Manchester Guardian* (12/7/22), commenting on this, says:—

“ While so many of the best leaders of German Democracy and Socialism have been murdered, neither Ludendorff, nor Helfferich, nor Kapp, nor Captain Ehrhardt, nor any of the reactionary leaders has been touched. The few acts of violence or mere disrespect committed against monarchists have been punished with excessive severity. Acquittals or light punishments for reactionary offenders, excessive punishments for Liberal or Socialist offenders—that has been the rule in the German Republic.”

Here we see the Second International at work and its precious democratic pretensions in practice. The only time that the German Government showed any energy in suppressing “disorder” was during the anti-reactionary rising of the Communists in March, 1920; on that occasion thousands of Communists were dealt with in the most savage manner, and never a protest escaped from Mr. J. R. MacDonald. Small wonder that even the *Manchester Guardian* admits that “German reactionaries have not been treated unjustly. On the contrary, German justice has been biassed in their favour” (12/7/22).

Why have the German Social Democrats been able to persecute Communists, oppose big strike movements, and yet been forced to treat the avowed counter-revolutionaries in the most gentle manner? The true explanation is that the White Terror organisation which Noske used against the Communists and which carried out the murder of Liebknecht, Luxemburg and Yogishes was not under his control, as he fondly imagined; it was dominated by the imperialist financiers and junkers. The policy of the reactionaries was brilliant and subtle. They knew that the German leaders of the Social Democratic Party had neither the courage nor the ability to conduct a revolution to its historical and logical conclusion. They knew that Noske and Schiedemann, like the MacDonalds and Hendersons, were brilliant platform men and adepts at manipulating Labour conferences against the Left, but who lacked the guts to deal with even such an historical anomaly as the monarchy. In Germany the

Kaiser solved the monarchical problem for them by scuttling away to Holland. The imperialist financiers knew that the German leaders of the Second International would be content to conduct affairs if they were permitted the wondrous democratic blessing of having the greatest number of *talkers* in the parliamentary chambers—and this is all that the advent of a Labour Government can mean in Britain. The Social Democrats in Germany have control of the greatest number of votes in the political debating chambers, and yet they can only enforce policies *against the working class, but not against the imperialists*. Why is this? It is because the real power of the State machine is still in the hands of the financial reactionaries, who are the actual rulers in Germany, as a result of the force which they wield through their unchallenged domination in the control of industry, the army, press, education, public services and police. The parliamentary majority of the Social Democrats can only use power when it is *directed against the working class and the Communists*, who are the enemies of the reactionaries; when they attempt to take action against the big financiers or the landed interests they find themselves impotent. This is exactly what the Communist International has been trying to hammer into the heads of the Socialist movement for four years, viz., the mere placing of a majority of Labour debaters into Parliament does not mean that the working class is the real political power in the State! This is the crux of the whole fight between the Communist and Second International; it was because of this difference that the Labour Party rejected the Communist Party's application for affiliation. The Communist Party denies that a Labour majority in the House of Commons can make the Labour Party the dominating force in the State. The MacDonalDs and Hendersons are blind supporters of the Liberal and middle class legend regarding the sovereign power of parliamentary democracy. The final test of political theory is historical experience. What, then, are the facts as revealed by the German situation?

PARLIAMENT OR POWER

We will not produce evidence from any Communist source. We intend to prove our case by quoting the two foremost Liberal organs in this country—*The Nation* and the *Manchester Guardian*; these two middle class journals have supplied Mr. J. R. MacDonald with most of his political education. Commenting on the German crisis, in an unsigned article, *The Nation* (8/7/22) says:—

“ Their Constitution is a model of all that the last generation aspired to under the name of democracy. But the work is only half done if the new forms must be administered by men reared in the old traditions. With few individual exceptions, the Civil Service has altered none of its habits of thought. It remains on the whole Conservative, and in great part Monarchist. It regards the Republic as a foolish and transient aberration. It tends to sabotage when it gets the chance, and its sympathies are all with the minute Opposition which is working for a return to Monarchy. It may not dare to join the extremer Right (German Nationalists), but it finds a convenient shelter in the less outspoken People's Party of Herr Stinnes. The worst manifestation of this tendency has been the almost unbroken failure of the courts to convict any of the authors of Monarchist murder and violence, and the shocking leniency in the few cases where conviction was unavoidable. Thus

the Monarchy, and all that it implies of class ascendancy and militarism, remains entrenched in all the offices of the Democratic Republic. Behind it stands the Army and the military police, which, in spite of its reduced numbers, can overawe the whole country, and could be combated only by a general strike."

Here, indeed, is a belated admission that the mere capture of Parliament does not carry with it *political power*. The only power in Germany that can defend the Republic against the reactionaries is the industrially organised masses using the general strike. It has taken the present German crisis to expose the amiable nonsense written by Mr. J. R. MacDonald, when he blithely stated that "A parliamentary election will give us all the power that Lenin had to get by a revolution" (*Parliament and Revolution*, p. 92).*

Even now we feel confident that the leader of the Second International will be unable to learn anything from the critical position of his colleagues in Germany. The strength of a Lenin rests in his eagerness to learn from historical experiences. Mr. J. R. MacDonald is not a realist; he is simply a democratic romanticist. He is too petty and arrogant to admit error. Like Napoleon's guard, he never surrenders; he merely dies.

When the cunning imperialist rulers of Germany in 1918 saw that the Bolshevik revolution had created a tremendous impression upon the minds of the masses they realised that the real danger to capitalism lay, not in the parliamentary talkers of the Second International who only desired a parliamentary election, but in the demands of the Communist leaders who demanded "All power to the workers." By all power, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and the other revolutionary leaders meant the complete destruction of any influence wielded by the propertied class and monarchists in either the army, police, industry, education, parliament, public services, or the press. This would have meant the replacing of the geographical and parliamentary State of Capitalism with the industrial and Soviet State of Labour. In a word, it would have meant the dictatorship of the proletariat. Seeing the danger that confronted them, the German imperialist-financiers and landed monarchists made way to enable the Social Democrats to get their election and to control the parliamentary chamber. Once the Schiedemanns and Noskes were contentedly in control of the votes in Parliament the propertied interests increased their grip upon the army, police, finance, education, press, and civil service, and in this way were able to enforce their will upon the innocent prattlers in Parliament. Not only did they do these things, but they organised secret military societies in order to wage civil war at any moment that the industrial masses threatened to rise to power; this they were able to do by means of the thousands of ex-army officers, the majority of whom belonged to the capitalist and landholding class. The *Manchester Guardian* (12/7/22) gives some idea of the armed power controlled by these reactionary elements:—

"All the landed gentry and the bigger farmers are monarchist. Of the middle class probably the majority are monarchist, although most of them are politically indolent and inert. The officers of the

* The problem raised here is dealt with at some length in *Communism and Society*, which anticipated all the troubles that have now overtaken the German Social Democrats.

Reichswehr, the regular army of 100,000 men, are nearly all monarchist, most of them fanatically so. The N.C.O.'s are predominantly monarchist. The rank and file are either monarchist or indifferent. They would probably follow their officers in a civil war.

"The Security Police, 150,000 strong, are a semi-military force. They are not mobilisable, and are not under the Ministry of War, but under the Ministry of the Interior. They have no general staff, no transport, and no artillery. But they have rifles and machine-guns, and are drilled like soldiers. Their officers are mainly monarchists, and so are many of the rank and file.

"The backbone of the active monarchist movement are the secret military organisations which exist all over the country. The most powerful of these is the 'Organisation Consul.'

"The quantities of arms and ammunition discovered by the Allied Control Commissions and by the German police show that the secret organisations are well equipped for civil war, although not for war against a foreign Power."

This completely shatters the naive idea of the Parliamentary Labourists that control of Parliament means control of the army. It may interest our proletarian I.L.P. friends, whom we do not confuse with Mr. J. R. MacDonald, to know that it was the "Organisation Consul" which the Social Democrat, Noske, used to murder Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. The reactionaries placed this White Terror band at the disposal of the Second International in Germany in order to enable it to attempt to crush out the Communist movement. The Ludendorffs and Hindenburgs, however, were working according to a splendidly conceived plan. When they, operating through the Social Democrats, had killed off the most active Communist leaders in 1918, the first surge of revolutionary enthusiasm, which had swept over the masses, spent itself. Their next step was to use their secret murder brigade to assassinate those moderate socialists whose courage and honesty made them potential revolutionaries and, therefore, a danger to the growing strength of German capitalism. They thereupon assassinated Haase and Kurt Eisner. The reactionaries grew ever bolder in the measure that they realised the actual weakness and cowardice of the Social Democrats who were revelling in their parliamentary "power." So contemptuous did the imperialist financiers and landed monarchists become that they decided to clear up some of the internal differences that were agitating their own groups. Their next victim was Erzberger, one of their own class, who made himself conspicuous in connection with the hateful Versailles Treaty. The internecine conflicts, among the different financial groups, were such that something serious was bound to happen. The two main divisions in German finance were headed by Dr. Rathenau and Hugo Stinnes; the former was not so reactionary as the latter, but he sealed his fate when he signed the Rappolo Treaty in which Germany recognised Soviet Russia. In Labour as well as in capitalist circles the true reactionary reveals himself by his embittered attitude towards the Soviet Government; Russia, as always, is the acid test. The murder of Rathenau, the millionaire and influential financier, rallied a great deal of capitalist support to the Government, because, as the *Manchester Guardian* states in an innocent remark, which reflects

middle-class opinion in Germany, "to murder such a man was going too far even in a country used to assassinations"; it may then be possible for the Social Democrats, because of the victim's social prestige, to obtain some little measure of power, other than that of the working class, to deal with the situation.

The murder of Rathenau tears away the veil of parliamentary democracy which covers the capitalists and imperialists. They care not a fig for constitutional democracy or parliamentary majorities once their interests are endangered. They are determined in their opposition to all who stand in their way, and unlike the working class they tolerate no traitors in their own ranks. If an Erzberger or a Rathenau oppose them they are speedily removed. No matter how much we are opposed to the counter-revolutionaries we must realise their heroic determination and courageous initiative in leading an opposition against Labour. The German imperialists and landlords have now come to the point when they have no further use for Noske and Schiedemann. There is no more humiliating sight in history than to observe the loathing and contempt which the capitalists have for the tools which they have used in the Labour movement against the workers. The same Schiedemann, of the Second International, whom the junkers used during the war to try and seduce Holland, to oppose the anti-annexation campaign of Haase and Liebknecht, and to demand a more vigorous submarine campaign; this same Schiedemann who was used by the imperialists to hunt down Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht was himself almost assassinated, the other day, by the very people whose servile tool he had been. And, Noske, who used the White Terror against the Communists, in 1918, is now surrounded by a greater bodyguard than that which was necessary to protect the Kaiser. Labour renegades never earn the gratitude of the imperialists they serve; a similar thought must have entered Mr. Arthur Henderson's mind when he was unceremoniously landed on the mat in 1917.

The great influential propertied interests were also able to use their economic power to control the public mind by means of the Press and educational institutions. The following excerpt from the *Manchester Guardian* (12/7/22) clinches our point, and shows whether political power depends upon counting noses in Parliament:—

"The German universities are notoriously retrograde politically. Professors with democratic ideas are in a small minority and they suffer from continual chicanery. The vast majority of German professors are extreme reactionaries of the most rabid kind. There are many who combine the highest academic learning with political ignorance greater than that of a negro. Republican or Socialist students are also in a small minority that seems even smaller than it really is. Students have played a sinister part in every *Putsch*, and they are guilty of many if not most of the political murders committed in Germany.

"The reactionary Press, which includes the papers owned by Stinnes, commands more than half the reading public. Berlin has three Socialist papers, *Vorwärts*, *Freiheit*, and the *Rote Fahne*, with a total town circulation of a hundred thousand at the most. The chief extreme reactionary papers of Berlin are the *Deutsche Zeitung*, the *Deutsche Tageszeitung*, the *Kreuzzeitung*, the *Tägliche Rundschau*, and the *Lokalanzeiger*. Ever since the Revolution they have

agitated against the Republic without intermission. Their attacks against the Wirth Cabinet, and more especially against Rathenau, attained a violence and a malevolence almost unknown in the British press. The *Lokalanzeiger* is a paragon of vicious and insidious journalism. With its many pages of small advertisements, and its numerous supplements, it maintains an enormous circulation, especially amongst the lower middle class.

"These papers and their innumerable sister-sheets in the provinces have created the atmosphere in which crime like the murder of Dr. Rathenau is possible. The agitation has a war-time psychology, for there is a latent civil war in Germany, a civil war between Monarchy and Republic. All those who remember the narrowness and malevolence shown by extreme Nationalists during the war will have some idea of the spirit that animates the reactionaries in Germany now."

The Russian Communists made it their first business, when they, through the masses, captured power to place the press of the country exclusively at the disposal of the revolutionary working class. They also placed the educational institutions under the control of the Soviet Government. When the Communists talk about all power being vested in the workers they mean *all power* and not merely the control of 400 impotent votes in the House of Commons. During a revolutionary crisis leaving the newspapers in the hands of the capitalist class may mean the freedom of the press, but in reality, as the *Manchester Guardian* shows, it actually means the freedom of the reactionaries to advocate murder.

Those of our readers who study that brilliant educational journal, *The Plebs*, will see an additional reason why we must build up a powerful movement for independent working class education in this country. Every intelligent observer now admits that our schools and universities are mere instruments of capitalist culture. It used to be argued, by the Labourists, that they would change all that when they had a majority in Parliament. The above quotation shows that the German Social Democrats did not control education by merely controlling the parliamentary chamber. Perhaps Mr. J. R. MacDonald will now see how stupid it is for him to sneer at the Plebs League and the Labour Colleges.

INTERNATIONALISM VERSUS RACIALISM

When speaking at the Labour Party Conference, Mr. Frank Hodges criticised the Russian Communists and sought to expose their tactics as the outcome of their "Asiatic Mind," he at once revealed himself as an ignoramus and a reactionary of the most dangerous type. We wish to draw attention to the fact that this statement was taken up by the *Labour Leader* and given a prominent place in its columns. There was a time when the *Labour Leader*, under the editorship of Bruce Glaiser and Keir Hardie, did, with all its faults, stand for internationalism. Even Mrs. Bruce Glaiser, when its editor, was able to resist the anti-Russian bias of Mr. Philip Snowden. When Mr. Frank Hodges made his attack upon the Russian Communists and their "Asiatic Mind" there was not one I.L.P. leader in the conference who took exception to his statement or challenged its anti-international implications; we know, however, that the rank and file of the I.L.P. is getting disgusted with such tactics. As we have already dealt with Hodges and his

Asiatic explanation of Communist tactics, it is well worth noting how the racial argument becomes the weapon of reaction. The capitalist and landlord class always attempt to recruit the masses to its side by appealing to their racial and nationalist passions. This nationalist and racial appeal is going to be used in this country with an ever-increasing intensity by the imperialists and anti-Labour forces. It is imperative that the more intelligent and honest elements in the Labour Party should vigorously oppose any attempt on the part of ambitious and unscrupulous people to foist racialism and nationalism upon the Labour Movement. Dr. Rathenau was murdered to the howling of a reactionary press which screamed at him for being a Jew. Because the class-conflict is keen in Germany the racial passions are deliberately stimulated against the international working class movement. The *Manchester Guardian* (12/7/22) gives very clear evidence of how the reactionaries seek to turn the class struggle into a racial struggle.

“ They are fighting to restore the partially lost privileges of their own class, to re-establish the militarist caste system of the former Empire and the military predominance of Germany in Europe. They are largely actuated by racial hatred against all foreigners, against the French and the Poles more than against the English, and most of all against the Jews. They have a superstitious belief in the existence of a pure Aryan stock and in its superiority over all other cases, a belief invented by a Frenchman, Count Gobineau, popularised by an Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and fostered by German schoolmasters and professors. It has resulted in an inability to conceive that any great man could be anything but an Aryan of the pure variety—that is to say, a German.

“ It may seem ridiculous, but it is nevertheless true, that there are educated Germans who seriously maintain that Christ was a German. Many German reactionaries have been worked up into a kind of pseudo-religious mania by steeping themselves in Teutonic paganism, not as it really was, but as it appears in the unobjective “Germania” of Tacitus, in German romantic literature, and in Wagnerian opera.

“ The young student Techow, who murdered Dr. Rathenau, was well educated in the academic sense and quite respectable when not obsessed with his rabid nationalism.

“ The responsibility for the very existence of such a type, and consequently for the murder of Dr. Rathenau, lies farther afield. It lies mainly with the remnants of the old system, with the school-teachers, the university professors, the reactionary press, and all active promoters of the monarchist idea.”

The above passage may help to let Mrs. Philip Snowden understand the reason why the Bolsheviks paid so much attention to the popularising of the “Internationale” as a song among the non-revolutionary workers in Russia. This lady, another distinguished figure in the Second International, complained that the Russian Communists had turned the “Internationale” into a national anthem. What the Russians really were attempting was to turn it into an *international anthem* in order to combat the racial hatreds which are developed under Capitalism. Time after time many of the Socialist Left Wing have had to defend members of the Second International who were marked down for persecution because of

their race. One of the I.L.P. delegates at the Labour Party Conference, who never raised a voice against Hodges' sneer at the "Asiatic Mind" of the Russian Communists, was Emmanuel Shinwell, of Glasgow. Does he forget the 40 hours' fight on the Clyde in 1919, when his activity and race was used by the press as a means of attacking the strike which, it was contended, was led by a Jewish-foreign element?

In contrast to the disgusting racial clap-trap of Hodges, contrast the dignified attitude of the Rev. Conrad Noel, who has been persecuted because of his conception of the international implications of religion. He refused to hang up in his church the symbol of imperialist rapine, the Union Jack, and hung up instead the Red Flag, the symbol of internationalism. He was warned that he "would not get on" if he stuck to his internationalism. By the same token, Frank Hodges, who denies internationalism, is destined "to get on." The Second International leaders are always ready to abandon their lip service to internationalism. When the Rev. Conrad Noel was publicly challenged, and threatened with bodily violence, to choose between the Union Jack and the Red Flag, he insisted on choosing the latter. When Mr. J. R. MacDonald, standing as a Labour candidate at Woolwich last year, and as the head official of the Second International, was asked whether he stood by the Red Flag or the Union Jack, he gave one of his characteristic and sophistical replies in which he attempted to show that there were *two* Union Jacks, one of which he was proud to associate himself with. This is the sort of cowardice that encourages the racial and national habit of looking at things. This is the attitude which led the leaders of the Second International, in 1914, to follow the national flags of their masters instead of the Red Flag of internationalism. This is the policy which was aptly described by the renegade, Gustave Herve, who declared that in August, 1914, the international leaders of Labour fell from the sky and they all landed in their respective Motherlands.

The refusal of the Second International to abide by the most elementary principles of internationalism resulted in its prominent leaders, like Vandervelde, signing the Versailles Treaty, which enabled the imperialist vultures of the Entente to cruelly exploit the German workers and to humiliate that nation in the eyes of the capitalist world. The Second International has reduced itself to such elements of idiocy that we have the melancholy spectacle of German members of that group denouncing indemnities, while other members, like Vandervelde and MacDonald, are in favour of indemnities!

The Versailles Treaty was denounced when it was signed by the Communist International. Only recently the Communist International offered to line up in a joint agitation with the Second International against the Versailles Treaty. This offer was refused.

Everyone knows that the German reactionaries have used the Versailles Treaty in order to stir up national hatreds among the masses. Had the Second International done its duty by vigorously opposing the Treaty, the German imperialist junkers would have been unable to have made any patriotic and nationalist appeals to certain easily misled sections of the workers. By its cowardly attitude the Second International leaders, particularly in France, Belgium, and Britain, have played right into the hands of the

monarchists in Germany and the financiers in the Entente countries.

THE GERMAN COMMUNISTS

The one force that the reactionaries in Germany fear is the power of the industrially organised masses. The Kapp putsch and the Rathenau murder brought the masses out into the streets in their millions. During the attempt of the monarchists to seize power, under Kapp, the Social Democratic parliamentary government shamelessly fled from Berlin; it was only able to return in safety in consequence of the direct action of the industrial masses and the fierce fights that took place in the streets. The Rathenau murder once again demonstrated that the parliamentary power of the Social Democrats is a myth and that the real defenders of the German Republic are the industrially organised masses. The defence of the Republic against the monarchists—in the streets and in the factories, mills, mines, and railroads—is a task imposed upon every sincere adherent to the cause of Labour. The German Communists were therefore active in every demonstration organised against the reactionaries. The same thing occurred in Russia, prior to the Soviet revolution, when the Bolsheviks joined hands with the moderate Socialists in defending the Republic against the Tsarists. There is an additional reason why the Communists are always eager to participate in industrial and street demonstrations against the counter-revolutionaries. These reveal to the workers their industrial mass power, and demonstrate the real significance of class solidarity; these also show the feebleness of a parliamentary majority as compared with the organised Might of the proletariat. It is necessary to understand this because we find that the Liberal weekly, *The Nation* (8/7/22), in an unsigned leading article, already quoted by us, dealing with the German demonstrations against the Rathenau murder, says:—

“ It was almost comic to find even the Communists marching in phalanx with the rest.”

This passage is so stupid that it might have been written by a Labour journalist of the Second International, or even by Mr. Brailsford. In these days, when Labour journalists write for Liberal weeklies and Liberal journalists edit Labour organs, some marvellous theories are put forward. There was nothing essentially comical in the Communists of Germany protesting against the murder of Rathenau; it is comical, however, to observe the amazing incapacity of Liberal journalists who are unable to see that the German Communists were not so much concerned with the dead financier as they were with the reactionary social forces that had struck him down. Our Liberal and Labour writers always see social forces operated by individuals; the Communists see individuals operated by social forces. *The Nation* thought it a splendid joke to see Communists demonstrating out of sympathy for a dead millionaire because it could see no further than the corpse of Rathenau. But the German Communists, trained in the school of historical realism, saw that the murder of Rathenau was a demonstration on the part of the financial junkers and monarchists; it was a challenge thrown to those who sought an alliance with Soviet Russia and to those who were opposed to the return of the Hohenzollerns. The dead body of Rathenau was merely a gauntlet thrown as a gage of battle.

The Communists are with the masses in all their everyday struggles against every form of reaction. Their devotion to the

workers makes them jealous of traitors even when these pose as leaders of Labour. But the Communist attack upon the leaders is not an attack upon the masses; it is an attempt to serve the workers to open their eyes to those who would betray them. Thus in Germany the Communists are in the front ranks fighting the reactionaries. They are even assisting Noske, of the Second International, whose hands are red with the blood of murdered Communists, to stem back the monarchist peril that threatens the Republic. They are doing this, not out of any respect for Noske, but because the immediate needs of the masses demand it. The Labour movement, and its struggles against reaction, is of more importance to the Communists than rigid theories or personalities. The Communists know that only in and through the class struggle can the masses learn the way to their emancipation. The Communists realise that the struggle will ultimately expose the chicanery of false leaders and the hollowness of the Second International; that is why they are always more than ready to help even a Noske or a MacDonald, and to fight beside them when they are forced into a real conflict with the capitalist enemy. The ever recurring crises of capitalism are the main factors that are exposing the idle and middle-class pretensions of the leaders of the Second International; on the contrary, these crises demonstrate that the tactics of the Communist International are not the outcome of overheated "Asiatic minds," but are, indeed, based on a most painstaking investigation into the problems of capitalism, the needs of the workers, and the process of revolution.

The German situation is a case in point. This crisis has shed a brilliant light upon the respective policies of the Second and Communist Internationals. It has demonstrated, beyond all doubt, despite the flamboyant rhetoric of a MacDonald or the reactionary polish of a Hodges, that the future and the masses will see the Red flag uplifted upon a world of Federal Soviet Republics.

Speed the day!

BOLSHEVISM & CHURCH PROPERTY *By D. Ivon Jones*

ISYATIE is the Russian word for "extraction" or "appropriation," we are told. In the minds of the monarchist clergy it stands just now for "robbery" and everything that is bad. For the revolution, which has been biding its time, has arrived at the church door and is demanding admission.

After the revolution, Tikhon, the Patriarch of the Church and faithful henchman of the Czarist régime, started off by hurling anathemas and excommunications at the Bolsheviks. The Church still stood like a mighty Greek column among the ruins of the autocracy. Its hold was strong on the masses. But the masses had received land, and prospects of bread and peace and freedom in the revolution. So some chose the revolution, the others said, "Neechevo," and marched one day in the Church parade, and the next day in the Bolshevik demonstration.

The revolution was able to lay rough hands on property, but

could not touch the God of Property, its heavenly witness, the Holy Church. Nevertheless, the forces being equal, both sides postponed the battle. Tikhon then made a show of blessing the Soviet régime. The Soviet confined itself to placing a stone inscription on the wall near the famous shrine of the Virgin, which said: "Religion is the opium of the people." And there the people have been going daily by the hundreds to kiss the sacred symbols.

The Communists are atheistic in their opinions on religion. The bourgeoisie, in the days of its revolutionary youth, gave a fleeting homage to the Goddess of Reason, and carried the discoveries of science to their cosmic conclusions. But the bourgeoisie was not the last revolutionary class. The proletariat was hard upon its heels, and the bourgeoisie, as Engels wittily remarked, threw away rationalism like a bad cigar. Only the industrial proletariat and its fighting advance guard, the Communist Party, is able to carry science into all realms, and can thus dispense with supernatural idols.

But the Communists know history. They have a special philosophy of history which enables them not only to read history aright, but to make history. And an example of the Communist method of interpreting and making history is to be seen in "Isyatie."

The Communists have refrained from frontal attacks on the unsophisticated religious faith of the peasant-toiling masses. Religious faith has two sides, like patriotism. One side of it is a reflection of the primitive outlook of the peasant; the other side is created by the exploiters who organise these native beliefs in the interest of reaction.

But it all depends what class is in power to organise the unsophisticated beliefs of primitive minds. Engels somewhere contemplated the possibility of the Salvation Army being a revolutionary organisation, because of its literal interpretation of the gospels by its votaries. And was it not the slogans of John Wycliffe's translation of the Bible that inspired the revolt of the English serfs under John Ball and Wat Tyler in the 14th century, one of the most winsome revolutionary movements? The first step, therefore, during a revolution is not to impose upon the peasant masses and the toilers who are new from peasant life a psychology that is appropriate to the full fledged industrial proletariat; but to draw out the revolutionary conclusions from the human side of their primitive beliefs. Only the proletarian State Power can afford to do this, to give the Christian Gospels a free field among the backward classes, while at the same time combating religious superstitions by the lessons of science.

And so we have to-day meetings of poor priests in Communist Party offices, both for the organisation of "Isyatie" and also for the fight against the Tikhon and the counter-revolutionary "anti-Christian" hierarchy! Pro-Soviet bishops write messages in *Pravda* beginning with "Brothers and Sisters in Christ"! *The Rote Fahne* in Berlin has not come to that yet, such is the difference that the capture of power by the proletariat makes in the form of the struggle.

Tikhon, we said, paid lip service to the Soviet régime and waited; always, as it now appears, keeping in touch with the counter-revolution. The Russian Church possessed movable wealth in gold, silver and jewels of fabulous value. This was listed and taken note of in the early days of the Soviet régime. But it actually still remained

in the hands of the Church hierarchy. With the coming of the new economic policy, and the advent of forms of credit and exchange into the Soviets' economic life, this Church wealth was capable of becoming a source of great economic power for the counter-revolutionary priesthood. It would be a state within the proletarian state, a centre of counter-revolution inside the Soviet power.

But the Church itself was never a homogeneous unit. The appointment of Tikhon as Patriarch, before the war, instead of the Czar as head of the Church, was a concession to the democratic elements below. It is only natural to expect that numbers of the lower clergy should reflect the unsophisticated religious beliefs of the peasantry in their life and conduct. This primitive religion could not breathe under Czarism, owing to the ruthless dictatorship exercised by the hierarchy under protection of the Czar's guns. But when these guns fell into the hands of the proletariat, and the poorer priests could join in the benefits of free discussion of Church reform and doctrine, then Tikhon might rave in vain, and the reformation of the Church was already begun; in fact, it was no longer the same Church.

It was inevitable that this freer atmosphere should produce a ferment of change. Under "normal" conditions that change might trace three lines of cleavage: the Church as a definite counter-revolutionary agent; the swan song of a chronically sick bourgeoisie, for ever getting born, and ever dying in the alien atmosphere of the Soviet Power; and the Church of the primitive peasant masses, Lutheran in doctrine and Church government.

But these old terms cannot quite fit. It was mentioned in a meeting of proletarian poets the other day that prayers are offered in some of the poorer Churches for "nash dorogoi tovarisch Lenin" (our dear Comrade Lenin) in the place once reserved for the Czar!

However, the great Volga famine came. And this has sealed the fate of the Church. We do not mean that it will cease to exist. History moves not always by sharp revolutions, but often by dimly melting processes of transfiguration. The early Christians did not destroy the heathen temples, but took possession of them. This is the historical method adopted by the Russian Communists towards the Church.

As the famine situation became more and more harrowing, the priests in the Volga region bethought them of the removable wealth of the Church, which had in times of plenty been drawn from the labour of the now starving peasants, and they began to talk about the crime of storing this wealth when bread could be bought by it for their hungry flocks. The Soviet Government was not long in responding with a decree ordering the appropriation of all the Church valuables of every description that were removable and which were not essential to the ritual of the Church. Patriarch Tikhon immediately denounced the decree and urged resistance to its execution. But the Soviet, although aware of this bold step it was taking, felt confident of the support of the toiling masses and peasantry and propertyless priests.

But this support was not secured without intense propaganda. This propaganda took the usual form of the coloured picture poster. These posters were marvels of direct appeal, and demonstrated how naive religious or patriotic beliefs, so often attacked in the abstract by Communists, can be used for, as well as against, the proletarian

revolution, once the proletariat is in power.

These posters in the main took the form of appeals to the peasants' primitive conceptions of Christianity. For instance, we had the picture of the early apostle worshipping in the woods under the stars of night, with tallow candle (not a golden one) to light the reading of the sacred word. Then there was that other poster, in two sections, which needed no explanation; one section shows the peasantry flocking with riches to the Church in times of prosperity, and the other shows the Church and its riches guarded by a dense row of well-fed black priests, indifferent and unmoved by the appeals of the starving millions who are falling and dying of hunger around them. Then there is the Volga victim, emaciated and bleeding, in the form of Christ with a crown of thorns.

"A trick!" say the enemies of the Soviet. It is not a trick of the Soviet, but a peculiar trick that history has of making even calamities do the scavenging work for a revolutionary class that is entering into power. The Soviet need only concern itself with exploiting the wealth of the Church to save the Volga millions in response to the call of the poorer clergy themselves. The wealth thus derived is variously estimated at tens of millions of gold roubles, some talk in higher denominations. In any event, the proceeds can only be slowly realised on the world market in exchange for food, and Isyatie in no way relieves us of the urgent duty of sending food NOW for starving Russia.*

In spite of the general acquiescence in Isyatie there have been collisions. It has unmasked the Church hierarchy as a counter-revolutionary organisation. It instigated riots in several provinces and one affray even, in Moscow, in which a Red Army man was killed by a stone hurled by a church zealot. Communists are selected for the work, and in the working-class areas volunteers are called for from the non-party workers, who readily respond. "After all," these workers say, "if Ilytch says it is right it must be done" (the workers reverentially call Lenin by his father's name). I passed a church one evening where Isyatie was in progress. A motor trolley was outside with a few Red Army men in attendance. There was a crowd, mainly of working men, and working women with shawls round their heads, quietly looking on and discussing the

* Another reason why Isyatie won't realise as much for the famine as was anticipated is due to the fact that the reactionary group in the Church have been themselves confiscating the treasures and selling them to subsidise the counter-revolution! The Soviet government made a careful inventory of all Church valuables at the beginning of the revolution, and many of the most precious jewels, etc., cannot now be found. This discovery has completely unmasked the reactionary policy of the orthodox clergy, and shows the real reason why it was bitterly opposed to Isyatie. What precious hypocrites are those who object to the "ruthlessness" of the Bolsheviks who had dared to lay sacrilegious hands upon the gold and precious stones of the Church for the purpose of feeding the starving children in the famine-stricken areas—while all the time the black-coated servants of heaven were stealing the jewels to maintain the very imperialist ghouls who had helped to turn the Volga into a pitiless hell of hunger. What has the English Bishop of Chelmsford, and his 50,000 supporters, to say now since the Bolsheviks have found out that his reactionary Church colleagues in Russia have themselves been utilising religious treasures for political and counter-revolutionary purposes? How well did Marx penetrate the thick skin of the theologians when he contended that:—"The Church will more readily pardon an attack on 38 of its 39 articles of the faith than on a 30th part of its income."—Editor Communist Review.

matter. In the centre of the crowd a hot discussion was going on, and one could hear the word "counter-revolution" very much bandied about. A big round-faced Red Army man pleaded with the people, "Comrades, you won't see anything, only boxes, please go away comrades, there is really nothing to see." Everybody agreed with the soldier's heartfelt appeal, but everybody waited quietly to see the boxes. The soldier sadly returned to the doorstep to sit down and console with a gun. I tried to imagine a London policeman appealing to the people as comrades, and the sympathy of the people with the soldier, and the soldier with the working people was of more worth than all the "boxes."

Out of the riots, public trials before the revolutionary tribunal took place, and the hand of Tikhon was clearly detected behind them. Sentences of death were pronounced, but this strong action produced no revulsion against Isyatie, but rather against Tikhon. The pro-Soviet leaders of the Church formed a deputation, not to plead, but to demand from Tikhon the calling of an All-Russian Church Congress, and his immediate abdication pending the decisions of such Congress. Tikhon, overawed by the course of events obeyed. And so the arena is now set for the transformation of the Russian Church, marking another defeat for the counter-revolution. We are going to have the Diet of Worms repeated, with the rôles of accuser and defender reversed; the Diet of Worms, "the second time as farce," coming after, not before, the political revolution. For as the master loved to say, "whereas in the bourgeois revolutions the phrase is far greater than the substance, in the proletarian revolution the phrase lags a long way behind the substance."

AN ANARCHIST ON RUSSIA *A Reply to Emma Goldman* BY WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD

EMMA GOLDMAN'S series of articles recently published and syndicated by the *New York World*, were mendacious in thought, malicious in intent, but relevant in purpose. It is Emma's desire to return to the United States, where she enjoyed the plaudits of an adolescent audience. The people of Revolutionary Russia are far beyond any radical ideas that Miss Goldman ever had.

The articles must be considered as they are intended, a gentle tapping of the lady at the doors of the United States. The doors which she, with a regretful whimper describes as locked and sealed. She is not angry at the United States, which she says "robbed her of her home and hearth," but is viciously mad at Soviet Russia, which gave her admittance, employment, shelter and sustenance. Is her reward to the Soviet Government any less than ingratitude?

Her egoism is for the time being satiated, in knowing that the mongers of sensationalism took advantage of her malignant attacks on Russia, and flambouantly peddled them all over the United States. She will protest a little under her breath to think that no Labour or Socialist papers or publications of radical tendency

have seen fit to reproduce her stories even in part. The fact is a vast majority of the workers of the United States are and will remain loyal to Soviet Russia and its revolution, notwithstanding the fact that Emma Goldman has hitched herself up with Sam Gompers, whose warped mentality has never conceived a constructive thought or nursed a radical idea.

Miss Goldman tripped up on the *World* articles, and has started to fall. When a woman falls, there is no telling the limit to which she will go. In my opinion there will be more articles, of the most scurrilous character from her pen, the instrument with which she is trying to pick the locks of the bourgeois doors sealed against her, while every word of the story she writes will condemn her in the minds of her erstwhile friends, who know that when she came to Russia that she was welcomed, and was assigned an important post by the Soviet Government, equipped with special cars and assistants, her duty being to collect the documents and relics of the revolution for the museum established by the Workers' Republic. Failure in this important work was due to inability, or perhaps, what is so prominent in so many Anarchists, lack of the sense of co-ordination.

Miss Goldman, unlike the Ibsen character she referred to, who untied a knot and unravelled the entire fabric, presents a skein more difficult to untangle. For example, she says, "How 'indecent' of the Russian people to light a conflagration which might have fired the whole world with revolution, just at the time when war profits were running high and Imperialism was so confident of complete triumph!" Then she twists herself into the assertion, "Perhaps the revolution was doomed at its birth, coming as it did on the heels of four years of war, which had drained Russia of her best manhood, sapped her blood and devastated her land. The revolution may not have had the strength to withstand the mad onslaught of the world." She truthfully proceeds, "The interventionists murdered millions of Russians, the blockade starved and froze women and children by the hundreds of thousands, and Russia turned into a vast wilderness of agony and despair." Then she, with more entanglements, contradicts herself, and the preceding statement, which the world knows to be true, by the following foolish remarks, "The Marxian policies of the Bolsheviki, the tactics first extolled as indispensable to the life of the revolution, only to be discarded as harmful after they had wrought misery and despair. This trust and antagonism were the factors that slowly undermined the faith of the people in the revolution."

After telling that the Russian revolution was doomed at its birth, fought by united capitalism of all countries, she tries to show that it was only the Marxian policies that weakened the strength of the revolution. Not entirely satisfied with this statement, which she knew to be false when she wrote it, she adds, "Counter-revolutionists, Right-Social-Revolutionaries, Cadets, and Mensheviks were the disrupting internal forces against Russia." She could have also truthfully said, "Anarchists of the Mahkno school, leader of the bandits," of which Emma seems to be a warm disciple. Something more will be said of the viciousness of this type of anarchist. Miss Goldman quotes from somewhere, "It was not against the Russian people, but against the Bolsheviki—they have instigated

the revolution, and they must be exterminated." This is given as the hypocritical attitude of the interventionists, but I ask if it is not exactly the thing she had in her heart to do with her miserable malignant stories.

After assigning several causes for the death of the revolution, first, that it was weakened unto death at its birth, then throttled by the interventionists, murderers who caused the blockade and starved and froze women and children by the hundreds of thousands, crippled by tactics that undermined the faith of the people, mortally wounded by the acts of the counter-revolution, she then blandly asserts, "The revolution was slain by the Bolsheviki." Attempts to prove that the Brest-Litovsk Treaty was "the first of all the evils," strangely saying that "it strangled the revolution"; blaming the ratification to Lenin, who demanded it as a breathing spell.

I have received from Trotsky his opinions on the Brest-Litovsk Peace, which I submit for the reader's enlightenment. The following are his words:—

"I have read the newspaper cuttings which you sent me containing the articles—the author of which apparently has not yet grown out of her infancy—discussing the Russian Revolution and the Brest-Litovsk peace.

"In one of the articles you sent me it is stated that I was 'opposed to the Brest-Litovsk peace, but I submitted to the discipline of the Party; that this Brest-Litovsk peace, which signified the trampling under foot of all the principles we have proclaimed,' was the source of all the misfortunes that have beset the revolution; that the civil war was a punishment for our 'treachery,' and that we surrendered Esthonia, Latvia, and the Ukraine to German Imperialism.

"Although it is inconvenient to give up some of one's time to criticise this childish prattle, one nevertheless must do so, for this prattle is published, and evidently somebody reads it.

"1. We signed the Brest-Litovsk peace because Germany had a mighty capitalist army, and we had not then a revolutionary army. The Brest-Litovsk peace may be regarded as a betrayal to the same extent that the acceptance of unfavourable conditions by workers after an unsuccessful strike may be regarded as a betrayal.

"We 'betrayed' Latvia and the Ukraine. But was it possible for us at that time to free them? If so, in what way? And why does our magnanimous but stupid author confine her commiseration for Latvia and the Ukraine? Why does she not demand that we should have liberated Germany itself, and several other countries which were then groaning and which are still groaning under the oppression of Imperialism?

"As a matter of fact, it was with the greatest effort that we managed to retain part of our territory at the time when German militarism, at that time omnipotent, seized the other part.

"2. Why did I oppose the Brest-Litovsk peace? The author states the case falsely. It is perfectly true that I, in complete agreement with our Party, did not sign the Brest-Litovsk peace, hoping that the German workers would not permit the Junkers to send their troops against Revolutionary Russia after the latter had openly declared that it would stop fighting and demobilise her army. Comrade Lenin regarded this step too risky, and thought that the Hohenzollerns would crush the Revolution before the German workers would rise.

"After my refusal to sign the peace treaty in Brest-Litovsk, the German army took up the offensive. We were quite impotent. What should we have done? We could either have thrown the half-armed flower of the working class against the Kaiser, and thus sealed the fate of the Revolution, or we could have accepted temporarily the noose of the Brest-Litovsk peace. We did the latter.

"Thus we did all we could. Disarmed as we were at that time, we refused to capitulate, and appealed for assistance to the German

workers, to the European workers, and to the working class of the whole world. But the Junkers' offensive commenced sooner than the assistance of the proletariat materialised. We had temporarily to capitulate in order the more surely to prepare the revolutionary 'revanche.' The class-conscious workers of the various countries understood the sense of our action in connection with the Brest-Litovsk peace. But the sentimental, anarchistic sheep, in bleating out her articles, did not trouble to think about historical realities, relation of forces, etc. It has its own tactics; in New York it bleats against capitalism, then it strays into Moscow, and there bleats against the treachery of the Soviet Republic, and then strays back again into the fold of the capitalist countries. It is much simpler to bleat against history than to take a real part in the making of it.

"3. All talk about the Brest-Litovsk peace being the cause of the civil war is not less foolish. The civil war was the result of the irreconcilability of interests between the victorious proletariat and the defeated bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie sought aid from the Germans and the Allies. A proletarian revolution is impossible without civil war. The intervention of one or another foreign army is only an episode in it. The statement that the Ukrainian peasant became hostile to the Bolsheviks owing to the Brest-Litovsk peace is all nonsense. On the contrary, under the oppression of the Junkers, Bolshevism in the Ukraine became the standard, not only of social, but also of national emancipation. All the insurgents began to call themselves Bolsheviks."

It is strange that Emma Goldman did not take issue with the Brest-Litovsk Peace before she left the United States. Perhaps she knew that criticising the Bolshevik revolution would not give her the same opportunity for exploitation as the means she resorted to. At any rate, it is a long silence from March, 1917, until March, 1922. It may be that, knowing that she was to be deported to Russia, she felt that silence was golden, while her collections were mostly currency and silver.

If Emma Goldman had been describing the famine area, one could understand what she meant when she speaks of only having seen one child in Russia who laughed. Because it is true that in that vast territory comprising several provinces, hunger has daily counted its tolls of hundreds of once smiling and laughing children. Starving children can't laugh. It is to be regretted that Emma could not have visited Sparrow's Hill, and seen there the thousands of children, boys and girls, robust and rugged, rosy-cheeked and beautiful in their remarkable collective exercise. Or have spent days at Pushkino, or some of the many hundreds of similar communities throughout Russia, where the summer homes of the bourgeoisie are turned into children's colonies. At one of these homes I saw between forty and fifty of these little tots just after their bath, romping and rollicking, laughing and full of glee, a sight that would please the heart of almost any man or woman. Too bad that Miss Goldman could not have visited the Moscow River within the environs of the city, where on summer days anyone could see the naked boys and girls at play enjoying a plunge in the water. She should have met the children that Mary Heaton Vorse had temporarily adopted while here, Little Demitrus and his friends would have been other laughing children to her credit. It is a great loss to think that she did not visit Children's Town. There the babes are learning, as they do in play, the advantage of association and solidarity. It is possible that Miss Goldman might have learnt, even from the little ones, that rules of order, discipline and self-government are the essentials of a socialised community. Miss Goldman would mention in the same breath men of such splendid

character and attributes as Lunarcharsky and Gorky, comparing them with that crooked little politician, Judge Linsay, who conducted the Juvenile Court in Denver, Colorado, and who only by the efforts of the officials of the Western Federation of Miners was prevented from sending little boys, who for delinquency were dealt with in his court, to work in the beet fields of Colorado, there to take the place of Russian emigrants who seasonally migrated from industrial centres for that work.

Emma admits, "More and more I came to see that the Bolsheviks were trying to do all they could for the children, but that their efforts were being defeated by the parasitic bureaucracy their State had created." She does not explain that the Soviet government, which is trying to do all it can for the child has been compelled to depend largely upon teachers of the old régime. These and their cohorts are the parasites of which she complains, but of them she makes no mention.

Lunarcharsky, the head of education, and hundreds of splendid Communist women, among them the wives of Zinoviev and Radek, are striving for the children's sake to for ever entomb the "dead souls," and to correct other detrimental influences. Miss Goldman knows, but she does not write about the hundreds of children that daily starve to death in the United States, the many thousands that go to school hungry every morning—this in a country with an abundance of food! Russia with one bountiful harvest, and the children of this great Republic will come into their own.

Russia is an agricultural country where 87 per cent. of its vast population are engaged in the farming industry. This great multitude of people prior to the revolutions was dominated by an absolute monarchy. A large number of the workers and peasants were either slaves or serfs, physically to the Tzar, nobles and landlords; mentally to the Greek Catholic Church and priests. Now it is different, as a direct result of the Bolshevik revolution, with the slogan of All Power to the Soviets, these people are free men and women.

In the terrible days of privation and actual starvation, where millions have succumbed to famine and disease, the Soviet Government has done all within human power to relieve the situation and to succour the people. They have done that which only a socialised government could do—they have appropriated the gold, silver, and jewels of the churches to buy food for the perishing. They have garnered the grain from all quarters of the Republic to provide seed and sustenance.

Were it not for the blockade of the ports and borders by unscrupulous capitalist nations, civil war precipitated by the same powers, counter-revolutionary plots, of disgruntled anarchists, monarchists, cadets, and social-revolutionaries, millions of lives could have been saved. Four years of devastation and bloodshed would have been turned into four years of reconstruction and service. Russia would have been the guiding star, which she is destined to be, for the oppressed of the world.

In Russia there are no *trade unions*. Miss Goldman to the contrary notwithstanding. There are more than 7,000,000 organised workers, millions of whom have been united under the guidance of Communists. It is true that for a time membership was compulsory. The open shop policy had no footing in Russia. The

union is likewise open; there are no restrictions to membership. Dues are deducted, as a small percentage was from the rations of members. Are not the miners of the United States fighting for the check-off, to deduct dues, fines, and assessments from the pay of members? It is compulsory that all men employed shall be members, where the miners are organised.

In Russia the dues are deducted by the union and used for the benefit of the membership. No per capita is paid for the formation of an appendix like the A.F. of L., which is not even a reliable mouthpiece. In Russia labour is paramount, the unions are "schools for communism"; some anarchists and no capitalists like the idea. Educational and cultural courses are provided. It is likewise the proud boast of Russia that in a comparatively short time there will not be an illiterate man in the army.

The unions control their magnificent buildings. The ownership of all the buildings is vested with the government. Streets, boulevards, academies, vessels, etc., are in many instances dedicated to labour and its stalwart champions. The mighty labour forces of Russia are united through the various unions of industry, sections of which are developing into labour trusts. These, in their initial efforts are supported by the Soviet Government. The membership is being educated and is rapidly learning the practical methods of industrial administration.

Emma Goldman, after her experiences in the United States, after two years under the Soviet Government, ventures the assertion: "I was never more convinced of the truth of my ideas, never in my life had greater proof of the logic and justice of anarchism." Kropotkin, speaking, says: "We anarchists have talked much about the revolution, but now many have ever taken pains to prepare for the actual work during and after the revolution? The Russian Revolution has demonstrated the imperativeness of such preparation of practical reconstructive work."

Lucy Parsons, widow of the martyred anarchist, Albert Parsons, severely criticises Emma Goldman because she sold herself to the capitalist press of the United States. She characterises the Goldman articles in effect as a rehash of the supercilious vapourings of capitalist reporters.

The following excerpts of a letter which Miss Goldman has read, written by a former anarchist, shows that she has received better advice than her vagaries would indicate.

"And the Revolution is 'Bolshevism.' History has written it, and you or I cannot unwrite it. The world is split into two divisions now for battle, for war. In war dictatorship wins and nothing else can win. Dictatorship is bad, so are gut-ripping bayonets bad, but dictatorship and bayonets win for one side or the other, and there are only two sides. From now on there can only be the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat until the bourgeoisie is exterminated (as a class). You can call it 'the dictatorship of Communist Politicians' if you like, and that won't alter the case in the least; the revolution is going to proceed, and the dictatorship of the proletariat is going to exterminate by force, and with what you may call 'injustice,' the property-owning class, as a class, and all that unconsciously serves the property-owning class by opposing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"When it is all over with, shall you say that you have not taken part in the great final struggle, because you did not like the way life decreed that the struggle should be? Or do you imagine that the revolution is going to take some other form than the dictatorship of

the proletariat against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie?

"I know you look with horror and disappointment upon my comparative unconcern with the fate of the men I knew in the past as revolutionists, and who are threatened with being crushed by the revolutionary trend which they oppose. You will not look out and see that a hundred times as many as they, better men than they, die in a single day of the revolution, and you will not see that their opposition costs the revolution a hundred times as many lives as theirs. I know that they are sincere. So were the Left S.R.'s. So was Kerensky. So was Babushka (Breshkovskaya). For the fate of sincere people I, too, have regard; but I can only give them a glance or a minute while the revolution is going on, and when the revolution is threatened I cannot give them that. I know ten times as many as they who are sincere as they, and who are dying day by day for the revolution. The follies of those first mentioned are costing the lives of the better men, better in the sense that they serve the revolution better. I am not moralising; no man is better than another in the abstract. One is better than another only for a specific purpose; and during the revolution, the Revolution is the only purpose that I can value things for."

"A good sample of 'revolutionary individual initiative' is the Kronstadt affair. I have given it a little study since I saw you last. There is no question that if the Kronstadt affair had not been wiped out, it would have resulted in the downfall of the Soviet Power. There is no doubt that many of the participants who called themselves Anarchists and S.R.'s were sincere in their notions. *Subjectively* they were doubtlessly highly moral revolutionists. But *objectively* it was a filthy counter-revolution. I don't give a damn for the moral values. The counter-revolutionary officers came over from Finland (protected by the Finnish Government!) and joined the anarchists and the S.R.'s and the Mensheviks. The French Navy lay outside the frozen area, waiting for the 'Anarchists' (who could compromise enough to associate with Cadet officers), to hold Kronstadt until the ice would break and let the French and British battleships fight for 'Soviets without Bolsheviks!' Yes, that is a fine example of free and easy 'revolution' without discipline. The fellows that did this crazy thing, killed thousands of the best and youngest and bravest of the soldiers that the revolution had. And yet there are people who call themselves 'Anarchists,' and ask me to pity the fellows who were responsible for the Kronstadt affair. Monks that poulder in their cells on the misfortunes of man in general can pity them, I have not time to pity such men.

"There are people calling themselves 'Anarchists' that are now saying that Kronstadt was the real 'Revolution.' If such people were to be allowed to operate with 'free speech' and 'free demonstration' within the circle that is held by the bayonets of the Red Army, the revolution would be dead now, and here would reign the 'democratic freedom' and pogroms of Capitalist Hungary, with Wrangel, Semnoff, Pilsudski, Harding, Briand, and Lloyd George guaranteeing you your 'freedom of revolutionary initiative.'"

Miss Goldman heard Bukharin at the Congress of the Red Labour Union International tell of some of the counter-revolutionary deeds of the anarchists in Russia. In the October days of '17 anarchist groups sprang up in the Soviets, having neither programme nor slogan of their own, were carried along by the hurricane of the mass movement. Their actions are recorded in a Communist document. "It was the terrible crisis of the spring of 1918 the anarchists began to counter and oppose the efforts of the Soviet Government, who, realising the needs of the country, were endeavouring to re-establish industry. Systematically they opposed the decrees of the Communist Party, undermined the discipline of labour, also took advantage of many disgruntled rich farmers and dissatisfied speculators, organising them into groups both in village and town, under the black flag of anarchism. When that criminal Keburie robbed the All-Russian Land Union and was arrested the anarchist groups in Moscow demanded his release."

White Guards and interventionists, finding the "anarchist" belief identical with their own, began to finance and assist them in their exploits. This sort of "anarchist" forgot to have their representatives in the Soviet; all they were concerned with was plunder. Mahkno and his anarchists believed in no discipline but their own, indulged in excesses and debauchery. He joined forces with Denikin in the drive north, and at the time these forces were within seventy miles of Moscow a bomb was thrown by anarchists into the Communist Party Executive offices, on Leontovsky Place, resulting in the killing of twelve responsible workers and wounding of fifty-five others, many of whom were employed in the factories of Moscow. Among the injured was Bukharin, editor of *Pravda*, whom many workers in the United States will remember when he was on his speaking tour in that country. The dead were Tram-conductor Ignatova; Volkova, department store girl; Zargoski, twenty years connected with the revolutionary movement; Razerenov-Nikitin, engraver; Nicolaef, secretary of the Railroad Workers' Union of Moscow; Titov, moulder; Kryptov, an old teacher; Haldina, aged 18, communist girl worker; Safonov, moulder; Kvasha, one of the first organisers of the Sabotnik (voluntary Saturday work); Kolbin and Tankus, worker-students of the Sverdlov University.

The "anarchist" Mahkno is mentioned by Emma Goldman as a friend and sending food to Kropotkin. In a diary of Fedora-Gianko, the wife of Mahkno, are recorded facts and dates to show that these marauders were guilty of arson, train-wrecking, murder, robbery, all committed against the Soviet Government. By them workers were killed, villages destroyed, bridges blown up, wrecks caused by wild engines turned loose against approaching trains, until Mahkno was driven from the country. This kind of work against the Soviet Government meets with the approval of Miss Goldman. Her heart was never with the Bolshevik revolution. Compelled to leave the United States, she came to Russia as there was no other place to which she could go. Friends have not cut her off; she has excommunicated herself.

Pen Pictures of Russia

By JOHN S. CLARKE

One of the Most Popular Books about Soviet Russia.

Now in its second edition

PRICE

4/6

Communist Party, 16, King Street, London, W.C.2

EGYPT & THE ENTENTE

BY J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD

THE GENESIS OF IMPERIALISM

IF one was endeavouring to put one's finger upon the specific causes which led to the breakaway from the Liberal Party of that considerable fraction of monied magnates and industrialists who formed the backbone of Liberal Unionism one would have to ignore, in large measure, the generally accepted explanation that it was occasioned by Gladstone's Irish policy and look very much further back than 1885.

The really critical year was not 1885. It was 1875. That was the year in which the approaching collapse of Egyptian finance became obvious; when the British Government, acting through the Rothschilds, acquired the Khedive Ismail's holding of Suez Canal shares; when the Ottoman Government defaulted upon its loans. That was the year when the British Government, under pressure of the creditors, had to intervene and exercise diplomatic influence on their behalf both in Cairo and in Constantinople, but particularly in Cairo.

The diversion of shipping from the Cape route, where Britain's power was established, to the Suez Canal route required that British influence should become paramount between Port Said and the mouth of the Red Sea.

The menace of French governmental intervention with a view to gain control of the Suez Canal waterway and the railways of the Egyptian delta necessitated the abandonment by Britain of her traditional policy in that part of the world. Whatever tendency, whatever factors have even a semblance of altering the *status quo* in India or on the approaches thereto become instantly the grave concern of the rulers of this country.

The triumph of the cotton merchants and manufacturers in the sphere of government, signalled by the rise of Gladstone to the Premiership, altered their attitude of passive hostility to a policy of expansion. The opening up of India after 1857 by the construction of railways and the entry of Glasgow and Liverpool merchants and shipowners into the commerce of all the seas from Zanzibar to Singapore and from Koweit to Kobe made an immense difference in the outlook of those who dealt in Manchester goods.

The completion of railway building in this country and the commencement of foreign competition in the supply of iron and steel resulted in a severe depression in the rail market during the "seventies." The price of iron rails fell from £9 18s. 2d. to £5 per ton, and of steel rails from £12 1s. 1d. to £5 7s. 6d. in the years between 1874 and 1883.

Whilst British pig-iron production rose between 1870 and 1884 a matter of 31 per cent., foreign production rose 138 per cent. New railway facilities made available to the steel masters of Pittsburgh the fabulous ore reserves of Lake Superior, and new technical processes rendered it possible to make into basic steel the hitherto useless phosphoric ores of Lorraine. German and American steel manufacture went rapidly ahead. British rail makers, as well as British contractors, had to look elsewhere than on the Continent

or in the United States for a market capable of absorbing their output of material.

Now, as early as 1856, the Ottoman Government had granted to a British syndicate a concession to build a line from Smyrna to Aidin. This was followed, in 1863, by a concession to another group, for a short line from Smyrna to Cassaba, which, later, was extended to Alacheir, the main depôt of the Anatolian carpet trade. In 1871 concessions were granted for lines, one to run from Haidar-Pachar, opposite Constantinople, which should, eventually, reach Baghdad, and the other from a Sea of Marmora port up country. Neither of these schemes proceeded very far.

When, in 1874, the British promoters stopped the construction, French interests advanced £500,000 to the Ottoman Government on the guarantee of the revenues of a line to run from Haidar-Pachar to Angora.

CONCERNING CYPRUS

This was the beginning of the incessant squabbles that have since ensued as to who should or should not railroad Asia Minor.

It is interesting to learn from one of the great railway promoters of the 19th century, Sir Edward Blount, that—

“Perhaps the chief reason why Disraeli took Cyprus was that that island lay opposite the approach to the Euphrates Valley from the Mediterranean. That railway would have provided swift communication with the East, and would have carried our troops to India in much less time than is now required.” (*Memoirs of Sir Edward Blount*, pp. 108-9.)

The Euphrates Valley Railway, often discussed during the “seventies” and “eighties,” never came to anything, because “our Government, in the end, refused, as usual, a guarantee.” It was that project, however, abortive as it was, that gave to Britain the otherwise useless island of Cyprus, the chief material accompaniment of “Peace with Honour,” brought back by Disraeli from the Congress of Berlin. British capitalism, at this time, however, took but an occasional and inconsequential interest in projects of railroad construction in the Near East for the very good reason that its pre-occupation with the regions whence it derived its raw cotton, wool, corn and other foodstuffs led its investors to assist in the building of railroads, if not in India, then in the United States, Canada, and South America. Britain’s statesmen and their military and naval advisers saw in every scheme for connecting India with the Mediterranean or for improving the communications of either Turkey in Europe or Turkey in Asia a means to assist Russia to hasten her armies’ advance upon the Dardanelles or to help France to conquer Syria as a preliminary to an assault on the outworks of India. They had command of the sea and, in consequence, desired that all traffic should pass under the guns of the British Navy. Considerations such as these caused Britain in the imperialist period to throw every possible diplomatic obstacle in the way of the promoters of the Baghdad Railway and to encourage, instead, the idea of a railway from Cairo to the Cape. Hence the most important railway promotions of the “sixties” and “seventies” having to do with the Ottoman Empire were put through by interests either wholly or predominantly French in inspiration and in financial backing.

THREE MEN OF MYSTERY

French capital—that of Baron Hausmann and the Société Générale de Paris—was placed at the service of the Khedive Ismail for the building of the railway across the Isthmus of Suez. French capital was also the main fund upon which the notorious *Baron de Hirsch* drew for his unscrupulous project of a railway to join up Vienna with Constantinople and Salonica. This Baron de Hirsch deserves more than a mere passing commentary. He was the first of three adventurers whose romantic careers have added new tales to the myths and legends of the East. He was the first of three characters, of three personalities, who, in their days and generations, were on all men's lips. First was *Baron de Hirsch*. Second was *Sir Ernest Cassel*. Third was, and is, *Sir Basil Zaharoff*.

Baron de Hirsch, the herald of that great army of railway promoters, public works contractors, and shady financiers who have, at one time or another, plied their peculiar callings at Constantinople, was associated with the same financial house as Sir Ernest Cassel. Sir Ernest Cassel was associated in his manipulations at Constantinople with the same firm of armament contractors and financiers as Sir Basil Zaharoff.

There is visible a definite connection between the three "mystery" men. There has been behind each, in his time, the same lurking presence. It has been disguised with consummate skill. But conceal their tracks as they may, the most cautious of capitalists cannot mask their identity for all time from those of us who search for them with the applied science of the materialist conception of history.

Baron de Hirsch was the son-in-law of Senator Bischoffsheim, the senior partner in the great international financial house of *Bischoffsheim, Goldschmidt and Co.*, of Paris, London, and Brussels. Bischoffsheim's were of German extraction, and the founder of the firm came to Paris from Mayence, via Amsterdam and Antwerp. Bischoffsheim, Goldschmidt & Co. were concerned in the formation of the *Société Générale de Paris* in 1863, and the *Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas* in 1871. They had powerful connections in Amsterdam, Antwerp, Frankfurt and Liverpool. They were associated with the Seligmans in the promotion of the *London and San Francisco Bank*. Like with the *Erlangers*, the *Oppenheims*, and the *Goschens*, they belonged to a group of Jewish financial houses whose home-town was Frankfurt-on-Main, but which was two generations younger than the Rothschilds and one generation younger than and in opposition to the group constituting the *Crédit Mobilier Français*. These firms seem to date from the Germany of the "48," when they turned away from the Prussian State, relying as it did on the bankers of Berlin, and towards Brussels, Paris and London. They struck their roots deep into the Californian goldfields and into San Francisco commerce. They financed the cotton trade of Germany, France, and Belgium. They established themselves as bankers or as loan agents in Turkey.

The Bischoffsheim's had their affiliations with the *Sterns* of Paris and London, and, what was much more important, with the *Ralls* of Alexandria, Marseilles, and Constantinople. It was as "freelance" of this house of Bischoffsheim, Goldschmidt and Co. that Baron de Hirsch executed one after another of the brilliant financial *coups* with which, in the "seventies," he startled the world in

general and the railway interests in particular.

"Though only a clerk," says the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, "he soon became the master-mind of this great international banking house. Still, although he was the son-in-law of the senior member of the house, he never became a partner. . . . Having inherited from his father and grandfather a considerable fortune, which was largely augmented by his wife's dowry, he embarked in railway enterprises on his own account in Austria, the Balkans, and in Russia."

In Russia he acted in collaboration with a war contractor and profiteer, *de Gunzburg*. It was through these two, *de Hirsch* and *de Gunzburg*, that Belgian investors acquired the earlier of those huge interests which, in these days, make the Belgian Government the bitter opponent of the Soviet régime.

In 1869 *Baron de Hirsch* obtained his concession from the Ottoman Government to construct a railway 2,000 kilometres in length through the Balkans. The syndicate actually built only 1,274 kilometres. It received 14,000 francs per kilometre from the Turks for construction, and when it was handed over the latter had to spend another 27,000 francs a kilometre in making it fit to use. *Hirsch* gave, in return for the grant, a loan to the Government. The amount with which the Turks were debited was 792,000,000 francs. What they actually got was 254,000,000 francs.

Hirsch passed on the concession to a Franco-Austrian syndicate at a substantial profit. Such was the origin of the *Orient Railway Company*. It was the one and only incursion of *de Hirsch*, as a principal, into the sphere of Turkish railway finance. After that experience the Turks returned to the habit of dealing with the Imperial Ottoman Bank and its Parisian and London associates.

MONEYLENDER—BY APPOINTMENT

The second adventurer of the series, *Ernest Cassel*, the well-known "empire-builder," also commenced his career in the house of *Bischoffsheim, Goldschmidt & Co.* Senator *Bischoffsheim's* mother had been a *Cassel*, and it can, therefore, readily be understood how it came about that, in the days of his firm's pre-eminence, *Ernest*, son of *Jacob Cassel*, banker, of *Cologne*, came to receive his training in the arts of international banking in this firm's employ.

"Born in *Cologne*, after working at *Brussels*, *Liverpool*, and *Cairo*, *Sir Ernest Cassel*," says the *Economist* (31/12/10), "first became prominent in *London* in connection with the firm of *Bischoffsheim*, through which he came into contact with the late *Baron de Hirsch*, and with the American firms of *J. H. Schiff* and *Kuhn, Loeb & Co.*" *M. Poulgy*, in *Les Emprunts de l'Etat Ottoman*, says of him that—

"English by nationality, banker to the King himself, his influence had no bounds in *England*."

The *Economist* described his business as "purely personal," and "neither exactly that of a bank nor of a general financial house." His particular sphere of activities, we are told, was—*Egypt*.

Now *Bischoffsheim's* had been interested in the formation of the *Franco-Egyptian Bank*. This was the concern out of which, in 1889, grew the *Banque Internationale de Paris* which, in its turn, joined forces with the *French Bank of South Africa* to form that powerful promotion of *M. Rouvier*, i.e., the *Banque française pour le Commerce et l'Industrie*. This latter bank appears, from other

indicators in this and other connections and directions, to have been one of the most important material interests inspiring the understanding between Britain and France known as the *Entente*.

The first mention of Sir Ernest Cassel that I have been able to trace occurs in a document relating to the re-incorporation as a limited company of what had formerly been the chartered *Bank of Egypt*. In the list of the seven original subscribers, dated April, 1887, Ernest Cassel appears as of "no occupation." Associated with him were representatives of the financial families of *Glyn* and *Grenfell*. In the first full share-list there occurs, also, the name of a young man called *Nathaniel Charles Curzon*. This was just at the time when a coalition of Liberal-Unionists and Conservatives, forming the first Salisbury Government, together with a Court clique, led by the late Dukes of Argyll and Fife, were, with the encouragement of the late King Edward, then Prince of Wales, initiating the new Imperialism.

EGYPT THE KEY OF THE EAST

The financial advisers and the other public and semi-public functionaries who appeared in Egypt's administration at that time and subsequently were now in Egypt, then in Turkey, and again in India. To show how closely the officialdom of what was, avowedly, a dependency conformed to that of what was, nominally, something less than a protectorate and of what was, again, a sovereign and imperial state, we will take a few representative cases.

Lord Cromer, for instance, was, in 1880, Financial Member of the Viceroy of India's Council, and from 1883 to 1907 H.M. Agent and Consul-General in Egypt.

Lord d'Abernon was from 1883 to 1889 Financial Adviser to the Government of Egypt, and from 1889 to 1897 Governor of the Imperial Ottoman Bank.

Sir Vincent Caillard was from 1883 to 1898 British representative on the Ottoman Debt Council, and in 1898 appointed to the directorate of the National Bank of Egypt, whilst *Sir Henry Babington Smith*, secretary to the Viceroy of India from 1894 to 1899, became British representative on the Ottoman Debt Council in 1900, and in 1909 was made President of the National Bank of Turkey, and is now Chairman of the Mortgage Company of Egypt, Ltd.

There is overwhelming circumstantial evidence to show that Britain has been working "according to plan" in the Near East, and that behind her officialdom and operating and inspiring them has been a clique of cosmopolitan financiers themselves, the agents of interests, yet further in the rear.

The finance, the diplomacy, and the arms of the British Empire have been slowly but surely penetrating the territories of the Ottoman Empire and the Persian Empire until, to-day, they are, in great part, "mandates" of this country, governed by officials from India and in course of development by British financial interests.

How the system worked was summed up very nicely in *Near East*, December, 1910:—

"The name of Cassel will be indissolubly associated with the modern history of Egypt. . . . His influence there in the last few years of Lord Cromer's régime was said to be almost supreme, and to his credit is due the financing of the mighty Assouan Dam. . . . Sir Ernest was instrumental in the forma-

tion of the National Bank and its offshoot, the Agricultural Bank, while he was also interested in the purchase of the Daira Sanieh Estates from the Government."

THE EMPIRE-BUILDERS

The whole project of the construction of the Assouan Dam and its accompanying irrigation works was conceived not in the interests of the fellahen of the Delta, but of the loan-mongers of London and Brussels, the land mortgage holders and estate owners of Cairo and Alexandria, the fabulously wealthy merchants who traded in the cotton and corn of Egypt.

The works were estimated in 1898 to cost nearly £5,000,000. They were to reclaim one-third of the land of Egypt. Two-thirds of the land was, in 1899, yielding £20,000,000 of rent, and this one-third was only yielding a little under £2,000,000. It was calculated that the direct ultimate return to the Government would be £750,000 a year, and that "the increased value of the crops would represent ten times that sum."

The Khedive's Government, in 1898 and 1899, was very busy granting concessions or selling properties to syndicates who, in return, were supplying loans for the construction of the irrigation works, for the improvement of the Sudan and for clearing off the outstanding expenses of Kitchener's campaign in the Nile Valley.

To pay for the works the Government borrowed the money from the Cassel syndicate, and, in return, it sold the Daira-Sanieh estate to this syndicate "at a price equivalent to the outstanding amount of the loan, £4,310,000" (*Economist*, 25/6/98).

Associated with Cassel were Belgian and other financiers, notably *M. Suares*, a promoter of the *Crédit Foncier* of Egypt, of several railway, water, and other public utility companies, and the owner of great sugar refineries in the Delta region.

In 1898, Sir Ernest Cassel and Glyn Mills Currie Co. were setting up, under Khedival concession, the *National Bank of Egypt*, and the former was, in conjunction with Belgian and other foreign capital, buying up the Daira Sanieh estates in the Delta. In 1899 Cassel and his associates were advancing money to build the dam. In 1902 the *Agricultural Bank of Egypt* budded off from the National Bank as a means "to enable the cultivators to get out of the clutches of the usurers who swarm in the interior of Egypt." Six years later, in 1908, Cassel founded the *Mortgage Company of Egypt, Ltd.* It was commenced under the most illustrious auspices. The first chairman was none other than *Viscount Milner*.

The largest shareholders were *Sir Ernest Cassel*, *Lord Revelstoke* (head of Baring Brothers and a cousin of Lord Cromer), the *Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas*, and the *Société Générale de Paris*.

This may be said to have marked the culmination of the economic penetration and subjugation of Egypt. It will be noted that, founded four years after the *Entente*, British and French banks were co-operating in the venture.

THE LORDS OF THE EAST

Not only were the two French banks, most cosmopolitan in character, and having traditional associations with the Bischoffsheim, Goldschmidt group, working in conjunction with Cassel. The *Banque Internationale*, connected with the Gunzburgs, and having intimate relations with financial circles in Brussels and London, was also operating in Egypt on behalf of French capitalism. Cassel

was notoriously on the closest terms of intimacy with King Edward and the British imperialists. Rouvier, the Radical Minister of Finance in France, who was in the Government when the *Entente* was being cemented, was the man who welded the Banque Internationale, operating in Egypt, and another French bank, operating in South Africa, into one of the most powerful financial houses in France. The de Gunzburgs and the Sassoons are closely connected. The former were powerful in Petrograd. The latter were intimate with King Edward VII. Both are mixed up in Belgian high finance.

These were, it is clear, favourable to the new orientation of national interests which brought together Britain, France, and Belgium into one political alliance. These were the interests which strengthened, if they were not, indeed, the actual progenitors of, the *Entente*. *Again, we would reiterate it, the Entente was built upon an understanding about Egypt, a country in which 46 per cent. of the investment capital, in 1918, was French, 37 per cent. was British, and 10 per cent. was Belgian.*

for at least two generations, unknown to all but a few, famed financiers. Whilst the French *rentier* and the Belgian investment banker and industrialist had been attracted to Egypt, there to sink their money in State loans, in land mortgage, in public works, in tramways, and in sugar factories, the British capitalists, native and naturalised, as true heirs of the Palmerston tradition of trading with and travelling through Egypt, monopolised a great part of her commerce. In 1913 46 per cent. of Egypt's exports and 37 per cent. of her imports were to or from the United Kingdom. All other nations were far behind.

The staple commodities of Egypt are cotton and corn. The biggest dealers in these staples are, in Egypt as in India, the mighty masters of merchandise and hence of money, that money with which, for at least two generations, unknown to all but a few famed financiers have juggled. They are the uncrowned and little recognised but very real masters of the British East, and, incidentally, of Greece—the house of *Ralli*.

VOLUMES ONE AND TWO OF THE Communist Review

*Bound separately in strong cloth covers and indexed
may be obtained, post free, for*

PRICE **5/6** PER VOLUME

¶ Order from any Labour Bookseller

BOOK REVIEWS

IMPORTANT NEW PUBLICATIONS

THERE are a number of books which have been published recently at a low price which are worth the notice of Communists. First among them comes *The Second and Third Internationals and the Vienna Union* (Labour Publishing Co.). This shillingsworth looks, by weight and size, much more like a half-crownsworth. It is the full report of the abortive conference on the "united front." From it we can learn, to our own satisfaction, who broke their promises, what was the pledge about the "S.R.s.," was it unconditional, and so on. Moreover, this is worth reading, not because of its matter only (most Congresses deal with something of importance, but their reports are deadly dull), but because of Radek's wit and liveliness in knocking Ramsay Mac and Vandervelde. Poor things, how they squeak!

Of a different character, but of remarkable value, is another shillingsworth from the same company, the Labour Research Department's *Labour and Capital in Engineering*. This is so very good that it should be one of the first things that every A.E.U. man with a job should get. The reason for the recent employers' onslaught here has not to my knowledge been stated with exactness anywhere before the appearance of this. It is shown (to take only one of their examples) by the Birmingham Small Arms balance sheet. "This shows a total increase [on £1,632,718] in the capital since 1913 of £7,100,070, OR 435 PER CENT. . . . The Chairman of the B.S.A. Co. himself stated that . . . considerably less than half the capital increase had been expended on plant." It has been expended on buying out or closing down, at three or four times their value, rival firms. We have, therefore, firms whose nominal capital is four or more times the real value of the plant they work with, who expect "war-time" dividends of at least six per cent. This fantastic rate of profit can only be obtained in one way—by an enormously increased exploitation of the workers.

The third book which has come to me for consideration is a little booklet called *Imperialism*, by K. M. Panikhar (Akra Company, Madras).

It is a work which is very completely done, and a similar simple, short exposition is badly needed over here. Jackson's *British Empire*, of course, is something, but it is much too small (and the lazy clod didn't even read the proofs). For us the chief interest in this book lies in watching the way the author—an able Oxford-educated moderate bourgeois nationalist—lets show unconsciously the future aims of an *Indian* imperialism. For example, on page 83 he lets us see that all Eastern Africa is going to be the first claim.

One section deserves special praise—Chapter V., "Christianity as an instrument of Imperialism." Altogether a good and stimulating little book; whether copies will ever be available over here I don't know, but more than one of us would care to have an account of Imperialism as an Indian thinker sees it.

The fourth book is not a book, but the offer of a book. As usual, it comes from the *Plebs*—which we welcome in its new 48-page form. If sufficient orders—250—can be booked in reasonable time, it appears that a limited number of Phillips Price's great 18s. history of the Russian Revolution will be available at 6s. (postage 6d.).

Six shillings is, of course, fully seventy-two pence to the average worker nowadays. But if it is any way possible, everyone should do his very best to get hold of this really valuable work. In mere size, in closeness of type and matter, the book is something of a bargain. The quality of its contents turn it into an "absolute must." Price has lived through the Russian Revolution. He did not, like John Reed, write a short dazzling sketch, a magnificent film record of ten days. What he modestly calls "*My Reminiscences of the Russian Revolution*" are really a serious and deeply thought-out history both of the events and the fundamental causes. The book is, in its time and execution, similar to the *Civil War in France*, and is so much the greater and more important as the events it deals with are greater and more important. And if there is higher praise possible than that, I do not know it.

R. W. P.

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW



America

Clothing Workers help Russia

AN interesting new form of international co-operation on the part of labour is the million-dollar company sponsored by the amalgamated Clothing Workers of America to operate a concession of Russian textile and clothing factories from the Soviet Government. This union is a radical body, and is not affiliated with the American Federation of Labour, although it has successfully organised the men clothing workers of United States and Canada. The enterprise will be conducted on a business basis, and represents the first large-scale attempt on the part of Americans to co-operate in Russia's economic development. The corporation is called the Russian-American Industrial Corporation, and, at the outset, will concentrate its activities on the development of the textile and clothing industry in Russia. Later on, according to the organisers, it will expand its activities to other industries.

Sidney Hillman, President of the Amalgamated, brought back with him from Russia last summer an agreement signed by Lenin for the Soviet Government for the concession of six clothing factories in Petrograd and three in Moscow, all in active operation, provisional upon the raising in the United States of a fund of at least \$1,000,000. Mr. Hillman laid his plans before the recent Convention of the Amalgamated at Chicago, which made an initial appropriation of \$60,000 for investment in the enterprise. William O. Thompson, a lawyer of Chicago, former President of the American Cotton Oil Company and of the N. K. Fairbank Company, and former member of the Board of Arbitration of Hart, Schaffner and Marx, is acting as financial adviser for the corporation.

Money raised by stock subscription in America will be used for the purchase of equipment and supplies, so that the Russian clothing factories may substantially increase their output. Not only will workers be asked to subscribe, but also all those in any way interested in the industrial development of Russia. Once the capital is raised, the agreement between Mr. Hillman and the Soviet Government provides for the prompt use of the money in the manufacture of clothing and textile products in the nine factories covered by the concession. Dividends will be paid at rates to be set in accord with the economic status of the enterprise. All earnings over 10 per cent. will be devoted to extending its activities.

The enterprise is to be managed by the Supreme Council of National Economy of the Soviet Government and by the American corporation, each side commanding an equal number of votes irrespective of the number of representatives. A central board will be set up charged with the general administration and technical management of the enterprises. The Soviet Government transfers to this board the physical properties of the factories in Moscow and Petrograd, together with raw materials, and provisions are made for Government priority orders in order to assure uninterrupted production. These orders will call for the production of clothing for civil servants and workers. According to Amalgamated officials, it is not planned to send American operatives to Russia.

"Russia," said Mr. Hillman yesterday, "has plenty of operatives. Seven thousand are now at work in the factories covered by the concession. The corporation will send over a staff of highly trained experts familiar with up-to-date clothing pro-

duction methods. There is every reason to believe from the reports that we have received from technicians who have investigated the clothing industry in Russia that with the help of these experts and with the funds raised in this country, the project will, beyond doubt, be successful. I went into the clothing industry in Russia. Quite a number of people whom I happened to know over here are working there. There is a great understanding in Russia of labour, and I know that I am taking great chances of being criticised here when I say that we have not got that understanding. Their thought is not destructive. The idea of sabotage, the idea that it is the purpose of labour to see how little it can do, is not found there. It is in Russia that labour appreciates that work is not something that one has to undergo as a punishment, but that work is something to be proud of. It helps build the world, and because the world is built by work and not by the fellows who quibble in the legal profession. Labour understands its mission in Russia, and its mission in life is to build. There labour has learned to accept an iron discipline, because it realises that no army can be successful in this struggle against life and against the other enemies unless it is disciplined."

It is planned to sell stock in the new corporation in ten dollar shares, and provisions are being made to prevent control of the stock by any group of individuals. Committees are being formed throughout the country by organised workers and other groups interested in Russia's problems, and mass meetings will be held to promote the enterprise.

In Other Lands

CHINA

THE centre of the working class movement in China is still Canton. A great movement has developed among the Chinese workers in the province of Huan-Dun for universal suffrage (a new demand in China). At the demonstration organised in Canton women workers also took part.

The workers in Canton have also carried on a determined struggle with the Chinese speculators—organising demonstrations and appealing to the whole of the population in the struggle against them.

The working class movement is also making rapid strides in other provinces. According to the *Shanghai*

Workers' Weekly new trade unions have been organised in Han-Su, Shan-Si, Tchzhe-Tsyan and Sin-Tsyan. In the middle of April a conference of the trade unions was held in Chu-bei, in the valley of the Tan-tzei, in spite of the fact that the "Municipal Council for Foreign Concessions," protecting the interests of the world capitalists, had demanded the disbanding of the conference, no matter where in Chu-bei it might be held. On April 15th demonstrations of workers and students were organised in Shanghai to help the starving in Russia. Six thousand workers took part in these demonstrations. A number of successful strikes have been carried out. In Sva-tou, in the north of the province of Huan-Dun, the workers won a strike for a 30 per cent. increase in wages. In Hong Kong the workers are demanding an eight-hour day. The miners in Madyao-Chen, in the province of Che-Nan, have declared a strike for better treatment and increased wages. The workers in the Chinese-Japanese paper factory in Shanghai have declared a strike with economic demands—5,000 workers took part. The sailors on the lake vessels of the province Huan-Dun have won their strike. The postal workers in Shanghai have declared a strike for an eight-hour day, for an increase of wages by 20 per cent.—1,000 workers took part. The Chinese workers have protested against the decision of the Japanese government to expel Chinese workers from Japan on account of the growing unemployment. An All-China Workers' Conference opened in Canton on May 1st.

The most popular monthly is the *Youth*, a communist organ edited by the leader of the Communist movement in China, Professor Chen-du-Sin. Its sale is prohibited in Peking and in Shanghai. The *Labour and Science* is the organ of the Communist men and women students group of the Peking Teacher's Institute. The *Day* is the organ of the Communist club in Shanghai and is published twice monthly. In the April number there were articles on "The Proletariat and Literature," "The Economic System of Soviet Russia," "Socialism and the People," "The Philosophy of Tolstoy," "Destruction and Construction."

NORWAY

There is much discussion in the Norwegian Communist Party regarding the question of the united front.

On May 23rd, 24th, and 25th the question was discussed in the Christiania branch of the Communist Party, in which members of the Central Executive Committee and of the Parliamentary faction took part. The following resolution of the extreme left was carried: "Whilst sharing the point of view of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the question of the united front we declare that the realisation of the principle of the united front in Norway can and must signify the consolidation and massing of all working class movements (namely, chiefly the trade unions) around the Norwegian Labour Party (officially known as the Norwegian section of the Communist International). This work we have been carrying on, and must continue to carry on with ever growing energy. Our aim is to make the Norwegian Labour Party the *only working-class organisation in Norway*. Closer relations must be established between the Executive of the party and the general secretariat of the trade unions both in the centre and in the localities. In actual practice we already have the united front in Norway—for the party and the trade unions are almost fused into one organisation. The Labour Party in Norway, like the British Labour Party, includes the trades unions. We are against all union or common work with the social democratic party, which only in April of this year united with the bourgeoisie against us in the by-elections at Vestfold. . . . We base our tactics on the resolution of the 1918 conference, and we have no intention of departing from the policy then laid down." This resolution received 126 votes, whilst one proposed by the executive and the parliamentary faction, emphasising the need for a united front and recognising the possibility of united action with the Social Democrats only under exceptional circumstances received 17 votes, and one moved by the Young Communists, in which amongst other things they say: ". . . As in Norway the vast majority of the working class follow the Communists and only one insignificant minority follow the Social Democrats, we consider it of first importance to unify the whole of the working and unemployed masses, as also the poorest peasantry and fishermen around the watchword and demands of the Norwegian Labour Party, which must become the *only workers' party in*

Norway, uniting all the labouring masses"—this received 37 votes.

Recently a whole series of trade union conferences held in Christiania, have decided in favour of breaking away from Amsterdam and joining Moscow.

The union of railway workers, which until recently was the backbone of the social democrats party, also decided to break away from Amsterdam. This is considered by the whole Norwegian press as a great victory for the communists. Most of the unions have decided in favour of greater decentralisation in their organisation.

In all the sports societies and associations in Norway (and there are a large number of these) communist nuclei are being formed.

DENMARK

Recently there occurred a conference of the Danish Federation of Labour, at which the old leaders received a vote of confidence by 200 by 63 against, with 300 abstentions. The Executive Committee in its report pointed out the critical position of the trade union movement. The membership of the unions has fallen from 278 thousand to 244 thousand in the course of two years. The chief problem of the leaders appears to be the struggle against the rise of communist ideas in the trade unions. "We collected for the famine-stricken peasants of the Volga," says the report, "but we did so not because we sympathise with the Soviets, but out of love of humanity—we have collected 90,000 crowns, a disgracefully small sum."

The Federation declared its solidarity with Amsterdam.

The president of the Danish Russian Society, Waldemar Jacobsen, writing in the *National Tidende*, suggests that the Danish Government should give an advance to those Danish capitalists who have suffered loss in Russia during the revolution!

SWEDEN

The Swedish employers started last year a frenzied struggle with the workers for lower wages. As a result: during March-May of this year new wages agreements were reached, according to which in comparison with 1920-21 *miners'* wages have gone down 25 per cent. in the Norland mines, and by 40 per cent. as compared with the maximum wages in other places.

The time rates are 1.60-1.80 crowns per hour for miners and 84-90

yere for other workers.

In the building trade wages have gone down 25-33 per cent. of the 1921 wage up to October, after they will go down by a further 13-15 per cent. Compared with the maximum wage of 1920 the decrease will be 45-50 per cent. The time rates vary between 80 yere per hour in Skone and 75 yere in the rest of Sweden. After October 1st this wage will go down another 10 yere. In the pottery works the decrease compared with the maximum for 1920 is 35-40 per cent. up to July 1st, when it will fall to 45-50 per cent. The time rate is 97-78 yere per hour. In the timber industry compared with 1921 the decrease is by about 36 per cent., but in comparison with the maximum of 1920 it is 46 per cent. On an average these workers earn 78 yere an hour, together with free housing and fuel, which may be reckoned at about another 10 yere per hour.

In the cellulose trade, in comparison with 1921, the decrease is about 40 per cent., in comparison with 1920 by 50 per cent. Similar decreases have taken place in the wages of the workers in the following industries: Paper, sugar, tailoring, artificial manure preparation, electrical manufactures, also of port and other workers. In all these reductions affect 200,000 workers.

From February 1st to April 30th the number of unemployed in Sweden has decreased by 38,000, but still there are 124,700 unemployed in Sweden. The Riksdag has granted 85,000,000 crowns asked for by the government for the relief of unemployment. The Left Social Democrats and the Communist Party pointed out the insufficiency of this sum, the former proposing 115 million, the latter 150 million crowns. The Riksdag approved the work of the commission on unemployment (which is a much more reactionary body than the Government) and supported it as against the government proposals. But the S.D. Government has not resigned.

LITHUANIA

The rise in the cost of living has led to the outbreak of strike waves every few months—these are not properly organised, and are usually repressed by the aid of the government, which adopts every repressive measure at its disposal, from court-martial and concentration camps to the attempt to break up the unity of the workers by stirring up national hatreds among the workers. The railway trade union has been sup-

pressed as the result of the railway strike.

On May 13th the representatives of the trade unions, the International workers' group, and of the Social Democratic Party sent a declaration to the presidium of the Constituent Seim and the president of the cabinet of ministers, in which they say: The position of the workers is very hard on account of the rise in the cost of living—the government has done something recently towards improving the lot of the officials and clerks, but not of other workers; on the contrary, when the workers, whether in private or State enterprises, are forced to strike they are put down with the help of the militia and by a cruel policy of repression. To prevent the workers defending their interests by an organised struggle the government has been keeping the country under martial law for two years. It represses the workers' organisations and pretends that purely economic struggles have a political and traitorous nature. Such a policy only sharpens the antagonism of the workers to their exploiters and makes still worse the economic position of the country. We make the following demands: (1) The workers of Lithuania must be guaranteed freedom to strike and to organise, liberty of the press and speech; (2) the state of martial law must be abolished; (3) the strike of the railway workers must be ended by granting their demands. Those arrested during the strike must be liberated and sent back to their work—there must be no victimisation; (4) the government must regulate food prices and must only then permit their export when the workers and the poor have been fully supplied at prices they can afford; (5) all books, documents, press premises and property confiscated by the government agents must be restored immediately to the trade union organisations. If the above demands are not granted the Lithuanian workers will find ways and means of fighting for their rights in spite of all repression. The Social Democrats give a time limit for the reply of the government, and their future action will depend on the nature of this reply.

On April 23rd the conference of the above party was held in Kovno.

Financially the party is in a bad way. Its total budget is 700,000 marks—a series of measures were proposed to remedy this.

THE RED CALENDAR

- June 11. Plenary session of the Executive of the Comintern ends.
11. Fight between German Monarchists and Communists in Königsberg.
14. Vandervelde abandons Moscow trial.
14. Reds expelled from the International Union of Woodworkers.
15. Executive of Vienna International meets in Frankfurt.
16-18. Anarcho-syndicalist Conference in Berlin unsuccessful.
17-19. Conference of the Second International in London.
19-25. German Trade Union Congress in Leipzig.
20. Big demonstration in Moscow against the Social-revolutionaries.
21. Fight between striking coal-miners and blacklegs in Herrin, Illinois, U.S.
22. Albert S. Inkpin released from prison.
24. Rathenau murdered in Berlin.
24-27. General railway-strike in Austria.
25. General strike of Italian metal-workers begins.
26. Congress of French Red Trade Unions (C.G.T.U.) opens.
27. Hague Conference between Soviet Russia and the capitalist world opens.
27. 12 hours' general strike and big demonstrations in Germany.
27-30. Labour Party Congress in Edinburgh; affiliation of Communist Party rejected.
28. Irish civil war. Fight in Dublin.
30. Berlin printers' strike begins.
30. French C.G.T.U. decides for the R.I.L.U.
July 1. 400,000 American railway shop men on strike.
2. National Council of German Independent Socialists (U.S.P.D.) agrees to unite with Majority Socialists.
4. A further 12 hours' general strike and big labour demonstration in Germany.
4. Dombal, Polish Communist M.P. trial opens in Warsaw.
5. Italian General Federation of Labour (C.G.L.) gives 250,000 votes out of 1,100,000 for policy of working with Communists.
7. Conference of the Workers' International Relief Committee opens in Berlin.

HAVE YOU READ THIS BOOK ?

“Communism & Society”

By WM. PAUL, Editor of Communist Review

200 PAGES PACKED WITH FACTS

PRICE 2/9 POST FREE

From Communist Party, 16 King St., Covent Garden, W.C.2