

# L. Trotzky: On Pacifism and Revolution.

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6 No. 45

# PRESS

3rd June 1926

# CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. -- Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schlessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

## CONTENTS

A. Lozovsky: The British Miners Holding Out!  
The Solidarity Action in the Soviet Union for the British Miners.

### Politics.

Karl Radek: Napoleon IV.  
P. R. Dietrich: Second Phase of the Fight against the  
Röber-Campaign of the German Ex-Princes.  
L. Trotzky: On Pacifism and Revolution.  
Habaru: The Change of Government in Belgium.  
Iran dust: The Treaty between Turkey and Persia.  
J. B.: Zaghlul's Election Victory.

Jay: Lovestone: The U. S. Government and the Agricultural Masses.

### The Balkans.

D. Fabrian: The Parliamentary Elections in Roumania.

### Economics.

J. Duplex: The Negotiations for the Regulation of France's Debts to Great Britain.

### In the International.

G. Zinoviev: The Results of the Sixth Session of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. (Conclusion).

## The British Miners Holding Out!

By A. Lozovsky.

For more than three weeks a million British miners have been engaged in a fight. During the first ten days millions of other workers fought along with them, and the miners received the support of the whole of the organised proletariat of Great Britain. After the General Council betrayed them, the miners remained alone in the struggle against the mineowners and the infuriated bourgeoisie.

The General Council, as is known, has capitulated, without even consulting the miners. The panic however, which set in among the trade unions immediately after the capitulation has not extended to the miners. The miners are remaining unshaken at their posts and are continuing the struggle, in a less favourable situation but with such elan, with such determination and with such a belief in victory that the joy of the English bourgeoisie over the victory over the General Council has been followed by a bitter after-taste. The miners are holding tenaciously to their standpoint: **not a penny less, not a minute more.**

The General Council, as is known, in its shameful capitulation, not only clung to the coat-tails of Baldwin but also to the Memorandum of Sir Herbert Samuel. This memorandum served to demoralise the leading upper strata of the trade unions. This trial balloon of Samuel did not contain anything in particular; according to its proposals everything would be left to the decision of the "neutral" chairman of the wage-board; nevertheless it was hailed with great triumph by those people who were only seeking a pretext in order to abandon the struggle.

When, after the capitulation of the General Council, the Miners' Federation asked the government, how the proposal of Sir Herbert Samuel was to be interpreted, they received from the Prime Minister the reply that the Samuel Memorandum did not bear any official character, and that if the miners had accepted it under the impression that the government would do the same, an extremely difficult situation for all interested parties would arise.

Baldwin has again carried out a clever manoeuvre. When it was a question of creating even greater demoralisation among the already demoralised upper section of the trade unions, he put forward Sir Herbert Samuel and his memorandum as a feeler. The latter dignitary, who "stands above the classes", declared that he only spoke in his own name, but gave the leaders to understand that this declaration had only a purely formal character and that the government naturally held his standpoint. When the General Council called off the strike the government openly declared that they had nothing whatever to do with the attempt of Sir Herbert Samuel, although the latter was Chairman of the Coal Commission.

All the complicated proposals, both of the government and also of the mineowners, regarding the question of settling the conflict in the mining industry, rotate round one axis: reduction of wages and lengthening of the working day. The miners will neither agree to the one nor the other, and are determined to hold out even if they remain on strike for months. This is no idle boasting on the part of the English miners. They have already

proved their fighting capacity and endurance, and not only the working class but the bourgeoisie also know that the miners are not in the habit of making play with empty words, but when they say that they will fight, they fight to the end.

The miners who in the year 1921 fought for thirteen weeks are now faced with the prospect of an even longer strike. Why? Because wages have reached their lowest possible level; a further reduction of wages would place them on the level of paupers. **Things cannot go any further.** This is how the position is regarded by the leaders and the simple fighting miners. That the fight will be a long drawn out and bitter one is already to be seen from the very fact that the miners have held out after the capitulation of the General Council.

What are the General Council now doing in view of the continued struggle of the miners? What is their standpoint? They are now engaged in complaining against Baldwin, they are "exposing" the insincerity and disloyalty of the English Cabinet. Their main occupation consists however, in the attempt to wash themselves clean in the eyes of the working masses. They do not believe in supporting the striking miners nor in rallying the hundreds of thousands of workers who have been thrown on to the street. They are all worrying their heads over the single question: **how they can represent the capitulation and the grovelling as an honourable "compromise", how they can disguise the naked, unadorned truth with smooth words.** The General Council now intends to convene a Conference of the Union Executives in order to explain the motives leading to the capitulation. But why did they not convene this Conference **before** the capitulation? Obviously they had no time, they had to hasten to Baldwin and, as a token of respect and of loyalty, present him with the calling off of the general strike.

Certain members of the General Council are now issuing appeals in which they seek to encourage themselves. Thus **George Hicks, Ben Tillet** and **A. B. Swales** have published a declaration in which they expose the government which "endeavoured to misrepresent the logical meaning of our act as being one of surrender" and characterise the government comments on the acts of the General Council as "meanly false" and a "cowardly travesty of the truth". We believe that the authors of this declaration are mistaken: the government estimates the situation more correctly than the General Council. It would be false if one were to represent the matter as if there had been no capitulation and that nothing had changed after the negotiations between the General Council and Baldwin.

Moreover, the declaration of these three members of the General Council is incorrect when it states that the "stupid insistence of the employers to force an admission of wrongful acts was more a sign of their weakness than of ours". That is a false and dangerous illusion. The employers have succeeded in compelling a number of trade unions to admit that their actions were wrong and to promise not to take part in any solidarity strike in the future. There exists no reason for wishing to hide this sad truth by empty words. One must have the courage to say to the workers that the **capitulation of the General Council**, the abandonment of the fight without a serious and tenacious struggle rendered possible a magnificent victory for the bourgeoisie. It will not help the workers in any way when the members of the General Council declare the defeat to be a victory.

In addition to this attempts are being made to justify the General Council and their tactics. "Left" leaders have already been found who appealed to the workers not to criticise those responsible for the defeat.

**Lansbury** wrote an article in the "Sunday Worker" in which, no doubt from honest motives, he appealed to the workers to **forget all and to forgive all.**

Forget what? That the strike was called off by the General Council? Can the millions of workers forget this fact? Should they forget it? If they forget it now, the same story will be repeated on the next occasion.

Pardon? Whom? **Thomas, MacDonald, Henderson** and those "Left" members of the General Council who went with Thomas? If they are forgiven what guarantee will there be that they will not once again repeat this shameful comedy? We do not believe that the slogan of a general pardon will find much sympathy among the British workers. We do not believe that the slogan "forget and forgive" can solve the questions which are now agitating the working masses of England. **Woe** to the English workers if they forget what happened during the General strike and forgive those people who led their army of millions to defeat.

We will see how the British workers will reply to **Lansbury's** sermon. Let him deliver his sermon to the miners, he will then learn how the workers appreciate his christian exhortation. The miners did not believe for a moment in the promises of **Baldwin**. They knew the value of all the machinations of **Sir Herbert Samuel**.

The miners are holding out after the capitulation. They are manfully and determinedly carrying on the fight and, with the help of the international proletariat and of the advanced section of the British working class, will carry it on to a victorious conclusion.

## Solidarity Action in the Soviet Union for the British Miners.

Moscow, 23th May 1926.

The Secretary of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the U. S. S. R., **Dogadov** in an interview to the press concerning the action of support for the British miners which is being conducted in the Soviet Union declared the following:

The General Strike and the miners lock-out in Great Britain caused the greatest interest and enthusiasm amongst the working class of the Soviet Union. The Central Council of Labour Unions decided, together with the Central Committees of the various labour unions, to contribute a quarter of a day's wages to the funds for the striking workers. A commission was elected and instructed to take the necessary sums, according to need, from the trade union reserve funds and from other resources of the unions in order to assist the British workers as quickly as possible. In actual fact however, the workers very often decided to give a half day's wages. According to temporary and conservative estimates we shall be successful in collecting 3 million roubles in the whole of the Soviet Union.

When the struggle in Great Britain was in full force the Central Council of Labour Unions was of the opinion that immediate help was necessary, and its Presidium decided on the 5th May to send the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress 250,000 roubles as a first instalment of the coming collections. Shortly afterwards it was decided to send another two million Roubles from the resources of the Central Council and the Central Committees of the Soviet Labour Unions. The most active representatives of the British bourgeoisie who were already excited enough through the strike itself issued statements concerning "Russian money", "Russian agitators" etc. in order to discredit the strike and at the same time to aim a blow at the workers of the Soviet Union by daring to support the British workers. The letter of **Tweed**, the chairman of the British Association of Creditors of Russia which was published in the "Times" and in a number of other papers followed the same aims and declared that the money which was sent to the General Council was taken from British credit. **Tweed's** contention is based on the fact that the financial report of the Central Council shows that it was not in possession of any such sum as was sent to the General Council. Recently the Central Council has in any case not issued any financial report. The labour unions are however strong enough to send assistance quickly to the striking British workers without having to call in the help of the credits. The general financial situation of the Labour unions of the U. S. S. R. is no secret for the foreign trade union organisations which receive the information bulletin of the Central Council of the Russian Labour Unions.

At the same time **Dogadov** gave the press representative information about the state of the treasury of the Central Council and the Central Committees of the Labour Unions of the U. S. S. R. On the 6th May 1926 the bank account of the Central Council showed 1,520,300 Roubles to the good. On the 1st April it was 5,500,091 roubles. Considerable funds belonging to the provincial departments are not included.

# POLITICS

## Napoleon IV.

By Karl Radek.

Moscow, 27th May 1926.

The telegrams regarding the first steps of the "dictator" Pilsudski and of the government set up him make an impression upon the reader as if, by some chance, in the radio reports regarding the English strike, couplets out of an opera or a Café Chantant had been sandwiched in.

Pilsudski arranged a military mutiny, for several days fought against the government troops in the streets of Warsaw, destroyed the Junker school and forced the President of the Republic, along with the Prime Minister, to escape over the railings of the government residence. And now, after such an application of constitutional measures, Pilsudski declares: I am being urged to become dictator, but all my life I have never loved and respected anything so much as constitutionalism.

In an interview with some journalists he declared that he was faced with the dilemma, either to proclaim the dictatorship as had been demanded of him, or to attempt to legalise the accomplished fact. Out of pedagogic considerations he had chosen the second course: he wishes to teach Poland to leave everything to one man. On the 31st of May he would convoke the National Assembly i. e. the joint session of the Senate and the Sejm which would have to elect the President\*). He will, as becomes a good democrat, guarantee the inviolability of this assembly.

There is no doubt that people will be found who look for a hidden motive in the actions of Pilsudski: Pilsudski, they will say, wishes once again to demonstrate the incapacity of the National Assembly to save the country; all the anti-dictatorial declarations of Pilsudski are empty gestures which are only intended to result in his being implored to take over the dictatorship. It is not impossible that the plan of the political advisers of Pilsudski is of this character, but it is more probable that we are dealing here with a typical, political absurdity on the part of this hero of our time. What can better characterise him than the declaration which his adjutant gave to the representatives of the foreign press:

"Social causes did not underlie the movement begun by Pilsudski; the Marshall considers the overthrow of the Witos government not as politics, but solely as an act for saving the honour of the country. He stands on the basis of absolute legality; he did not aim at revolution, he did not know where his action would lead to. He marched into Warsaw with a band, and it was not he who gave the first command to fire."

In these weeping, groaning, assertions there is revealed not only the illiteracy of the adjutant, but Pilsudski himself.

He embodies in himself not the idea of the fight against the class of big landowners and against clericalism, whose chains the Polish people have not yet thrown off. Neither does he embody the idea of the fight of the courageous Polish proletariat for Socialism, nor the idea of the fight of the Polish bourgeoisie against Socialism. What then does he represent?

He represents the necessity of some sort of historical heritage, of some sort of historical legend without which the bourgeois State cannot exist. The English have the legend of being the bearers of peace and civilisation. The French live on the legend of the "Great Nation". The Germans point to their great industrial role. All these legends have a certain basis in fact. What legend however could the Polish bourgeoisie adopt?

During the partition of Poland Polish idealism created the belief in the future of Poland from its sufferings. And the best people of the Polish nobility fought on the barricades of all the revolutions in Europe. But over fifty years have elapsed since that time; the Polish bourgeoisie can no longer point to the fact that General Wrublewski fought in the ranks of the Paris

\*) Since the above was written the meeting of the National Assembly has been held, at which Pilsudski was elected as President with 292 votes against 193 received by Bninski. After the closing of the National Assembly Pilsudski made a written statement in which he declared that he would not accept election. Ed.

Communards against the troops of Versailles, for the Polish bourgeoisie has received its State from the hands of Versailles. But the legend of the constancy to the fight for independence is necessary. As its incarnation there appears on the scene of history, Marshall Pilsudski, the last Mohican of Polish romanticism.

That which was his tragedy and which led to his bankruptcy in 1905, that which drove him to swear allegiance to the Emperor of Austria, the fact that no living class of capitalist Poland fought for independence, serves him now as a pedestal. He has the monopoly of the title of fighter for the independence of his country. He is, so to speak, the only man among the whole people who had conducted the fight for its independence. Who can help making a hero of him? All the poets have set to work and made him a hero. Poland which was not created on the basis of the fight of the classes, but which sprang up like a spark from the ruins of the Tsarist and of the German Empires, required a national emblem, and for this only Pilsudski was available.

But there is nothing more annoying for a hero than when he does not meet his death mounted on a war horse, but has to sit behind a broken down nag on a dung cart. Pilsudski made out of the realistic profession of the soldier a new and enlarged edition of the legend of the knightly sword. After he took the leadership of the State out of the hands of the compromising government of the workers and peasants in 1918, he handed power over to the bourgeoisie in order to retain the army for himself. He did not realise that a democratic army is impossible if the State is reactionary. And when the Polish bourgeoisie were convinced that they no longer required the legend of Pilsudski as a bulwark to protect them against the demands of the mass of the people, they threw him out of the army and proceeded to purge it of all democratic and revolutionary elements.

The incapacity of the Polish bourgeoisie to overcome the economic and political difficulties, created tremendous discontent among the broad masses. Pilsudski was able to get a portion of the army into his hands, but he would only be able to retain them if he also got the State into his hands. For this purpose one must have the support of the masses of the people. When the White Russian soldiers proceeded to the bayonet attack against the junkers who guarded the Belvedere, they cried out: "Down with the Pans!" It was not the legend of the wizard Pilsudski who had created the country out of nothing, that drove them to the struggle, but class hostility. But Pilsudski has none of this hostility against the bourgeoisie and against the big landowners. He therefore does not know what to do. Therefore he today arranges a fight over Warsaw and tomorrow he calls upon those who have fought against each other, to show mutual love.

The dictator Pilsudski is a joke of world history, jokes however, do not last long. In History there have been fools on the throne, for even a fool can inherit a crown if he has only been born in a royal bed. But the Cromwells and Napoleons only come into the world in great historical struggles as the bearers of the will of great classes. But a great class does not place the dictator's mantle on the shoulders of a fool.

## Second Phase of the Fight against the Robber-Campaign of the German Ex-Princes.

By P. R. Dietrich (Berlin).

The movement in support of the expropriation of the former Royal Houses without compensation, which was initiated and led both politically and organisationally by the Communist Party, is now entering its second stage. The Government has fixed for June 20th the plebiscite concerning the Bill introduced by the German Communist Party and the German Socialist Party.

According to the law regulating plebiscites, 50% of the votes cast in the preceding election of the Reichstag must be cast in favour of the Bill in order that it may become law. This means 20 million votes. Even the reactionary Press admits the possibility of this number being registered.

The recognition of this eventuality has called forth a large-scale counter-offensive on the part of the Monarchist parties

and associations against the plebiscite. The monarchist parties proclaim a ruthless terrorism against the ballot and are preparing a *coup d'Etat* to prevent by means of violence the carrying out of the expropriation of the nobility. The chief role in the counter-action is being played by the United Fatherland League, which is the general organisation embracing all legal and illegal Fascist organisations and which is supported by the German Nationalists and the German People's Party. In the same front with this organisation is the Government itself, at the head of which is the leader of the Centre Party, Marx, who was put up by the "Republican Parties" in opposition to Hindenburg as candidate in the presidential election. Marx, the prototype of a thorough-paced Central Jesuit, recently declared in a Government proclamation in the Reichstag that the fundamental attitude of the Government to the Bill concerning the uncompensated expropriation of the Princes upon which a plebiscite was to be held, would in no way be affected by the change in the Government. This means that the Cabinet, with the "Republican" Marx at its head, is just as much opposed to the uncompensated expropriation of the Princes as was the Cabinet formed by the Monarchist Luthier, and that it will endeavour, in conjunction with the reactionary parties and organisations, to prevent its execution. Stresemann has recently confirmed this statement unequivocally. He declared to a conference of the Press that should the Bill be accepted, no government would be found to put the law into effect.

This declaration of the German Chancellor indicates the attitude of the Centre in regard to the plebiscite. In an official resolution of the party council and the Reichstag fraction of the Centre, the party leaders have declared against the plebiscite in opposition to the workers supporting the Centre. By means of a resolution of the party council the Democratic Party has left its members free to vote as they wish in the plebiscite. This resolution is attributable to the constantly increasing opposition of the Democratic voters and, more especially, to pressure from the Democratic Youth organisations.

The Social-Democratic Party is entering into the fight for the plebiscite with very mixed feelings. It was only under strong pressure from the Social-Democratic workers that the Social-Democratic leaders were compelled to add their support to the referendum. They did everything in their power to sabotage the creation of a proletarian united front against the predatory aims of the princes and the threatened monarchist reaction.

Wels, Müller, Scheidemann and Dittmann would have much preferred a solution in the form of a compromise with the bourgeois parties. They are fully aware that the fight for the uncompensated expropriation of the princes is at the same time a stubborn fight against the monarchist parties as well as against the People's Party and the Centre. Such a fight is by no means welcome to the Social Democratic leaders because it endangers the prospects of the big coalition for which they are working. That the Social Democratic leaders have no desire to jeopardise their relations with the so-called "middle parties", i. e. the present government parties, is further proved by their attitude to the Marx Cabinet. Although Marx has declared himself to be a pronounced opponent of expropriation without compensation, although he has stated that the flag decree of May 6th, by which the monarchist flag was again adopted and which led to the fall of the Monarchist chancellor Luthier, will remain unrescinded, although the Marx Cabinet continues the Luthier Government's home policy against the workers — the foreign policy need not be mentioned, in this regard for the Social-Democrats laud the policy of Stresemann as the result of their "socialistic foreign policy" — the Social-Democratic Reichstag fraction, together with the bourgeois parties, supported the vote of confidence in favour of the Marx Cabinet. By supporting the vote of confidence and opposing the Communists' no-confidence motion, the German Socialist Party granted a lease of life to the Marx Cabinet and, therefore, is responsible to the whole of the working class in Germany for the policy of this Cabinet.

From this attitude of the Social-Democratic Party it is evident that they will not fight seriously for the uncompensated expropriation of the princes, either now in the campaign of the plebiscite or later for the execution of the law, when, after a successful plebiscite, the Government and the president will be able to put it into operation.

It will be seen that the Communist Party, is the only party which is exerting the whole of its power for the carrying out of the referendum. Several proletarian organisations have

ranged themselves alongside the Party, and at the head of these there is the Red Front Fighters League, which in the campaign for the referendum worked with the Party as leader and supporters of the mass movement which should culminate in the plebiscite.

The fight for the uncompensated expropriation of the princes which is being conducted by the Communist Party is steadily developing into a fight for power between the bourgeoisie and the working-class. The opposing fronts in this struggle are very clearly defined. On the one side there are gathered under the leadership of the German Communist Party the working-class and millions of impoverished petty bourgeois and small peasants; on the other side, the whole of the bourgeoisie from the industrial magnates of the Rhine and the junkers of the Elbe to the Liberal traders. The development of the plebiscite movement up to the present is a classic example which in the course of the fight for the plebiscite will make it comprehensible to every single worker that every struggle of the working-class commenced on the basis of petty bourgeois democracy must of necessity become a revolutionary battle which will burst the framework of democracy, when it threatens the class interests of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie and their Government have declared the plebiscite to be incompatible with the constitution. In spite of this, the plebiscite is being carried out upon the basis of the constitution; this means that, if the plebiscite is successful, a pretext is furnished for the strengthening and further extension of the *coup d'Etat* policy of the monarchists and big capitalists; if, on the other hand, the plebiscite fails, petty bourgeois democracy would be forced to capitulate still more, while the offensive of reaction against the working class would be intensified.

The Communist Party is not permitting the German working-class to cherish any illusion that a numerical victory in the plebiscite would be any guarantee for its being carried out, and insists that this is only possible through revolutionary methods, through the fight of the united proletarian front in alliance with the broadest masses of the working people. In this knowledge the German Communist Party will persevere in its efforts to promote the will to unity of the German working-class and to consolidate the proletarian united front. Even though the united front of the proletariat still embraces only a minority of the German working-class a steady growth of the front is observable. This growth is shown by the numerous mass demonstrations of recent months, by the strengthening of the Red Front Fighters League, the influx of unorganised workers into the trade-unions and the increasing confidence of the masses in the Communist Party.

A very striking illustration was the Whitsuntide Rally of the Red Front Fighters League, which constituted one of the most forceful and impressive demonstrations that the workers of Berlin have yet witnessed. Hundred of thousands of Berlin workers took part in this gathering, in addition to Red Front Fighters from all parts of the country who had come to Berlin even at the cost of great privations and serious sacrifices. Never before had Berlin seen such a storm of enthusiasm among hundreds of thousands of people as the march of the Red Front Fighters called forth. Never before had the will to unity found such tremendous expression as upon the occasion of the Red Whitsuntide Rally, Reichsbanner delegations marched in the procession of the Red Front Fighters and Social-Democratic workers cheered the march-past of the Red Front Fighters League.

The Red Whitsuntide Rally of the Red Front Fighters League showed that the bourgeoisie and their accomplices in the camp of the German Socialist Party and the trade-union bureaucracy will not be successful in breaking the proletarian united front which is embracing ever increasing masses.

The Red Whitsuntide gathering in Berlin was a mighty prelude to a victorious plebiscite. Just as the masses of the workers came forward unitedly in the demonstration in Berlin and impressively proclaimed their will to fight, the working masses of the whole of Germany will rally under the leadership of the Communist Party and proclaim their determination to fight for the execution of the expropriation without compensation of the princes in the interests of the millions who during the war and in the post-war period were haunted over to extreme misery and poverty.

## On Pacifism and Revolution.

By L. Trotsky.

The following article is part of a longer essay written by Comrade Trotsky in answer to the criticism of **Bertrand Russell**, the British pacifist, on Trotsky's book "Where is Britain Going?" The article was written on May 3rd, i. e. immediately before the outbreak of the general strike.

The peculiarities in Great Britain's development are chiefly due to its insular position. The clearest expression is given to these peculiarities by the part which the British Navy plays in the fate of the country. At the same time the British Socialists, who accuse us of lack of understanding for the hidden or undefinable peculiarities of the British spirit, forget, when discussing the question of the proletarian revolution, to mention so clearly definable a quantity as the British Navy. **Russell**, who speaks so ironically on the support given by the Soviet Navy, does not say a word about that navy which, even under the **MacDonald** Government was augmented by light cruisers.

It is a question of the conquest of power in a country where the overwhelming majority of the population belongs to the proletariat. Success in this direction must have its political basis in the will of the proletariat to seize power at any price, even at the cost of great sacrifice. Only a Party of the workers can unite the masses of workers in these their endeavours.

The second essential condition for success is a clear understanding of the ways and methods of the fight. Only a party whose eyes have been cured of pacifist cataract, can see for itself and make it clear to the proletariat that a real transference of power from the hands of one class to those of another depends to an incomparably greater degree on the British army and navy than on Parliament. **The fight for power of the proletariat must therefore be a fight to win over the navy.**

It is necessary that the seamen — not of course the admirals, but the stokers, electrical engineers, sailors and other workers know of and learn to understand the tasks and aims of the working class. All difficulties must be surmounted in order to find the way to them. Only by indefatigable, systematic preparatory work can a situation be created in which the bourgeoisie will no longer be able to rely on the navy in its struggle. Unless this condition is fulfilled it is nonsense even to speak of victory.

We do not of course for a moment imagine that the navy and the army would go over to the side of the proletariat in a bloodless fighting order in the first period of the revolution. This will not occur without deep internal convulsions within the navy. It is proved by the history of all revolutions. Convulsions in the navy in connection with an introduction of new blood into the Staff of command, involve inevitably a general loss of strength to the navy for a comparatively long period. This loss must not be left out of consideration. **The more determined the work of the leading party of the proletariat, the more difficult it will be for the navy to survive the period of crisis and of internal weakness.** The better the connection of the proletariat with the navy in the preparatory period, the more courageously it will act in the fighting period, the more clearly it will show all the oppressed that it is capable of seizing and maintaining power.

Only very slight injury can be done to the machinery of war of the ruling class by pacifism. This is best proved by the courageous but rather futile efforts of **Russell** himself during the war. The whole affair ended in a few thousand young people being thrown into prison on account of their "conscientious objections."

In the old Czarist army, the sectarians and especially the Tolstoians were often exposed to persecution because of their passive resistance to militarism; it was not they however who solved the problem of the overthrow of Czarism. In Great Britain also, the pacifists did not and could not prevent the war being carried on to the end. Pacifism turns its attention less to the military organisation of the bourgeois State but rather towards the masses of the workers. Among them, its influence is really disastrous; it paralyses the will of those workers who, in any case, do not suffer from a superfluity of that quality. It preaches the harm done by arming those who, as it is, are unarmed and are victims of class power. In the

present circumstances of British life, when the question of power is in the foreground, **Russell's** pacifism is thoroughly reactionary.

The papers reported that **Lansbury** recently called upon the British soldiers not to fire on the workers. Thousands of workers of both sexes who were present at the meeting, held up their hands as a sign of solidarity with this demand which indeed, it is difficult to reconcile with **MacDonald's** policy, though it marks a step forward on the path to revolution.

It would be very naive to imagine that **Lansbury's** demand opened the way to a peaceful, bloodless, pacifist solution of the question of power. On the contrary, if this demand should clear the way for reality, it would inevitably lead to violent armed conflicts. We must not think that all soldiers and all sailors will refuse at the same time to fire on the workers. As a matter of fact things happen in such a way that revolution drives a wedge into the army and into the fronts. The division would take effect in every company, every squadron, every warship. One soldier has already resolved not to fire, though it cost him his life; another hesitates; a third is prepared even to fire on those soldiers who refuse to fire. In the first period the number of waverers will be the largest.

How did things happen in our country in the years 1905-1917? The soldiers or sailors who, by deeds expressed their solidarity with the workers, were fired on by the officers. In the next stage, the officers were fired on by the soldiers who were carried away by the heroic example of their progressive comrades. These conflicts spread. A regiment in which the revolutionary elements prevail was faced by a regiment in which the power was still in the hands of the old commanders. At the same time the workers armed themselves, relying on the help of the revolutionary regiments. In the navy, affairs took a similar course. We would advise **Russell** and those who share his views to see the film "Armoured Cruiser **Potemkin**", which shows in a very telling manner the mechanism of a revolution among an armed throng. It would be still more important to show this film to the British workers and sailors. We hope that the Labour party will do so when it comes into power.

The bourgeois hypocrites and the civilised cannibals will of course speak with great indignation of our efforts to lead and stir up brother against brother, soldiers against officers. The pacifists will echo their words, they will repeat that we see everything in a blood-tinged light and that we do not know the peculiarities of Great Britain or realise the fruitful influence of Christian morals on the officers of the navy, the police and on **Joynson-Hicks**. This however will not hold us back. Revolutionary policy demands above all that we should look facts straight in the face and anticipate what direction further development will take. Revolutionary policy seems fantastic to the Philistines because it sees as far as the day after to-morrow, whereas they dare not even think of to-morrow.

In a period when the national organism in its totality cannot be saved by conservative means, but only by surgical intervention which removes the diseased organ, i. e. the class which has outlived its day, pacifist sermons, by their nature, arise from haughty indifference. In such a situation, the greatest "mercy" implies the greatest **power of decision** in order to shorten the agony and to reduce the suffering.

The American bourgeoisie will be all the less inclined to interfere in the fight, the more energetically the British proletariat seizes hold of the means and instruments of the British bourgeoisie. The American navy will have all the less possibility of overthrowing a proletarian power in Great Britain, the more rapidly and completely this proletarian power gets control of the British navy.

In saying this, we do not mean to imply that a military intervention on the part of the transatlantic republic is out of the question, on the contrary, it is extremely probable and, within certain limits, even inevitable. The result of this intervention however is closely connected with our policy before and during the revolution.

The behaviour of the French navy will have no small influence on a general blockade of the British Isles and above all on their isolation from the European continent. Can the French bourgeoisie send its ships against the proletarian revolution in Great Britain?

We possess a certain amount of experience in this respect. In 1918, **Millerand** sent French warships against the ports of the Soviet Republic in the Black Sea. The results are well

and associations against the plebiscite. The monarchist parties proclaim a ruthless terrorism against the ballot and are preparing a coup d'Etat to prevent by means of violence the carrying out of the expropriation of the nobility. The chief role in the counter-action is being played by the United Fatherland League, which is the general organisation embracing all legal and illegal Fascist organisations and which is supported by the German Nationalists and the German People's Party. In the same front with this organisation is the Government itself, at the head of which is the leader of the Centre Party, Marx, who was put up by the "Republican Parties" in opposition to Hindenburg as candidate in the presidential election. Marx, the prototype of a thorough-paced Central Jesuit, recently declared in a Government proclamation in the Reichstag that the fundamental attitude of the Government to the Bill concerning the uncompensated expropriation of the Princes upon which a plebiscite was to be held, would in no way be affected by the change in the Government. This means that the Cabinet, with the "Republican" Marx at its head, is just as much opposed to the uncompensated expropriation of the Princes as was the Cabinet formed by the Monarchist Luther, and that it will endeavour, in conjunction with the reactionary parties and organisations, to prevent its execution. Stresemann has recently confirmed this statement unequivocally. He declared to a conference of the Press that should the Bill be accepted, no government would be found to put the law into effect.

This declaration of the German Chancellor indicates the attitude of the Centre in regard to the plebiscite. In an official resolution of the party council and the Reichstag fraction of the Centre, the party leaders have declared against the plebiscite in opposition to the workers supporting the Centre. By means of a resolution of the party council the Democratic Party has left its members free to vote as they wish in the plebiscite. This resolution is attributable to the constantly increasing opposition of the Democratic voters and, more especially, to pressure from the Democratic Youth organisations.

The Social-Democratic Party is entering into the fight for the plebiscite with very mixed feelings. It was only under strong pressure from the Social-Democratic workers that the Social-Democratic leaders were compelled to add their support to the referendum. They did everything in their power to sabotage the creation of a proletarian united front against the predatory aims of the princes and the threatened Monarchist reaction.

Wels, Müller, Scheidemann and Dittmann would have much preferred a solution in the form of a compromise with the bourgeois parties. They are fully aware that the fight for the uncompensated expropriation of the princes is at the same time a stubborn fight against the monarchist parties as well as against the People's Party and the Centre. Such a fight is by no means welcome to the Social Democratic leaders because it endangers the prospects of the big coalition for which they are working. That the Social Democratic leaders have no desire to jeopardise their relations with the so-called "middle parties", i. e. the present government parties, is further proved by their attitude to the Marx Cabinet. Although Marx has declared himself to be a pronounced opponent of expropriation without compensation, although he has stated that the flag decree of May 6th, by which the monarchist flag was again adopted and which led to the fall of the Monarchist chancellor Luther, will remain unrescinded, although the Marx Cabinet continues the Luther Government's home policy against the workers — the foreign policy need not be mentioned, in this regard for the Social-Democrats laud the policy of Stresemann as the result of their "socialistic foreign policy" — the Social-Democratic Reichstag fraction, together with the bourgeois parties, supported the vote of confidence in favour of the Marx Cabinet. By supporting the vote of confidence and opposing the Communist no-confidence motion, the German Socialist Party granted a lease of life to the Marx Cabinet and, therefore, is responsible to the whole of the working class in Germany for the policy of this Cabinet.

From this attitude of the Social-Democratic Party it is evident that they will not fight seriously for the uncompensated expropriation of the princes, either now in the campaign for the plebiscite or later for the execution of the law, when, after a successful plebiscite, the Government and the president use to put it into operation.

It will be seen that the Communist Party, is the only party which is exerting the whole of its power for the carrying out of the referendum. Several proletarian organisations have

ranged themselves alongside the Party, and at the head of these there is the Red Front Fighters League, which in the campaign for the referendum worked with the Party as leader and supporters of the mass movement which should culminate in the plebiscite.

The fight for the uncompensated expropriation of the princes which is being conducted by the Communist Party is steadily developing into a fight for power between the bourgeoisie and the working-class. The opposing fronts in this struggle are very clearly defined. On the one side there are gathered under the leadership of the German Communist Party the working-class and millions of impoverished petty bourgeois and small peasants; on the other side, the whole of the bourgeoisie from the industrial magnates of the Rhine and the junkers of the Elbe to the Liberal traders. The development of the plebiscite movement up to the present is a classic example which in the course of the fight for the plebiscite will make it comprehensible to every single worker that every struggle of the working-class commenced on the basis of petty bourgeois democracy must of necessity become a revolutionary battle which will burst the framework of democracy, when it threatens the class interests of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie and their Government have declared the plebiscite to be incompatible with the constitution. In spite of this, the plebiscite is being carried out upon the basis of the constitution; this means that, if the plebiscite is successful, a pretext is furnished for the strengthening and further extension of the coup d'Etat policy of the monarchists and big capitalists; if, on the other hand, the plebiscite fails, petty bourgeois democracy would be forced to capitulate still more, while the offensive of reaction against the working class would be intensified.

The Communist Party is not permitting the German working-class to cherish any illusion that a numerical victory in the plebiscite would be any guarantee for its being carried out, and insists that this is only possible through revolutionary methods, through the fight of the united proletarian front in alliance with the broadest masses of the working people. In this knowledge the German Communist Party will persevere in its efforts to promote the will to unity of the German working-class and to consolidate the proletarian united front. Even though the united front of the proletariat still embraces only a minority of the German working-class a steady growth of the front is observable. This growth is shown by the numerous mass demonstrations of recent months, by the strengthening of the Red Front Fighters League, the influx of unorganised workers into the trade-unions and the increasing confidence of the masses in the Communist Party.

A very striking illustration was the Whitsuntide Rally of the Red Front Fighters League, which constituted one of the most forceful and impressive demonstrations that the workers of Berlin have yet witnessed. Hundred of thousands of Berlin workers took part in this gathering, in addition to Red Front Fighters from all parts of the country who had come to Berlin even at the cost of great privations and serious sacrifices. Never before had Berlin seen such a storm of enthusiasm among hundreds of thousands of people as the march of the Red Front Fighters called forth. Never before had the will to unity found such tremendous expression as upon the occasion of the Red Whitsuntide Rally. Reichsbanner delegations marched in the procession of the Red Front Fighters and Social-Democratic workers cheered the march-past of the Red Front Fighters League.

The Red Whitsuntide Rally of the Red Front Fighters League showed that the bourgeoisie and their accomplices in the camp of the German Socialist Party and the trade-union bureaucracy will not be successful in breaking the proletarian united front which is embracing ever increasing masses.

The Red Whitsuntide gathering in Berlin was a mighty prelude to a victorious plebiscite. Just as the masses of the workers came forward unitedly in the demonstration in Berlin and impressively proclaimed their will to fight, the working masses of the whole of Germany will rally under the leadership of the Communist Party and proclaim their determination to fight for the execution of the expropriation without compensation, of the princes in the interests of the millions who during the war and in the post-war period were hounded over to extreme misery and poverty.

## On Pacifism and Revolution.

By L. Trotsky.

The following article is part of a longer essay written by Comrade Trotsky in answer to the criticism of **Bertrand Russell**, the British pacifist, on Trotsky's book "Where is Britain Going?" The article was written on May 3rd, i. e. immediately before the outbreak of the general strike.

The peculiarities in Great Britain's development are chiefly due to its insular position. The clearest expression is given to these peculiarities by the part which the British Navy plays in the fate of the country. At the same time the British Socialists, who accuse us of lack of understanding for the hidden or undefinable peculiarities of the British spirit, forget, when discussing the question of the proletarian revolution, to mention so clearly definable a quantity as the British Navy. **Russell**, who speaks so ironically on the support given by the Soviet Navy, does not say a word about that navy which, even under the **MacDonald** Government was augmented by light cruisers.

It is a question of the conquest of power in a country where the overwhelming majority of the population belongs to the proletariat. Success in this direction must have its political basis in the will of the proletariat to seize power at any price, even at the cost of great sacrifice. Only a Party of the workers can unite the masses of workers in these their endeavours.

The second essential condition for success is a clear understanding of the ways and methods of the fight. Only a party whose eyes have been cured of pacifist cataract, can see for itself and make it clear to the proletariat that a real transference of power from the hands of one class to those of another depends to an incomparably greater degree on the British army and navy than on Parliament. **The fight for power of the proletariat must therefore be a fight to win over the navy.**

It is necessary that the seamen — not of course the admirals, but the stokers, electrical engineers, sailors and other workers know of and learn to understand the tasks and aims of the working class. All difficulties must be surmounted in order to find the way to them. Only by indefatigable, systematic preparatory work can a situation be created in which the bourgeoisie will no longer be able to rely on the navy in its struggle. Unless this condition is fulfilled it is nonsense even to speak of victory.

We do not of course for a moment imagine that the navy and the army would go over to the side of the proletariat in a bloodless fighting order in the first period of the revolution. This will not occur without deep internal convulsions within the navy. It is proved by the history of all revolutions. Convulsions in the navy in connection with an introduction of new blood into the Staff of command, involve inevitably a general loss of strength to the navy for a comparatively long period. This again must not be left out of consideration. **The more determined the work of the leading party of the proletariat, the more difficult it will be for the navy to survive the period of crisis and of internal weakness.** The better the connection of the proletariat with the navy in the preparatory period, the more courageously it will act in the fighting period, the more clearly it will show all the oppressed that it is capable of seizing and maintaining power.

Only very slight injury can be done to the machinery of war of the ruling class by pacifism. This is best proved by the courageous but rather futile efforts of **Russell** himself during the war. The whole affair ended in a few thousand young people being thrown into prison on account of their "conscientious objections."

In the old **Czarist** army, the sectarians and especially the Tolstoians were often exposed to persecution because of their passive resistance to militarism; it was not they however who solved the problem of the overthrow of Czarism. In **Great Britain** also, the pacifists did not and could not prevent the war being carried on to the end. Pacifism turns its attention less to the military organisation of the bourgeois State but rather towards the masses of the workers. Among them, its influence is really disastrous; it paralyses the will of those workers who, in any case, do not suffer from a superfluity of that quality. It preaches the harm done by arming those who, as it is, are unarmed and are victims of class power. In the

present circumstances of British life, when the question of power is in the foreground, **Russell's** pacifism is thoroughly reactionary.

The papers reported that **Lansbury** recently called upon the British soldiers not to fire on the workers. Thousands of workers of both sexes who were present at the meeting, held up their hands as a sign of solidarity with this demand which indeed, it is difficult to reconcile with **MacDonald's** policy, though it marks a step forward on the path to revolution.

It would be very naive to imagine that **Lansbury's** demand opened the way to a peaceful, bloodless, pacifist solution of the question of power. On the contrary, if this demand should clear the way for reality, it would inevitably lead to violent armed conflicts. We must not think that all soldiers and all sailors will refuse at the same time to fire on the workers. As a matter of fact things happen in such a way that revolution drives a wedge into the army and into the fronts. The division would take effect in every company, every squadron, every warship. One soldier has already resolved not to fire, though it cost him his life; another hesitates; a third is prepared even to fire on those soldiers who refuse to fire. In the first period the number of waverers will be the largest.

How did things happen in our country in the years 1905-1917? The soldiers or sailors who, by deeds expressed their solidarity with the workers, were fired on by the officers. In the next stage, the officers were fired on by the soldiers who were carried away by the heroic example of their progressive comrades. These conflicts spread. A regiment in which the revolutionary elements prevail was faced by a regiment in which the power was still in the hands of the old commanders. At the same time the workers armed themselves, relying on the help of the revolutionary regiments. In the navy, affairs took a similar course. We would advise **Russell** and those who share his views to see the film "Armoured Cruiser **Potemkin**", which shows in a very telling manner the mechanism of a revolution among an armed throng. It would be still more important to show this film to the British workers and sailors. We hope that the Labour party will do so when it comes into power.

The bourgeois hypocrites and the civilised cannibals will of course speak with great indignation of our efforts to lead and stir up brother against brother, soldiers against officers. The pacifists will echo their words, they will repeat that we see everything in a blood-tinged light and that we do not know the peculiarities of Great Britain or realise the fruitful influence of Christian morals on the officers of the navy, the police and on **Joynson-Hicks**. This however will not hold us back. Revolutionary policy demands above all that we should look facts straight in the face and anticipate what direction further development will take. Revolutionary policy seems fantastic to the Philistines because it sees as far as the day after to-morrow, whereas they dare not even think of to-morrow.

In a period when the national organism in its totality cannot be saved by conservative means, but only by surgical intervention which removes the diseased organ, i. e. the class which has outlived its day, pacifist sermons, by their nature, arise from haughty indifference. In such a situation, the greatest "mercy" implies the greatest **power of decision** in order to shorten the agony and to reduce the suffering.

The American bourgeoisie will be all the less inclined to interfere in the fight, the more energetically the British proletariat seizes hold of the means and instruments of the British bourgeoisie. The American navy will have all the less possibility of overthrowing a proletarian power in Great Britain, the more rapidly and completely this proletarian power gets control of the British navy.

In saying this, we do not mean to imply that a military intervention on the part of the transatlantic republic is out of the question, on the contrary, it is extremely probable and, within certain limits, even inevitable. The result of this intervention however is closely connected with our policy before and during the revolution.

The behaviour of the **French** navy will have no small influence on a general blockade of the British Isles and above all on their isolation from the European continent. Can the French bourgeoisie send its ships against the proletarian revolution in Great Britain?

We possess a certain amount of experience in this respect. In 1918, **Millerand** sent French warships against the ports of the Soviet Republic in the **Black Sea**. The results are well

known; the cruiser "Waideck-Rousseau" raised the flag of insurrection. Neither did everything go smoothly with the British in the North of Russia; revolution is very contagious and sailors are more susceptible to revolutionary infection than other people.

At that time, when the French sailors Marty and Bardina mutinied and refused to fight against the proletarian revolution in Russia, France was at the zenith of her power. Now the epoch of atonement for the war is making itself no less seriously felt in France than in England. Anyone who is of the opinion that, after the monarchy, the landowners, the bankers and the manufacturers have been thrown overboard in England, it will be possible for the French bourgeoisie to police the Atlantic Ocean or even the English Channel, is monstrously optimistic with regard to the bourgeoisie and shamefully pessimistic with regard to the proletariat. It is not for nothing that Great Britain, i. e. her bourgeoisie, was ruler of the waves, and the British revolution will draw wide circles on all the seas. The first result will be that discipline will be undermined in all navies. Who can say whether in these circumstances the American Admiralty will not be compelled to abandon all idea of war and of a strict blockade and to withdraw its ships as far as possible from the possibility of being infected by Europe.

Finally, the navy is not the last court of appeal in America. The capitalist regime in the United States is more powerful than ever. We are no less well acquainted than is Russell with the counter-revolutionary character of the American Federation of Labour to which he calls our attention. Just as the bourgeoisie of the United States has raised the power of capital to a height which has never previously been attained, the American Federation of Labour has arrived at the utmost limits of opportunist methods. This however by no means implies that the American bourgeoisie is all-powerful. It is incomparably stronger as an opponent of the European bourgeoisie than it would be as an opponent of the European proletariat. In the very home of the American aristocracy of Labour, the most privileged aristocracy of Labour in the world, revolutionary instincts and tendencies are silently fermenting below the surface among the masses of workers of North America who belong to the greatest variety of races. A revolution in the Anglo-Saxon country on the other side of the Ocean would have more effect on the proletariat of the United States than any other revolution.

This does not mean that the rule of the American bourgeoisie will be overthrown the very next day after the British proletariat has seized power. The overthrow of the rule of the Dollar will necessarily be preceded by a number of serious economic and military convulsions. The American bourgeoisie itself is preparing for these cataclysms by investing capital all over the world and thus linking its power with European chaos, with the powder magazines in the East.

Revolution in England will inevitably find a loud echo on the other side of the "herring-pond", both on the New York Exchange and in the homes of Chicago. There will be an immediate change in the self-consciousness of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat of the United States; the bourgeoisie will feel weaker, the workers stronger. The self-consciousness of the classes however is an extremely important component of the so-called relation of forces. This again does not mean that the American bankers and trust magnates may not make attempts to throttle the revolution of the American proletariat economically with the help of their navy. These attempts however, in themselves mean that the internal regime of the United States would be further shaken. Finally, not only the revolutionary events in Great Britain but the mood to which they give rise among the proletariat of the United States will be reflected in the interior of every American ship and in its engine-room. The sum total of all this does not mean that a proletarian revolution is free from difficulties and dangers — on the contrary, both are enormous. But — on both sides. This lies in the nature of revolution. The more important the position of a nation in the world, the greater will be the scale on which the forces and counter-forces which are roused and developed by revolution, will act. In these circumstances, our "sympathies" may be of considerable advantage.

Revolutions are not made in such a way that among various possibilities, the most advantageous is chosen. Were it possible to prescribe a revolutionary line of march rationally, revolution could probably be avoided altogether. Revolution is just the expression of the fact that a society divided into classes cannot

be transformed by rational methods. Logical arguments, even if Russell should raise them to the level of mathematical formulas, are powerless when opposed by material interests. Rather than renounce their privileges, the ruling classes will let civilisation perish along with its mathematics. In the fight between the miners and the coal magnates of Great Britain, the approaching revolution is already completely revealed in an embryo stage. The irrational factors in human history take effect in their most blatant forms through class antagonisms. These irrational factors cannot be neglected. Just as mathematics which works with irrational quantities, arrives at quite rational conclusions, so can politics be rationalised, i. e. the order of society can be transformed into a rational system, but only if the irrational contradictions of society are fully recognised in order to overcome them once and for all. This victory cannot be gained by avoiding revolution, but only through its help.

We might very well conclude with these words. Russell's objections have given me the opportunity of enlarging on those sides of the question which were not dealt with in my book ("Where is England Going?". Ed.) Nevertheless it may not be superfluous to discuss the last and strongest argument of our pacifist critic. Russell maintains that our relation to the British revolution is dictated by our Russian patriotism. He says:

"I am horrified to think that Trotzky, like the rest of us, is a patriot. The communist revolution in England would be an advantage to Russia; he is therefore in favour of it without disinterestedly weighing the question as to whether it would be to our advantage."

This argument may sound very fine, but it is not new. The Chamberlain and Hick's Press repeats it daily. The "Morning Post" proved long ago that the international communist revolution would serve the purposes of Soviet imperialism which, on its part, is carrying on the traditions of Czarist politics. Accusations of this kind have been hurled at us ever since the bourgeoisie became convinced that our Party had finally seized power and was not disposed to yield it to anyone. In the period before and immediately after the seizure of power, we were accused of exactly the opposite. It was said that the Bolshevists were void of any national feeling, of any patriotic enthusiasm and that their leaders were forcing a Hohenzollern policy on Russia. Arthur Henderson, Emil Vandervelde, Albert Thomas and others came to Russia with the object of convincing the workers that the Bolsheviki were prepared to betray the most important interests of Russia for the sake of their international chimeras (or, according to other versions, for the gold of the German Emperor). This accusation was developed most clearly in the said "Morning Post". Just as Russell now accuses us of being prepared to reduce the population of Great Britain to 20 millions for the benefit of Soviet Imperialism, we were accused nine years ago of being prepared, in our unscrupulousness, to reduce the population of Russia to a half or a third in the interests of the anti-national aims of Soviet Imperialism. Our Party, as is well known, took the point of view that the defeat of Czarist Russia in the war would be beneficial both for the Russian and for the international working class. The Socialist lackeys of the Entente could not persuade us to change our standpoint. In the epoch of the Peace of Brest-Litovsk, the accusations that we were carrying on an anti-national policy (among other versions in co-operation with the Hohenzollerns) reached their culminating point. In spite of this, our Party did not allow itself to be drawn into a capitalist war. The Hohenzollern regime has fallen, and in its overthrow the October revolution played no less important a part than the arms of the Entente.

The antagonism between the Soviet Republics and the Governments of the victorious Entente came to the foreground, and the ruling classes of Great Britain are playing the most reactionary role in the whole world — in Europe, Egypt, Turkey, Persia, India and China. Every change in the world situation in economics and politics is directed against the predominance of Great Britain. This is why the overweeningly proud British bourgeoisie is carrying on a frantic struggle against any change in order to prevent power slipping from its hands.

The American bourgeoisie is powerful. Its fight against the revolution will be on a larger scale than that of England. At present however, America takes a second place. The most active and worst enemy of the revolutionary movement in Europe, Asia and Africa is the ruling class of Great Britain. One would think that for a Socialist this fact would be more



than enough to explain the antagonism between the Soviet Union and British imperialism. "Are we patriots?" We are, in the same measure as during the war we were "anti-patriots." We are defending with the methods of national power the same interests for which we fought with the methods of revolt: the interests of the world proletariat.

When Russell says that we are prepared to sacrifice the interests of the British working class to the interests of the Soviet State, it is not only false, it is folly. Any weakening of the British proletariat, particularly its defeat in an open fight, would inevitably be a severe blow to the foreign policy and internal situation of the Soviet Union. When, in March 1921, at the III. Congress of the Comintern, the German Communists tried to force the proletarian revolution in Germany, they justified themselves on the grounds of the serious situation of the Soviet Republics and of the necessity of coming to their help. Together with Lenin we said to them: "No heroic effervescence, and still less revolutionary adventures can help the Soviet Republic. We need just what the German proletariat needs — a victorious revolution."

It would be essentially wrong to believe that the proletariat of any country ought to take any steps whatever in the interests of the Soviet State which do not arise from its own interests as a class which is fighting for its complete emancipation. This point of view, which has grown into the very marrow of our bones, is alien to those Socialists who take the side of their bourgeoisie, if not always, at least at the decisive moment. Russell himself is no exception. It is true that during the war he opposed his Government with a fairly courageous resistance, though from the political point of view it was not very effective. That was an individual demonstration, an act of conscience — but the fate of the regime was not in any sense in the balance. When, on the other hand, it is a question of the revolution of the proletariat, Russell finds in his spiritual armoury no arguments than those of the "Morning Post" and all the Churchills of his country.

The greatest peculiarity of British politics — resulting from the past history of the country — is the striking contrast between the revolutionary degree of maturity of the objective economic factors and the extreme backwardness of the ideological forms, especially in the ranks of the workers. It is just those who most clearly incorporate these peculiarities, the bourgeois humanists, out-of-date pioneers and pacifists, who understand them least. They, as well as the reactionary petty bourgeois Reformists, consider that they have been called to lead the proletariat. Bertrand Russell is not the worst of them; but his writings on social and political subjects, his manifesto against war, his polemics with Scott Nearing on the Soviet regime, unmistakably characterise his political blindness, his superficial dilettantism, his complete lack of understanding for the historical development, i. e. the fight of the living classes which has arisen on the basis of production. He sets up against history the propaganda of a few pacifist slogans which he himself composes very badly. In doing so he forgets to explain to us why the pacifist work of enlightenment could not save us from wars and revolutions, although such eminent persons have interested themselves in this work as Robert Owen in the first half of the 19th century, the French Encyclopaedists in the 18th century, the Quakers since the 17th century and many others. Russell is a belated enlightener who has inherited from the early enlighteners, not their enthusiasm, but their political prejudices.

Russell is a sceptic through and through. He apparently opposes the peaceful and evolutionary methods of science and technique to the methods of the revolutionary use of force. He has however as little faith in the saving power of scientific thinking as in the force of revolutionary activity. In his polemics against Nearing, he tries under the cover of sham socialist phrases to disparage and compromise the revolutionary initiative of the Russian proletariat, in another of his writings he ridicules the optimistic belief in science and technique. In his book "Icarus" he openly expresses his conviction that the best way of escape would be for the whole of our civilisation to perish. And this person who is permeated through and through with egoistic, self-centred aristocratic scepticism, considers it to be his vocation to give the English proletariat advice and to warn it against our communist "intrigues". The British working class is entering on an epoch in which it will need the strongest faith in its own mission and its own forces.

For this, no artificial stimulants in the form of religion or of idealistic morals are necessary. All that is necessary is that the British proletariat should understand the situation in its own country in connection with that of the whole world, that it should be clear as to the rottenness of the ruling class and should clear out of its way the upstart charlatans and the bourgeois sceptics who imagine that they are Socialists merely because they are occasionally nauseated by the atmosphere of decay in bourgeois society.

## The Change of Government in Belgium.

By H a b a r u (Brussels).

After long and difficult negotiations the new Jaspar government has been formed, which takes the place of the Poulet-Vandervelde Ministry. Whilst the former government, based upon the results of the elections of 5th April 1925, constituted a coalition of socialists with the Left Catholics, the new Ministry is a concentration Cabinet which unites the leaders of all three big Parties, and whose real master will be the banker Franqui, the most powerful financier in Belgium.

The socialists have retained in this government four of their Ministers who were in the last government, namely: Vandervelde (Foreign Affairs), Wauters, (Ministry for Labour), Anseele (Railways), and Huysmans (Science and Art). All the Left Catholics have been driven out and their places taken by the Conservative leaders of this Party, who had most sharply attacked the former government. The Liberal Party which was in opposition, sent its leader, Hymans, to the Ministry of Justice. In the former government there was one banker, Janssen, Minister of Finance, representative of the Banque Nationale. Now there are two bank people in the government, Houtart, Minister of Finance, and Franqui, Minister without Portfolio. The latter is the real Prime Minister. If the government crisis lasted several weeks it was because it was necessary to find the forms and persons which could best conceal the dictatorship of the banker Franqui. A first attempt with the Socialist President of the Chamber, Brunet, was unsuccessful as a result of the demands of the Liberals, and therefore it was finally decided to agree on Jaspar.

The formation of this Cabinet opens a new period in the history of this country. Its programme means the undisguised removal of all illusions regarding the democratic achievements which the Belgian Labour Party had fostered since its election victory of 5th April 1925. The Belgian Labour Party which had already abandoned a great portion of its promises under the Poulet-Vandervelde Ministry, is now giving away along the whole line before the pressure of the bourgeoisie and the threats of the bankers. The resolution by which the General Council of the Belgian Party accords the government its support, empowers the socialists to enter the Ministry under the following conditions:

1. that it must be a concentration Cabinet of only a temporary character, formed for the purpose of restoring order in the finances of the country;
2. that no attack shall be made against the existing social legislation which shall remain wholly in force;
3. that the government propose to Parliament the acceptance of the bills regarding tenants and the ratification of the Washington Agreement;
4. that the General Council is in a position to investigate the necessary financial measures before the parliamentary fraction can accept them.

That is the acceptance of the programme of the Banker Franqui, the first point of which is to obtain full powers in order to adopt such financial measures as appear calculated to bring affairs into order. There is already talk of a postponement for a year of the municipal elections which should take place in October. The political class peace shall be complete and the discontent of the masses shall be given no opportunity of finding expression.

The government of Jaspar-Franqui-Vandervelde-Hymans, will, with its full powers, make the attempt to rescue the franc and to restore the finances of the country which are endangered by the inflation. It is clear that the measures which are to be adopted for this purpose will place heavier burdens than ever upon the working masses who are already suffering severely under the growing burden of high prices.

## The Treaty between Turkey and Persia.

By Irandust.

The signing of the treaty between Turkey and Persia, concerning neutrality, arbitration and the settlement of the frontier questions, is not only a fact of great significance to the States participating but also an important event in international affairs in general. Turkey is exposed to heavy pressure exercised upon her by the big capitalist States of the West and is compelled in consequence to defend not only her economic independence but also her territory; to her this treaty means protection of her rear in the fight.

It is well known that, in spite of the resolution of the League of Nations passed in December 1925 to hand over to Great Britain the Kingdom of Irak, and thereby the rich oil-yielding province of Mosul the fight for Mosul has not yet been terminated. The Turkish Republic, which is not a member of the League of Nations, has not acknowledged the right of the latter to dispose of Turkish territory. For this reason, British diplomats are endeavouring to come to an understanding with Turkey, and they are offering the Turkish Government a big loan, economic help and also insignificant frontier adjustments in order to get Turkey to renounce her right to Mosul.

As, however, the Turks are not disposed to sell this considerable portion of their national territory to the British diplomats and petroleum kings, the Conservative Government of Great Britain is arming for the purpose of maintaining possession of Mosul which it took by force of arms, at the same time it is working to organise a Balkan front against Turkey under the banner of a "Balkan Locarno" and to bring Greece and Italy into conflict with the Turkish Republic.

The treaty of neutrality between Turkey and Persia affords the Turkish people the possibility of defending the vital interests which they have at stake. This treaty is the logical development and extension of the recently concluded treaty between the Soviet Union and Turkey concerning neutrality and abstention from participation in hostile mobilisations, as also of the treaty between Turkey and France concerning neutrality on the Syrian frontier. Furthermore, the signing of the treaty with Turkey proves that the leaning of Turkey towards the East, which affords the Turkish people the possibility of becoming the vanguard of the nations of the Near East in their struggle for independence, is gaining the chief place in the policy of Angora, and as result Turkey's resistance to the pressure and encroachments of the Imperialist West is strengthened.

The treaty is also of no less significance to Persia, which is now living through the difficult period of the creation of a national State upon the ruins of the former feudal anarchy and the zones of Imperialist influence. The economic and financial weakness of Persia has prevented the country from freeing itself completely from the political influence of British Imperialism, according to the plans of which Persia is to serve as one of the buffer-states of the British Empire and guard the approach to India. In order to achieve this purpose British diplomats are using all the means in their power to prevent Persia's establishing friendly relations in other directions and to spoil feeling between Persia and Turkey on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, and thus bring about the political isolation of Persia and win the country for the purposes of British Imperialism in the East.

The understanding between Persia and Turkey in regard to neutrality and the pacification of the border tribes appears to be the beginning of the establishment of political and economic relations between Persia and the other nations of the East. The fact that Persia is linking itself up with these nations will render that country's liberation from the yoke of British bankers and British diplomats an easier task. The understanding also modifies the tension arising out of the "Kurdistan question", which is constantly exploited by Great Britain to bring political pressure to bear upon both Turkey and Persia and is fomented by supplies of arms to the Kurkestan border tribes and plans for the creation of an "Independent Kurdistan" under the suzerainty of England.

To Great Britain this understanding between Persia and Turkey means a severe blow to the strategic plans of Britain to establish in the Near East a system of mandatory States with

its right wing supported by Persia and its left resting upon Egypt. Britain's efforts to get Persia on to its side in conflicts with Turkey may now be regarded as wrecked, while the plans for the creation of a military alliance between Persia and Irak to maintain Great Britain's occupation of Mosul have also been frustrated. The rapprochement between Turkey and Persia is proof that the British diplomats have not succeeded in subordinating the policy of Persia to the interests of the British Empire nor yet in isolating Persia politically.

The power of the British Empire rests upon two main pillars, one of which is the colonial policy and the other the policy of corrupting the leaders of British Labour, whose demoralisation is effected with bribes out of the colonial surplus. At present we are witnessing the collapse of the foundations of British Capitalism, as the advance of the British proletariat which is becoming more radical coincides with the failure of British colonial policy in the East. In this failure the rapprochement between Turkey and Persia is no insignificant factor.

The understanding between Turkey and Persia is in its nature one of the latest examples of those new peaceable international treaties with which the Soviet Union is countering the notorious Spirit of Locarno, whose aim would appear to be the plotting of fresh wars. The nations of the East are following with ever growing determination the path towards the settlement of international relations which is indicated to them by the example of the peoples in the Soviet Union.

## Zaghlul's Election Victory.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

On November 21, 1924 the popular government of Zaghlul Pasha fell under the pressure of a British ultimatum. During the short period of his rule in Egypt Zaghlul, whose party represents the interests of the rising Egyptian bourgeoisie and which has the broad masses of the peasants behind it, continually vacillated between a compromise with Great Britain and the radical demands for independence represented by the national revolutionary movement. His final defeat was the result of this antagonism within the Wafd (Zaghlul Party).

Zaghlul's defeat in the Autumn of 1924 was so sudden and unexpected that many of those who are familiar with Egyptian politics considered that his influence was at an end. The English set up, under the mask of an Egyptian "non-parliamentary" Zivar Pasha government, a ruthless dictatorship with which they hoped to suppress the elementary national revolutionary movement. In addition to the usual methods of terror -- wholesale arrests, death sentences etc. Zivar Pasha also wished to defeat Zaghlul on the political field. For this purpose there was set up, under the high protectorate of the puppet-king Fuad, who was thoroughly hated in Egypt, a government party, "Ittehad" (Unity), which everywhere established organisations and in the first place pursued the aim of breaking away the Right elements from the Wafd.

Yet already at the first trial of strength, when Zaghlul's star was still very low, in February 1925, this Angiophile Party proved itself incapable of getting in any way into contact with the masses of people. At the parliamentary elections which were held at that time, Zaghlul emerged as a victor, even if with a not very great majority, and Zivar Pasha was again compelled to resort to illegal means, to dissolve parliament, in order to secure his rule.

From this time on there is to be again observed a marked progress of the Zaghlulists. The Zivar government has become so unpopular by a long series of treacherous acts in the sphere of home and foreign policy, that the followers of Zaghlul Pasha who have become indignant are streaming back to him wholesale. Measures of an inner political nature, such as repeated sensational trials, the rendering more stringent of the law regarding meetings, working out of an unconstitutional election law, attempt to drive the Zaghlul Party into illegality, fierce persecution of the workers' organisations and of others, and, as regards foreign policy, the continually repeated compliance with English demands, the recognition of the British rule over the Sudan (expressed by the dispatch of an official government representative to the formal opening of the Sennar-Dam in Sudan), the handing over of Dshagaboub to the Italians etc.

recognition of the British mandate over Palestine — all this was water to the mill of the national revolutionary movement, at the head of which Zaghlul Pasha became more and more prominent.

In addition to this, in Autumn 1925, Egypt was visited by a severe economic crisis which considerably increased the bitterness of the population against Zivar. The 21st November 1925 was the great turning point in Egyptian politics. Zaghlul, in alliance with the two small Egyptian parties, the Nationalists and the Liberal Constitutionalists, convened the dissolved parliament and thereby declared open war on the government. The government was thereupon compelled to retreat. It had, in the first place, to prescribe new elections, afterwards to abandon its own mutilated election law in favour of the previously existing universal suffrage and finally, to allow officials who against its orders, followed the instructions of Zaghlul, to return to their posts.

In March, immediately before the elections, Zivar Pasha attempted a final stroke. He instigated a monster trial against seven of the most prominent Zaghlulists, whom he charged with being in connection with terrorist organisations, and actually succeeded, immediately before the elections, in getting the court to accept the charge as proved and to have one of them condemned to death. But this last bloody sentence had the exact contrary effect. The Zaghlul Party triumphed at the elections of 21st of May. Out of the 200 seats it will receive about 150 (the counting is not yet over). The two parties allied with it receive a further 30 seats, whilst the Ittehadists obtain in all... 4 seats, although they had put forward their candidates in 150 constituencies.

The only thing that can now be said regarding the election victory of Zaghlul is that it represents an imposing manifestation of the Egyptian national revolutionary will. The Egyptian people has voted against Zivar Pasha and thereby against Great Britain, and thus again, as in the year 1918—19 and 1924, expressed its definite wish to gain real and complete independence.

The English newspapers have for some time been discussing the question whether Great Britain can enter into new negotiations with Zaghlul whom it so brutally overthrew two years ago. A constitutional government in Egypt without the participation of the Wafd is unthinkable. The continuation of unconstitutional conditions, however, is creating material for conflicts which, as the English are quite aware, must sooner or later lead to bloody outbreaks. On the other hand a great deal depends upon the attitude of the Wafd. The further political development in Egypt will be determined to a great extent by whether within the great National Party, as the Wafd has again proved itself to be, the capitalist Right wing or the small peasant-radical Left wing retains the upper hand.

## The U. S. Government and the Agricultural Masses.

By Jay Lovestone (Chicago).

A great political drama is now being enacted in the House of Congress. One should say, a political tragedy, to be more exact. The battle is being fought actually in the corn fields and in the cotton fields, but to all intents and purposes, the present act is being performed in the House of Representatives.

Neither the Haugen Bill or the Tincher Bill affords substantial relief for the exploited American farmers. Of the two, the Haugen Bill unquestionably affords a bit more than does the Tincher Bill, which is simply a camouflaged piece of legislation aiming to put the farmer to sleep on the Coolidge bandwagon for 1926 and 1928.

The basic economic problem for American agriculture is as acute as ever. The divergence between prices for agricultural commodities and industrial commodities has been increasing within the last few months at a pace altogether too alarming for the most conscious leadership of our ruling class. The World War lent great impetus to the development of American agriculture to capacities far beyond the demands of the so-called normal world market. Besides, while industry is being operated more and more on a gigantic and collective, monopoly scale, agriculture is falling behind in development, when compared with the tremendous progress in technical and commercial avenues within the last decade. In the main, American agriculture is still organised on the individual basis prevailing at the opening of this century.

The deepening crisis in agriculture is having its political reflex in the class relationships in the United States. But we already hear talk about the "solid middle-west".

We are now being introduced to "corn-belt committees". An attempt is being made to secure the passage of the Haugen Bill through an alliance of the representatives of the farmers of the middle west and the representatives of the cotton growers of the south.

Simultaneously, however, there is being created a chasm between the big bourgeoisie and the small bourgeoisie of the South. In the House of Representatives, the small bourgeoisie of the South have some substantial representation. In the Senate, they have considerably less.

Some sort of an agreement between the representatives of the Western and Southern small and middle farmers has been arrived at through the arrangement to appropriate one hundred million out of the three hundred and seventy million dollars provided for indirect farm-relief in the Haugen Bill to meet losses in cotton marketing operations. The spokesmen of the big financial interests, located primarily in the East, are exerting every possible pressure they can, on the Southern representatives, in order to break up this combination. The Bill, introduced by the reactionary Congressman Aswell of Louisiana, notorious for his attempt to secure the enactment of wholesale deportation legislation, is an example of the efforts of the Southern big capitalist interests to win away the Southern agricultural, the smaller cotton interests, from the camp of the middle western congressmen.

The extent to which confusion has crept into the camp of the bourgeoisie in their efforts to meet the agricultural crisis is shown clearly by the fact that neither a political, nor even a numerical, majority could be secured in the House Agricultural Committee consisting of twenty-one members for any of the three major agricultural Bills now before the House. Of course, since it was impossible to secure a majority in a committee of twenty-one, the likelihood of securing a majority in a larger Committee of the House of Representatives, consisting of 435 members — is even slimmer. Come what may, no matter what bill be passed or rejected by the House in its closing deliberations, the hold of the Republican Party on the agricultural sections will be further considerably weakened.

What may the farmers expect from the United States government? Perhaps the best answer to this question is to be found in the recent action of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in its dealings with the railroads. The railroads owe the United States \$ 304,000,000, which were lent to them during the war period by the United States Treasury. This money was lent to the railroad interests at the rate of six percent. Only the other day the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce reported favourably a bill for the reduction of the rate of interests from six to four and one half percent on the amount owed the government by the railroads. This reduced rate of interest means an annual loss to the United States government of more than six million dollars.

At the same time, the Senate is refusing to enact legislation to give money to the land banks for use in helping the farmers in the Piedmont regions of Georgia and South Carolina to meet the emergency caused by the severe drought, which is the worst experienced by the farmers in this territory in many years. A futile effort has been made to secure an appropriation of five million dollars in order to enable these farmers to make loans at the local banks for the purpose of meeting interest on overdue debts.

These South Carolina and Georgia farmers are being compelled to borrow from local banks at exorbitant interest rates or forced to lose their property. At the same time, the railroads are being saved millions of dollars by the government. While the railroads are enjoying a most prosperous year, many sections of these states have had their whole cotton crop destroyed. Nearly one half of the counties of South Carolina have been so hard hit that their entire crop has been wiped out.

Through the land banks, the farmers of these territories owe the government approximately one hundred million dollars. The farmers being bankrupt cannot meet these obligations. They are thus forced to give a second mortgage on their farms or to mortgage other property they may happen to have at the local banks. These banks charge the farmers a minimum interest of nine percent. The government consequently is compelling these farmers to pay the loan sharks at least nine percent in order to

meet the interest maturing on the mortgages controlled by the land banks of the Washington administration.

If anyone wants to know whose government is now being run at Washington, all he has to do is to examine the above facts.

The American capitalists are ready to give practically a moratorium on debts to railroads, to the Fascist government of Italy and to all capitalist cliques in Europe and elsewhere but the United States government is too poor to help farmers in distress. **Senator Nye of North Dakota** does not stand one chance in a million to get even the slightest consideration for his bill to have the United States government accord the same treatment to the bankrupt farmers which it has accorded to the Fascist government of Italy.

In the meanwhile, the workers in the industrial centers can glean increasing signs of developing hostility on the part of the small farmers to the big capitalist interests.

The class conscious proletariat of the United States has a distinct and imperative duty in its relations to the agricultural masses. It is the task of the working class to win over as many of the agricultural masses as possible to its banner and leadership in the fight against the big bourgeoisie. The contradictions in American agricultural economy are too inherent and ingrown to be met by the half-hearted efforts of our capitalists. Herein is a real opportunity for communist inspiration and leadership.

## THE BALKANS

### The Parliamentary Elections in Roumania.

By D. Fabian (Bucharest).

At the end of May there took place in Roumania the general elections for the Chamber and the Senate.

The first Averescu government had, in the year 1922, i. e. in its second year of office, completely fulfilled the tasks committed to it by the ruling classes. It had, on the one hand, by the so-called agrarian reform, deceived and pacified the broad masses of peasants, and on the other hand by an unrestrained white terror had decapitated and destroyed the labour movement. Although General Averescu at that time possessed a firm and safe majority in parliament and although the legislative period still had two years to run, the king, without any ado, decided one fine day to dissolve this government and entrusted with the formation of a new government the **Liberal Party**, which saw the ground cleared of all remnants of the upheaval of 1917—1918 by General Averescu. This act was nothing else than a *coup d'état* under the protection of the king, as at that time the Liberal Party had in parliament only 7 out of 380 seats, it being the numerically weakest opposition group. The new elections which were held under terror, in which the ballot boxes were stolen and wholesale cheating took place, gave this *coup d'état* an appearance of legality: the Party which in the previous parliament only had 7 seats, in the new elections won 280 seats.

In the course of the following four years this party, with the aid of a new reactionary constitution and a new economic legislation, seized possession of all the wealth of the country. At the same time it abolished all existing civil rights, completely subjugated the working and peasant masses, as well as the national minorities, and concentrated all power in the State, the municipalities and districts into the hands of the civil, military and clerical bureaucracy.

In this way there was set up the "legal" dictatorship of the bank oligarchy, the landowners and Generals. At the same time, however, the masses of the people who were exposed to unbounded exploitation and plunged into misery by starvation and suppression, were roused to indignation which found expression in local revolts and outbreaks of desperation, while thousands sought escape in emigration.

The young Communist Party of Roumania, throttled by illegality and terror, has the majority of the organised, industrial workers on its side, but is still far from being the leader of the working and peasant masses. The parties of the "democratic" opposition however, the National and Peasant parties, led by petty bourgeois elements or parasitic reactionaries, direct whole policy towards converting the king to democracy

instead of organising the resistance and the offensive of the masses against the alliance of the oligarchy.

The Roumanian oligarchy which possesses the political experience of century-long rule, is conscious that methods of terror are more effective when they are reinforced by political means. During the rural elections of August 1925 and the municipal elections of March 1926 they realised that, in spite of the miserable capitulation of the opposition leaders, the masses are filled with hate against them. In order to allay this hate and to give the appearance of a concession to the backward masses, they "retired" from the government. In the same way as they came to power by a *coup d'état* they abandoned power by initiating, with the king as an accomplice, a new *coup d'état*. They called upon General Averescu to take over the reins of government, although his party only had eight seats in parliament.

Although this manoeuvre of the Liberals was supported not only by General Averescu but also by some reactionaries in the **National Party**, the facts have proved that the political consciousness of the peasantry and the working class — that is of the overwhelming majority of the population — is today more developed than either the oligarchy or the leaders of the democratic opposition had imagined. The formation of the figure-head government of General Averescu was regarded by the masses as a challenge, and provoked tremendous excitement. At the same time, however, they recognised that the policy of the leaders of the peasants and of the national minorities had suffered shipwreck. The first success of the masses over the leaders of the democratic opposition was that they compelled the peasant leaders to terminate the existing agreement with the reactionary leaders of the National Party. The second success of the masses was the withdrawal of the pro-liberal Right wing from the National Party and its open adhesion to the camp of the oligarchy. As a result the National Party, forsaken by the masses, rejected by the court and "betrayed" by a considerable number of its leaders, collapsed.

Finally, in view of the increasing reaction, the idea of the united front took root among the masses: the united front which should embrace the political and economic organisations of the working class, of the peasantry and of all sections of the suppressed population. The formation of this united front would have meant a life and death struggle. Therefore, the oligarchy, as well as the leaders of the opposition, sought to oppose it, because the latter did not wish to fight and feared an action on the part of the masses more than anything else.

The leaders of the peasant party were the first to return to the alliance with the reactionary National Party. They then rejected the proposal of the united front brought forward by the workers' and peasants' bloc who proposed that the struggle should be conducted on the basis of the following concrete programme: **abolition of the liberal constitution and of all the laws against the workers and national minorities, abolition of the State of siege, amnesty, confiscation of the large estates and their distribution among the peasants, social legislation etc.** The social democrats also refused to take part in a joint action on the basis of this fighting programme of the masses.

Although the government perceived the retreat of the opposition, it nevertheless felt too weak in the face of the furious hate of the masses and their firm determination to vote at any price against the oligarchy. It therefore resorted in the first place to bribery. It granted concessions to the Hungarian magnates and opportunist Saxon politicians, created ad hoc a "Bulgarian Party" and concluded an electoral alliance with the minority parties. The government then resorted to an unheard-of bloody terror. It drew up election lists which deprived of the right to vote nearly everybody suspected of "being oppositionally inclined". Half of the polling cards were not even delivered. Meetings were either forbidden or dispersed by the gendarmerie. The villages were surrounded by cordons of troops and shut off from the outside world. No opposition speaker was allowed to enter them. Many localities were declared to be in quarantine and were thus altogether shut out from the election. In many districts even the nomination of the candidates was prevented. The appeals of the opposition were confiscated.

The terror, however, was directed before all against the working class. The workers' and peasants' bloc was scarcely able to nominate half of the proposed candidates. Hundreds

of workers and thousands of peasants were arrested and cruelly ill-treated by the gendarmerie. Three candidates of the peasants party were wounded and many peasants were murdered. In the little Bessarabian town of Calarasi a meeting of peasants was fired upon by machine guns.

On the day of the election hundreds of candidates and functionaries of the opposition were arrested at the polling booths. In Bucharest all the functionaries of the workers' and peasants' bloc were arrested. Owing to the lack of any control or check — or in spite of the existence of such a check — the ballot boxes were tampered with or removed.

In this manner this most unpopular government was able to obtain a compact majority from the ballot boxes. It "obtained" 60% of all votes cast, although, it is true, only 48% of the electors voted. Owing to the Mussolini election law the government list received 286 mandates, the Peasant and National Party 77, the Liberal Party 14 and the fascist anti-semitic Party 9 seats. The latter obtained the 9 mandates with 38,000 votes, whilst the social democrats who polled 35,000 votes and the workers' and peasants bloc who polled 28,000 votes did not return one candidate. At the Senate elections the government obtained 108 out of 113 seats.

The "legal" dictatorship has therefore been saved. This victory however is illusory. The most backward masses are awakening to political life. The oligarchy has this time succeeded in distorting the will and the leaders of the opposition have succeeded in abusing the confidence of the masses. In the meantime signs of storm are increasing. Sooner or later the masses of the workers, peasants and suppressed minorities will form the united front of labour which will be capable, in determined and open fight, to shatter the united front of the oligarchy and their confederates. The best guarantee for this are the votes in the numerous rural districts which for the first time were cast for the workers and peasants' bloc.

## ECONOMICS

### The Negotiations for the Regulation of France's Debts to Great Britain.

By J. Duplex (Paris).

Raoul Péret, the Minister of Finance in Briand's Cabinet, has returned from London where he has been negotiating with his British colleague, Winston Churchill, in regard to an agreement between France and Great Britain to cover France's debts to Great Britain.

These war debts are theoretically divided into two categories:

1. The debt of the French Government to the Government of Great Britain, the **political debt**, which within the last year has amounted to 620 million pounds sterling.
2. The debt of the Banque de France to the Bank of England, the **commercial debt**, which totals 60 million pounds sterling.

As cover for the **political debt** a sum of 53 million pounds sterling in gold is deposited in the vaults of the Bank of England, which sum has been taken from the gold reserves of the Banque de France. As cover for the **commercial debt** an amount of gold from the same source and valued at 18 million pounds sterling has been deposited.

Concerning the **political debt** — against which neither capital instalments nor interest payments have been made — a preliminary agreement draft was drawn up in August 1925 between the French Finance Minister of that time, Caillaux, and Churchill. According to this draft the State debt was to be liquidated in 62 yearly payments each of 12.5 million pounds sterling. Great Britain, however, reserved the right to require an increase in the value of the annual payments in case the French debt to the United States of America should be regulated upon conditions less favourable to France than those provided in the Caillaux-Churchill agreement draft. Furthermore, Caillaux succeeded in gaining acceptance of the principle of having France's capacity to pay depend upon receipts accruing from the Dawes-Plan.

Now, however, the conditions for the settlement of France's debts to United States are, according to the Mellon-Bérenger agreement, harder than those provided in the negotiations carried on by Caillaux. Furthermore, the dependence clause has had to be relinquished. The claims of the British Government are, on this account, naturally greater than they were last year, and they will, in view of the considerable deficit caused by State subsidising of the coal-mining industry as well as through the general strike, be further increased.

If the conditions governing the regulation of France's debt to the United States are to apply to the regulation of the debt to Great Britain, 60 annual payments averaging 15 million pounds sterling will have to be made in order to liquidate the **political debt** to Great Britain; the conditions, therefore, are considerably more stringent than those of 1925.

Concerning the debt of the Banque de France to the Bank of England, it should be pointed out that these two banks of emission concluded an agreement in the year 1923 whereby the 60 million pounds loaned to the Banque de France should be repaid in annual payments rising from 5 million pounds sterling in the year 1924 to 9 million pounds sterling in the year 1928 to reach 15 million pounds sterling in the year 1929 and concluding with a final payment of 5 millions in the year 1930.

Relying upon the payments which France should make under the heading of the liquidation of the **commercial debt**, Péret counted upon being able to merge the **political debt** and the **commercial debt**. The repayments made by France under the heading of the latter were to represent France's first payments towards the liquidation of the **total debt** to Great Britain. This would have admitted of no payments being contemplated before the year 1930 higher than those already provided for in the contract concluded between the Banque of France and the Bank of England. This would have allowed the French banks a certain breathing space.

Associated with this plan devised by France there was the very ardent desire to expedite the repayment of the 71 million pounds sterling deposited by France as pledge in the Bank of England but still appearing as gold reserve in the balance-sheet of the Banque de France.

Now that the franc has suffered further great depreciation the return of, at least, a few millions out of the 71 million pounds sterling deposited in London (representing 1789 million gold francs) would have greatly assisted the French Government in **maintaining the franc exchange**. Now, however, the first repayment of 3 million pounds sterling will not take place before the year 1928.

According to the view of the **British negotiators** the yearly payments in liquidation of France's **political debt** — averaging about 15 million pounds sterling — should be made in addition to the yearly payments against the **commercial debt**. For the French Treasury this would mean burdensome commitments which might jeopardise the balancing of the budget and the value of the franc.

It will be seen that Péret has to deal in London with a British Cabinet whose inexorability is stiffened through budgetary difficulties. Concerning the 71 million pounds sterling of the Banque de France, these form part of the gold reserve in the Bank of England which has served to bring the pound sterling up to gold parity and to keep it there. No government of Great Britain could sanction the release of this reserve without causing difficulty in the maintenance of the British currency.

The defeat which Péret has suffered in London and which can be disguised only with great difficulty has had its effect upon the **exchange market**. It was the hope of the French Minister of Finance to find sufficient financial support in Great Britain to enable him to intervene upon the exchange market in support of the franc. He was unable, however, to arrange anything definite with the City banks. The **President of the Bank of England**, Montagu Norman, acting in agreement with New York financiers has got Péret to undertake an attempt to stabilise the franc as an indispensable condition of Anglo-Saxon assistance.

For the purposes of stabilisation it is contemplated: to abolish the modest measures which the capitalists and financiers adopt in regard to their holdings or to their speculations; to increase considerably the consumption tax which hits the masses of the people; to increase production by abolishing the

eight-hour day; to take coercive measures in order to resist wage advancement in conformity with the increase of prices.

This policy, which meets with the approval of the Anglo-Saxon and the French capitalists, will oppress the working masses exclusively. It is probable that its execution will shortly be supported by the Government and also by the parliamentary group of the Left Bloc, whose impotence becomes clearer day by day.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Results of the Sixth Session of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

(Report delivered to the functionaries of the Moscow organisation of the C. P. S. U.)

By G. Sinoviev.

(Conclusion)

#### II. The International Labour Movement and the Main Lines of Direction of the C. I.

##### The Trend to the Left of the International Labour Movement.

The second group of questions which the Enlarged Executive discussed, concerns the condition of the international labour movement. The Executive had to express its opinion on a whole number of new phenomena in this sphere. There is indeed something new; that is a certain trend to the Left in the international labour movement, which is particularly striking if we compare the condition of two years ago with the phenomena which can now be observed in all capitalist countries with the exception of America.

What are the causes of this trend to the Left? The Comintern pointed out four causes.

**Firstly:** the uncertain stabilisation leads to a deterioration in the material situation of the working masses in a number of countries. Capitalism now counts five million of unemployed. Its temporary stabilisation is being achieved at the cost of wages.

**Secondly:** in a number of the most important European countries the Coalition policy has suffered collapse. For a whole period, Social Democracy has tried in several countries, in Germany, France, Sweden, Belgium etc. to create a stable position by a Coalition with the bourgeoisie. These attempts have broken down.

In one of the last numbers of the "Sozialistisches Westnik" (the organ of the Russian Mensheviks in Berlin) we find a feuilleton by Dan, the well-known Menshevik leader, under the title of "The Crisis in the Coalition Policy". Even the Menshevik leader cannot deny the fact that the Coalition policy is passing through a crisis in a number of countries. There cannot of course be any question of a resurrection of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International, but the fact of a real trend to the Left cannot be denied even by Dan.

The third cause of the trend to the Left in the international labour movement is the economic growth of the Soviet Union, the gigantic process of the building up of Socialism which is going on in our country. It is long since our revolution exercised the power of attraction which it is doing to-day. The workers of other countries who have sent their delegations to us, have understood instinctively what is going on here in Russia. They know — even the Communist workers realise that very well — that we have to struggle against enormous difficulties. This has meant an extremely important factor in the trend to the Left of the Social Democratic masses in Europe. It is a matter of common knowledge what a great part has been played in the labour movement by the English, German, Austrian and various other delegations which have visited us.

**Fourthly:** The workers of the European countries felt instinctively that the danger of imperialist wars is again gradually approaching. This danger also drives them to the Left, a fact which should not be underrated. In the latest farce at Geneva, in the Conference of Locarno, in the attempts to isolate the Soviet Union, in the victory of the English Conservatives, the European workers, who very well know what an im-

perialist war means, sense the approach of a danger of a new war. They are not mistaken; their class instinct is right in telling them that the danger is an extremely real one. They cast their glances all round and involuntarily look for a power which might save them from a new war. They thus, naturally, come to the conclusion that their only possible ally in this case is the Soviet Union as it alone is seriously taking up the fight against the danger which threatens.

The question is where the limits of this trend to the Left are to be found, what can be built up on it and what not. This is a very important question. On the basis of this trend to the Left of the working masses, the tactics of a united front have entered on a new phase. It is on the basis of this trend to the Left that the foundation of the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee was possible. We have already said that our chief path, the old path of the Comintern consists in the organisation of the Communist Parties, in the consolidation of Communist nuclei. We are already marching along this path. Side by side with it, however, a new path has become visible, which we must not forget. This path is the formation of the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee, the visits of delegations of workers to our country — new phenomena which are proceeding on the soil of the trend to the Left which is taking place in the international labour movement. These new facts should be for us a starting point for our further work in carrying out the tactics of unity. We are making every effort in order to call into being a Left trade union wing in every country. At the same time, however, we must not overestimate this movement, we must not think that it can replace for us the old main path of the Communist International.

If we trace the curve of the Labour movement, from the foundation of the 2nd International to the first years of the 3rd International, we see that the wave of Reformist illusions now sinks and now rises — depending on the course of economic development, depending on the course of political events. Menshevik illusions will still arise under the influence of various factors. We can only erect a firm and stable building on our own Communist Parties, on our party nuclei, which have passed through our school, have accepted our programme, who wish to become Bolsheviks and who wish to join the organisation of our ranks.

Thus the Executive has established the following diagnosis: there is, as a matter of fact, a certain trend to the Left among the working class. Its causes are deeply rooted. The development of this phenomenon must be promoted. This trend to the Left of the working class makes it possible for us to advance with our policy of the united front and to form a Left wing of the Social Democratic party everywhere. We must not, however, let ourselves be carried away. We must not believe in the resurrection of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International, we must not believe that even now we can rely firmly and permanently on these Left elements. The most important basis of the Comintern, its original foundation are the Communist Parties. When the Communist International grows in numbers, when it can rely on dozens of large Communist organisations such as the German, French, English, Czech, Italian ones etc., then we can undertake assaults on the enemies' camp, then we can detach the workers from their Social Democratic leaders and exercise an influence in our own favour on the working masses in the interest of maintaining and expanding the Anglo-Russian Committee. I hope the Amsterdamers will not succeed in dispersing the Anglo-Russian Committee. We shall endeavour to find dozens of new ways of developing the tactics of the united front in depth and in extent. Taught by experience, we shall rightly appreciate the value of the trend to the Left which is going on in the working class, we shall not underrate its importance nor yet overrate it.

#### The Fight for a United Trade Union International:

The question of the trade unions is closely connected with the question just dealt with. In the course of the last two or three years we have become convinced that the solution of the trade union question is an essential condition for the tactics of the united front. The German, Italian and a number of other ultra-Left groups have arisen in connection with this question. The chief mistake of the ultra-Left is that they do not grasp the importance of trade union work and admit of deviations from Leninism in this respect.

It was a matter of course that at this Enlarged Executive which concerned itself with the exact definition of the tactics of a united front, great attention was devoted to the **trade union question**. The question as to whether our Soviet trade unions should or should not be allowed to join the Amsterdam International alone, was much to the fore. I openly admit that some foreign comrades are inclined to answer this question in the positive, they would be glad to push the Soviet trade unions on to the path of independent affiliation to Amsterdam.

The standpoint of our Party in this question is well known from a number of resolutions, but especially from the letter of our Central Committee to our brother parties, shortly after the 14th Party Congress, in which it is categorically stated that:

The C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union most decidedly refutes all the counter-revolutionary gossip suggesting that the trade unions of the Soviet Union intended to join the Amsterdam Trade Union Federation or that the Soviet Union was contemplating joining the League of Nations."

This is the point of view of our Party. I identify myself with it and the Comintern also take this view. I believe that the independent, isolated entry of our trade unions into the Amsterdam International would not only mean the collapse of the R. I. L. U. but, in the present situation, a serious blow for the Communist International. In view of the whole situation it would mean losing our connection with the best sections of the working class, with its vanguard. This is why we continue to hold the point of view that a united world trade union International must be created. Under no circumstances shall we consent to our trade unions joining the I. F. T. U. independently.

There can be no doubt that this point of view has the effect of cooling down the English trade unions to a certain extent. Some of them hoped that we should put on a few airs and graces, offer a little resistance, arrange a few meetings — and then find our way to Amsterdam. When they saw, however, that we are honestly in favour of unity, but of the unity of the trade unions of the whole world, that we shall not for a moment admit of a breach between our revolutionary trade unions and those of the German, French, Czech and other nations, when they had become convinced that we will not give up our freedom of agitation, even after a congress for unity, and shall continue to fight for our ideals, some of the sham "Left" English trade unions began to vacillate.

**Bordiga**, one of the representatives of the ultra-Left, accused us at the Executive of having abandoned the old slogan "**Amsterdam or Moscow**". We replied that this is not true, that we have not abandoned this slogan and have no intention of abandoning it. We are now fighting for trade union unity, but we make no secret of the fact that, if we succeed in creating a unified trade union International, we shall not lower the banner of Moscow before the Reformist banner of Amsterdam, and we shall fight for our principles even within the new unified International. In other words, the dispute "**Moscow or Amsterdam**" continues but in another form.

#### The Comintern and Social Democracy.

Like other conferences, the VI. Session of the Enlarged Executive did not pass without certain **internal dissensions**. In view of the multiplicity of circumstances in which the individual Communist Parties have to work, in view of the difficulties in their path, mistakes and crises are inevitable to a certain extent. The Enlarged Executive had again to be very much on its guard in order to prevent deviations to one side or the other from the Leninist lines of the Communist International.

There were indeed some attempts to lead the Comintern astray from its main principles. The attempt was made for instance to undertake a certain revision of the lines of the 5th World Congress. The form given to the question by the French Right is that the resolutions of the first four Congresses are right, those of the 5th on the other hand are erroneous. Other comrades express it less frankly but tend to hold the same view. Above all they maintain that the characterisation of Social Democracy by the 5th World Congress is to-day incorrect, too severe, that it is impossible to describe Social Democracy in such harsh terms and at the same time to preach the tactics of the united front to the Social Democratic workers. In my opinion, these objections are entirely wrong. The cha-

racterisation of Social Democracy by the 5th World Congress is and remains absolutely right. This characteristic is surely plain enough. The 5th Congress said that European Social Democracy is often intertwined with Fascism, that European Social Democracy might, in a number of States, be described as the **third party of the bourgeoisie**.

Do not the leaders of the **American Labour movement** represent "the third party of the bourgeoisie", is not their activity most closely bound up with Fascism?

Or take the **French Socialist party**. It does not indeed directly participate in the Government, but it supports the Briand Government in all essentials. Without its support Briand could not rule for a single day. It hands over the petty bourgeoisie and a section of the workers to the mercy of the large bourgeoisie of which Briand is the representative. Can it be denied that it is a "third party of the bourgeoisie"?

It is superfluous to speak of such Social Democratic parties as the **Bulgarian** or the **Roumanian** or the **Hungarian** which, with the help of the police, fight against the Communists, have them imprisoned, storm their buildings etc. The part played by the Bulgarian Social Democrats in the physical destruction of a whole generation of Bulgarian Communists is well known. Are they not the "third" party of the bourgeoisie, do they not march shoulder to shoulder with the Fascists? The same may be said of the leaders of a whole number of the Social Democratic parties.

It would, of course, be quite wrong were we to admit of a revision of the 5th World Congress in the question of its estimate of Social Democracy. **The Enlarged Executive remained unshaken in its loyalty to the resolutions of the 5th World Congress.**

I have received a communication which says: "Are they not, in England, thinking of marrying the 2nd International to the Communist International?" That is just the trouble, that some people think that attempts are being made in this direction. The **Independent Labour party**, the largest political organisation in England, Macdonald's party, published on March 1st a resolution proposing that a Conference be held between the 2nd and 3rd Internationals with a view to amalgamation. At this discussion, three questions were to be laid before the 3rd International. Firstly: "Is the 3rd International of the opinion that socialism can only be materialised through an armed fight?" Apparently those who put the question believe that the capitalists can be persuaded to yield their place voluntarily to the workers. The second question concerns the Russian and Georgian Social Democrats in Soviet prisons. The third question is about our "policy of splitting" within the Labour movement. These are the three "small" questions which they intend to put to us.

It is a matter of course that we spurn any possibility of negotiations with regard to the amalgamation of the 2nd and 3rd Internationals as well as of individual Social Democratic and Communist parties. In various countries, where we have proposed to the Social Democratic workers to fight in common with us for the economic or the most elementary political demands of the workers, the opportunist leaders frustrate our plans and, on their part propose: "if we are to unite, let it not be in small questions, let us rather form a united party, a united International!" I fear that in this case we are faced by an attempt of this kind.

There was then an inclination, though not a very pronounced one, to revise the resolutions of the 5th World Congress as to its estimate of Social Democracy, it was an attempt to overrate the importance of the trend to the Left in the Labour movement, and an attempt to interpret this trend to the Left as a symptom of the resurrection of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International. An attempt was also made to persuade the Soviet trade unions to join Amsterdam. Furthermore the French Right tried to revise our attitude towards war.

At the same time equally strong and obstinate attempts were made to bend the line of the Comintern in an ultra-Left direction. These attempts originated with **Bordiga**, the Italian comrade and with some ultra-Left German groups. Three groups of this kind may be distinguished. At the head of one group is a certain Katz, whose exclusion from the party was fully justified; the leader of the second group is Prof. Korsch, who openly takes up an attitude against the policy of the Comintern and of the Communist Parties; the third group is under the leadership of Ruth Fischer and Maslow. The first two ultra-

Left groups tried openly, and the third in a concealed form, to deflect the line of the Comintern in the direction of a negative attitude towards the tactics of a united front, they tried to advocate an erroneous standpoint with regard to the trade unions, they tried to spread fundamentally incorrect views (in the first group even counter-revolutionary ones) with regard to the significance of the Russian revolution, the Soviet Power and the Comintern.

Apart from this, endeavours were made both by the Right and the Left to lead us away from the old lines of the Comintern in questions of organisation, as for instance in the question of factory nuclei as the basis of our party.

#### The Deviations to the Right in the French Party.

Everyone who is well informed as to the history of the Communist movement, knows that in our fight for the lines of Leninism we have often had to combat deviations to the Right and to the Left at the same time.

The deviations to the Right have presented themselves chiefly in the form of the French group of Souvarine and Co. I know that rumours are in circulation that we have persecuted the Souvarine group with unjustifiable severity, that they are not bad Communists etc. I will illustrate by examples what this group represents. At the 5th Congress, Souvarine was excluded from the Comintern for a year with the rider that, if he behaved in a disciplined manner, he might bring up the question of his re-admission in a year's time. Souvarine understands a little Russian, he is a fairly gifted journalist; he has, however, written a whole number of articles against the Communist International, thus compelling the 5th World Congress to proceed against him. After the resolution of the 5th Congress, he took no step to facilitate his readmission to the party. He began to publish a paper directed against the Communist International. This paper he calls the "Bulletin Communiste" although it contains nothing of a communist nature and is gradually turning into a counter-revolutionary journal. I will quote a few extracts from the articles and declarations of Souvarine that you may yourselves be convinced what is his real attitude towards the International and the French party to which he wishes to be readmitted.

He writes for instance:

"We cannot condemn too severely the amorality, cynicism, hypocrisy, mendacity, misrepresentation, ambiguity and intrigue which characterise the high policy of the newest type of Leninists who only waited for Lenin's death in order to use his name for their own purposes."

Souvarine wrote this against the leaders of French party. The second quotation is devoted to the Comintern.

"Why did Moscow in 1924 issue an order that the leaders of the Czech party should be relieved? Who was nominated into the C. C.? Persons who have many an offense to hush up; Leninists recruited in 1924; police spies, thieves, strikebreakers etc."

It is evident from this that the back-stairs' gossip of the White Guards has been collected by Souvarine and published in his "Bulletin Communiste". These quotations reveal the true character of the people round Souvarine. When they saw that the Communist International and the French workers demanded strict discipline, they broke away from the Communist party. When the war in Morocco began, the attitude of the C. P. of France towards international tactics was a truly heroic and exemplary one; Souvarine and his group on the other hand worked against the party; they worked against the anti-war strike in which about a million workers participated.

From this one can judge whether the Communist International treated him with too great severity. In my opinion, the Communist International dealt with Souvarine in a perfectly just way. The same must be said with regard to Monatte and Rosmer, who form one group with Souvarine. They originally published a small newspaper in common, called "The Proletarian Revolution". They then began to publish two papers with the idea of a division of labour. "The Proletarian Revolution" remained in the hands of Monatte and Rosmer for the purpose of trade union propaganda, and Souvarine published the "Bulletin", containing purely political matter. Monatte and Rosmer contributed to this paper and supported Souvarine's policy.

They very cleverly made use of these two newspapers for agitation in favour of their group. They even succeeded in winning over a number of workers — a very small number, it is true — to their side. It is quite possible that they will be able to form some kind of a party; that is by no means difficult in France. In that country 100—200 persons of the same way of thinking may call a "party" into being and, with the help of the "Left" bourgeoisie, may possibly even get one or two deputies into Parliament. This is all the more easy because our party in France is still comparatively young. It arose almost entirely out of Social Democracy, it had successively to cleanse itself from Freemasons, camp-following advocates, syndicalists who would not accept the point of view of the Communists and finally the last cleansing, the exclusion of Souvarine.

Souvarine, who has but a slight knowledge of Russian conditions, tried also to intrigue between the groups with various tendencies within our party. The Right deviation was most clearly emphasised by this group who sent a worker called Engler to the Executive and bombarded us with various declarations. Engler is an upright comrade, who is, however, so thoroughly imbued with the traditions of Reformism that he himself was not clear as to what he was doing there. The Communist International, of course, aimed powerful blows at this Right deviation.

The Right deviation has recently found especially crass expression in Norway, where we have a serious mass party supported by the trade unions. In this Party, however, there is also a wing which is inclined to liquidate. It is enough to point out that the secretary of one of the provincial organisations recently wrote an article in the organ of the Tranmael party which is hostile to us, in which he stated that the Communist Party must be liquidated and amalgamated with Tranmael's Labour party.

Deviations towards the Right have also occurred in a number of other parties, for instance in the Spanish, Dutch, Czechoslovakian and partly also in the Polish Party.

#### On the Ultra-Left in Germany.

The ultra-Left deviation was this time chiefly represented by the German groups. This is no coincidence but is explained by the stage of development at which the C. P. of Germany has arrived. It has seen some eruptions of civil war. After this came a long standstill. In 1923 we saw the defeat of the Right Brandler group which, at the party Conference it itself had called, not only did nothing to correct its mistakes but did everything in its power to aggravate the situation, and thus roused the distrust of the whole Party. On the soil which had been prepared by Brandler's mistakes, there grew up and flourished the ultra-Left deviation which caused immeasurable harm to our German brother Party.

I will not discuss in detail at this moment the relation between this Executive and the Ruth Fischer-Maslow Central. It is well known that at one time we had to place the leadership of the Party in the hands of this group as there was no other alternative. For a time it was hoped that this group would learn from its own mistakes and that, with the help of the Comintern, it would work its way up to being a Bolshevik nucleus of the C. P. of Germany. This was not the case. Ruth Fischer and Maslow continued with their Left blunders and led the Party on lines which were opposed to those of the Comintern.

In August 1925, when we were convinced that Maslow and Ruth Fischer were leading the Party along wrong paths and that, in spite of all our endeavours, the line of the German C. C. was not corrected, we felt compelled to help the German Party to carry out a thorough change in the leadership of the C. P. of Germany. Since the time when the C. C. removed Ruth Fischer and Maslow from the leadership, it consists chiefly of workers, with Comrade Thalman, one of the best functionaries, at its head, and, with the help of the Executive, it has achieved valuable results. The workers have gradually gone over to the side of the C. C., which has worked on correct lines. Supported by the Executive, the nucleus round the C. C. is constantly growing.

Nevertheless the ultra-Left is still strong. It is indeed dominating before our eyes, as its fundamental lines are wrong, its standpoint of the ultra-Left in the questions of trade unions and of the united front is wrong, it is an obstacle in the path towards winning over the masses. We hope that the German



C. C. will succeed in exposing the true nature of the ultra-Left, and in freeing the Party from the influence of that group.

We also summoned Comrade Ernst Meyer, an old functionary of the German Party, who at one time took part in the organisation of the Right group and even now is the representative of a special group within the C. P. of Germany — although he denies the existence of a specially organised fraction — to appear before the Executive. Undoubtedly he still has certain leanings towards the Right. At the Plenum he stated that he had only supported the C.C. because the C.C. had come to him and not vice versa. In a resolution, we pointed out the error of this standpoint. We knew that Comrade Meyer would understand this and would collaborate with the German C. C. The chief fight however was carried on against the ultra-Left group and in the first place against the Ruth Fischer-Maslow group. The great mistakes made by this group are sufficiently known.

In this direction the C. P. of Germany will no doubt meet with great difficulties; we should allow ourselves no illusions in that respect. Under the new leadership however, the C. P. of Germany can already boast of good results. The course of the campaign for the expropriation of the princes is generally known. The question of an expropriation of the former ruling houses without compensation has been brought up.

In Germany to-day the number of the unemployed is more than two million. And it is at such a time that the question is raised of restoring to the ex-Kaiser two milliards of gold marks for "juridical" or other reasons. The Communists fought against the proposal and declared that it would be much better to use this sum for supporting the unemployed. Needless to say, this proposal has found enthusiastic support among the masses.

On the initiative of the Communists, 12 million votes were collected. There still remains the plebiscite, at which the proposal of expropriation must be backed by more than half the votes registered at the last election. If the Communist Party and those who sympathise with it, succeed in producing more than 20 million votes, the Communist party will have turned this question into a fighting question for German politics as a whole. Such a victory would help the Party to persuade the masses to make the tactics of a united front a reality, to win over the Social Democratic workers.

At the Enlarged Executive the remnants of the ultra-Left ideology, which still exist, had to be unmasked. For this reason a detailed resolution against the ultra-Left deviation in Germany was passed as well as one against the Right deviation in the French Party. Both resolutions are very important and both are based on the same lines, i. e. the further development of the tactics of the united front, and the further development of Leninism which combats both the Right and the ultra-Left deviations. It is not in Germany alone that we have an ultra-Left deviation; in the Italian Party it is represented by Comrade Bordiga, in the Polish party it is associated with the name of Comrade Donski. In the Norwegian and in the French Party there are also ultra-Left deviations.

It may therefore be said that the correct marching route of the last Enlarged Executive is bounded by two lines — the Right in France and the ultra-Left in Germany. The fight against these two deviations helped in the working out of the fundamental lines of the Executive.

#### The Struggle with Social Democracy for the Masses.

I should like, first of all, to say a few words about a short characteristic episode. Comrade Rades, one of the Russian laborers in the apparatus of the E. C. C. L. was dissatisfied with the political theses which were unanimously approved of by our Pol. bureau and stated:

"It is difficult, nay even impossible for a Russian comrade to criticise the theses of the C. P. of the Soviet Union before the Enlarged Executive. This is all the more difficult because even those who are well informed always run the danger of blundering, as they do not know the strategy with regard to the subject in question, as they do not know what has been said in a particular case and with what object, whether or not something has been said intentionally so that thoughts may be concealed. To-day there is a great deal of strategy both inside and outside the Party."

Comrade Rades is further of the opinion that the proposal of the I. L. P. of Great Britain to amalgamate the 2nd and the 3rd International should not be answered by an abrupt "No", but that negotiations should be entered into with the object of attracting people etc.

Of course we must attract the masses. In Great Britain we are also succeeding in attracting them. But it is not on this that Comrade Rades lays political emphasis. He says:

"A serious and influential political group (i. e. the functionaries of the Independent Labour party, G. Z.) shows sympathy with us under pressure from the masses of workers."

Is this true? No! The masses of workers are in sympathy with us, but by no means the official upper stratum of the I. L. P. This is just what we must make plain to the broadest masses of the workers.

Comrade Rades of course only represents his own point of view. I know of no one else in our Party who wishes for or would consent to an amalgamation of the 2nd and 3rd Internationals.

Our answer to the proposal for amalgamation was as follows: — if the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain wishes to join in a united front with us, let it begin by combining with the British Communists in the support of the British miners' strike. That would be a united front.

It is indeed characteristic that voices such as that of Comrade Rades are beginning to penetrate even into our ranks. This attitude corresponds to the attitude of mind in various groups of other parties of which I have spoken. It is quite clear that if we wish to carry through the firm Leninist line against the Right and the ultra-Left deviations, we must combat these views with all energy.

For those who would understand the tactics of the united front it is very important to get to know the social composition of the Social Democratic parties.

Among 844,000 members of the S. P. of Germany in March 1925, 1200 were leading party officials; 7000 trade union officials; 600 members of the National and Provincial Administrations; 6500 members of the Municipal Administration; 30,000 members of Town Councils; 1500 burgo-masters; 2300 in the employment of the Municipalities etc. Thus, more than 50,000 Social Democrats are employed in the administrative apparatus of the Labour organisations. Apart from this there are in the Social Democratic party 100,000 small traders and non-proletarian housewives, 10,000 hotel and restaurant keepers, 70,000 small and lesser officials and 10,000 technical and commercial employees. The present S. P. of Germany has thus altogether 350,000 intellectual and petty bourgeois members and 500,000 belonging to the proletariat.

In France, the petty bourgeois element is still more strongly represented in the Socialist party and weighs like a heavy burden on the proletarian elements in the party.

These petty bourgeois elements, during the war, drove German Social Democracy on to the path of social patriotism and is now driving it into the arms of the bourgeoisie. This composition of the Social Democratic parties also affects the results of our tactics for the united front in a high degree. The Social Democratic Party is becoming more and more, at least in its upper stratum, a bourgeois party, not only in its policy but in its social composition. For this reason we are fully justified in hoping that we can detach from them those proletarian elements which have still remained in their ranks. It may be taken for granted that, since almost half of the 800,000 members of the S. P. of Germany consists of petty bourgeois elements and the other half of proletarian ones, we can win over the half consisting of workers by correct, skillful and purposeful united front tactics. The social composition of the Social Democratic parties to a certain extent clears the way for us for carrying out the tactics of the united front and for choosing the right weapons to help us to win over the masses.

#### The Leadership of the Comintern and the Inner-Party Regime.

I should like to add a few words about the internal regime of the Comintern. Which questions came up for discussion in this connection? First of all the question of Democracy within the Party, of the internal regime of the Comintern, became acute at this Conference. Comrade Bordiga said that the situation within the Comintern was catastrophic. This however was the voice of a comrade who is opposed to the Communist Inter-

national almost along the whole line. It is important that the very centre of the Communist International brought up the question of an improvement of the leadership, of a more collective leadership in the C. I. As is well known, our 14th Party Congress passed a resolution suggesting to the Comintern that non-Russian comrades should be enlisted much more than hitherto in the work of the Executive.

As early as at the IV. Congress of the C. I. we constantly drew attention to this and begged the foreign Parties to send their best representatives to the E. C. C. I. In connection with this, the question of greater independence for the Communist Parties was discussed, it was pointed out that they should **rely more than hitherto on their own experiences**. The C. I. must of course remain a centralised organisation. We believe however that the Parties, in building up their political life, in the choice of their leaders, must rely more on the history of the class war in their own country, on making better use of their own experiences.

Further, the question of Democracy within the Party was brought before the Plenum. In the Comintern, the word "normalisation" is often used instead of Democracy within the Party. This word originated in France. The thesis regarding Democracy within the Party, which was unanimously accepted by our delegation, is of great importance not only for our Party but also for the foreign Parties.

The Comintern came into being amidst the fire of civil war, in a situation when it seemed to all of us that we were on the threshold of the decisive battle. This is the reason why a discipline was introduced into it which was not only an iron discipline but a military discipline, a discipline which is essential in the periods of the sharpest fighting.

In a number of countries however, the party Centres, which have not had the great historical experience which our Party possesses, which have not had a leader like Lenin, who was our teacher for decades, began to transform democratic centralism into bureaucratic centralism. Even in the period of standstill they were opposed to "normalisation". We saw examples of such behaviour in the French Party, in which some comrades exaggerated this centralism to an extreme degree and forgot that it is not merely centralism we need, but democratic centralism. Many Communist Parties are now leading a legal existence, they have a certain breathing space, they are collecting new masses of workers round them and are attempting to prepare better cadres; at such times we ought to say, and we have said, that much more attention should be paid to normalisation, to democracy within the Party.

The Enlarged Executive has issued very detailed instructions with regard to normalisation or to democracy within the Party in the spirit of the fundamental thesis. Some foreign comrades tried to modify the passage of the resolution which has been quoted. As regards illegal parties, we do not think that a party is to blame which, as is the case with the Italian Party, working under the three-fold pressure of Fascism, cannot establish a finished system of democracy within the Party.

As regards other Parties which are working under a more or less "normal" régime, even though a bourgeois one, the Executive resolved to insist on these Parties carrying out Democracy within the Party.

#### Old Aims, New Paths.

The chief results of the Enlarged Executive were as follows:

As regards the analysis of the economic situation in the capitalist countries, this situation was characterised by the words "trottering stabilisation"; in the trade union question, we keep to the old lines. In the question of the ultra-Left and Right deviations, we also stick to the Leninist line and combat hostile deviations where ever they are especially strong. If for instance the Right is particularly strong in France, we aim our blow at it etc. As regards the tactics of the united front, they have been intensified and we are carrying them on with more success. We see the trend to the Left of the working masses, but we do not overrate this fact, we know that there are still many people in the Labour movement who will often vacillate in the future.

The relations between the Russian revolution and the Communist International remain as they were; we shall defend the Leninist line. Propaganda for the united front must continue to be the most important form of our work. The workers delegations which visit us are one of the most important forms of this propaganda. The building up of Socialism in our country is the most powerful instrument for communist mass propaganda among the non-party and Social Democratic workers in other countries.

To sum up, I can say that, in spite of all the difficulties our Party has experienced, we have succeeded in fulfilling our duty towards the Communist International.

On the first anniversary of the Communist International, Lenin wrote in his article "The Third International and Its Place in History":

"The First International laid the foundation of the fight of the international proletariat for Socialism.

The Second International was the epoch of preparing the soil for spreading the movement widely among the masses in a number of countries.

The Third International inherited the fruits of the work of the Second, lopped off its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty bourgeois excrescences and began to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat."

In this way Lenin defined the place of the Communist International in history. The whole work of the Communist International is directed towards justifying this characterisation. We can say with confidence that the Comintern unswervingly remains at its historic post. We have still to expect difficult times and complications, even now we shall have losses in China, but our fundamental lines are right. Take for instance a party such as the C. P. of Great Britain. Three years ago it was a small group and to-day it is gradually changing into a mighty organisation which will be followed by millions of workers.

The French Party understood how to take the correct standpoint in the question of opposing war in the most difficult times; it has successfully outlived a whole series of crises and has become a Communist mass organisation.

Our Czechoslovakian Party has survived the severe crisis through which it passed only a year ago and is now the strongest party in Czechoslovakia. It has recovered from all its internal ailments and is on the right path to Bolshevisation.

The same may be said with regard to the Italian Party. When Comrade Bordiga asked: "A whole year has passed since the thesis of Bolshevisation was accepted, and where is your Bolshevisation? You also are suffering from various diseases and crises," we answered him: "Live for ever, Bolshevise for ever!" The party cannot Bolshevise itself in one year, it will take many years. It must be steeled through its crises. The formation of a party moulded in one piece is a difficult matter in view of the bourgeois environment, in view of a Social Democracy which is still strong.

Comrade Lenin showed the Comintern the duties which lay before it in many questions. We continue of course to pursue the old aims, but it is equally a matter of course that we must seek some new paths. Old aims, new paths! I believe that the Enlarged Executive which discussed the most difficult questions and listened to a whole number of comrades, while it reported some successes, was also doing its duty in pointing out a large number of mistakes. The unity of the Communist International was perfectly preserved. Although it was necessary to exclude individuals from various parties, as for instance Souvarine etc. it only had a salutary effect.

The Comintern is gaining in strength. For many years it was exposed to attacks from all sides. The bourgeoisie has often buried it. It has passed through severe crises. It has issued from each crisis in a stronger position. The fate of the Communist International is the fate of the international working class, and I believe that the Enlarged Executive has done everything in its power to help the workers of other countries to find the right way to Socialism. In spite of its internal and external difficulties, our Party has succeeded in carrying out its duty, and I hope that in the future it will fulfil it with equal devotion. (Enthusiastic applause.)