

embodying many changes in the tactics hitherto pursued by the Non-Cooperators. The most important among these was the abandonment of the boycott of the Reform Councils, and the contesting of the 1924 elections by the Congress Party with the object of "entering the Councils to end them or to lead them". The whole struggle of the Congress turned upon this issue, which was supported, not only by Mr. Das and his immediate followers, but by the strong right-wing faction of rational "Pro-Change" politicians who had long been agitating within the Congress for the abandonment of the boycott of the Reform Councils. Thus Mr. Das, leader of the left-wing Extremists, found himself temporarily allied with the "Responsive Cooperators" of the right-wing faction of the Congress. The complete defeat of Mr. Das' program led to the resignation of the latter at the close of the Congress as President of that body, and to the formation within the Congress of a separate party, headed by Mr. Das and including the right-wing elements, known as the "Swaraj Party", whose avowed object was to work within the Congress with the object of obtaining the majority in that organization and to work independently with its own program, for the attainment of Swaraj by non-violent means.

The new party thus included within its ranks incongruous elements of the left and of the right, whose bond of union consisted in the disgust of both factions with the orthodox Non-Cooperators and their moribund tactics, and in the tactics of contesting the elections to the Reform Councils, with the object of entering them to practice obstruction and so force the government either to dissolve the Councils or to concede further reforms. There were however, many revolutionary elements who drew back from allegiance to the new party on account of their dislike of anything even remotely resembling cooperation with the government, as entrance into the Reform Councils seemed to imply, even though qualified as obstructionist tactics. Such elements were represented by the faction within the Congress which, for two years past, has presented a resolution calling for the definition of Swaraj as "complete independence outside the British Empire, to be attained by all possible and proper means". Such a definition stands in direct opposition to the rather vague Congress slogan of "Swaraj", which has only very recently been defined by various accredited leaders as meaning Home Rule or Dominion Status within the British Empire. To this latter definition, the Swaraj Party of Mr. Das and his adherents subscribe, and in their recently published program, drawn up in February of this year, it is clearly announced that the objective is "complete dominion status". Thus, there is still room for a republican party standing for the freedom of India from all foreign rule, and such a party has been formed within the past two months by those extremist elements inside the Congress whose resolution calling for complete independence has been twice rejected. This third party is known as the "Independence Party", which has issued a manifesto and announced its intention of working within the Congress until it obtains a majority. Its following, however, is much less than that of the Swaraj Party, which claims to control the votes of one-third of the Congress delegates present in this session just past.

The Swaraj Party contains within its ranks all the leaders of the Non-Cooperation movement possessing any personality and influence on the country as a whole, and it embodies the principles of bourgeois democracy, as opposed to the reactionary and metaphysical politics of the orthodox Gandhites. As such, it is bound to command a majority in the 1923 session of the National Congress, and has already commenced an intensive campaign of organization and propaganda throughout the length and breadth of India. So widespread was the response, and so enthusiastic the popular reception given to the leaders of the Swaraj Party, that the faithful followers of sacrosanct Gandhism became alarmed, and overtures for negotiation and compromise were made by the latter to the leaders of the new and more vigorous faction. These overtures bore fruit in several conferences, and at last resulted in a temporary understanding, whereby the Swaraj Party agreed to postpone all independent propaganda for its own program until after April 30th, the date on which the Congress had pledged itself to collect its fund and enlist 50 thousand volunteers. This temporary truce was to hold good until, at the end of this period, it was seen whether the country was ripe for the declaration of Civil Disobedience, and each side agreed to work in unison until the Congress Committee should announce its decision on this point.

The agreement to compromise means several things. It means, first of all, that the orthodox Gandhites realize that their day is over, and that in order to prevent the new party winning control of the entire Congress organization, it was necessary to temporize and eventually to concede the main points at issue in order to preserve the unity of the Non-Cooperation forces. This is a tacit confession that the victory of Gandhism at Gaya was an illusive one, and that the real strength of the movement

has shifted from the petty-bourgeois sentimentalists and transcendentalists, to the rationalist politicians of the school of "Responsive Cooperation" advocated by the late Lokmanya Tilak, whose death prevented him from organizing an effective resistance to the spiritual politics of Mr. Gandhi and his disciples.

The compromise means also, that the New Party is unwilling to go to the length of a definite split from the Congress ranks, if it can drag the unwilling followers of Gandhi in its wake. The game of "Responsive Cooperation" is a dangerously opportunistic one, which the present Moderates who accepted the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms as a "stepping-stone" to complete Self-Government, can on occasion play with the government in a very spectacular manner. The decision of the Swaraj Party to contest the elections to the Reform Councils alarmed the Moderates and put them on their mettle to prove that they, after all, had been right all along in their decision to accept the Reform Scheme for what it was worth, and to utilize it for what it was worth, in order to extract more concessions. On several occasions during the past two years, they have practised obstruction within the Councils with some degree of success, and since the beginning of the present year, they have three times rejected measures proposed by the Government, necessitating the "certification" by the Viceroy that such steps were necessary for the welfare of the country, and so passing them over the heads of the Legislative Assembly. Thus, the demands for increased railway expenditure and for the expenses of a Royal Commission to investigate the question of the Indianization of the Government Services were refused by the Assembly and passed by order of the Viceroy, while the Bill to protect the Indian Native States against Disaffection, by curbing the freedom of the press was rejected by the Assembly and certified by the Viceroy, whence it was afterwards laid before the British Parliament and approved by that body, and so became a law. Even more sensational was the very recent rejection by the Assembly of the official proposal to double the Salt Tax as a means to raise revenue to cover the huge Budget Deficit, now totalling some £100,000,000. This increased burden on the poor people was recommended by the Inchaape Committee, which let the staggering military expenditure off very lightly. The enhanced Salt Tax was twice rejected by the Legislative Assembly, and was thereupon certified by the Viceroy and will go before the British Parliament to become a law in the next months.

Thus, the struggle within the Councils is already taking place, and the prospect of new elections looming up early in the coming year will do much to enhance this opposition of the enthroned Moderates, who are very loth to lose their seats in the Legislative and Provincial Assemblies, to the faction of the Non-Cooperators who have declared for contesting the elections. There is little doubt that the Non-Cooperators lie closer to the heart of the very limited electorate than do the ultra-loyal Moderates, and that candidates from the Congress or Swaraj Party would stand a much better chance of election than those from the Liberal League. But that the "Responsive Cooperators" will be able to accomplish more within the Reform Councils by obstructionist tactics than the Moderate Liberals have, remains extremely unlikely. The character of the Reform Councils has not altered, and the government can manipulate those bodies, as well as the elections, to suit its own purposes. It is certain that the Non-Cooperators will not obtain a majority of the seats in the coming elections, so well controlled is the official representation and so complex is the system of communal and special class voting.

However, a break away from the blind alley of spiritual politics has been made, and the Non-cooperation movement is struggling for a new program and new tactics to guide the national struggle. The elaborate Programme and Constitution of the Das-Swaraj Party has been drawn up and laid before the country for criticism, suggestions and approval. It suffices to say that one of its main clauses calls for the "growth and protection of private property" to understand the highly-bourgeois nature of the new party, and its intense class-consciousness. The fact that its program also calls for the organization of peasant and labor unions to help in the national struggle only makes the signs more ominous. It means that the Indian working-class will be consciously exploited by the national movement for its own ends, instead of unconsciously, blindly and sentimentally, as heretofore.

April 18, 1923.

Correction:

A most poignant error has crept into last week's *Inprekorr.* It is only too obvious that the last article on the last page should have come under the heading: "Youth Movement".

Printed by Friedrichstadt-Druckerei G. m. b. H., Berlin SW 46

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 36 [18]

9th May 1923

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for *Inprekorr.* — Telegraphic address: *Inprekorr.*

CONTENTS

Politics

Karl Radek: Empty Threats . . .
G. H. Martin: Oil and the British-American Rivalry
Fight of the C.P.F. against Poincaré
W. Stoeker: French and Communists on the Ruhr
P. Böttcher: The Saxon Proletariat

Economics

E. Varga: II. World Economic Situation in the 1st quarter of 1923

In Soviet Russia

Leon Trotzky: Relations between Proletariat and Peasantry in Soviet Russia
Pierre Pascal: Soviet Russia: March 15.—April 15.

The Labor Movement

J. T. Murphy: England: Yellow Leadership
French and German Railwaymen

In the International

John Pepper: The Workers' Party of America — Its Problem
W. Martarty: The C.P. of Canada

In the Colonies

E. Roy: Where are the Indian Masses?

Discussions and Polemics.

R. Albert: War: a conversation with a Pacifist
Our Problems.
E. Hörnl: The Proletarian Film

Empty Threats . . .

By Karl Radek.

When the English Parliament began to play a conservative comedy in place of the liberal, Mr. Ronald McNeill became specialist for foreign politics. He began to brandish a paper ~~sabre cut out~~ of the leading articles of the arch-reactionary *Morning Post*, and to proclaim in terrifying bass voice the firmness of English foreign politics as pursued by the conservative cabinet. Mr. McNeill is under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, and speaks for his department in the House of Commons; for his chief, Lord Curzon, adorns with his worthy person the Upper House, that honorable assembly of speculators, who contribute money for the election campaigns of the governing party.

We were much ashamed of our ignorance when we first came across the name of this new shining light of the English Parliament and of English diplomacy in the newspapers. We had no idea who he was, and were obliged to look up reference books to obtain information concerning this gentleman who has so suddenly emerged from obscurity. But alas! The reference books gave us nothing to go by, for all we could learn about this ill-disposed individual, who cherishes such unfriendly feelings towards Soviet Russia, is that he is 63 years of age, that he has been assistant to an editor issuing the 11th edition of the *British Encyclopedia*, and that he has written a work on the harmfulness of socialism and the utility of the exploitation of Ireland. But how this young man with the tremendous past has become the bard of English imperialist hopes, was a mystery to us until a few days ago, when we read the solution in the Fabian organ, *The New Statesman*. Mr. Ronald McNeill belongs to the most stupid-headed wing of the English conservatives, and has blazoned his name eternally in the book of history by a heroic deed. During the struggle carried on between the conservatives and liberals over the Irish question, he threw a book at Winston Churchill's head. For this he has now been rewarded by the position of under-secretary of state in the foreign office, and the reader is thus obliged to study his biography.

This gentleman declared only a few days ago in Parliament, that there could be no thought of recognizing Soviet Russia until it acknowledges the debts and gives the English capitalists their factories back again. But even should Soviet Russia do all this, the severe Mr. McNeill is only going to "see" . . .

Mr. McNeill is making a mistake. He will not get the chance of "seeing". For Byron's words, when he spoke of the heroes who come and go every month, and have incense burnt before them in succession by the newspapers, apply still more to the England of today than to the England of a century ago.

The honorable Lord Balfour, in 1918, threatened the Soviet government that he would make it personally responsible for the crime of the Red Terror. His lordship is now engaged in curing his piles and reading medieval mystics because he has plenty of time for such things, being no longer in the government. And then the prime minister himself, Ulysses Lloyd George the versatile, took an oath that he would never sit at the same table with the Moscow robbers. But still he did so, and even made himself very agreeable. Although we are convinced that the haughty English government will find itself obliged, sooner or later, to enter into negotiations with regard to the recognition of Soviet Russia, still there is little likelihood of our having anything to do with Mr. McNeill, for Mrs. Britannia has become very fickle in her old age, and changes the heroes of her heart with astonishing rapidity.

The hero of a month, Mr. McNeill, has been endeavoring to frighten us. He has sent us a semi-official threat per radio, relating to the execution of that spy in Catholic cowl, the prelate Butkiewitz, and informs us that the English government is about to examine into the advisability of withdrawing the English representative in Moscow, Mr. Hodgson, since the Soviet government does not grant immunity to Entente spies. This intimation can do no more than call forth a smile at the clumsy agitative methods of the personified incapability at present representing the English government. It goes without saying that the Soviet government has been guilty of unheard of inhumanity in having spies shot. But that the English government will break with us on account of a Polish spy is something which nobody is likely to believe; for that we have too much respect for the understanding of the English government, however low its level may be at present.

The Bolsheviks are very bad people. But still they are good enough to trade with, and at the present time this trade is likely to be considerably increased, now that the fresh crops will permit the export of grain. But even were we to preserve silence on these material motives, none but a blockhead would think

for a moment that the English government in its present international situation can risk destroying the weak beginnings of relations with Russia, represented by the commercial treaty of 1921.

It is of course ridiculous to suppose that the latest phase of Russo-English relations is the result of the appearance on the scene of such a high principled philanthropist as Mr McNeill. He, of course, does not count one iota. This policy is not even determined by Lord Curzon's historical enmity for Soviet Russia. It is the result of the blind alley which English politics ran into at Genoa and the Hague.

After the Entente had become convinced that it had not the power to subdue us by force of arms, English Imperialism relied upon a change of policy on the part of the Soviet government. It was thought that the Soviet government would enslave the Russian people for the purpose of maintaining its own power, that it would fleece the peasantry in order to pay the loans of the Tsarist government, that it would not only restore to the English capitalists all the old factories, but would, in addition, hand over half Russia to them in the form of concessions. In Genoa and at The Hague, we explained clearly to the allies that the Soviet government has no intention whatever of renouncing its existence as such in order to maintain its power, but that it is prepared to make contracts, and to grant economic advantages in return for others. The English capitalists could not make up their minds to go in for such a policy, and the new English government is waiting for good weather.

Let it wait. But why smash the furniture!! One year will succeed another; Russia will begin to heal her own wounds, and the English capitalists will see, in the course of time, that if they want to do business, they must do it in a businesslike manner, that is, they must pursue a real policy based on mutual advantage. But pending the moment when the English cabinet scrapes up sufficient common sense to come to fresh decisions, we advise that at least no panes be broken, and that the clowns sporting themselves in the English parliamentary circus, and flourishing their paper swords, be put on the chain at present.

English policy has obliged its enemies to respect its earnestness. If the English government is desirous of cutting a comic figure with its ridiculous threats, we cannot forbid it, but it will scarcely be of any use in Russia and the Near East. The peoples of the despised Orient have a keen sense of humor, but the popularity to be gained by appealing to this sense of humor is of no great use for bettering the relations between two countries.

POLITICS

Oil and British-American Rivalry

By G.H. Martin.

We are entering the oil age, and the nation which dominates the world's oil resources, will dominate the world.

The Standard Oil Company of America (S.O.C.) in 1920 had assets valued at \$3,000,000,000; and by profiteering and working men on the oilfields 12 hours a day, and seven days a week, its constituent companies have paid large dividends. In 1922 several of them gave stock bonuses of from 200% to 800%. It is said, now that the S.O.C. has hitched the American Government to its cart, Standard policy has become national policy.

The Royal Dutch Shell combine (R.D.S.) relies upon the British navy to defend its farflung interests, reaching all round the world. As only 40% of its shares are "Shell", it is a foreign trust, but when it decided to absorb the British "Mexican Eagle Oil Co.", in defiance of regulation 30 B.B., the British Government had to suspend its own regulation during the merger.

These two trusts backed by the American and British Governments are the chief combatants in the struggle for the world's oil resources.

The fight for the distributive trade, has given rise to a new German word, *Petroleumverkehrsmonopolisierungsbestrebungen*.

At first France tried to exclude the trusts, but finding she was not strong enough, she opened her doors to all, hoping to benefit by competition; so through their subsidiaries the S.O.C., the R.D.S. and the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. (A.P.O.C.) scrambled for French trade. Petrol is being sold below cost in Belgium, where the A.P.O.C. started a price cutting war.

During the war, Mr. Churchill's eastern policy had placed British troops in advantageous positions for occupying oilfields in Persia, Palestine, Russia and Turkey.

Writing in the *Industrial Digest*, in 1922, Mr. Paxton Hibben F.R.S. said, "The Baku fields . . . and the Grosny

fields . . . were good for over 10,000,000 tons of oil a year . . . It was plainly nothing to sneeze at. Nor indeed has anybody sneezed at it, quite the contrary. When the sound of the last rifle shot died away on November 11th, 1918, those with an eye to the future discerned three vast oil properties to be had the getting and one to be negotiated for. The three, were in Mesopotamia, Persia, and Russia, and the one that could not exactly be seized, because it was in an allied country, was in Roumania."

British troops occupied the Baku oilfields but only succeeded in holding them for a short time. Denikin captured the Grosny oilfields, the oil journals rejoiced, and Denikin was awarded the K.C.B. by Britain, but was defeated by the Bolsheviks through Archangel. British troops were sent to Archangel to push through to Koltchak, the "supreme ruler" who was utterly defeated; the British troops had to be withdrawn.

The last North West Russian Government, set up under British protection, was popularly known as the "oil government", because Mr. Lianozov, the Russian oil king, was president, and supplied half the ministers from his staff.

Mr. Vanderlip said oil was known to exist in Siberia, and American troops were sent to Siberia.

After the Russo-Japanese war, Japan was ceded the southern part of the island of Sakhaline, but the oil was in the northern portion, and in Kamtchatka, both of which were occupied by Japanese troops, and three Japanese oil companies started operations.

Baron Wrangel, financed by the "Russo-French Society for the exploitation of South Russia and the Crimea" (Capital 12,000,000 francs) pushed on towards the oilfields, but was defeated before he reached them. He was not awarded the K.C.B. As the American troops had to be withdrawn, other methods were adopted. Mr. Silas Root of the S.O.C., and Mr. Bud Foster of the Maguire Petroleum Co., turned up in the Caucasus as Red Cross officers; they did not get the oilfields, but Bud Foster returned to America with a jewelled knife, a present from General Wrangel.

Despite all this, the Russian oilfields remain the property of the first Workers' Republic.

As oil dominates international politics, it occupied a prominent place at the Peace Conferences. Russian delegates were allowed to attend the Genoa and "Genoa moved to the Hague" conferences as the Russian oilfields were the chief bone of contention. America decided not to take part, but two S.O.C. representatives arrived, so did Mr. Pierpont Morgan; and Colonel Boyle went for the Shell interests and was followed by their chairman. The Federation of British Industries had two representatives; Mr. P. W. Robson was sent by the Agricultural Machinery Manufacturers, and of course Mr. Leslie Urquhart of the "Russo-Asiatic Consolidated", the "good friend" of Admiral Koltchak, was there; but of the workers, only those of Russia were represented. So much for bourgeois democracy.

The British, French, Belgian companies which had pre-war concessions in Russia, tried to form a united front against the Russians, but the R.D.S. started buying up shares in the Russian companies for a mere song from the impoverished shareholders; the S.O.C. sent a representative to negotiate in Moscow; the "American Barnsdall Corporation" is now working a new field for the Russian Government; the Lucey Rex interests are supplying oil field machinery, and the Sinclair interests have obtained concessions in Sakhalin and Kamtchatka.

At the time of the Versailles Conference, the Ruthenes, being a small nation, demanded their independence; but an international oil committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles Perkins became very active, and insisted that East and West Galicia could not be separated, as this would form an economic boundary between some of the oil wells and the refineries; so the Ruthenes were given to the Poles.

French finance became dominant in the Polish oil industry, which however did not prosper, partly because some of the companies were formed to sell shares rather than to produce oil, and even dry boreholes were sold to unwary foreigners.

A cry was raised in America, that Britain was trying to obtain control of the world's oil resources. The British Government held a controlling share in the enterprising Anglo-Persian Oil Co., and it was accused of entering the oil industry under the name "Royal Dutch Shell". American suspicions were increased by the activities of the "British Controlled Oilfields Ltd.", which was floated in Canada in 1919, with a capital of \$40,000,000, and started obtaining concessions over huge tracts of land, chiefly in South America; and the vice-president, Sir Edgar Mackay predicted that in ten years time the Americans will spend something like one thousand million dollars for oil controlled by Britain. The American Government set up an enquiry, and President Wilson's oil report stated, that the British Government was excluding aliens from oilfields in the British Empire and

trying to obtain control of oilfields in foreign countries. The British Government denied having any monopolistic intentions, sold the blocks of shares it held in the R.D.S., which it said were only purchased to stabilize the exchange, and maintained that its interest in the A.P.O.C. was to secure a supply of oil for the navy. Then foreign secretaries Curzon and Colby exchanged stiff notes, and a diplomatic struggle began, in which forged documents purporting to be signed by Queen Victoria and Lord Salisbury played a part.

There is no oil in America, and Britain, France and America all refused the mandate; there is oil in Mesopotamia, Britain obtained the mandate and much trouble.

Sir John Cadman tells us, that "American suspicions of our policy in Mesopotamia found a practical outcome in Central and South America, where British oil concessions began to be blocked or cancelled". France had been promised a zone of influence in Turkey which included the Mosul oilfields, but in the annex to the Sykes-Picot agreement, it was stated that, "all British pre-war concessions should be integrally respected". At San Remo Mr. Lloyd George explained to the French, that the "Turkish Petroleum Co." had a pre-war concession for the oil, so the French were given the *Deutsche Bank's* interest of 25%, the R.D.S. had 25% and the A.P.O.C. 50%.

Then Sir Charles Greenway, the chairman of the A.P.O.C., said he regards Mr. Lloyd George as "the greatest of all our British Premiers". The San Remo agreement was the first international agreement to be signed by two oil experts, Sir John Cadman and P. Berthelot.

The R.D.S. wanted to co-operate with the French Government in the management of any petroleum interests which might be reserved for France by the Peace Treaty. Emir Feisal was pushing the troops under General Gouraud towards the Syrian coast, when Lord Curzon said, "Sign the agreement with the Royal Dutch and you shall have Syria"; M. Millerand accepted; Feisal was removed to Mesopotamia and set up as king of Iraq, while the Greeks kept Kemal and his army busy.

America found that she too, had a pre-war concession, obtained by Rear Admiral Colby M. Chester,—to build railways in Turkey and exploit the minerals on either side of the line.

One line passed through the Mosul oilfields, so America insisted upon an "open door" policy in Mesopotamia, and sent an observer to Lausanne, while Mr. Untermyer urged "the claims of twenty two Turkish Princes and Princesses to the oilfields."

France sent Mr. Franklin Bouillon to make a pact with Kemal, who then wiped up the Greeks, so that his army was free to reconquer Mesopotamia. Britain rushed out troops and gun boats, and asked France and Italy to strengthen their troops in Turkey, but they both replied by withdrawing them. This left Britain with a somewhat precarious hold on the oilfields, especially as Feisal wanted them to clear out of Irak. Now the Angora Government has ratified the Chester concession.

The S.O.C. has also obtained its pre-war concession in Palestine. Persia had been divided before the war into a Russian zone of influence in the North known to contain minerals, a British zone in the south containing oil, and a strip in the centre for the natives. Oil was discovered in the Russian zone, and a Russo-Persian Oil Co. was floated in 1917.

After the Russian Revolution, the Bolsheviks withdrew the Russian troops from Persia, and restored North Persia to the Persians. Then the British troops were pushed through into North Persia, and in 1920, "North Persia Oils Ltd." (Capital £3,000,000) was floated, with Sir Charles Greenway of the A.P.O.C. as chairman; the Persian army was supplied with British officers, and the Persian Government with a British financial advisor.

A vigorous anti-British propaganda emanated from the American legation at Teheran, which Curzon told Colby to stop; but it proved so successful that the concession which the Persian Government (Nord Persian Oils Ltd.) obtained by coercion, was offered to the S.O.C., and the British financial advisor, has been replaced by an American financial advisor, Mr. Millsbaugh, himself an oil man.

Italy was promised the oily part of Albania, and the S.O.C. obtained a concession for the oilfields; but now at the instigation of the Fascist Government, which desires to emancipate Italy from the domination of foreign oil groups, the Italian Syndicale of Fascist Co-operatives has formed a company to deal in liquid fuel.

South America promises to become a great oil producing country, but the "British Controlled Oilfields Ltd." found they had not the resources to exploit their huge concessions, so despite the boast that here was a "real British company, not a barrel of whose oil should be subjected to alien control", today both the R.D.S. and the S.O.C. are working on its concessions.

What will be the end of this oil struggle in which thousands of natives have been slaughtered in Russia, Turkey, Persia, Syria, Mexico, and elsewhere, and which was one of the chief causes of the last war. Sir John Cadman of the A. P. O. C. suggests that it may end in co-operation. But Sir John Cadman was only endeavouring to smooth away the growing differences between English and American interests. Co-operation they may achieve against the workers of Russia, but co-operation to supply fuel for essentially rival navies is a contradiction that cannot be removed by capitalist states. So the workers see a consortium formed which unites the oil interests in their attacks on Russian workers, but they see at the same time English and American Governments defending each other's oil magnates. Before these governments find a passive defence inadequate to protect the profits of the oil mongers,—let the workers remove the obstacles which prevent real co-operation in the production of a vital fuel.

The Fight of the CP. of France against Poincaré

The following resolution, moved by the speakers of the CP. of France and the CGTU, has been passed at numerous mass meetings of the French proletariat during the last few days:

"The workers here assembled, after hearing the address, call attention to the disastrous results for the proletariat arising from the Ruhr occupation and the Versailles peace. They emphasize the necessity of intensifying the struggle being made by the French proletariat, of extending it to a European and international struggle against the policy of violence being pursued by French imperialism and German capitalism in the Ruhr area. The meeting calls upon the German workers in the occupied territory, as well as the French soldiers and officials, to fraternize in the Ruhr district, and thus to prevent the shedding of proletarian blood. The assembled workers demand the demobilization of the army class called up in 1921. They stigmatize the criminal attempts of the capitalists of all countries to mobilize bands of armed Fascists and militarized colonial slaves against the workers. They declare that the reparations should be paid by the seizure of the real values in the hands of the capitalists, by the French and German states alike, until the proletariat takes possession of the means of production by means of revolutionary action. The assembled workers undertake to fight against the increased capitalist exploitation which will arise from the agreement which will be come to between the German and French capitalists, and to combat the danger of a renewed imperialist war. They stand for a labor government in Germany, for the evacuation of the Ruhr territory, and for the annulment of the Versailles treaty, as well as for the payment of the reparations by international capital.

The assembled workers call upon all labor organizations, and upon all unorganized workers, to establish the united front of the proletariat. They declare that they will proclaim their demands in public demonstrations. The task before them is the preparation of a European general strike.

Away with the French troops from Germany!

Long live the international proletariat!

Long live the revolutionary emancipation of the workers of the whole world!

French and Communists in the Ruhr area

By Walter Stocker.

With the same regularity as the bourgeois Philistine finds his rolls on his breakfast table, he has for some time past had dished up to him every morning by his favorite newspaper the announcement: the communists in the Ruhr area make pacts with the French; the communists are playing into the hands of the French. On the occasion of the events in Mülheim, it was even asserted that the "Red Army" had been equipped and provisioned by the French! Although they know very well that there is not a word of truth in it, the bourgeois press thus works upon its readers, in order that it may be able to accuse the communists of treason, to represent them as "criminal elements", and to prepare the soil for a complete suppression of the Communist Party. A section of the social democratic press is also pursuing this line. As a matter of fact, the communists on the Rhine and in the Ruhr have been carrying on a fight against French imperialism for three months, so decidedly and unequivocally, that this humbug can at least find no foothold in the Ruhr area.

It was the Communist Party in the Ruhr area which, some days before the invasion, proposed to the social democrats and free trade unions that all the workers should join in a protest strike for several days, in order thereby to arouse the interest of the proletariat all over the world in the defensive struggle of the Ruhr workers. The attitude adopted by the Communist Party leaders and communist press in Rhenish Westphalia was plainly shown in their clear and decided appeals against the unheard of act of violence committed by French imperialism. But the communists as a matter of course are carrying on this struggle as a proletarian class struggle, and therefore as a war on two fronts, that is, against German capital as well. The workers on the Rhine and in the Ruhr are carrying on their defensive struggle with determination and unity, because they are aware that the advance being made by French imperialism is a simultaneous attack on the working class. For this reason, the communists in the Ruhr are heading the struggle against French imperialism, and are doing their utmost to lead and intensify this struggle in such a manner that the French capitalist government will be forced to withdraw its troops from the Ruhr area. Wherever workshops, etc. have been occupied in the Ruhr area, or other action taken by French troops, the most active participation of the communists has almost invariably led to proletarian demonstrations and protest strikes.

This determined attitude of the Communist Party has subjected it, and many communist workers, to the brutal methods of suppression practised by French militarism. The communist *Ruhr Echo* was one of the first newspapers whose appearance was prohibited. The *communist Workers' Paper* for Duisburg, Hamborn, has now been suppressed by the French authorities for the third time since the three months of occupation. The same fate has also been suffered for the third time by the communist *Saar Workers' Paper*, in Saarbrücken. For weeks all communist meetings have been prohibited over wide areas of the occupied territory, for example in the environs of Cologne, Bonn, Aix-la-chapelle, Düsseldorf, and on the left lower Rhine. The prohibitions even went so far that I was personally forbidden to report to my constituents on the lower Rhine on the political situation. There are a great number of communists among the general victims of the defensive struggle, among the expelled and discharged railwaymen and workers, and the numerous unemployed. As the communists are not carrying on the defensive struggle in the Ruhr area against France or against the French people, but against French capitalism and militarism, in which they are aided by the closest co-operation of the French working class, many communists have, by their special propagandist activity, been brought into conflict with French court martials. The following are a few cases:

Mückelet, workman, Düsseldorf: 6 months imprisonment.
Kirsten, workman, Düsseldorf: 6 month imprisonment.
Karl Wöll, Düsseldorf: 6 months imprisonment, 200,000 marks fine.
Gärtner, workman, Duisburg: 4 months imprisonment, 35,000 marks fine.
Graf, workman, Kupferdreh: 1 month imprisonment, 100,000 marks fine.
Bischof, workman, Hörde: 8 months imprisonment, 500,000 marks fine.

This is only a selection from those punished. Besides these, numerous communists are imprisoned on remand, and await their conviction. On the occasion of the court martial held on the blood bath of Eater Saturday, three editors of the *"Ruhr Echo"* were called upon to give evidence, but determinedly refused to make any statements. That there have up to now been no sharper conflicts with the French authorities is due to the French generals and officers having received strict injunctions to treat the workers in a "friendly" and "obedient" manner, for the gentlemen in Paris hope, by these cunning methods, to render the workers more easily pliable. And if M. Poincaré and the Comité des Forges have not yet succeeded in this aim, despite hundreds of agents and spies, this is chiefly due to the attitude of the Communist Party. The French agents have directed much attention in the past weeks to the unemployed, seeking to utilize these simultaneously for the destruction of the defensive working class front and as cheap tools for their coal robbery. Here also the communists on the Rhine and in the Ruhr, from the very outset, issued their clear slogan to the unemployed: not a stroke of work for French imperialism!

These are the facts concerning the attitude taken by the communists in the Ruhr struggle. These must be opposed to the slanderous and lying announcements of the bourgeois and social democratic press. But the bourgeoisie has every reason to cry out: Stop thief! The working class fighting in the Ruhr feels all too poignantly the dagger stab of the capitalists in the back!

The Attack on the Strategic Positions of the Saxon Proletariat

By Paul Böttcher (Dresden).

The sacred order of the Cuno bourgeois republic, by the grace of Stinnes, is threatened. In the midst of the wedding festival of the black-red-gold united front, threatening underground rumblings are heard from the Saxon proletariat. The exhausted home-workers of the Vogtland, the starving toy carvers of the Erz Gebirge, the poverty-stricken weavers of the Lausitz, the proletariat of the cities and industrial districts in east and west Saxony, all are rising in defiant protest against the continued capitalist offensive. The flunkey press of the aniline patriots and corn profiteers reply to the challenge of the Saxon workers by a howl of rage. The White Terror is being mobilized!

The governmental declaration of the left social democratic government of Saxony, which was issued on April 10, in the Saxon provincial diet, has evoked the most active resistance from the capitalist parties. The social democratic leaders, under pressure from the workers of Saxony, were obliged to abandon the policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie. They were compelled by the communists to adopt fighting slogans against the propertied class. This transformation was clearly expressed in the governmental declaration.

The German CP. does not fail to bear in mind the fact that this is a social democratic governmental declaration, formulating the political program of the left United Social Democratic party of Germany. This program demands a policy of fulfillment under the password of "sacrifice of property", but without drawing the only possible revolutionary consequence: Overthrow of the Cuno government and fight for the worker's government. And then the aims of this program are pacifist, not revolutionary. The German CP. shows to the working class the weaknesses and vacillations of this government, and exerts every endeavor to propagate the revolutionary solution to the crisis: the worker's government. But the German CP. would be pursuing a mere infantile policy if it did not emphatically agitate among the broad masses for the carrying out of the agreements made between the German communists and the German united social democrats, which led to the formation of the left social democratic government in Saxony. Even before the government was formed, these agreements were the subject of the most violent attacks in the bourgeois press. After these slogans had been incorporated into the government program, a well directed fire against Saxony was commenced in the whole capitalist press. The objects of the attack are: the proletarian defence organizations and the control committees. The government had devoted the second half of its declaration to pointing out the Fascist dangers, and had designated the national defence troops as an immediate danger to the republic. The governmental declaration openly threatened to combat the national government, should the latter venture to proceed against the proletarian defence units by means of exceptional laws.

The continued treachery and submission of the social democratic leaders had rendered the governing class so certain of victory, that it no longer believed in any serious resistance on the part of the working class. Suddenly, the capitalists made the discovery that the counter-attack of the workers had begun, and had begun with great energy against the most susceptible point in the enemy front: against Fascism. Not that the bourgeois parties would have been afraid of the left socialist ministers; they know the weaknesses of these leaders just as well as do the communists. But they were afraid of the masses marching behind these leaders—masses who recognized instinctively, that slogans were now being issued which are really capable of being realized, if only the will to their realization exists. The slogans are not revolutionary, but the realization of these promises must inevitably lead to the revolutionizing of the broad masses, and to the objective intensification of the class struggle. This would furnish the starting point for further conflicts and for practical revolutionary politics which would demonstrate the bankruptcy of petty-bourgeois democracy and its parties in all their forms. The dangers attending this policy were as clearly observed by the bourgeoisie as by the social democratic Right. In the course of the debate in the Saxon diet on the governmental declaration, this fact was specially accentuated. The bourgeois parties quoted a wide selection of choice extracts from the social democratic press against the governmental program, against the defence units, control committees, the political activity of the shop stewards, and the amnesty. The United Social Democratic party of Germany had in fact, a short time previously, fought against all these demands by the most perfidious methods, denouncing them as "communist cheating manoeuvres", "slogans

of confusion", etc. The social democratic workers were worked upon by every possible means, in the press, at meetings, and in the trade unions, against the communist demands.

The bourgeois press canaille had further to prove, that the bourgeois order can in no case tolerate the steps taken by the Saxon workers. Breach of the constitution! National executive!—these are the alarms raised to frighten the workers and mobilize reaction. The obedient national government has already declared that *hundertschaften* (defence units) and control committees will not be tolerated. Cuno has not yet ventured to set the heel of the monarchist General v. Seekt on the neck of the proletariat of Saxony, neither have the threats issued by the national government been carried out. But there is no doubt that, when the internal situation becomes more acute, as it is bound to do with the liquidation of the Ruhr war, then the Cuno government will have to show the Saxon working class its teeth. The national government is powerless against Bavaria. White Bavaria is already separate from the realm; it is only a question of time, and it will refuse taxes and obedience to the Berlin government. A repetition of Bavaria in Saxony and Thuringia would however lead to the complete dissolution of the realm. A bourgeois national government is bound to suppress a proletarian Saxony for its own sake.

The dangers threatening the strategic positions of the Saxon working class from outside are serious and immediate. The national defence troops closely co-operate with the Fascisti. Saxony is the central point of Germany. The Fascist troops march in from Bavaria and Silesia. The national defence troops threaten the Saxon proletariat of its western support, and of isolating it completely. In order to attain this object, the national government has put severe pressure on the social democratic Thuringian government. Severing sent security police reinforcements to the Thuringia district. The Fascisti were again permitted to hold meetings in Thuringia. The Thuringian government itself is ready to capitulate to the bourgeoisie, and to form a coalition government. Should this plan succeed, then Saxony will be the sole social democratic government with communist support in Germany. Saxony will then be surrounded on all sides. Martial law and the national executive will then do their best to annihilate in Saxony the last positions of the German proletariat.

The internal dangers to which the strategic positions are exposed in Saxony are no less severe. The right Social Democratic party of Germany wanted to solve the last government crisis by entering into a coalition government with the democrats and the German people's party. A national party conference of the United Social Democrats called the pro-coalition leaders back again. The social democratic workers succeeded in forcing the conclusion of the agreements with the German C.P., but against the open and concealed resistance of the Right. The set of Right leaders were obliged to disappear, and to give place to the confidence men of the left. The social democratic party committee in Berlin, as well as almost all social democratic leaders throughout the country and in Saxony, are enemies of the present government and its policy. They are already working by means of sabotage, for its downfall. The government has therefore but a narrow foothold. It leans upon the Left social democratic and communist workers. The position is rendered the more difficult by the inner weakness of the government itself. The left social democratic leaders in this government are in many cases actual adherents of the Right, and are only restrained from capitulation to the propertied class by the constant pressure of the masses. And on the other hand there are many pacifist elements, anxious to avoid open conflict with the bourgeoisie, and fearing civil war.

The carrying out of the most urgent tasks of the German C.P., under these circumstances, demands great mobility of tactics and untiring exertion of all forces. The German C.P. must closely supervise every deviation to left or right, within its own ranks, involved in these tactics. The circle of influence of the Party must be constantly extended by unceasing struggle. All Party organs in Saxony are straining every nerve to have the agreements with the United Social Democrats carried out. The present passivity and sabotage of the right German S.P. must be compensated by redoubled activity of our own powers. The formation of hundreds is being carried on energetically. In the factories and workshops the organization, equipment, and activity of these defence units form the subject of daily discussions among the whole working class. The masses perceive that means of defence against Fascism are being systematically organized. They are beginning to recover faith in themselves and in the class struggle. The organization and equipment of the defence organizations must be accompanied by energetic measures on the part of the control committees against high prices and profiteering. According to the agreements, a control committee

is to be formed in every rural or municipal district of more than 10,000 inhabitants. In this sphere the Party is just starting work. Besides this, the labor chamber law will be published shortly. This also affords wide possibilities for propaganda and development of movements. The labor chamber for Saxony is to consist of 100 delegates, to be elected approximately in accordance with the provisions of the shop stewards law. This parliament is to meet regularly, and is to take up a definite attitude toward all political, economic, and legislative measures of the government. The labor chamber is of extraordinary importance for the application of the united front tactics, and for the strengthening of the influence of the German C.P. within the ranks of the proletariat.

In Saxony, the Party is much further advanced in the practical carrying out of the united front tactics than the rest of the Party. The fighting positions which have been won by the Saxon workers are also much superior to any others in the realm. At the present time, the most important task of the Party, is to lead the masses into the advanced lines occupied by Saxony. By this means, the enemy's tactics will be thwarted, the isolation of Saxony prevented, and the basis of the Saxon government extended in the proletariat. In these struggles the social democratic working class will find demonstration of the fact, not only by propaganda, but by their own political experience, that the next strategic position must inevitably be that of the labor government.

ECONOMICS

Survey of the World Economic Situation in the 1st Quarter of 1923

By E. Valga.

II. Reparation question and Ruhr occupation.

During the period covered by this report economic life in Europe has been completely dominated by the Ruhr occupation. We assume that our readers are acquainted with the events themselves, and shall only attempt to analyse them as clearly as possible.

Formally, the occupation of the Ruhr area was based on the failure of Germany to carry out her obligations with regard to the coal and wood deliveries. This was of course only a pretext. The real reason was that England and France had failed to come to any agreement, on a wide range of international political questions. The Ruhr occupation is directed not against Germany alone, but simultaneously against England and America: the intention has been to force these countries to accept a solution favorable to France in the questions being contested. The occupation of the Ruhr was the last card which France was able to play: "The French experiment must either definitely succeed or definitely fail", writes the *Times*. Hence the persistent tenacity with which France clings to the occupation, and Germany to her passive resistance.

What are the points being contested between France on the one hand and Germany and England on the other?

1. The amount of reparations to be paid by Germany.
2. The distribution of the German payments.
3. The interallied debts.
4. The methods of securing the payments.
5. The coal question.
6. The military security of France.

We must here emphasize the fact that without exception, the governments and politicians of France, England, and Germany have no definite policy to pursue; all of them vacillate backwards and forwards; it seems that the European bourgeoisie is incompetent to master the problem.

The French standpoint.

France's standpoint is that the cost of restoring the devastated districts is to be covered by Germany's payments. Until this is done France can pay no interest on the interallied debts, and cannot agree to any reduction of the reparations.

We must remind the reader that the addition of the pensions to the reparations has much damaged France's position. Such a step would have been of advantage to France had Germany really been in position to pay the whole of the 132 milliard gold marks imposed upon her by the London ultimatum. This is not the case. And now France awakens to the fact that she

surplus, for unless agriculture makes progress there will be no progress in industry either. Here we wish to act as go-between, we wish unreservedly that the proletariat come to an understanding with the peasantry.

The question of the extent of taxation is then solved in principle. The question of the best way of collecting taxes remains. The farmer lives with the seasons. It must be possible to calculate and determine exactly his work beforehand. If he finds himself confronted by an incalculable and complicated taxation policy, he suffers. It is therefore necessary to lend a uniformity to all the various taxes and levies. The taxes must be made comprehensible to the peasants and easily payable; it must be made possible for the taxes in kind to be paid in money on occasion.

Our taxation policy is one of the most important factors in the relations between proletariat and peasantry. The next immediate question is that of export. For if we are agreed that we must leave to the farmer his surplus, we must also leave him the possibility of selling it. For this the home markets do not suffice, for here we find an immense disproportion between the prices of agricultural products and those of industrial products. This is not so much the result of the condition of our industry as of the isolation of our agriculture from the world market. Hence it is necessary to give the peasants the possibility of selling a part of their produce on the world market. No speculation is to act as go-between between our peasants and the foreign buyers; the Soviet power will have to play the part of intermediary. The simplification and regulation of our taxation policy will further the export of Russian grain. The monopoly of foreign trade, this unqualified pre-requisite of the proletarian dictatorship, gives us the possibility of regulating the grain export on a uniform plan. Our foreign trade must be adapted to the development of our agriculture and duly consider the growing possibilities of grain export, but at the same time it must take into account the necessity of protecting our industry. We are unreservedly in favor of a socialist protectionism (protective duty system), without which foreign capital would plunder our economy.

Soviet Russia

March 15.—April 15.

By Pierre Pascal (Moscow).

The specially characteristic feature of the moment is the campaign against religion. The newspapers report on closed churches, on schools which renounced the Easter holidays, on factories in the province of Odessa which desired as a demonstration to change their day of rest from Sunday to Monday. The masquerading procession arranged by the Communist Youth at Christmas caused a certain amount of sensation, even abroad. In Moscow a cheap weekly paper is being published under the title: *The Goddess*, in which parsons of every description and creed are held up to ridicule. The show-window of this paper, which is decorated with posters in the same style, is always besieged by curious spectators. The spirit of passionate satire now obtaining, respects neither the "living church" formed recently with a program of reform and political sympathy for the Soviet government, nor the church of Tichon the patriarch, who will presently be sentenced by the revolutionary tribunal. The success seems to be great, but it does not yet signify anything decisive. It is nothing new for the Russian people to laugh at its priests. A comrade who was recently sent out to make a thorough study of some country districts, reports that he heard more malicious stories about the clergy from the peasants, in one evening, than 10 papers such as the *Goddess* could print in a year. But this does not disturb the somewhat vague beliefs of the country population, and does not prevent young and old alike from faithfully delivering up their pounds of flour, their eggs and hens to the priest. And what the official churches lose is gained by the sects, who always found good soil in Russia. This same comrade reports on the successes of the Baptists, who preach the gospel and combat intemperance. But even the bitterest opponents of the religious spirit cannot attain their aims by articles on religious history, comparing Christ with Mithras and other heathen gods, or in drawing attention to the dangers of infection attendant on the Easter kiss or the holy communion.

A more important matter is the serious resumption of national school instruction. The schools, which suffered severely at the beginning of the new economic policy, are commencing to revive. As a general rule, the provincial budgets allot one third of the sums at their disposal for school purposes. The position of the teachers, which was exceedingly wretched, is improving. The *Pravda* got up a competition for finding out the best and

the worst factory manager. Now it announces a competition for ascertaining the best school teacher. Prizes in the form of books, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, are offered to those teachers who are considered the most competent, and to the correspondents who describe the merits of such teachers. The competition has been carefully prepared. For several weeks the paper published instructions as to how the communications were to be made, and how they were not to be made. The answers are now beginning to come in. A perusal of them demonstrates the usefulness of such a prize competition; for Russia is so large that many objectionable happenings in the cities fill the public eye, while thousands of admirable efforts outside in the provinces remain unobserved. But it is these latter whose totality creates the revolution, and it appears that in this the teachers are playing a leading part. The first report received states: In the province of Tver excellent work is being done by the teacher W. Pankov, 29 years of age, and a one-time soldier of the Red Army. He gathered around him a dozen sons of workers and peasants, boys generally regarded as subnormal, and with them took joint possession of a villa which had belonged to a rich tradesman. The house had been demolished by the peasants, and nothing was left but the walls and roof. At first they had to sleep and eat on the bare floor, but with the small resources at their disposal they set to work, and very soon doors, windows, tables, benches, etc. appeared. They continued to work, and today, after 2½ years, the villa has a meteorological observatory, a bathing establishment, fruit plantation, school garden, and workshops. The devastated house and site have become a model school. The so-called subnormal children have proved as capable of receiving instruction as the most normal. They are now learning on the plan of an agricultural intermediate school. The instruction is based on practical methods of work; the scholars make excursions and carry out experiments. Last summer the scholars built for themselves a small ship, and went hundreds of kilometers up the Volga, studying nature with their friend and teacher Pankov. They collected minerals, plants, and insects, everything required for carrying on instruction in physics and natural history. The peasants, who at first looked on with disapproval at the piece of ground thus taken out of their hands, now come to the school to ask for advice, to see the new plantations, etc. Lenin once said: "If we organize one single district in a perfect manner, that will be a mighty accomplishment." A school is even smaller than a district, but the influence exercised by Pankov and his work reaches far beyond the immediate vicinity, over the whole district and province.

On the 12th and 13th of April the Council of People's Commissars published an important regulation for the organization of industry, that is, the regulation relating to trusts. What is known as a trust in Russia is a comprehensive industrial unit, owned by the state, and granted independence by the state for its own business, according to certain rules laid down for each separate trust. Such a trust works on commercial principles, in order to win a profit. The trust is a legal corporation and the state is not liable for its debts. At its formation, the trust receives a certain amount of working capital which is estimated in gold roubles and represents its basic capital. The state can also grant it long term loans on conditions to be fixed by agreement, in addition to customary bank credit. Private capital does not participate in the trust, unless the trust is transformed into a mixed company. The supreme politico-economic council has the right of disposition over the basic capital of the trust. This body appoints the administrative council of the trust, and two members of the control committee. It has to confirm the annual business plan, and to distribute the proceeds. The administrative council is appointed for one year, and elects its own director, who acts as chairman. The administrative council is responsible for the proper conducting of the business, it has a free hand in the execution of the plan of production, in buying and selling, in the giving and acceptance of orders, and in the statement of the yearly balance. The syndicate appoints the third member of the control committee. Eighty per cent of the surplus gained by the trust goes to the state treasury for the reserve fund, the bonus for the administrative council and the staff. The trusts have to pay the same taxes as the private undertakings, and are, as a rule, permitted to fix their own selling prices. When doing business they have to give the preference to state undertakings. At the present time the question is being discussed as to the relations between the trusts and the separate undertakings belonging to them. The question is being brought up by a society of "Red Directors", communists and sympathizers, formed on the initiative of the *Pravda*. The Party conference will debate this question.

At the Moscow congress Kameney spoke on the present situation; at the Ukrainian congress Trotsky delivered an address on the same subject. The discussion relates chiefly to the questions raised by Lenin: reorganization of the control, closer relations

between the Party and the state undertakings. Ossinsky reproached Lenin for representing a theory in accordance with which the bourgeois specialist would do all actual business, and the communist would merely exercise supervision. The right answer to this was given by Kameney in a polemic article. Neither Lenin nor anyone else ever submitted such a theory. Ossinsky himself admits that the Lenin theory, as intended by Lenin, had the sole import of counteracting the opposite tendency, that is, the belief in communist omniscience, and of thus finding the right middle path.

It is a remarkable fact that Leninism is now acknowledged as an independent theory; this is perfectly justified. Marx substantiated in his time the methods of social study and the theory of capitalist society. Lenin applied this theory in its further relation to present times, and added the tactics of the class struggle, the overthrow of the capitalist state, and the leadership of a workers' state. Marx knew nothing of Soviets, he had no need to occupy himself much with the agrarian problem, nor with the relations between proletariat and peasantry, nor with the part played by syndicates. The course of history has raised these new questions, and Lenin has solved them on certain lines. Thus a Leninism exists, but its study presents difficulties quite different from those of Marxism. This latter is a theory laid down systematically in a series of books, but Leninism is theory and practice at the same time, and is to be derived from a number of actions, and of writings which are again representations of actions, and which are difficult to reduce to a system. The leading ideas must be gathered from all this. This application to the conditions of the struggle must be observed. Too many abstract conclusions must not be drawn; we must remain within the confines of historical development, and at the same time recognize the lessons applying to the future. On these premises all communists could welcome the resolution passed by the Moscow provincial congress, which decided to establish a Lenin institution in order to lay down the fundamentals of the new teaching for the proletariat, Leninism. This by no means signifies homage paid to one individual, it is the long delayed recognition of a fact. There is no study which can better show the proletariat the way to conquer and maintain power than the examination of the tactics pursued by Lenin before and during the revolution.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Yellow Leadership

If Trades Union history in Britain is at all a criterion, the employers need only hand over the settlement of disputes to the labor "leaders" and they can rest assured that their interests will be most sacredly guarded. The record of industrial disputes during the last few months provide the contemptible and inglorious record of all the pages of British labor history. Black Friday 1921 stood out as an astounding calamity, packed with the incident of treachery. But treachery has become a policy, a deliberate conspiracy on the part of the leaders of the Second, the 2½, and the Amsterdam Internationals, in this country to prevent proletarian unity.

Disputes have raged in practically every section of industry during the last three months, and there has not been the slightest attempt to organize a common defensive action. Craft unionism with its claims for autonomy has been used to the full; and when even this has not been as successful as anticipated in preventing action and paving the way to a retreat, then the good offices of the Labor Party's chief phrase-monger, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, have been introduced. The combination of forces is interesting. It will be a great convenience to us when the Second and 2½ Internationals have amalgamated. It will simplify matters considerably. Meanwhile, an explanation is required. Mr. MacDonald is the leader of the Labor Party in the "House"—the Labor Party is the principal party of the Second International. He is also leader of the Independent Labor Party which is in the 2½ International. Mr. Henderson is of the Second International. Mr. J. H. Thomas is leader of the Amsterdam International which has within its fold practically all the trade union leaders of the British trade unions.

Now to their deeds. In December 1922, there was a Miners' Conference at Southport. It was one of the most despondent and miserable affairs on record. Delegate after delegate reported that miners in their district were compelled to seek aid from the Board of Guardians to make up their wages to subsistence level. There were 70,000 unemployed miners.

Wages were falling in spite of increased production. Many districts were deeply in debt as a result of the terms of the National Agreement which guaranteed to the mineowners a certain percentage profit before wages could increase. Some delegates demanded the termination of this wage agreement and a new national increase. Mr. Hodges persuaded them to see Mr. Bonar Law instead and to meet again in three months. At this time the building workers were preparing against the threat on hours and wages due by the end of March. Railway shopmen were threatened with wage reductions. The capitalist offensive was opening on the agricultural workers, pottery workers, etc. The month of March would land the whole movement in crisis. Now follow them one by one.

The building workers conducted for several months a vigorous campaign against the attempt to take from them the 44 hour week and to lower wages. The General Council of the Trade Union Congress came out with blazing manifestoes calling on the unions to support the building workers, and characterizing the attack upon them as part of a general attack upon the workers.

But as soon as there appeared any likelihood of action, the General Council was conspicuous by its silence. The employers demanded the extension of hours to 47 and a wage reduction of twopence per hour. By an overwhelming vote the rank and file of the Building Trades Federation rejected the terms and then the band began to play. Lock out notices were posted and the union leaders ran like rabbits from office to office to see if it wasn't possible to avoid the lock-out. There were already 15,000 locked-out in the eastern counties. The agricultural laborers were fighting in Norfolk. Mr. Hodges dodged the united front the self same week, and the engineers' and railway unions were negotiating.

Meanwhile, amidst the silence of the General Council and the dilemma of the leaders who thought all hope was gone and a fight coming, a new footstep is heard at the eleventh hour. It is *Macdonald*. The new leader! In calm, resonant yet soothing tones he rolls his message forth to the discordant throng: "gentlemen, come, let us reason together."

So, the lock-out is off—wages and the agreement go to arbitration and a regional ballot is to be taken on the hours question. After the struggle of years to get national uniform standards, after an overwhelming vote against the employers' terms, to proceed to disrupt the national ballot and pave the way to local settlements and local conflicts is one of the most damnable pieces of treachery perpetrated upon the workers of any industry. The "leaders" must have been paralyzed by the thought of a lockout to accept such terms, while Macdonald could not have done more to shake the whole Building Federation to its foundation, and to undo the work of the last ten years in the unions if he had been directly commissioned by the employers to smash the unions.

In the meanwhile, Mr. Hodges performs a similar feat with the miners. In December he asked for three months further trial of the miners' agreement and an interview with the Premier. The Premier meets Mr. Hodges and his colleagues and gives them nothing—not even a promise. The conference of miners' delegates is convened on March 27th. The conference hears his report. Two districts demand the abrogation of the agreement but Hodges fights for the agreement and plays off local organization against local organization and finally succeeds in getting through a resolution to vote on the agreement district by district. This is fatal and he knows it. It leads the miners backwards to the old local agreements and county rivalry.

And now the railway shopmen! There has been a dispute for a long time as to which industry the railway shops belong. This was recently decided by an arbitrator following the engineering lock-out of 1922. They are definitely recognized as part of the railway industry. This has intensified the rivalry of the unions. The Engineering and Shipbuilding Federation of 47 unions has members, the A.E.U. has a big percentage of its members in the railway shops, and the N.U.R. which aims at embracing all the workers in the industry claim they ought to belong to the National Union of Railwaymen. The demand is now for 6/6 per week reduction. Three weeks ago the N.U.R. met in National Conference and authorized its executive to call a national railway strike if the railway companies insist upon the reductions. Mr. J. H. Thomas of Amsterdam International fame is on the Continent at the time; he runs home at once and immediately prepares to refer the matter to the National Wages Board of the railway industry. But this can't be done without alterations by Parliament. The A.E.U. meets separately, refuses the terms and is offered modified terms which "must be kept secret."

Then the Engineering and Shipbuilding Federation makes public the secret terms and rejects them. The A. E. U. meets again for further discussion, rejects the modified terms and declines to take a ballot. The E. and S. Federation meets again and three unions decide to take a ballot and recommend rejection of terms. The Building Federation separately rejects the terms and this merry-go-round continues while the miners of South Wales strike against non-unionism. 30,000 Jute workers of Dundee are locked out and 60,000 pottery workers are threatened with a lock-out, and the 20,000 agricultural laborers are fighting against wage reductions.

The story of the railway shopmen is not yet completed, but the whirligig of the union leaders is so lovely that the final stages need a little unravelling. It is doubtful whether Mr. Macdonald will get his chance to show his statesmanship in this act. Messrs. Thomas, Brownlie, Clynes and the other stalwarts of Amsterdam are so well experienced that they can manage the job without him.

But the agricultural laborers' dispute has made him famous. The agricultural laborers come within the purview of several unions, viz.—The Agricultural Laborers' Union, The Workers' Union, and The Scottish Farm Workers' Union. Agriculture has been severely hit during the last 2 years; but although the attack has been general throughout the last eighteen months or two years they have never attempted to make a national fight. Every county has its own settlement. Some counties are divided north and south with separate settlements. All agreements terminate at different dates and the conditions of the agreements vary from district to district. So the Norfolk laborers have been permitted and encouraged to wage a single handed fight. On no occasion has there been an attempt on the part of their union to present a united front of agricultural workers throughout the country for uniform rates or even the uniform termination of agreements.

So Norfolk laborers have this interesting history. Their wages in September 1921, were reduced from 46/ to 42/ per week. On October, 1st, 1921 a further drop to 36/ and on March 1st 1922, 30 shillings for 50½ hours until harvest. After harvest, 25/ for 50 hours. In February, 1923, the farmers demanded five pence per hour for a 54 hour week. Later they modified to 5½ per hour for a 54 hour week. During the dispute, they offered 25/ for 53 hours, 26/ for 54 hours. The men refused the 54 hour week and stood firm for the 50 hour week.

Enter the Labor Statesmen. Fisst, Mr. Gosling, M. P. who bargains them down to 26/ for a 50 hour week. But settlement does not come. So once again enter Macdonald. "Come let us reason together." And this is the forthcoming agreement, 25/ per week for 50 hours—sixpence per hour for each hour above 50 to 54—overtime rates to be fixed after 54 hours—hours to be arranged so, that the laborers get a half day holiday per week. Put the first two clauses together and you get a complete surrender on the hours question. These two clauses mean 27/ for a 54 hour week and can mean nothing else. That's statesmanship for you! Well might Fimmen confess the failure of the Amsterdam International. Its deeds of treachery fill even the ordinary simple trade unionist with disgust.

No wonder the masses are dispirited and demoralized. But the record of these few weeks of the Amsterdam leaders' conception of the United Front in Britain will hasten the day of their departure.

The French Railwaymen stand by their German Comrades

The committee of the Red French railwaymen's union has issued the following declaration:

The United Railwaymen's Union raises the sharpest protest against the methods of the French government, which at the present time are driving some thousands of German railwaymen out of the Ruhr area. The reports received show that these workers and their families are being ruthlessly driven out of their dwellings and expelled from the district, because they refuse to serve the intruder whom they rightly regard as their enemy. The exponents of patriotism, who make it their boast when French workers fulfil their "national duties", must surely admit that the German workers are also doing nothing more than their national duty. What our imperialists consider to be duty on one side of the frontier, should be equally appreciated by them when it happens on the other side, from like patriotic motives. But the revolutionary workers can only regret that the German and French workers, brothers in misery as they are, should still allow themselves to be deceived by those who are to blame for the butchery of the last war. The French United Rail-

waymen's Union reminds the governing class of France, that during the 1914/18 war, this ruling class protested against the deportations practised by German militarism, and denounced them as barbarous. This same ruling class is now exercising precisely the same barbarity, towards workers even though there is no war. The Railwaymen's Union therefore calls upon all French railwaymen at present mobilized in Germany, to show the greatest solidarity, despite all difficulties, with the German railwaymen now undergoing such severe trials. The Railwaymen's Union appeals to the whole international proletariat, to proclaim its indignation at the barbaric methods being employed against defenceless workers.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Workers Party of America - Its Problems

By John Pepper (New York).

The entire policy of the Workers' Party is focused today upon the United Front.

Our campaigns for defense, for amalgamation, for protection of foreign born workers, against Fascism, are but attempts, through many avenues, to reach various sections of the working class.

The greatest step forward have been made by us in the united front against Fascism. For this very reason we must discuss in this connection the limits of the united front.

The policy of the united front holds two dangers. We have sectarians who do not wish to admit that it is permissible, in any way, to form a united front with yellow leaders. And we have too broad-hearted comrades who want to embrace everybody in the united front, and in this way they forget their own Party.

The Italian Federation of the Workers' Party has accomplished admirable work. It seized the initiative in time, and established the united front with all the Italian trade unions, with the Socialist Party, against the Fascists. Our comrades captured all the important strategical position in this struggle. The *Alba Nuova* took up with energy the struggle against the Fascists.

But we must openly say, that in the continuation of the fight so brilliantly begun, dangers may arise.

Sharply and clearly stated, the main danger is that the Party will be pushed into the background in the minds of our comrades. We must therefore energetically follow the following policy.

1.—Some of the Italian comrades are opposed to allowing the Anarchist group (Carlo Tresca) to enter the united front. But at the same time a comrade who otherwise is a very good Communist, declared naively, "We want to forget our hatred for the yellow Socialist leaders."

Naturally, both viewpoints are false. We cannot allow a so-called left group to stand outside of the united front. And it is impossible to forget the hatred against the yellow leaders at the moment when the Socialist Party, in an underground meeting, makes a formal conspiracy against Soviet Russia, and against Communists in general.

2.—The fight against Italian Fascism must be broadened and extended into a fight against international Fascism. Not only in Italy, but also in Hungary, Fascism holds sway. In Germany it is increasing in might. In Poland and in Czechoslovakia it has armed organizations. In the United States the Ku Klux Klan and its policy against Jews, Catholics, and Negroes is becoming ever mightier. The United Front of the Italian workers in America must call upon the German, Polish, Hungarian, Jewish, Czechoslovakian workers of America, and the negro worker and tenant farmer to establish a great and mighty united front against international Fascism. The German, Polish, Jewish, Hungarian Federations, and the negro organizations of the Workers' Party must follow the example of the Italian Federation of the Workers' Party, and group around themselves as many labor unions as possible, and lead all American workers to a great common united front against Fascism.

3.—We must also broaden the program and the slogans of the struggle. And at the same time we must anchor it deeply in American political life. We must unify the anti-Fascist campaign with our campaign for the protection of the foreign-born workers, and for a labor party. The various efforts of

American capitalists to carry through laws for discriminating against foreign-born workers are nothing but the American expression of international Fascism. And without a mighty independent political party of the working class it is impossible to break the might of the Ku Klux Klan, or the Italian Fascist organizations in America, and it is impossible to prevent the introduction of laws aiming at treating the foreign-born workers as criminals and prostitutes.

4.—It is incumbent upon our Italian comrades to double the membership of their Federation in this struggle. The present Italian Federation is too small a basis for influencing the masses.

It is our duty to convert our Italian Party units, which until now have been built on an artificial basis, into shop, trade, and trade union branches. The Workers' Party can really become a party of the workers only if it knows how to take root in the industries and factories.

To sum up: We should form the united front with every workers' organization. But we would not forget for a moment our distrust and hatred for reactionary leaders. We become bad Communists, when we forget our own Party within the United Front. The Communist Party's interests can never stand in contradiction to the true interests of the working class. It is not Party egoism which prompts us to protect the absolute organizational and ideological independence of our Party within the United Front. The trade unions represent only the immediate and sectional interests of the workers. The Socialists and Anarchists have no clear program for the historical tasks of the working class. The Communist Workers' Party is the only organization which represents, not only the immediate interests of the workers, and not only the interests of all sections of the working class, but the greatest interests of the whole future of the proletariat. The Communist Party is the head of the working class. Communists who forget their own Party within the masses unified for the struggle, are like soldiers who lose their heads in the midst of battle.

The Origin and Growth of the Canadian Communist Party

By W. Moriarty.

In the late Fall of 1921, Comrade Peel, then Editor of the *Workers' Guard*, was besieged with requests that his paper be used to advocate a unified, revolutionary organization to replace those small, isolated groups then attempting to function as Communists. The idea took hold, and the comrades in charge of the paper saw in this expression, possibilities of establishing a Dominion-wide party which would break away from the old ideas prevailing among the scattered bands of reds. This move ended with the conference held in Toronto, December, 1921.

Early organizations.

Over fifty delegates attended, resulting in a Provisional Organization Committee being set up. This committee promptly sent Comrade MacDonald on a tour through the Pacific Coast. All along the line he met with sympathy for the tactics of the Communist International, and disagreement with the condition of the movement in Canada. This intensive period of organization work, financed only by individual donations and sparse returns from the organizations formed during this period, culminated in the National Convention of February, 1922, attended by comrades from Vancouver to Montreal.

First Convention.

This was an extremely interesting affair. The process of hammering out the differences of opinion, so as to get the right sense of direction, was productive of many difficulties. The attack of Delegate Russell of the O. B. U. upon the Labor Union policy adopted, only served to emphasize the correctness of the tactic. True, it caused confusion for some time, but we are more than ever satisfied that secessionism is, and ever will be, fatal to the working class movement.

Early Organization.

The Convention adjourned, leaving in charge of the Party, an Executive without a great deal of experience, plus an alarmingly empty treasury. In the course of the past year, the Party experienced enough shocks to break almost any organization. Desperately attempting to satisfy the increasing demand for organizers, even at the expense of enjoying the thrills of bankruptcy time and time again, weakened by the desertion of

some of the active spirits, the Party steadily extended its influence. The most gratifying feature of this extension was the response shown to the need for centralism. The process of planting the seed of centralized organization has been a difficult one, but efforts in this direction have provided the bedrock upon which any Party must be founded if it is to live and grow.

International Representation.

The action of the C.E.C. in sending delegates to Moscow was a bold one, again marking a definite step in the history of the Canadian movement. The reports presented to the Second Convention, the touring of Comrade Spector to carry the message of the Fourth Congress into all Party units possible, is all in keeping with the lessons obtained from the past methods of isolation and "purity", which passed as "Marxism".

Getting Down to Bedrock.

The feature of the Second Convention was the recognition of these facts. Lacking many of the dramatic touches which characterized the first gathering, yet the determination to fight and grow was more marked. Many new elements were in attendance, and past experiences with their many mistakes were checked up. Arising from it all was the evident necessity for expansion until we really become a mass Party. The chief hindrance in this direction is lack of money. The masses are there, ready and waiting, but we cannot get in touch because of impossible expenses connected with organization work. With more and more contact with the Trade Union movement becoming evident, the fact that we are now aligned with the Canadian Labor Party, all this is indicative of real progress.

"The Worker."

A word in passing on the Party Press. The growth of *The Worker* has been an accomplishment of merit. The splendid assistance of the rank and file has made this possible. The success of the editorial policies is reflected in the ever-increasing circulation. Now being published weekly *The Worker* will soon be a factor in leading the thoughts of the workers towards Communism.

The Outlook.

Now for the outlook. The steadying up influence of the Second Convention is noticeable. More and more it is becoming apparent that the revolution is not "just round the corner". The Party members have settled down in their stride and are fast familiarizing themselves with the theories and tactics of the Party which are those of the Communist International. The closer contact being established between the Comintern and the Party is also having a healthy influence. The endorsement of the policies of the W. P. of C. by the C. I., contained in its letter to our Second Convention, serves to increase the confidence necessary for results in the difficult task of building up a Communist movement in Canada.

But still we move, still we grow, and to-day but mark another opportunity for the proletariat to celebrate a further advance of class-consciousness. The Workers' Party is taking a definite part in the world struggle for economic freedom under the leadership of the Communist International. As in the days of '48, a spectre is haunting Europe—the World—today, and the rising tide of Communism is creeping, creeping, over the world's surface.

THE COLONIES

Where are the Masses?

By E. Roy.

The third annual session of the Indian Trade Union Congress, which was scheduled to meet last November, and whose activities have been wrapped in a veil of mystery, met at last in Lahore on March 26th of this year. The five months' postponement did not seem to mar the composure of the organizers, and may have served rather to enhance the atmosphere of social breeding and culture which pervaded the whole assembly. The sessions of the third All-India Trade Union Congress were adorned, not merely by the presence of University graduates of several degrees of erudition, but by the chief figure-heads of nationalist politics, distinguished for their eloquence, beauty, or fame, and by many persons prominent in the intellectual circle of the labor movement, who added the proper "tone" to the function. Altogether, by waiting a trifling matter of five months, the energetic propagators of the Trade Union Congress idea succeeded in gathering together a

variegated assortment of delegates and visitors, who represented practically every class in Indian society except the working-class. Labor leaders there were in abundance, and perhaps one or two among them may at one time have swelled the ranks of the proletariat, but with the solitary and distinguished exception of Mr. Miller, Irish Railway Guard and organizer of the North Western Railway Union of the Punjab, there was present in that social and intellectual galaxy no worker or peasant who earned his bread by the sweat of his brow, and who had nothing to lose but his chains.

One can only guess at the motives which prompted the holding of this patriotic and laboristic conclave in the remote agricultural province of the Punjab, where the number of industrial proletariat is almost nil. The absence of proletarian elements was not compensated by the presence of the landless peasantry, with which that province abounds. Mr. C. R. Das, ex-President of the Indian National Congress, and Chairman of the Swaraj Party, was elected to preside over the gathering.

For the opening ceremony, let the Lahore "Nation" of March 27th speak in its own words:

"A huge fleet of motor-cars drove up to the gates of Bradlaugh Hall, and vociferous cheers greeted the arrival of the leaders. The Hall was gaily decorated with wreaths of flowers. Several parties of musicians were present who sang National Songs until the arrival of the President elect. As soon as Deshbandhu's car drove up, shouts of "Bande Mataram" and "Deshbandhu Das ki jai!" went up from all quarters. Bi-Amman arrived in the middle of the proceedings, and was greeted by shouts of "Allah-ho-Akbar". Many other ladies and gentlemen were also present. The proceedings were charged with great enthusiasm. Deshbandhu Das' speech created a sensation in so far as it was a brilliant and passionate exposition of the case for the labor movement in India. Mr. Kanhaya Lal's speech was like a string of pearls, a fine performance finely delivered."

All of which makes charming reading for patriotic nationalists and labor dilettantes, but is painfully far removed from those sweating, toiling masses which this fashionable gathering had met together to represent. The atmosphere was as charged with "social uplift" and "moral welfare" as any philanthropists' club or Social Service League to be found in England or America. The only other note struck was that of earnest nationalism, as voiced by the Deshbandhu, or of honest trade unionism, as expounded by Mr. Miller, or of simple Menshevism, as expressed in the glittering phrases of the Oxford don, Mr. Chaman Lal, General Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress, and of his chief assistant, Mr. Kanhaya Lal Gauba, whose opening speech as Chairman of the Reception Committee was so like unto a "string of pearls".

The difference in spirit between these amateur theatricals and the grim setting of the second session of the Trade Union Congress, held in 1921 in the coal-fields of Bengal at Jheria, was emphasized, perhaps unconsciously by Mr. Das, who described the machine-guns and cavalry called out by the government to patrol during its sittings, and the refusal of the coalmine owners to permit the workers to attend, leading to a three day's strike on the part of the latter, and the tendering of a public apology and an unfulfilled promise of a 20% wage-increase on the part of the employers. And the vision of the six thousand ragged delegates straight from the coal-pits, who attended that victorious conference must have risen before the mind's eye of some of the "ladies and gentlemen" who represented the cause of labor uplift in the present session, so devoid of the perspiring and noisome odour of the masses and the reprehensible spirit of the class-war.

The nearest one got to the subject of class-war was when Mr. Das ventured to quote the stirring peroration of Karl Marx, in the "Communist Manifesto": "Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains". The rest of the proceedings either trickled with the sugary sweetness of "labor uplift", or resounded with bombastic phrases of social reform. Mrs. Naidu, nationalist poetess of bourgeois India, "pleaded", in the words of the *Nation*, for a human status and an equal place among the nations of the world for 98% of India's population. She described "with great pathos", the condition of the ill-fed, ill-clothed laborers in the slums of Bombay and declared herself for the thousandth time to be "against identifying Indian labor organizations with those in the West". "The Indian Labor Movement should have a distinct character of its own", said the patriot-poetess, going on to speak of removing the stigma of untouchability from the lower castes, and of Mahatma Gandhi's mission of "compassion and sympathy", which has helped Indian leaders to grasp the fact that Swaraj could only be based on the liberty of the masses.

"There can be no better description of the aims of our Labor Party", declared Mr. K. L. Gauba, than that of "Swaraj for the Masses". And he went on to demand rhetorically; "Is

there a Labor Problem in India?" To which he himself replied, "Of course there is. The problems of labor are manifold, and in no country of the world do these problems require more careful handling and sympathetic encouragement than in India. The claim of Labor is that power should be decentralized, monopoly upset, and exploitation put an end to. These claims are not wild or extravagant,—they are based upon elements of natural equality." Then Mr. Gauba declared that "the day is coming when Government will be truly democratic.—Labor should be conscious of its rights before society crystallizes into hard and fast divisions. The example of Europe should be a standing lesson to all of us. A class-struggle is ensuing in many countries, and Russia only recently settled the question by a terrible and bloody revolution. We have enough divisions already; we do not want more."

The Presidential Address contained all of the sentiments of Mr. Das with which anyone who has read his public speeches during the past six months is already familiar. There was the same stressing of the necessity of organizing the masses to help win Swaraj; of aiming at a "Swaraj for the masses, and not for the classes", and of avoiding the class-war that rages in the West today. Labor he described as "98% of the population", and the middle-class as 2%. If the 2% got power, Mr. Das declared that he would be the first to lead the struggle to wrest power from the hands of the selfish classes, and give it to the masses. "The uplift of the masses was necessary for culture, and for the national struggle for freedom." He stressed the necessity of labor organization, and urged that the Trade Union Congress send labor propagandists to the different provinces to form unions affiliated to the central organization. But the work of the Congress, he said, was to guide and not control, to offer advice and not to impose itself upon the branches. Labor should claim for every adult man a vote. In closing, he urged upon those present to avoid all congresses and conferences, and to take into their own hands the fight for freedom, the erection of the temple of Nationalism.

The resolutions passed were of the same variegated nature as the people who were present and the ideas they set forth. There was a Resolution congratulating Mr. Saklatvala, Indian Member of Parliament, on his election victory, and another moving thanks to the Workers' Welfare League for India, for its services to Indian labor, and moving for the creation of a separate fund for the support of Indian labor, by that organization. There was a resolution moved against war, as detrimental to the laboring classes, and declaring that Indian labor should not participate in any war in future, especially if waged "unjustly and oppressively". Then there was a resolution against the system of forced labor, known as "Begar" which prevails in British India and the native states. It was moved that a sub-committee be appointed to examine thoroughly the whole question of taxation in India from the workers' point of view. Another resolution moved a request to have paid over to the All-India Trade Union Congress from the Indian National Congress a fund of 40,000 rupees, in accordance with the decision of the latter body to support the cause of labor-organization. A resolution against Railway Retrenchment taking the form of dismissal of workers, was carried, and another one to foster the spread of technical education as necessary to the industrial development of the country.

On the second day of the Congress more resolutions were passed, calling among other things, for protective legislation for trade unions, for an eight hour day and a forty-four hour week for clerical workers. Legislation providing for unemployment, sickness and old age insurance was demanded; improved housing and sanitation for the workers, and a minimum living wage in all industries, to be determined by a Committee of the Congress. A vote of censure was passed for failure of the Government to protect labor adequately in various industries, under the terms of the Factory Act, the Mines Bill and other legislation, and a resolution was carried approving the idea of finding out the condition of labor in India by means of a questionnaire or any other means judged fit by the Congress. Legislation providing for maternity benefits and the abolition of underground work for women in the coal industry was likewise called for. The Congress called upon the authorities, in another resolution, to "establish Conciliation Courts and Arbitration Boards in every industry". The betterment of the system of recruitment and of the conditions of service for Indian seamen was demanded. Finally, two resolutions, declaring in favor of adult suffrage and primary mass education for both sexes, were passed, and the Congress adjourned, after listening to the concluding speeches of the assembled leaders, and nominating officers for the coming year. These include, Mr. D. Chaman Lal, General Secretary, Mr. K. L. Gauba, Treasurer, and Mr. J. B. Miller, Organizing Secretary.

The concluding sentiments of the General Secretary, as well as some unexpected remarks of Mr. C. R. Das on private property, are of interest, as tending to throw more light, if light were needed, on the nature of the men who have suddenly assumed the guidance of Labor's destinies in India. Mr. Chaman Lal, after describing the condition of the Indian working-class, inquired: who had said there were no class distinctions in India? "We should aim at abolishing them, making India one whole, and carry the message of unity and brotherhood by propaganda and organization, throughout the country, to make India a land fit for heroes to live in," declared the speaker, in a burst of eloquence which was received with cheers by his auditors, but which, we fear, destroys his claim to pass as a disciple of Karl Marx,—or even of Karl Kautsky, the renegade Marxist.

Mr. Das, in bidding farewell to the Congress, gave vent to one of those disconcerting remarks which the faithful Reuter invariably cables to England for the edification of Die-Hard Toryism. "Let us hope", said the Deshbandhu amid cheers, "that the 98% of the people of this land will be the real proprietors of India. They are in fact, the real proprietors, but they do not yet realize their own power."

But lest this seem too much like Bolshevism, he hastily added an explanation of his idea of property. "I do not believe in property as generally understood. I believe in it, and I do not. The right of holding private property is useless and unjust unless it leads to a higher national interest.—I do not object to private property, but I object to the evil in it. The selfish man will give up being selfish if he thinks less of himself and more of humanity. It is the same with a nation. Let the right of property be so pursued, that each man will of his own accord, dedicate it to the country.—When people say that the right of private property should be done away with, do not be misled. It is, in short, the evil inherent in private property that should be done away with. This is true Socialism."

And amid shouts of "Deshbandhu Das ki jai!", the third session of the All-India Trade Union Congress, strange conglomeration of Nationalism, Utopianism and Reformism, (to say nothing of more dubious 'isms, such as Humanitarianism and Opportunism), came to a triumphant close. One hears nothing more of it, until, on turning the pages of the "Nation", we see a Social Item: "A Garden Party,—To Meet Mr. C. R. Das." It reads:

"This evening, Dewan and Mrs. Chaman Lal a Garden Party to meet Meshbandhu Das. The party was largely attended by delegates to the Trade Union Congress, and various prominent public men and numerous ladies. Among many others, one noticed, etc. The party was a great success."

So too, perhaps, was the Congress. But where, we would like to ask, were the Masses,—those Indian masses about whom it has become the fashion to speak? The new labor leaders of India have come no closer to them than the old Congress leaders. Where are the masses?

POLEMICS AND DISCUSSIONS

War: a conversation with a Pacifist.

By R. Albert.

Was the comrade a Socialist or an Anarchist? Our brief talk has not enlightened me upon this. He began in the following manner: My friend, I do not believe there is a danger of war. It is a splendid agitational topic for you, but after five years the world war is not now starting afresh. When the Turks defeated the Greeks and advanced to the Dardanelles, you cried then that war had come. But war had not come. When Poincaré occupied the Ruhr territory, you cried again: War! But today you must yourselves admit that Stines and Loucheur, Poincaré and Cuno, will, in all probability, come to an amicable agreement on the backs of the proletarians of their countries. Therefore...

I answered him: You resemble that clever gentleman who would not believe in the Russian Revolution, and resolutely invested all his money in Russian government bonds. The good man is today cleaning boots in a hotel. It is a fact. The great war was a long time brewing, before it broke out. The capitalist world in those days was still very strongly knit together; a brilliant, indestructible order ruled in Berlin. Since then, Berlin has had one revolution and four revolts. There were three empires in Europe, Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary. In all those lands there are today republics. At that time there was, as yet, no Bolshevism, no Soviets and no Fascism. The good old bourgeois dictatorship, with a democratic veneer, ruled the

world. England annexed Egypt, France almost came to blows with Germany over Morocco. You remember the coup of Agadir, Italy seized upon Tripoli. The little peoples of the Balkans cut one another's throats. Poincaré, the disaster bringing man of honor, travelled around and shook the bloody hands of the Tsar. When it was then said: War is coming, the Balkan brand will set the whole continent ablaze, Poincaré means war, you remained incredulous. Rubbish! A war over Skutari or Montenegro, that is entirely out of the question. I snap my fingers at the Bulgars and Turks, you said, and went on with your trifling party game. And you were so guileless and believed so firmly in peace, that one day the agents of the government could write: "Mobilization is not war". But on the same day you were already starting for the trenches.

"When you read in your newspaper that on July 28, 1914, in Serajevo, an Archduke of Austria was assassinated (whereabouts is Serajevo actually? In Bosnia. What sort of country is that?), you still did not know, that this was the beginning of the great butchery, which brought under the sod 700,000 Frenchmen, 500,000 Italians, 650,000 Englishmen, 2½ million Russians, 100,000 Belgians and many others.

War came then, as it is coming now, because it is one of the inevitable results of the system of capitalist production. The only difference is, that today Europe is exhausted. A second attack of madness might kill her outright. Capitalism, which was flourishing in 1914, is today in distress. It loses its head, it daily shows itself incapable of finding adequate solutions for the problems pressing upon it. The fire, which then smouldered in the Balkans, smoulders in 10 places today. It may continue to do so for months and years, for years do not count for much in the scale of history. But the question of the Dardanelles will only finally be settled, when one day free Turkey and free Russia speak a final, and—for England—very disagreeable word. The oil question in Mesopotamia and everywhere else brings England and America up against each other. The Egyptian question causes the London statesmen grave concern. The economic war in the Ruhr, to say nothing at all of its manifold immediate dangers, puts a gulf between imperialist France, the lord of the mainland, and England, which gulf million of corpses will have to fill sooner or later. Poland mobilizes the Little Entente mobilizes, the Baltic States mobilize against the Russian Revolution, Europe bristles with bayonets. If they prepare so assiduously for war, they must also in the end make war.

The last war has brought about great technical improvements in the art of warfare. Aviation, the guns which shoot a distance of 130 kilometres and the poison gases. It has enabled France to raise her black army. Do you know the extent of the sacrifice it cost? On the side of the Entente, 6 million dead upon the battlefield, 4,150,000 of the civil population dead through the increase of the general mortality, a decline of the birthrate which is estimated at 13,200,000,—altogether a loss of 23,300,000 human lives. For the Central Powers the toll of 4,200,000 dead upon the battlefield, 1,850,000 of the civil population dead, decline of the birthrate estimated at 7,650,000. (All the figures taken from Professor Hickmann of Vienna). The total for the Central Powers is 13,700,000. Altogether humanity has lost 37 million lives. That is the same number as the population of France. To this there must still be added the ruin of Central and Eastern Europe. The war of tomorrow will be still more murderous, if we do not prevent it. In the General Staffs the talk is all of chemical warfare, of bacillus warfare and the ingenious spreading of deadly epidemics over entire peoples, of electrically driven flying machines which will destroy the enemy towns, and of the black and yellow cannon fodder which is to triumph over the white cannon fodder.

"Agreed that you are right! But you, indeed, yourselves want war. Bukharin lifted the mask at the 4th Moscow Congress. That is workers' imperialism. But when I say: Down with war! I say so without mental reservation. I stand for no new imperialism."

You march only under the old slogans. And you march in the wrong direction. It is quite a mistake to use the old catchwords for new things. There is no workers' imperialism. Capitalist imperialism conquers in order to exploit. The Revolution, whose Red Army was created by life itself, liberates in order to live. The Revolution is born in the interest and by the will of the working masses, to whom it brings the certainty of a better future. Can oppression be grounded upon the basis of the socialization of production and the political authority of the producers' councils, of the Soviets? Only one kind of oppression permits of being so grounded, namely, the oppression of the oppressors of yesterday, if they offer resistance.

If, at a demonstration, you see a brutal policeman clubbing a worker, what will you do? You will throw yourself

upon the policeman. If the metal workers strike, and the railwaymen act in solidarity with them, will you blame the railwaymen on that account? Would you agree, that a Commune in Paris, which is victorious, may allow a Commune of Lyons to be butchered? This would indeed be monstrous would it not? But what you have just acknowledged, is the right, nay, it is even the duty of Red Intervention. The Russian Commune cannot permit that the young German Revolution be strangled, if it one day flies its red flags in the face of the Senegalese of Gaurod and Mangin.

The pity is only, that, the practice is not quite so simple as the theory. In practice, Red Intervention may follow under altered circumstances. A workers' government, which is not yet Communist and not yet revolutionary, may invoke it and thereby seal its own fate. Bourgeois governments, in the heat of their mutual rivalries, may subsidize it and thus commit suicide. What, however, stands beyond all doubt, is that armed revolutionists have not the right to look on, while their proletarian brothers in the neighbouring lands are being murdered. I understand. But it is not pleasant, that we have again to prepare for war, even if it is only against the war.

Certainly, it is not pleasant. But neither is the old bourgeois society pleasant. It relies upon its barracks, upon its institutions of stultification, the church and the school, upon its prisons, upon its brothels, upon its gallows, upon its drab towns full of misery and consumption. If, however, we do not wage the revolutionary war in our own interest, tomorrow, this same bourgeois society will compel us all to perish, in order that the 300 robbers of high finance, who today rule the world, may grow still richer.

OUR PROBLEMS

The Proletarian Film

By E. Hoerle (Moscow).

The cinema is a child of modern technics. Within a very brief period it has won a leading place among the ideological weapons of the bourgeoisie. The film possesses the suggestive power of the theatre, without requiring its costly apparatus. It has an advantage over the theatre, in being capable of unlimited and comparatively cheap multiplication. It is thus not without reason that the cinema has been named the "poor man's theatre". And above all the cinema possesses, in common with the church and the theatre, the quality enabling it to gather the masses together, and to exercise mass suggestion.

The revolutionary proletariat has long since recognized the dangers of the film as dominated by the bourgeoisie. We are perfectly agreed, theoretically, that it does not suffice to merely criticize the bourgeois film, and to combat its most provoking forms; it is imperative that the reactionary bourgeois film be opposed by the revolutionary proletarian film. The suggestive power of the film must serve the purposes of revolutionary propaganda, precisely as it has hitherto served the purposes of reactionary propaganda. Why has the revolutionary proletariat, even in Soviet Russia, the land of proletarian dictatorship, done so very little towards obtaining control of this means of mental domination over the millions?

Until the fighting proletariat has won complete power, it can only obtain control of the film in exceptional cases. The technical manufacture of the film requires large capital. The film industry is at the present time in the hands of a small number of powerful and well organized capitalist companies. Even before conquering complete power, the class conscious proletariat may save its pence here and there and call into existence this or that film of a proletarian tendency, but it cannot hope to compete with the bourgeois film, neither in extent nor in technical devices, nor in the dramatic form of representing its world of ideas, its actions, sufferings, and struggles. The dramatic film is the core of every cinematograph performance, and is the sole film capable of attracting the masses to the cinema day by day; it is solely the dramatic film which renders the cinema a paying concern, both as regards finance and propaganda—and it is the dramatic film which remains the exclusive weapon of the ruling class until the proletariat seizes power.

If we now, in the country of proletarian dictatorship, are calling into existence a proletarian cinematograph undertaking, for the purpose of creating, for the first time, the "proletarian film" on a broad basis, then this signifies that we intend to utilize the economic force of the victorious proletariat for creating a film surpassing all first attempts and beginnings, and actually capable of competing with, or even surpassing, the bourgeois film. We shall consciously employ the film as a means

of mass propaganda. We must therefore not content ourselves with the line hitherto pursued, the filming of demonstrations, congresses, Red Army parades, sport performances, etc., or with more or less successful representations out of the lives of revolutionary workers, of their Soviets, their factories, their children's homes,—we must systematically carry our efforts into every sphere of film art, must enter into competition with bourgeois film undertakings, and substitute the reactionary film drama by the revolutionary dramatic film.

With the proletarian film drama as a central piece, other films of a more real character can be grouped around it, as is already done in the case of the bourgeois film. Films informing the spectators on the economic, social, scientific, political, or military events occurring throughout the world. Our revolutionary informative films will differ from the bourgeois informative films, in openly refusing to wear the mask of party political or world philosophical neutrality, and in representing all events from the standpoint of the revolutionary proletariat. Ultimately, we may accompany the presentation of our informative films by short explanations from a communist propagandist.

For purposes of educational work in a narrower sense, we shall create the proletarian instructive film. The bourgeoisie utilizes the instructive film to a wide extent at the present time. Even in the elementary schools, for which the worst is generally good enough, the instructive film has been introduced, for its suggestive power has been recognized.

We revolutionary proletarians shall devote special attention to the economic film. The economic instructive films made by bourgeois companies, for bourgeois schools and instructive institutions, are useless for our purposes. All they show is the externals of up-to-date technics and of up-to-date giant undertakings; they say nothing of the real working process, of the inner organization of the factory, of the class struggle going on between workers and employers in every capitalist undertaking. For us, the economic film will be a means of making the spectators at once familiar with the actual working process, and with the organization of the work, the constant struggle between capital and labor.

We must not forget the comic film! The comic is an important medium of suggestive influence. The masses want to laugh. Laughter is equally valuable as a means of releasing tension as weeping. It is true that during the period of acutest class war, of civil war, and of extremest tension, our laughter will be laughter of a very special character, a bitter-sweet laugh, a fighting laugh. It will not be humor which is contained in our films—humor is a specifically petty-bourgeois phenomenon—but satire, ridicule, irony, and the merriment of the conscious victor. The worker must learn to laugh at his enemies, at the short-sightedness and narrow-mindedness of his exploiters, at his own mistakes. The working masses of today are lacking the confident consciousness of victory. And this is possessed in the highest degree by the ruling class. But the working class must prepare to become a ruling class. The proletarian film must bring laughter onto the side of the revolutionists, must use laughter systematically as a revolutionizing medium. We shall also apply to the film the art of revolutionary caricature, which we have hitherto only employed for posters and newspapers.

In conclusion, a few remarks on the relations between art and the proletarian cinema. So far, we have intentionally omitted to mention the word "art" in connection with "cinema". At the present juncture, it is of secondary importance to discuss whether it is really possible for the cinematograph to be art. For the proletarian film this is not the question of the moment; the proletarian film is to be suggestive in effect, true to life, striking. It is to be filled with the warm breath of proletarian revolution, it is to manifest the great ideas and aims of revolution by such means as the cinema has at its disposal. And if it fulfils this object—then it is art. If it remains lame, if it possesses no go and vital energy, then it is not art, not even if our leading writers, directors, and actors take part in its production.

The proletarian cinema requires the zealous and positive co-operation of all revolutionary workers. They must not only visit and criticize the performances, but must co-operate in collecting the material and in drafting the librettos. Only then can the proletarian cinema be really proletarian, not only for but of the proletariat. The revolutionary proletariat must create its own cinema as it has created its own press as it is now creating its theatres, its schools and universities, in a word, its new culture, and it must do this out of the needs of the struggle and the revolutionary propaganda, out of its own powers.

Printed by Friedrichstadt-Druckerei G. m. b. H., Berlin SW 48

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 37 [19]

17th May 1923

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

CONTENTS

Soviet Russia's Reply to England

Politics

E. Heilen: The struggle between Lorraine Ore and Westphalian Coke

Shop Stewards Conference of Ruhr Miners

L. Domski: Impending Changes in Poland

U. Terracini: Political Crisis in Italy

In Soviet Russia

Non-Diplomat: The 12th Conference of the C.P.R. and Foreign Politics

D. Ivon Jones: The Russian Church unfrocks Tikhon

P. S.: Opening of the All-Russian Exhibition

Russian Workers and Peasants help Political Prisoners

E.C.C.I.

June 10th: Enlarged Executive Session

E.C.C.I.: Amalgamation of the 2 and 2½ "Internationals"

Economics

E. Varga: Survey of the World Economic Situation in the 1st Quarter of 1923 (III.)

Fascism.

B. Camilla: In spite of Fascism.

(Com. of Action): Circular to all workers

In the Camp of Our Enemies

K. Radek: Death of Martov

Bukharin: The International of General, Equal and Open Abjection!

Appeals

Red Sailors to the Seamen of the World!

Soviet Russia's Reply to England

The Soviet government has not availed itself of the 10 days respite granted by the English slave holder Lord Curzon. On the 11th of May it handed to the English representative a note which will take its place among the archives of honor in the history of the proletarian struggle.

While the Russian proletariat springs forward, as though stung by a whip, at the news of the English note and of the murder of comrade Vorovsky, the Soviet government remains calmly and steadfastly at its post, the advocate of peace, not only for Russia, but for the whole world. It makes a last attempt to preserve peace. It releases the English ships which were rightly confiscated; it declares itself ready to pay compensation to Englishmen for arrests, if the English government will also compensate those Russian citizens which it has kept imprisoned for years without trial. It practically cancels the note in which it replied to England's interference in Russian internal affairs, and in which Lord Curzon was given the answer he deserved. It accords every consideration to English vanity, and proves that it is superior to all the petty anxiety as to prestige by which the bourgeois governments are influenced. But at the same time it declares with iron resolution that it will not permit itself to be addressed in the language of ultimata, in terms of threats.

"Although the increasing reaction in Europe against the working class in recent months, which is inevitably accompanied by increased enmity against the Soviet republics, gave every reason for fearing that steps would be taken against the workers' and peasants' republic, none the less, in its sharpness and hostility, the ultimatum issued by the English government is a great surprise. To use ultimata and threats is by no means the right way to settle disputes among different states. And in any case it is not the way to attain desirable relations with the Soviet republics."

Thus begins the note from the Soviet government. And it further states:

"In the opinion of the Soviet government, one of the main causes of the constantly recurring misunderstandings between Soviet Russia and the English government is, that the Versailles peace has created relations in which certain sections of the Entente decline to negotiate with other states on equal

ground. Without denying that, during the last few years, a large number of states have actually fallen into a state of complete or partial dependence upon the Entente countries, the Soviet government regards it as its duty to declare that the Soviet republics are not dependent on the will of any foreign government, and cannot and will not be so dependent. If the ruling classes of England would recognize this fact, the chief obstacle preventing the restoration of normal peaceful relations, such as are in the interest of both states, would be removed."

The Soviet government declares to the most powerful state in Europe: Flourish your whip over the capitalist countries which you have conquered, whose bourgeoisies cower before you. But we, the first proletarian state, we do not cower before your whip, however much we may desire peace. We are anxious for peace, and therefore we make concessions, and do not rattle our sabres, but if you lords of the world's capital imagine that you can fasten your yoke upon our shoulders, then just come and try it! Thus speaks a proletariat, which has emancipated itself from its own bourgeoisie, to the victorious bourgeoisie of the world.

The Soviet government does not deny that great differences exist between Soviet policy and English capitalist policy in the Orient. How could it be otherwise? The Soviet government seeks, in all friendship and disinterestedness, to aid the awakening peasant peoples of the East in their struggle against their own and foreign exploiters. England is the slave-owner of the East. Soviet Russia has none the less declared herself ready to discuss England's definite complaints, to attempt to avoid collision. But one thing she says definitely to the English imperialists: if you think you can force us to adopt your policy, you are mistaken. We shall only follow the policy of the Russian worker and the Russian peasant.

The Soviet government proposes to the English government that an Anglo-Russian conference be convened, at which all points in dispute can be settled. If English imperialism rejects this proposal, then it bears the responsibility for what follows. With it lies the responsibility of peace or war, for a state of 150 million inhabitants cannot be ignored. One must either be at peace with this state, or at war with it. There is no third possibility. And the English government will have to decide whether it wants peace or whether it wants war.