

The COMMUNIST REVIEW

EDITOR :: WM. PAUL

Volume 3

November, 1922

Number 7

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SINGLE COPIES

SIX MONTHS - - 3/6 POST FREE

TWELVE ,, - - 7/- ,, ,,

BUNDLE ORDERS

13 COPIES FOR 5/3 POST PAID

SALE OR RETURN

REVIEW OF THE MONTH THE FIFTH YEAR

WE are now able to congratulate the Russian Soviet Government upon maintaining power for five years. Despite the world-wide attempt of all the counter-revolutionaries to destroy it—from the armed intervention of capitalist states to the criminal propaganda of the Second International—the red flag still floats in triumph over the Kremlin.

Russia has suffered cruelly during the past few years. Now, at long last, she is getting strong and healthy. The wounds and birth-pangs of the new system are almost healed. Europe has suffered too. In Britain, with millions unemployed, there has been hunger almost akin to that of a famine stricken region. But the suffering in Europe and Britain has been caused by the death-agonies of capitalism.

Due to the superb skill and determination of the Russian Communists, the Soviet Government now commands the respect, thanks to its power, of the capitalist states. The international situation is such that during the next year Red Russia may be able to compel her imperialist enemies to officially recognise her as a sovereign power. Not only does the Soviet Republic influence the policies of the imperialist states; during the coming winter the lessons of the Bolshevik revolution are going to play an inspiring part among the rebel masses of Germany and Italy.

The winter before us may prove to be an historic one. The inability of capitalism to stabilise itself, and the failures of the imperialist statesmen to solve the most pressing of national and international problems can only result in producing a revolutionary crisis. Not only have the capitalist politicians failed; in Germany, and elsewhere, the leaders of the Second International have not attempted to face the realities with which they have been confronted. Wherever these have held power—whether as leaders of trade unions, of parliamentary parties, or as the heads of governments—they have retreated in the most cowardly manner before the attacks of the capitalist class. The masses have already suffered in consequence of

these shameless retreats. The cruellest period of suffering has, unfortunately, not yet passed; the coming winter will bear witness to our contention. We are rapidly moving towards a period of new revolutionary struggles. The experiences of the Russian Communists in 1918, tested and modified by five years of governmental responsibility, are destined to influence the masses, particularly of Germany, in the battles that now confront them.

COMING BATTLES.

ON every hand there are signs of the coming revolutionary crisis. This explains the extreme anxiety of the Communists, and all true revolutionaries, to set their houses in order in anticipation of being called upon to engage in new struggles. In each country the Communist Party has set itself the task of getting its organisation and policy perfected. True to its desire to know its own power, and the measure of its discipline, the Communist Party in each land has unflinchingly faced the ordeal of dealing with the critics inside its own ranks. To superficial observers the heated discussions, at the various Communist congresses, seem to be based upon personal conflicts. Nothing of the sort. Questions of policy in every organisation generally result in struggles among the powerful personalities who advocate certain policies. It has been the historic procedure of every great revolutionary party in the past, that before it entered into a period of struggle it had to thoroughly overhaul its organisation and test its membership in order to get unity of action. No revolutionary party, no organisation of struggle, dare contemplate an attack upon its class enemies unless it is confident that every one of its units will unswervingly respond to disciplined action and loyally support a definite line of campaign. Carping critics and waverers can easily demoralise a revolutionary movement during a moment of conflict. These must be thrust outside of any party that contemplates audacious and united action.

Where an organisation has no serious intention of fighting it is the simplest thing in the world for it to hold a congress where conflicting policies are buried beneath a welter of meaningless phrases in order to mislead the public and to make it believe that sweet harmony reigns. Were the British Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress to attempt to formulate a fighting policy against the master class, it would immediately result in a terrific internal struggle among the various leaders. This was most clearly seen at the recent Trades Union Congress over the discussion on the General Council; it also revealed itself in the Labour Party Conference, at Edinburgh, during the heated debate on the reduction of the interest of the war loans. Neither of these issues were honestly faced; the problem in each case was clumsily dodged in the interests of a false unity. The Communists are too seriously minded to side-step their inner differences in such a cowardly manner. As a result of the fighting nature of their organisation they dare not permit important differences of policy to remain unsettled. Every Communist Congress is a meeting place where all party problems and differences are thrashed out and definitely settled. Being realists, the Communists understand the dangerous futility of smothering vital differences within their ranks by false high sounding and nebulous phrases about peace and unity. We have here the explanation of the fierce debates that have taken place in the Communist Parties of France, Germany, etc.

The dangers of attempting to hide important differences behind a paper facade of unity has been most vividly exposed in the recent history of the Italian Socialist Party. Two years ago many vital differences were noticeable in its ranks. At that time the revolutionary elements were most powerful in what was then the largest socialist organisation in Europe. The Communist International advised the revolutionary majority to clear out the feeble minority of moderate reformers. The majority, led by Seratti, refused to do this. The best fighting groups of the organisation left and formed the Italian Communist Party. After two years of internecine struggle, during which the Italian Socialist Party dwindled to a fragment of its former self, the split was forced upon the revolutionary element by the march of events. And now that the split has taken place it has been seen that, during those two years, the power of the once feeble reformist minority increased.

Just as a fierce thunderstorm clears the air, so a congress where blunt and straight talking is freely indulged in clears up the differences in an organisation.

The little noticed Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, recently held in London, was a most successful affair. It dealt with the most important things that matter for a revolutionary Party—improvements in the machinery of organisation and the consolidation of the membership. The work of the Congress will make itself felt in the testing times and crises that lie ahead for British capitalism. A compact and well disciplined organisation, which knows how to utilise its membership, can accomplish miracles when the suitable moment for action arises. To gather together such an organisation is a much more difficult task than most people imagine. Nevertheless, this is the task of the Communists in each country. And this was, primarily, the great work of the recent Communist Congress in London.

“THE NEW LEADER.”

WHEN a new Labour journal makes its appearance it is an event worthy of notice by all sections because it indicates the development of some new tendency within the Labour Movement. The passing of Keir Hardie's old journal, the *Labour Leader*, and the appearance of the *New Leader* marks an epoch in the history of the I.L.P.

At the founding of the I.L.P. an earnest attempt was made by the then stalwarts, Keir Hardie, Bruce Glaiser, etc., to make it a fighting political organisation of the masses. Despite many errors, the old leaders were never ashamed to advance a proletarian view-point in all industrial and political matters. The efforts of countless thousands of unknown but enthusiastic rank and file workers, stimulated by Keir Hardie, made the I.L.P. a power in Labour politics, and a force destined to play an important part in the land. Because of this it attracted several ambitious and disgruntled middle class Liberals who imagined that the Liberal Party was not over keen in utilising their “wondrous intellectual gifts.” When these elements entered the I.L.P., they gradually weaned it away from its earlier proletarian view-point, and even managed to modify the sturdy stand taken up by old Hardie. From being a militant organisation of the masses, the I.L.P. gradually degenerated into a middle-class caucus of ambitious parliamentary careerists, who used thousands of misguided socialist workers for their own ends.

Within the last few years an internal struggle has taken place in the I.L.P. between those who desired to maintain the old Keir Hardie Socialist tradition and those moderates who preferred to follow the Liberalism of Mr. J. R. Macdonald. The growing success of Macdonald was plainly seen in the welcome extended to President Wilson's capitalist policy and the fierce hatred shown to such as Lenin and Trotsky and the Communists of this country. Macdonald's latest triumph may be witnessed in the scrapping of the *Labour Leader* and the launching of the *New Leader*. The *Labour Leader*, in the hands of such footling fools as Mr. Carter, became a standing joke in the Labour Movement, and got beyond all redemption. The *New Leader* is an intellectual middle-class paper for people with advanced Liberal ideas. It is just what one expected Mr. Brailsford to produce—a twopenny edition of the *Nation*, with a very small dash of the old *Weekly Herald* in it. It lacks, of course, the brilliance of the former and the rebel spirit of the latter. Despite all the money that has been poured into it, the *New Leader* is miles behind the *Glasgow Forward*, which still remains the best propagandist journal of the I.L.P. in the country.

It is very necessary, of course, for people like Mr. Macdonald to have a political party and a good journal behind them. Unlike Mr. Henderson, Mr. J. H. Thomas, Mr. Clynes, and the other candidates for the Labour Premiership, who have strong trade unions and trade union journals to boost them, the Macdonalds, Snowdens, and Jowetts, etc., have no industrial strength to back them up now that the Labour Party is becoming an important parliamentary party. The I.L.P. professional parliamentarians have always felt that the trade union leaders, even those with no particular political ability, could always command the attention of the public. One need only compare the lavish Press reports obtained by people like Mr. Clynes or Mr. Thomas in contrast to the meagre notice taken of Mr. Macdonald or Mr. Jowett. It is not the first time that Mr. Snowden has said harsh things regarding the political preference shown to trade union leaders. And everyone knows that even Mr. Macdonald had a grudge, which he could not hide, against the *Lansbury Daily Herald*, because it, as he imagined, devoted so much attention to the political utterances of trade union leaders and neglected him. As M.P.'s Mr. Macdonald, and particularly Mr. Snowden, were able to keep themselves before the public eye by writing popular drivel for the capitalist Press.

With the possible return of about two hundred Labour men to the next Parliament, the majority of whom will be trade union leaders, it becomes all the more urgent for the purely professional middle-class politicians, in which the I.L.P. specialises, to have a popular weekly organ to sustain them. Now that the Right Wing of the I.L.P. has plenty of money to spend, it is doing the proper thing, from its standpoint, in devoting it to the creation of a non-proletarian journal like the *New Leader*.

The End of the Romanovs

THERE are still many legends in circulation with regard to the death of Nicholas II. and his family. The State Library of the Urals published in November last a history of the revolution in the Ural provinces, of which the first chapter describes the end of the last of the Romanovs and of his family. This book was written by N. Nikolaev.

The provisional government interned the autocrat in a palace at Tsarkoe Solo. When his life was threatened by the anger of the Russian people, he was sent to Tobolsk in Siberia. It should be noted that this was done by the provisional government of Kerensky and not by the Bolsheviks.

The bourgeois press of Petrograd and Moscow immediately began to publish accounts of the life in Tobolsk led by the Imperial family, of the flight or capture of the Tsar, and of the assembling of Tsarist counter-revolutionaries in Siberia. These accounts were very varied, and often quite fantastic, but the bourgeois papers never ceased publishing them.

The Soviet of Tobolsk consisted of Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries; there was no Communist organisation in the town. The Romanovs, living in what had been the Governor's palace, enjoyed a certain measure of freedom. They corresponded freely with those outside their "prison." Prince Dolgoronkov was allowed to visit them as often as he wished, and they received other visitors. "But the Soviet of the Urals soon heard of the presence of counter-revolutionary suspects in Tobolsk; Archbishop Hermogene was plotting there in secret, and Prince Lvov—at the time premier in the Provisional Government—was arrested on arriving at Tiumen, not far off, whole strangely enough "travelling for the fuel supply services."

THE TRANSFERENCE TO THE URALS.

The Urals Soviet then began to negotiate with the Central Executive Committee of the western Siberian Soviets for the transference of the Tsar to a safer place of internment. There was some question of Omsk, but later the Central Committee decided to send him to the Urals. This was in February, 1918, after the second Revolution.

The journey was made in haste, owing to the fact that a thaw was expected almost at once which would make the road impassable. Nicholas Romanov, his wife Alexandra, their daughter Marie, Dr. Botkine, and Prince Dolgoronkov were taken swiftly to Tiumen. The other members of the Tsar's family, and of his suite, were to wait until the ice broke up and it was possible to travel by river.

At Tiumen, Dolgoronkov was arrested. He was carrying a very considerable sum of money and two maps of Siberia, marked with various conventional signs; it seems to be established that Dolgoronkov was planning the Tsar's escape within the immediate future.

In Ekaterinburg, the Tsar was housed in a mansion that had formerly belonged to a certain Ipatiev, who had left the town. A high paling was erected around this house to protect the Romanov family from public curiosity. The official in charge of the building

—which the Soviet authorities called simply "The Special House"—decided to search the baggage of the Romanovs. The Tsar made no objection; the Tsarina refused. The official threatened to separate them from their family and, if necessary, force them to work. Alexandra gave in.

THE SPECIAL HOUSE.

Ipatiev's house had only two stories. The ground floor, which was rather below the level of the ground outside, was occupied by offices, the kitchen, etc. The Romanovs received five rooms on the first floor. In May their son and other daughters joined them. A constant watch over the "Special House" was kept by a detachment of Red Guards lodged in a neighbouring house. Nicholas Romanov, who in general wore an air of complete indifference to what was happening, bore his "imprisonment" calmly. Several times he happened to enter into a conversation with the sentinels; he was asked to cease doing this, and submitted. Alexandra Romanov's attitude was different; she was continually protesting against orders, and provoking trouble with the representatives of the district Soviet.

The Romanovs received their meals from the best communal restaurant in the town; two dinners were sent in to them per person. They could walk in the garden attached to the house at any time they chose. The official in charge did not interfere in any way with their methods of spending their time; amongst themselves they were free.

Meanwhile, Ekaterinburg became a rallying point for the monarchists. Ladies, old and young, of the nobility, dignitaries of the church, officers, and members of foreign missions filled the hotels in the town, wrote innumerable letters to the fallen sovereign, and besieged the Central Executive Committee and the district Soviet with incessant applications for permission to visit the Romanovs. The foreign Red Cross organisations sent their delegates. A certain Major Migitch, of the Siberian Army, came "wishing to interview Nicholas Romanov with regard to the cause of the war." The Soviet showed itself to be immovable.

In the workers' quarters, and especially in the factories of Verkh-Issetsk, there was considerable excitement. The district Soviet had to reckon with the possibility of a lynching of the Tsar; it was rumoured that the workers would attempt this on May 1st. On that day the members of the Soviet themselves took it in turn to watch over the Romanov's safety.

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY INSURRECTIONS.

Then two counter-revolutionary insurrections occurred. The Cossacks of Orenburg rose, and the Czecho-Slovak troops started to use their arms against the Government. This complicated the situation; Ekaterinburg was in danger.

The number of prisoners held by the district Soviet had just been increased; the Grand Dukes Serge Mikhailovitch, Igev, Constantine, and Ivan Constantinovitch were transferred from Viatka to Ekaterinburg by order of the Congress of Soviets in Viatka. The widow of the Grand Duke Serge Alexandrovitch also arrived from Moscow, sent by the Extraordinary Commission. It seemed dangerous to keep so great a number of notable prisoners in Ekaterinburg; all these new arrivals were therefore sent to Alopevsk.

Immediately afterwards the Serbian Major Migitch, another Serbian officer called Voyevitch, and an attaché from the Serbian court named Smirnov, were arrested in Ekaterinburg. These three Serbs had come to the district Soviet and demanded to be allowed to escort Princess Elma Petrovna, wife of the Grand Duke Ivan Constantinovitch, to Petrograd. They stated that the Central authorities in Moscow had authorised her departure. This was untrue. These three counter-revolutionaries claimed to speak on behalf of the Serbian Ambassador, Spoloike.

THE TSARINA'S SECRET COURIER.

At this time the authorities seized a part of the Tsarina's secret correspondence. In her letters to monarchist officers Alexandra prepared them for an attempt which should coincide with the approach of the Czecho-Slovaks. The district Soviet was in possession of a large number of letters addressed to the Tsarina, generally signed "An officer," or "One who would die for you"; all these emphasised, for the Soviet, the imminence of peril.

If the Tsar could have escaped and found refuge amongst the troops of the counter-revolution, or reached security abroad, he would have incarnated the "legitimate order" for the reactionaries. The question of the execution of the Romanovs came before the district Soviets before the end of June; execution was not agreed upon until the first days of July. The Bureau of the Soviet was charged with arranging for the execution and fixing the date. The Bureau did not sign the death warrant until the Czecho-Slovaks approached, and the counter-revolutionary bands menaced the city from two sides, along the Cheliabinsk railway-line and from the western Urals. Haste was imperative.

A tried revolutionary, a worker from the Verkh-Issetsk factories, Peter Lakharovitch Ermakov, was charged with the execution of the Romanovs. He was already a veteran, having fought against the bands of Dontov. He set about the business in such a way as to make it impossible for the monarchists to anticipate him by a *coup de main*.

THE EXECUTION.

During the evening of July 16th, 1918, the Romanovs were requested to assemble on the ground floor of their house. They all did so, including Dr. Boktine and the tutor and the governess of the former heir to the throne, Alexis. They thought that they were going to be moved again to another town. It was about 10 o'clock. In the largest room on the ground floor the official in charge of the building read to them, in the name of the district Soviet, the warrant for their execution. They had not time to recover from their astonishment. Nicholas Romanov could only say: "They are not going to move us then?" In a few instants the Romanovs had been shot.

At about one in the morning, their remains, having been carried out into the forest close by, near Polkino, were burned. Shortly afterwards the Whites entered into Ekaterinburg and began the preliminary proceedings for a grand trial of the "assassins of the Emperor." The judge, Sokolov, sentenced 200 persons, all of whom, however, had had nothing to do with the Tsar's execution.

Wild stories began to circulate about the fate of the Tsar and his relations. But General Diderichs, to whom Admiral Kolchak delegated the work of enquiry, finally dismissed all these rumours

and stated officially that the remains of the Romanovs had been completely destroyed (declaration made to the press at Vladivostok, November 27, 1918).

Towards the middle of July, at Perm, the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovitch, to whom the bourgeoisie had tried to transfer the crown after the abdication of his brother Nicholas, was shot. At the same time the Grand Duke Serge Mikhailovitch Igev, Constantine, and Ivan Constantinovitch were shot in Alopoevsk.

The Romanov family was therefore almost completely wiped out in July, 1918, by the workers of the Urals.

In July, 1918, the Bureau of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets was informed by its President, I. M. Sverdlov, that the Tsar had been executed. After deliberation, the Bureau approved of the decision taken by the district Soviet of the Urals.

The Spoiling of Turkey

BY J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD

[We publish, below, one of the most important articles that has yet been written by J. T. Walton Newbold in his brilliant survey of the economic factors which are causing strife among the imperialist States in the Near East. These articles have been appearing in the COMMUNIST REVIEW for several months and were written with the hope that the Labour movement would prepare itself for the struggle which the writer prophesied would take place in the Near East. The romantic leaders of the Labour Party were too busy denouncing French imperialism to notice what their own imperialists were doing. While we were unable, several months ago, to persuade the Labour Party leaders to study the facts regarding the Near East, they were ultimately forced, by concrete events and a series of crises, to take action on the matter.]

There is abundant food for thought in Newbold's article this month. His analyses explain why Lloyd George diverted troops from France to the East at a most critical moment during the war, a tactic which led to a serious disaster for the British Army and which resulted in the death of thousand of soldiers; Newbold's searchlight also exposes the reason for Churchill's gamble at Gallipoli with its mountain of proletarian corpses.—ED. COMMUNIST REVIEW.]

GERMANY ENTERS THE EAST.

JUST at the time when the British Government was pre-occupied with the diplomatic preliminaries of the South African war, and was making, in addition, very considerable increases in its naval armaments, with a view of strengthening the China Fleet against the eventuality of a crisis in its relations with Russia on the Pacific sea-board and at Peking and Tientsin, the German capitalists took advantage of so unique an opportunity to clinch the bargain with the Ottoman Government and to secure the definite concession for the Imperial Ottoman Baghdad Railway. The moment was chosen with an eye not only upon the entanglements into which Britain and Russia were getting, the one in South Africa, and the other in the Far East, but with a keen appreciation of the internal strife which was, at that time, weakening the French Republic, newly recovering from the turmoil of the Dreyfus scandal, and about to embark on an acrimonious campaign against the unlicensed religious orders of the Roman Church.

The domestic and foreign difficulties of Britain, Russia and France prevented either of them giving much attention to the pre-

liminaries of German railway construction in Asia Minor, which engaged the Deutsche Bank and Dr. Siemens during the years 1899 to 1903. However, Delcassé was in Petrograd in 1899 and, again, in 1901, whilst, in 1900, France made strong representations to the Ottoman Government concerning its treatment of French creditors having claims upon the revenues of the Haidar Pacha and Angora Railway. France might be pre-occupied, but she had not forgotten her interests in that quarter. She was exerting just enough diplomatic pressure to obtain for the *Banque de Paris* and the newly-formed *Banque française pour le Commerce et l'Industrie* a share in the financial operations connected with the new railway project. French Radical diplomacy and French Radical high finance were knowing very well how to blow hot and cold now in Petrograd and again at Frankfurt and Berlin. At that period the Republican Left, from Delcassé and Rouvier to Millerand and Briand, was seeking to withdraw France from the chauvinist antagonism to Britain and Germany, which, under Clerical and Nationalist influence, she had been developing, and was inclining her towards that cosmopolitan outlook which invariably characterises the foreign policy of any section of the capitalist class at the stage of development at which the *Bloc* of the Republican Defence then was.

BRITAIN COUNTERS GERMANY.

But the annexation by Britain of the Transvaal and the continued and reinforced regime of the British occupation in Egypt brought very considerable interests in investments and in banking belonging to the *personnel* of this Republican Left permanently under the British flag. The foreign and colonial policy of the British Government under Lord Salisbury had not only resulted in the great Rand mines, so largely capitalised by the Jewish houses of Amsterdam and Paris, becoming British, but had brought British, French and Belgian capital very closely together in West and Central Africa.

With the accession of Edward VII. to the throne of the United Kingdom, and the vast opportunities which this gave to the Sassoons, Sir Ernest Cassel and the Gunzburgs to exert their influence in high places, Britain, Belgium and France began to come very much closer together in the realms of high finance and of high politics. The Sassoons and the Reuters (barons in Coburg) were pushing into Persia from the south, and the Belgian financiers were pushing into Persia from the North.

On the 28th May, 1901, the original pioneers of the venture, out of which the Anglo-Persian Oil Company has subsequently evolved, obtained from the Shah of Persia exclusive privileges to search for, develop and carry away and sell petroleum, natural gas, asphalt, etc., in all provinces except five throughout his empire, and, in 1903, at the instance of the British Admiralty, Lord Strathcona, an especial and intimate friend and adviser of King Edward VII., subscribed the money for the initial development of these properties.

In the same year, 1903, the relations between Britain and Belgium became increasingly friendly, and next year, in April, 1904, the Anglo-French Agreement was signed, not immediately mentioning the Ottoman Empire, apart from Egypt, but bringing to a happy cessation the rivalries of the two Powers in the Near East.

In the course of an article in *Near East* (5/1/10) there occurred a rather curious and insinuating commentary upon one of the major consequences of the Anglo-French Agreement, which, assuredly, in view of all that has happened recently, makes one pause and think.

"There is," says *Near East*, "the fact that the *Entente Cordiale* . . . served to detach the French Government from the interest in the Baghdad Railway it had hitherto shown."

In other words, Rouvier and his associates, messieurs the agents of the French Radical bourgeoisie, were induced by a cunning but thoroughly courteous British Conservative Foreign Office to stop looking so intently at Asia Minor and beyond it at Baghdad and Delhi, and to direct their gaze instead upon Tangier, Fez and the road to nowhere that lies beyond!

THE RENAISSANCE OF HELLENISM.

Meanwhile, in 1902, yet another house of cosmopolitan financiers, welcome at Court, friendly with the Rallis, and influential alike in London and Paris, the *d'Erlangers*, together with the railway contracting subsidiary which they had organised for carrying through public works in Central and East Africa, viz., Pauling & Co., and the French makers of rolling stock, the *Société des Batignolles*, constituted a new company, the *Société Hellenique des Chemins de Fer*, whose purpose was to be to build and operate a line running from Athens to Larissa in Thessaly. This track would, once it was completed, not only help to develop the potential cotton-growing tracts of Boeotia, but would give the Greeks a strategical advantage in any subsequent endeavour to advance from Thessaly into Epirus and Macedonia. Signally defeated in 1896, the Greek bourgeoisie had no intention of acquiescing in its ignominious position, and was only waiting a favourable opportunity to reopen the Cretan question and to renew its attempt to possess itself of Salonika.

In 1904, the same group, that of the *d'Erlangers*, together with the *Banque de l'Union Parisienne* and numerous firms in London and Marseilles interested in the dried fruit trade, promoted, in conjunction with the *Bank of Athens*, the *Privileged Company to Protect the Production and Commerce of Currants*, which placed considerable capital at the service of Greek viticulture and trade.

In 1905-6, three interesting events happened in relation to Greece.

In March, 1905, was formed the Phil-Hellenic Society of France, with Georges Clemenceau—who, subsequently, helped Venizelos to obtain Smyrna—as an original vice-president and Aristide Briand as an original member.

In July, 1906, the Cretans, under Venizelos, re-commenced their agitation for autonomy and union with the Hellenic kingdom, and, in August, 1906, the *Banque de l'Union Parisienne* subscribed a 50 per cent. increase in the capital of the *Bank of Athens* to enable the latter to take over and develop the *Credit and Industrial Bank of Greece*.

Next, in February, the *Bank of Paris* and the *Imperial Ottoman Bank* issued a big loan for Serbia, and it became obvious to the Turks that they were being encircled and that they were becoming a prey to big capital and foreign control without and within.

ON THE EVE OF REVOLUTION.

Menaced on every side by the capitalists of the Entente, who, whether operating in Persia, Egypt, Serbia, or Greece, encircled the Ottoman Empire and threatened it with eventual strangulation, the Sultan Abdul Hamid, on the morrow of the Russo-British Convention with regard to Persia, gave new and enlarged privileges to the Deutsche Bank and the other concessionaires interested in the Baghdad Railway project. Thinking, doubtless to put himself and his empire under the protection of the Power which delighted to honour his capital with the most magnificent embassy buildings that it anywhere possessed, the Sultan and his advisers gave into the hands of German imperialism the whole resources of Asia Minor.

He did this, unfortunately for him, just at the time when the British Admiralty was thinking in terms of oil fuel and when it had every intention of reserving to its own future use not only the petroleum resources of Persia, but those, also, of Mosul. The interests of the British Navy and those of the capitalists of Bombay were equally disturbed by the intervention of German high finance in the regions between Angora and Baghdad.

Concession hunters were active in all parts of the Near and Middle East. The great oil "boom" was well in progress and the whole of the territories of the Ottoman Turks seemed big with hope if not with promise. When, therefore, the Sultan virtually closed the book and handed over to the highly centralised capitalism of Berlin the treasury of Asia Minor's mineral and agricultural riches and, simultaneously, the accursed Greeks were menacing Salonika, little wonder that the *bourgeoisie* of the latter town, an oasis of Judaism in a desert of Bulgar, Greek and other peasant peoples, took steps to save the common fatherland from the dangers that alternately penetrated and encompassed it.

The population of the Asiatic territories of the Ottoman Empire came, for official purposes, under three categories, viz. : Mussulmans, Jews, and Christians. These, religious in character, in the simple economy of those regions, reflected also a reality of racial and class distinction. The Mussulmans, whether Turkish by race or not, were attached to the soil as cultivators or as owners. The Jews and the Christians, the latter either Greek or Armenian, were engaged in trade and, in some measure, in handicrafts. The Armenians displayed a remarkable aptitude for the banking business, whilst the Greek was a success as a merchant and shop-keeper. Prior to the rise of the Greek Nationalist movement, the Greek subjects of the Sultan's had not much cause of complaint on the score of persecution, and many of them had been high in official favour, and financial opportunity had been theirs. The Jews had, however, the advantage that their religion does not regard themselves as having placed themselves beyond the pale if they embrace, in addition to their own beliefs, the faith of Islam. Consequently, the rise of Jews to the rank of vizier was by no means impossible, and throughout the empire members of their creed and race were to be found in the highest positions of trust.

In Constantinople, Damascus, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Baghdad, Brussa, Adrianople, but, above all, at Salonika, there were large and influential communities of Jews. Most of these were Maranos who had fled from Portugal and Spain to the hospitable land of Suleyman the Magnificent, there to escape from the merciless terror

from the friendly Ottoman to the hostile Greek.

Therefore it is easy to understand why the Turkish Revolution of 1908 had its headquarters in Salonika and why it came about in the manner and at the time that it did.

THE MATERIAL BASIS OF FRENCH MASONRY.

The Committee of Union and Progress, which derived its inspiration from Paris, was controlled by the Freemasons of the Grand Orient of France, and had also its connections, as was revealed after the event, with the Masons of Vienna. It was the faithful instrument of the Parisian and Viennese banking junta, which, working through the Laenderbank and its *filial*, the Bank of Salonika, sought to reconquer the East from the Deutsche Bank and the Bleichroders.

Superficial criticism of French bourgeois cosmopolitanism in banking generally confuses the obvious intercourse existing between the Banque de Paris and the Société Générale de Paris on the one hand and the Viennese credit institutions on the other, with something that it, most emphatically, was not, viz., an amiable and concerted alliance between the French Jews and the financiers of German Imperialism. There was, after 1870, an antagonism of the most acute nature dividing the banking interests of France and of Germany.

The houses at Frankfurt that had, in the days before the defeat of Austria and the consolidation of the German Empire around the Prussian kingdom, been essentially cosmopolitan in their operations had needed to make their choice as to whether they would remain German institutions and incline towards Berlin, or whether they would gravitate toward Paris and their reinforce the cosmopolitan elements around the Banque de Paris. Many of them did the latter, but, where they remained predominantly German, they introduced or, rather, perpetuated in German finance a cosmopolitanism that was alien to the spirit of the great Berlin banks. To him they had brought their wisdom and their skill in the casting of cannon and the making of gunpowder, arts which they introduced among the Turks, and so contributed in no small measure to the successes of their patrons whose armies had, on one occasion, to be bought off by bribes, disguised as loans, from the walls of Vienna.

In Salonika, the Jews were so numerous that it became known as "the Mother of Israel."

Thus, into a city, Hellenic in origin, Roman by conquest, Byzantine by tradition, surrounded by the Slavonic "Greeks" and Bulgars of modern times, held and, in large measure, occupied by the Ottoman Turks, there came many thousands of Spanish and Portuguese Jews to reinforce the earlier Roman Jews and themselves to be reinforced thereafter by co-religionists from the Danube valley.

Salonika was thus, for centuries, a great emporium whose commerce was in the hands of Jews, maintaining traditional links with the entire Levant, doing extensive business with Marseilles and the Western Mediterranean, having ramifications of intercourse through Smyrna, Damascus, and Baghdad into the Indies, and, latterly, becoming, thanks to the opening of the railway from Belgrade, one of the chief outlets of Austro-Hungarian commerce.

Families, like the Oppenheims of Frankfurt, Vienna, Constan-

tinople, and Alexandria, the Camonder of Constantinople and Paris, or the Vitalis of Salonika (who go by the name of Whittalls in Smyrna), had no satisfaction in seeing the Benachis of Alexandria and the Rallis of Chois coming in the baggage wagons of Venizelos and his Cretans to Salonika or to Smyrna. These privileged bourgeois of an earlier dispensation approved neither the diversion of East European traffic from Salonika and Smyrna to Sofia and Constantinople nor the threatened transfer of the two former ports

Austrian banking, like South German banking, had this same hesitant direction, and, whilst it always tended to lean upon some centre of greater strength, it was by no means happy in its general dependence on Berlin. Consequently, one sees again and again the Banque de Paris or the Société Générale de Paris operating not only in the Balkans, but also with Viennese houses at the same time that the whole trend of German and Austrian diplomacy was hostile to such penetration.

This cosmopolitan strain in French bank capital was, therefore, not running counter to, but was actually the under-current of the masonic intrigue and the diplomatic policy of the French Republic. It prompted the campaign of the Grand Orient in favour of the Self-Determination of Small Nationalities, and was in fundamental antagonism to the notions of Kaiserism and a Central European Statism.

The Turkish Revolution of April, 1908, was, therefore, the first shot in the war between the French banks and the German Empire. It struck a deadly blow at the influence of the latter in Constantinople, and, whilst the Radicalism of the first phase was modified later as the conservatism of Anatolia, made itself felt at the expense of the predominantly petit-bourgeois and cosmopolitan elements that held sway in Salonika, it was some time before the Young Turks, irritated at the obvious tendencies of the Venizelist party in Greece, oriented again towards the only possible ally of Turkey at that time, viz., Germany.

MAMMON IN MESOPOTAMIA.

Amongst the first things that the Young Turks did was to introduce modifications into the mining laws so as to make easier the leasing of concessions to foreign capitalists, and within a few months the capital was agog with adventurers from every country in the capitalist world.

In the *Economist* (5/9/08) "great hopes" were "placed in the exploration of the wealthy mines of Asia Minor, which unjust laws made inaccessible to the foreigner." *Near East* (October, 1908) remarked:—

"The fabulous mineral wealth of the country will now be opened up. Great tracks of virgin forest lands bearing rare and valuable woods will be exploited, oil-wells will be tapped, irrigation will produce a ten-fold crop to that now secured and enhance the value of the land, and agriculture will flourish. . . . Roads, railways, telegraphs, and public works generally will be engineered tending to advancement and enrichment."

As for the *Manchester Guardian*, quoted in the above periodical, its correspondent was sending home these glad tidings to the Rallis in Cottonopolis:—

"The needs of the country are inestimable. . . . The

rich grain products of Syria are now unmarketed because there is no feasible way of bringing them over the mountains of the Mediterranean coast. . . . This new Turkey is, in short, a virgin field for the engineer and the capitalist."

One of the first steps of the new Government was to engage the services of the great Indian irrigation expert, Sir William Willcocks, for five years to act as official adviser for irrigation works in Mesopotamia. This was followed up by a valuable concession to the Euphrates and Tigris Steam Navigation Company for a new service of steamers on the rivers, whilst at the same time that the *Sassoons* were coming into this shipping venture, they, together with *Brown, Shipley & Co.*, the Anglo-American cotton bankers, the *Bank of Liverpool*, the *Banque de Bruxelles*, and the *Société Générale de Paris* were promoting the *Eastern Bank, Ltd.*

Founded in 1909, in the same year but some months later than the *Anglo-Persian Oil Co., Ltd.*, this bank, incorporating the great cotton-growing and vending interests of Liverpool and Bombay, was an implicit challenge to the German capital interested in the Baghdad Railway.

The issue at stake in this region can be judged from the following statements made in 1919, the one by Robert Fleming, one of the big men of Dundee, who is interested in oil:—

"Mesopotamia is a land that Western effort may cause to overflow with wheat and oil, if not with milk and honey"
(*U.S. Commerce Review*, 21/3/19);

and the others from the *Board of Trade Journal* (16/1/19):—

"Germany's main purpose in building the Baghdad Railway and in penetrating Lower Mesopotamia was to turn the country into a huge cotton field. For cotton-growing, Mesopotamia is said to have great climatic advantages, and a Mesopotamia under cotton, and directly connected with Germany by railway, might have made the German Empire independent of overseas supplies. Mesopotamia is, even in her present state of decay, a large exporter of dried fruits, and a considerable exporter of barley and wool. In wool, especially, there are almost unlimited possibilities.

"Until Germany appeared in the trade of the Persian Gulf, the trade in cotton goods was entirely in the hands of Great Britain and India, and though Lancashire remained predominant, the competition of cheap German cloths was beginning to be felt. At present the bulk of the trade with Mesopotamia is naturally British and Indian."

To say that the trade in cotton goods was entirely in the hands of Great Britain and India was synonymous with saying that it was in the hands of the Rallis of Manchester and the Sassoons of Bombay.

These were the gentry whose interests were menaced by Germany and who knew then as now and any time during half a century how to make their own pecuniary gain appear in the transcendental disguise of Christian civilisation and British imperial glory.

CASSEL AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Meanwhile, the more immediate patrons of the Turkish bourgeoisie, the interest, who for some two years prior to the Revolution had been transmitting moneys through the Italian and French masonic lodges, were happy to see the new administration appoint

as its financial adviser Charles Laurent, President of the French Board of Audit. "Under his able and disinterested guidance," said *Near East* (Nov., 1908), "the finances of Turkey will be remodelled in keeping with Western requirements." That, to say the least, was very nicely phrased and most delicately put. It was also, in all probability, consonant with the interests of truth.

When we recall that this gentleman subsequently became President of the all-powerful Union of Metallurgical and Mining Industries of France, and was, in 1919, made French Ambassador to Berlin, we understand where and how to place him.

In the following summer, the Banque de Paris, the Société Générale de Paris, and the French and British banks operating in Vienna undertook a reorganisation and increase of capital of the Banque de Salonique, appointing a representative of the Banque de Paris as president.

By this time the great game of concession hunting and of political intrigue had become fast and furious. The hotels of Constantinople were crowded with financiers and their technical advisers, whilst at Athens, in Sofia, and, further away, in London, Paris, and Berlin the diplomats and their experts were working overtime.

Whilst Sir Wm. Willcocks had been engaged as adviser on the irrigation requirements of Mesopotamia and Charles Laurent as adviser on finance at the capital, Admiral Gamble of the British Navy was taken on to re-organise the Turkish Fleet. The Turks were going to send their youths to Paris for financial and legal training, to Berlin for military instruction and to Britain for engineering and other studies. They had not much time for the Imperial Ottoman Bank or for Armstrong, Whitworth and Co., but the star of Vickers was decidedly in the ascendant. This was not surprising in view of the connexions which that superlatively shrewd and supple firm has, at one time or another managed to establish with men trained in the business methods of Pera and the diplomatic niceties of the Yildiz-Kiosk.

It had been fortunate in securing, as a director, Vincent Caillard, who had been a member of the Ottoman Debt Council from 1883 to 1898. This gentleman had then become the very shadow of Sir Ernest Cassel, who was on the best of terms with the Société Générale de Paris and the Banque de Paris. It had obtained for its European manager, Francis Barker, the son of an eminent and influential private banker in Constantinople, and it seems to have had as its local agents the Whittalls, who were big people in the barley trade of Smyrna, and were really, Vitalis, of Salonika.

Whilst the Société Générale and the Banque de Paris were improving the shining hour at Salonika or seeking concessions for tramways or other undertakings in the capital and, in the case of the former, collaborating with the Sassoons and the Banque de Bruxelles in the Eastern Bank, their friend and associate, Sir Ernest Cassel, who had for more than twenty years been a very present comfort in time of need for the Vickers firm, was obtaining a bank concession for himself.

The story of this is the more interesting in that he was balked in his major project by the French and that out of this concern, in its attenuated and fitful survival, developed the Levant Company

and the various activities in which the British Trade Corporation has engaged in Eastern Europe since 1919. It is interesting in that it was formed to facilitate the business of Vickers as armament contractors to the new Turkey, and that it was modelled upon the same plan as Sir Ernest's National Bank of Egypt. It is interesting and all important in that in and around this enterprise and its offshoots has been centred all the intrigue of British capitalist imperialism at the Straits and at Constantinople.

The *Economist* (21/8/09) remarked:—

“We note the creation of a new National Bank, formed partly with British capital, though with the co-operation of the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas. The Bank is promoted by Sir E. Cassel, Lord Revelstoke, Sir Alexander Henderson, and other well-known financiers; Sir Henry Babington Smith has been induced to leave the Post Office for Constantinople in order to act as President. The bank directorate will have the benefit of Sir Adam Block's experience.”

The same journal, on September 27th, 1910, stated that Sir Ernest Cassel was busy negotiating a loan for Turkey on condition that the Government transferred its accounts from the Imperial Ottoman Bank to the National Bank of Turkey. This, of course, aroused the antagonism of the French interests predominant in the former institution, and the fact that Cassel was in touch also with the Deutsche Bank—never in pre-war days a very far cry from Vickers, who lived on the best of terms with its engineering associate, Siemens-Schackhert—helped to bring the whole weight of French diplomacy into the scale against him.

In its issue of October 1st, 1910, the *Economist* complained that:—

“The National Bank of Turkey was founded with the approval, if not at the expressed wish, of the British Foreign Office, to represent English finance in Turkey, so that English sympathies for the new régime might be assisted by material help, or, at least, might not be crushed by the pressure of financial arguments applied by other countries . . . its action is deprecated by the high and mighties of the Foreign Office who raise political objections.”

This opposition, it alleged, was inspired by France, and the able writer of *Les Emprunts de l'Etat Ottomane*, M. Poulgy, remarks that in trying to place his Turkish loan in Germany, Sir Ernest Cassel “had counted without the Entente Cordiale.”

FRANCE PREFERS THE GREEKS.

The Turks had, in the autumn of 1910, hastily ordered two cruisers from Germany, and despite the placing of a contract for gunboats with a French firm, the French Government was hindering the Turks in the floating of a new loan.

At the same time, the *Crédit Mobilier Français* and a number of smaller French banks, including that of *Louis Dreyfus & Co.*—which had connections with French Menshevism and M. Albert Thomas—was nibbling around this same question of a loan and had a good deal to do with checkmating Cassel.

Finally, however, the Turkish Minister of Finances lost patience alike with London and Paris and placed the loan with the Deutsche Bank on unfavourable terms for Turkey.

Meanwhile, other French interests, notably those of the *Banque*

de l'Union Parisienne and the *Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris*, were bringing financial assistance to Greece.

There, a crisis was rapidly developing, having its nominal inspiration, of course, in Crete, where the *Ethnike Hetairia*, "subsidised," said the *Economist*, "by Greeks outside the Greek Kingdom," was again making a demand for union with Greece. In August, 1909, matters came to a head in that direction. In the following January, Venizelos landed in Athens. Next summer there was more trouble in Crete, and in 1910 Venizelos, assuming for the while his pose of a moderate, became head of the Greek Government.

All this time, from 1907 to 1911, first one French bank and then another was helping now this and now that Greek bank to increase its capital, whilst the *Ionian Bank*, a "British" institution, opened up in Alexandria in 1907 and steadily developed connections and branches throughout Egypt in the following years. The mass of the foreign population of Egypt being Greek and the cotton trade of the Soudan being almost exclusively in their hands, one can realise the strength of the ties which were linking together Alexandria and Athens.

When Venizelos became Premier of Greece, one of his first measures of reform was to establish a Ministry of Commerce, Agriculture and National Economy, and therein to instal his friend, Emmanuel Benachi, President of the Greek Colony of Alexandria, member of the Egyptian Agricultural Society, member of the Council of Sir Ernest Cassel's National Bank of Egypt, and head of the firm of *Davies, Benachi and Co.*, of Liverpool, Manchester, Alexandria, etc., etc., "the leading British concern in cotton exportation."

Turkey drifted back into dependence on Germany. Greece obtained the assistance of France and Britain whilst in several promotions, such as the *Anglo-Russian Trust, Ltd.*, we find Anglo-Greeks actively and prominently participating.

Yet such were the cross currents in the Balkans that in 1911 we find the Turks placing orders with Vickers, Ltd., and Armstrong, Whitworth and Co., Ltd., for two new battleships—on whose equipment British Naval inspectors, superintending the inexperienced Turkish inspectors, had instructions to place the British Admiralty mark—and, in 1912, the Greeks ordered the super-dreadnought, "Salamis" from the *Vulkanwerfte* of Stettin.

MORE VICKERS.

Early in 1914, the Turks, who had already leased the Stamboul Dockyard to Vickers and Armstrong-Whitworth for an extended period, borrowed £3,000,000 from the *Perier Bank* of Paris to enable them to purchase from Brazil the luxuriously equipped battleship, "Rio de Janeiro," but, whilst this last word in gun-carrying capacity changed her name to the "Sultan Osman," the only active service she ever saw was under the Union Jack as the "Agincourt."

The British Admiralty delayed her delivery—she was ready months before the War—on the plea that to send her out to the East would be to precipitate trouble between Greece and Turkey, and promptly confiscated her on the outbreak of war with Germany. The Turks protested but without getting any satisfaction, and, in their anger, welcomed the "Goeben" and the "Breslau" in

exchange, and thereby afforded the Entente Powers with the excuse they were seeking for picking a quarrel with the real objective victim of the War of 1914.

The whole business of Sir Ernest Cassel in endeavouring to set up a land mortgage and general banking institution like the National Bank of Turkey was apiece with his activities in Egypt, with the sending of the British Naval Mission to Constantinople under Admiral Gamble in 1908, and with his subsequent recommendation to the Turks to order ships from Vickers. British capitalism was seeking in 1908 to establish itself at Constantinople as it had done at Cairo years before.

The composition of the board of the Cassel bank, including the inevitable Baring, a civil servant from the G.P.O., the Smyrna Agent of Messrs. Bass, Ratcliff and Gretton's barley purchases, showed clearly enough the imperialist motive in mind. Defeated in this project and acquiescing in this defeat, not too active at this time in the finance and politics of Greater Hellenism but leaving this dubious, because then unproven, asset to France, content to leave Russia and Germany to settle accounts at the Straits, British capitalism made no false steps in the areas that more immediately mattered to it.

British capitalism made certain of Southern Persia and made equally sure, also, of Mesopotamia.

British capitalism made certain of Southern Persia and made megalomania which is its inherent, and, seeing its stage of development, inevitable characteristic. It just saps and mines, mines and saps at the foundations of those states whose territories it covets and which it may reasonably hope, in time, to appropriate. Then as pieces become dislodged it quietly and unobtrusively pockets them and proceeds to loosen the next.

The Middle Eastern Empire has been a long time in gathering, but its planning is of a very recent date. Churchill is the testator not the originator.

The Debacle of Gandhism

BY E. ROY

GANDHISM as a political force reached its climax in the Ahmedabad session of the Indian National Congress, held in the last week of December, 1921. The six thousand delegates, representatives of India's outraged nationalism—outraged by the policy of deliberate repression launched upon the Government of India—conferred upon the Working Committee and upon Mr. Gandhi, as its head, supreme dictatorial powers to guide the national destinies during the ensuing year. Non-violence, non-co-operation and mass civil disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, were adopted as the means to attain the goal of a still-undefined *Swaraj*.

Few leaders can ask for more than this—the sense of power that emanates from a nation's mandate, backed up by the popular will. The field was clear for Mr. Gandhi to exercise his qualities of leadership and to match steel with his powerful opponent—British Imperialism. If, at first blush, the contest looked unequal between the slender David and the giant Goliath, it must be remembered

that the odds were not all in favour of the latter. Three hundred and twenty million people, united under the single command of an adored and trusted leader, who has cleverly put his bristling opponent at a disadvantage from the outset, by proclaiming non-violence as his chief weapon—such a force, if properly manœuvred, could be made to wring more than one concession from the irritated and nonplussed adversary, whose moral position in the eyes of the world is a bad one, and whose cowardly hypocrisy smarts under the knowledge of this fact. And concessions were all that Mr. Gandhi asked for. He is not, and has never been, an avowed revolutionary who puts the issue squarely to the enemy—“either you or I must go.” His unsubstantial *Swaraj*, when pieced together from reluctant definitions, means only “Home Rule within the British Empire,” as the defeat of Hazrat Mohani’s resolution for “complete independence outside the British Empire” proved at the Ahmedabad Congress.

If, instead of winning concessions for at least a section of the Indian people, Mr. Gandhi won for himself a six-year jail sentence and a martyr’s crown at the hands of the British Government, he has only himself to blame. Great positions carry with them great responsibilities, and Gandhi the Dictator, who played a lone hand against his powerful adversary, must acknowledge that his tactics brought him to a catastrophic defeat. The situation at the close of the Ahmedabad Congress was a delicate one, and success for either side hung in the balance. It is in such moments that leadership turns the scale, and judging by the denouement, the palm must go to Lord Reading and not to Mr. Gandhi.

A moment’s retrospect will make clear the position as it stood. The visit of the Prince of Wales to India served its purpose, by showing the Government that there was real force behind the Non-co-operators,—the force of the striking masses. Stung by this demonstration of power, the bureaucracy adopted a policy of such wide repression, that to-day, in addition to all the prominent leaders, twenty-five thousand Indian patriots lie in jail upon very vague and unproven charges of “sedition,” “disaffection” and of “waging war against the King.”

But in its eagerness to stamp the movement out, the Government overshot the mark. The Moderates, that tiny section of upper class Indians whose “loyalty” gave a show of legality to the wholesale arrests and prosecutions of their fellow countrymen, these same Moderates rebelled against their leading-strings, and demanded a change of policy. Members of the new Councils resigned, others protested; lawyers and landowners and capitalists banded themselves together in a sort of unity to tell the Government it must cease its rampant repression. The suggestion of Pundit Malaviya to hold a Round Table Conference of all shades of opinion, for the solution of the crisis, was responded to by all the political parties. This was the crucial moment, and the wary tactics of the Viceroy in this crisis prove that he was fumbling in the dark.

In a speech made in Calcutta on December 21, 1921, just before the Ahmedabad Congress opened, the Viceroy himself stated that he was in favour of a genuine attempt to solve the problems of unrest by means of discussion and consideration at a conference, and that meanwhile, there should be a cessation of activities on both sides, both Non-co-operators and Government. He further declared that such a truce would involve no advantage or triumph to be claimed on

either side. The reason for this offer to mediate was clear. It was desired to save the face of British prestige during the Prince's visit, and for this reason, Lord Reading was ready to negotiate. No definite response was given immediately to his offer, and his real object,—that of making the Prince's visit a success, was thereby lost.

But his words had not fallen on deaf ears, and we find the idea of a conference being toyed with by Mr. Gandhi in the Ahmedabad Congress, who "left the door to negotiations open," and again in the Conference held in Bombay on January 15th, in which definite terms were laid down for the calling of a Round Table Conference, in conformity with the Viceroy's speech; that the Government cease its arrests and release all prisoners and that the Non-co-operator cease all activities pending the negotiations. Mr. Gandhi, meanwhile, as Congress Dictator, had suspended Civil Disobedience until the end of January, in order to assist the arbitration.

In this desire of Mr. Gandhi to arbitrate lay the secret of his defeat. Lord Reading discovered that Mr. Gandhi was no less unwilling than himself to call into action the sanguinary forces of the Indian masses. This was amply demonstrated by his ever-growing insistence upon the creed of Non-violence at the expense of its concomitant Non-Co-operation. By his sharp rebuke to every manifestation of force on the part of the masses, such as his "Manifesto to the Hooligans of Bombay" after the events of November 17th—20th and Madras, in which he declared, "it is better to have no hartal and no hooliganism"; above all, by his shrinking from embarking upon the final step that he himself declared must lead to *Swaraj*, namely, Mass Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes. This latter step was thrice postponed after its formal adoption in the Ahmadabad Congress; postponed for no reason whatever, except Mr. Gandhi's own timid horror of the inevitable conflicts between police and people that must follow its inauguration.

It did not need much acumen for Lord Reading to discover this weakness of Mr. Gandhi, who proclaimed it from the housetops, for the benefit alike of Government and Non-co-operators. On January 25th, he wrote in *Young India*, at the very moment when the Round Table negotiations were under way, and he was supposed to declare Mass Civil Disobedience in operation within five days if the overtures for peace fell through:

"I don't know what is the best course. At this moment I am positively shaking with fear. If a settlement were to be made, then where are we to go? After coming to know the strength of India, I am afraid of a settlement. If a settlement is to be made before we have been thoroughly tested, our condition will be like that of a child prematurely born, which will perish in a short time."

In the face of this naive avowal of indecision, helplessness, and terror, is it any wonder that the Viceroy, afflicted by no such qualms and very conscious of his end in view, should bring the negotiations for a Round Table Conference to an abrupt end and pursue his serene course of lawless repression, undeterred by the voice of his own or Mr. Gandhi's conscience? Lord Reading's decision was communicated to Pundit Malaviya and the 200 delegates from all political parties, in a telegram sent by his secretary, towards the end of January, which stated that His Excellency was unable to discover in the proposals put forward by the Conference the basis for a profitable discussion on a Round Table Conference, and no useful pur-

pose would therefore be served by entering into any detailed examination of their terms.

The Viceroy had begun to advance from the very first step of retreat taken by Mr. Gandhi in postponing the application of Mass Civil Disobedience until the outcome of the Round Table Arbitrations. If instead of this amiable postponement, Mr. Gandhi had issued an edict to the waiting peasantry to cease payment of taxes immediately at the close of the Congress, the whole outcome might have been different. The response of the peasants cannot be doubted. Wherever tried, its effect was instantaneous and overwhelming. Lord Reading, confronted by a show of force and firmness, backed by mass-action on a large scale, might have wavered and accepted negotiations with the Non-co-operators. But Mr. Gandhi merely threatened and then postponed for two weeks that which constituted his only weapon. On February 4th, when the Viceroy had already declared the road to negotiations closed, Mr. Gandhi addressed a letter to him, once more offering to delay the inauguration of Mass Civil Disobedience pending the Conference, if the Viceroy would revise his policy of lawless repression.

The reply, of February 6th, was a Government Communique which declared that "Mass Civil Disobedience is fraught with such danger to the State that it must be met with sternness and severity," while Mr. Gandhi's overtures for peace were completely ignored. Matters had now come to a showdown. The Government had called Mr. Gandhi's bluff, and all cards were laid on the table.

Mass Civil Disobedience, already declared at Bardoli on January 20th, but suspended pending the Gandhi-Reading negotiations, was formally launched through the medium of a mass-meeting held at Bardoli, and a Manifesto issued February 7th by Mr. Gandhi, in which he declared:

"The choice before the people, then, is Mass Civil Disobedience with all its undoubted dangers and lawless repression of the lawful activities of the people."

Although Mass Civil Disobedience was not formally sanctioned by Mr. Gandhi until all hope of a compromise with the Government had been given up—that is, until the first week in February—in reality it had begun spontaneously in various districts since January, in the form of non-payment of taxes, and was approved by the various local Congress Committees. The rumour spread from village to village that the Gandhi-Raj had come, and it was no longer necessary to pay taxes. That the movement was spreading rapidly is proven by the fact that local officials began to resign in large numbers because of their inability to collect the revenue, as well as by the official reports, which show large sums outstanding which the officials were unable to collect from the peasantry. District magistrates complained of incitement among the people not to pay taxes, of popular resistance to rent-warrants, of insults heaped by prisoners under trial upon their judges, and a general subversion of jail discipline.

The prompt and energetic measures taken by the Government to arrest the non-payment of taxes movement prove how seriously it was regarded. Already on January 10th, a Communique from the Punjab, warned the people against the consequences of Civil Disobedience, which the Government threatened would be dealt with by more rigorous and systematic measures than any yet adopted. On January 20th, the Madras Government issued a similar notice, stating that the resignation of village officials would not be accepted, and

that officers refusing to carry out their duties would be dismissed and deprived of their hereditary rights, and that the land of persons refusing to pay taxes would be seized and put up for sale. Extra police were recruited at the expense of the population, but those paying taxes before the prescribed date would be exempt from this liability. Military police were called out in Assam to assist collections, but were met with resistance by the people.

Conflicts between the police and the people became a daily occurrence, but a strict censorship was maintained to conceal the extent of the unrest. Only the reports of the revenue-officers form a gauge of the strength of the movement. In Guntur District, Madras, collections amounted to 100th part of the money due.

Non-payment of taxes was not the only disturbing feature of Indian unrest during the months of January and February. Widespread disturbances throughout India, from the Punjab to Madras, from Bombay to Burma, arose from the attempts to enforce the various measures of the Non-co-operation programme, such as boycott of cloth and liquor-shops, resulting in encounters between police and people, and mob-risings, with loss of life and many arrests which tended to increase the general disquiet. The correspondent of the *Morning Post*, writing from India at the end of January, says:

“ In large areas, particularly Upper Assam, conditions border on anarchy. Rent and revenue payments are refused, and where resort is had to loyalist volunteers and *Gurkhas*, the Gandhites have openly ridiculed such military procedure. In a police affray arising from picketing in Serajgunge (Bengal), the police fired, killing five and wounding 200. The present tension, unless eased by stronger Government action, will have a most serious outcome.”

In Bombay, the movement was more peaceful, consisting mainly of boycott of schools and enlistment of volunteers, so that in a mass-meeting held in Bardoli in January, under the auspices of the Non-co-operators, Mr. Gandhi was able to declare the district self-disciplined and fit enough for the adoption of Civil Disobedience. But even this model atmosphere was ruffled when the Bombay Government announced on February 9th, that the Municipalities of Ahmedabad and Surat would be superseded for two and three years respectively, for having resolved to conduct their schools independently of Government control and for refusing the Government education grant.

At this critical moment, an unexpected pin-prick exploded Mr. Gandhi's faltering resolution, and sent him scurrying back to the protection of law and order. On February 4th, a riot occurred in Chauri Chaura, a village of the United Provinces, in which a procession of volunteers was fired on by the police and the infuriated mob charged the police station, captured the building, killed 23 policemen, and then set fire to the police station, cut the telegraph wires and tore up the railway. The news of this untoward but by no means unusual event, whose counterparts were being enacted all over India in every province, leaked through the official censorship on February 6th, just at the moment when Mr. Gandhi and the Viceroy were exchanging their famous notes, and full details reached the Mahatma on the very day on which he announced the formal inauguration of Mass Civil Disobedience.

The gruesome details of burned policemen and dismantled telegraph wires were more than Mr. Gandhi's sensitive conscience could bear. By some extraordinary mental process, he held himself and

his declaration of Civil Disobedience to be responsible for the whole occurrence, and with a loud wail of dismay and despair, announced a five-days' fast (reduced to two days on the supplications of his followers) as penance and punishment for the tragedy of Chauri Chaura. In an article published on February 10th in *Young India*, Mr. Gandhi declares :

" I regard the Chauri Chaura tragedy as a third warning from God against the hasty embarkation on Mass Civil Disobedience, and it is my bitterest cup of humiliation, but I deem such humiliation, ostracism, or even death preferable to any countenancing of untruth or violence."

Without loss of time, on February 11th, a Conference was hastily convened at Bardoli, wherein the Working Committee of the Congress revoked not only Mass Civil Disobedience, but all picketing, processions and public meetings as well. The peasants were ordered to pay land-revenue and all other taxes due to the Government, and to suspend every activity of an offensive nature.

Mr. Gandhi's harkening to his conscience did him the good service of delaying the order for his own arrest, a fact of which he was unaware at the time. The Government at Simla, a little amazed at this temperamental outburst and sudden change of heart, stayed its hand temporarily to permit Mr. Gandhi to lead the movement into confusion worse confounded. The national uprising which they had feared and prepared against during the last three months, was checked and thrown into rout by the good offices of Mr. Gandhi himself, whose incorrigible pacificism and dread of the popular energy could be counted upon to prevent the explosion. What Governmental repression in all its varied forms had failed to accomplish, the agonized appeal of the Mahatma was able to effectuate. Truly, as a Pacifist Reformer, Mr. Gandhi may well congratulate himself on his success in soothing the just anger of the populace, even though he may have to admit his utter failure to melt the heart of the Government. That which arrests, tortures, floggings, imprisonments, massacres, fines, and police-zoolams could not quell—the blind struggles of a starving nation to save itself from utter annihilation—Mr. Gandhi, by the simple magic of love and non-violence, reduced to impotence and inactivity, which insured its temporary defeat.

The Bardoli Resolutions were received throughout the country with mingled feelings of triumph, relief, and alarm—triumph on the part of the Government and its supporters, relief to the feelings of those moderates and secret sympathisers with the victims of Government repression, and alarm on the part of those Non-co-operators whose ideas of strategy and tactics differed widely from those of Mr. Gandhi.

While the Nationalist Press on the whole supported Mr. Gandhi in his *volte-face*, and local Congress Committees immediately began to put the Bardoli Resolutions into practice, a section of Extremist opinion found itself outraged by the sudden retreat from the Ahmedabad decisions. Some Mahratta newspapers criticised Mr. Gandhi for stressing isolated incidents like Chauri Chaura and Bombay to the detriment of the movement as a whole. Mr. S. R. Bomanji, in a lecture delivered in Bombay on " The Lessons of Bardoli," declared that the people were asked to sacrifice everything and were prepared to do it, because they thought Mr. Gandhi was leading a fight for freedom. Mr. Gandhi was the most greatly admired man in India, but that did not preclude them from the right of thinking, and in

the hero-worship of Mr. Gandhi they were losing their individuality.

The regular session of the All-India Congress Committee was held in Delhi on February 24th, and the Bardoli Resolutions were presented for endorsement. Pundit Malaviya, Mr. Gandhi's *alter ego* of Pacifism and Moderation, urged the ratification of Bardoli, and the complete abandonment of Non-co-operation in all its forms. Mr. Gandhi, still horror-stricken at the bloodshed of Chauri Chaura that presaged Revolution, hugged the Bardoli decisions without going to the length of Pundit Malaviya's surrender. But an angry section of earnest Extremists, realising the disastrous effect upon the movement of the abandonment of all aggressive tactics, and smarting under the Government's ill-concealed triumph, urged the repudiation of Bardoli and the renewal of Non-co-operation, including Civil Disobedience. Mr. Gandhi himself, caught in the unpleasant predicament of being "let off" by the Government for good behaviour, felt himself stung to self-defence by a return to his abandoned position. Accordingly, a compromise was struck, and the Delhi session of the Congress Committee sanctioned all forms of Non-co-operation, including individual Civil Disobedience, both defensive and aggressive, and picketing. The Resolution affirmed that "Civil Disobedience is the right and duty of a people, whenever a state opposes the declared will of the people."

The Delhi decision was a complete reversal of Bardoli, and as such, constituted a direct challenge to the Government.

The arrest of Mr. Gandhi, already once postponed, could be henceforth merely a matter of time and place. The wider issues of imperial policy as well as the Government of India, demanded it. In England, the Die-hards were clamouring for his blood, together with that of Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, whom they identified with the liberal policy of the Montford Reforms. Lloyd George, threatened with a General Election by the dissolution of his Coalition, ran hither and thither, hatching devices for saving his job. Having achieved the Irish Free State and "Independent" Egypt as sops to Liberal opinion, it became necessary to placate the Conservatives by some blood-offering, and this he proceeded to do by the sacrifice of Indian hopes and aspirations.

India's victimisation to Lloyd Georgian and Imperial exigencies took three outward and visible manifestations. The *first* was the attempted splitting off of the Mussulmans from the Nationalist Movement by granting certain concessions to the claims of the Caliphate; the *second* was the dismissal of Mr. Montagu and the appointment of a Conservative to his post; the *third* was the arrest of Mr. Gandhi, with the purpose of dealing the *coup de grace* to the Non-co-operation Movement. Mr. Lloyd George is a clever politician, but events have not justified the wisdom of any one of these three steps.

The revision of the Treaty of Sévres had formed one of the demands of the Non-co-operators from the very beginning, as a means of bringing about the Hindu-Muslim unity so essential to the success of Indian nationalism. But Mr. Gandhi was not the only angler for Muslim goodwill. The historic "divide and rule" policy of the British Government, which had met with so much success in India by the separation of Mussulmans and Hindus, could not be checkmated by so simple a manœuvre as taking up the cudgels for the Caliphate. It was clear that if Muslim support could be bought by concessions to religious fanaticism, the British Government would be the first to buy it over, if it considered it worth while.

The time came when this policy seemed expedient. At the end of January, Lord Northcliffe, in the course of his Indian tour, published a significant and sensational letter advising concession to Muslim opinion, and the conservative Press in England echoed his advice. The Viceroy of India took advantage of the approaching Paris Conference to telegraph the Home Government his oft-reiterated plea on behalf of some revision in favour of the Caliphate. It was evident that the Die-hards, influenced by traditional belief in the militant fierceness of the Mussulman, were inclined to placate this element at the expense of the Hindu community.

In a word, the Imperialists stole Mr. Gandhi's thunder, and hoped thereby to split the strength of the Indian Extremists. The Paris Conference, duly presided over by Lord Curzon, who had his instructions, granted most of the things that Indian Muslims had clamoured for. But the result has been somewhat disappointing. Seith Chotani, President of the Indian Central Caliphate Committee, issued a statement on behalf of his organisation regarding the Near East proposals, which he stigmatizes as "pro-Greek" and entirely unacceptable to Indian Muslims. "Indian Muslims and their fellow-countrymen demand that England keep her promises to the letter and spirit." In view of international complications, England cannot very well concede more, so the ruse of buying up Muslim goodwill can be said, on the whole, to have failed.

As for the dismissal of Mr. Montagu, this served its purpose with the Die-hards, but at what a cost to Indian public opinion only Lord Reading, as the man on the spot, best knows. Mr. Montagu enjoyed a wide popularity among Indian Moderates, based on a fictitious idea of his friendliness to Indian constitutional reform, and this popularity has attained a frenzy of adulation since his spectacular martyrdom on the altar of British Liberalism in India. This frenzy is enhanced by a growing fear that his successor, Lord Peel, symbolizes a reversal of the Reform policy adopted in 1919. The slightest act of reversion on the part of the India Office will be heralded in India as the beginning of reaction and oppression. What Mr. Lloyd George has gained at home, he has more than sacrificed in India by this peculiarly inopportune victimisation of pseudo-liberalism, which in reality, was never anything but a sugar-coated imperialistic pill.

As for the arrest of India's Mahatma! Mr. Lloyd George should beware of the *Ides of March*. Scarce twelve days after the Delhi decisions, and simultaneously with the dismissal of Mr. Montagu, Mr. Gandhi was arrested on the charge of "tending to promote disaffection against the existing system of Government" by certain speeches and articles, and a few days later was brought to trial. True to his gospel of Non-co-operation, Mr. Gandhi pleaded guilty and offered no defence, urged the judge to find him guilty and to give him the maximum sentence, and in the course of a long written statement which he read out before the court, he reaffirmed his doctrine of non-violent Non-co-operation with the existing system of government in straightforward, eloquent words.

The judge who sat personifying British justice and honesty must have felt some inward qualms of conscience in the face of this ringing indictment, which fell upon the court-room like the voice of suffering India itself. In a few words, half-explanatory and almost apologetic, he pronounced sentence—*six years' simple imprisonment*—and the farce was over. *Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi*, apostle of

Non-resistance, leader of Non-co-operation and beloved Mahatma of India's struggling millions, was led off to jail.

Let neither Lloyd George, nor Lord Reading, nor the thinking public be deceived by the calm that fell upon India's millions at news of Mr. Gandhi's incarceration. The Non-co-operators, those who intoxicate themselves with the opiate of non-violence, may attribute it to Soul-Force; the Government may deem it the justification of its policy of repression; but for those who know India of to-day, this unearthly calm presages a storm more violent than any which has yet shaken the political horizon. That which is lacking is leadership in the Indian movement to-day. But without disrespect let us say frankly, that no leadership for a time is preferable to Mr. Gandhi's misleadership. He performed gallant service in the last three years in leading the Indian people out of their age-long hopelessness and stagnation into the path of agitation and organisation which attained a nation-wide response and scope. His own mental confusion was but a reflection of the confused and chaotic state of the movement itself, just staggering upon its weak legs and learning to walk.

All honour to Mr. Gandhi, who found a way for his people out of the entanglements of Government censorship and repression; who, by his slogans of non-violent Non-co-operation, boycott and Civil Disobedience, was able to draw the wide masses into the folds of the Congress Party and make the Indian movement for the first time truly national. But the movement had outgrown its leader; the time had come when the masses were ready to surge ahead in the struggle, and Mr. Gandhi vainly sought to hold them back; they strained and struggled in the leading-strings of Soul-Force, Transcendental Love and Non-violence, torn between their crying earthly needs and their real love for this saintly man whose purity gripped their imagination and claimed their loyalty.

Mr. Gandhi had become an unconscious agent of reaction in the face of a growing revolutionary situation. The few leaders of the Congress Party who realised this and sought a way out, were rendered desperate, almost despairing at the dilemma. Mr. Gandhi had become a problem to his own movement, and lo! the British Government, in its infinite wisdom, relieved them of the problem. Mr. Gandhi out of jail was an acknowledged force of peace, a sure enemy of violence in all its forms. Mr. Gandhi in jail is a powerful factor for unrest, a symbol of national martyrdom, a constant stimulation to the national cause to fight its way to freedom.

Since his arrest, two wings of the Congress Party have developed into clear-cut prominence. One veering towards the right, headed by Malaviya, seeks reunion with the Moderates, the abandonment of Non-co-operation and a bourgeois programme of constitutional reform within the Empire. The other struggles vainly after the vanishing slogans of Gandhism—*Satyagraha*, Non-violence, boycott of foreign goods, and the reconquest of India by the *Charka* (Spinning-wheel). In this camp, which is all that remains of Extremism, reigns consternation and confusion, but a few voices are rising clear and strong above the din. The voice of Mr. C. R. Das, President of the last Bengal Provincial Conference, recommending the capture of the Reform Council and the formation of 'peasant and workers' unions; the voice of Dr. Munji in the Maharashtra Conference, which proclaimed that "the aim of the Congress is thoroughly worldly and for worldly happiness and has to be attained by worldly means which

should be easily understandable and practicable"; the voice of nationalist journals which cry that the nation must be organised for the struggle, and that the real work lies among the masses.

New leaders are surging to the front, ready to learn by past mistakes and to build a new programme for the future. Upon their understanding of the present Indian situation depends their present success or failure. The mass movement among the workers and peasants is still strong and powerful; the Aika peasant movement in the United Provinces, the outbreak of unrest among the Bhils in Central India, the three months' strike of the workers on the East India Railroad, prove where the real strength of the Indian movement lies. Reformist trade-union and co-operative workers are already in the field to capture the allegiance of the Indian masses. It remains for the Congress leaders to anticipate them by formulating such a programme as will bring the workers and peasants of India to their side. In the dynamic struggle of mass-action under wise political leadership lies the true and only solution of the Indian struggle for freedom.

THE FORUM

ON THE THEORY OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION RECONSIDERATION OF A MARXIAN PREDICTION.

DEAR COMRADE,—

The following is not a treatise on the theory of all revolutions. The theory of social revolution limits itself to that period of history when Capitalism ceases to function, and is supplanted by Communism. The writer pre-supposes the reader to understand that capitalistic competition is not a self-perpetuating process, but, rather, an elimination of the less efficient competitors.

What are the causes of social revolutions?

The capitalistically less efficient countries in the world's trade competition are bound to have increasing misery of their workers, and therefore social revolutions sooner than the capitalistically more efficient countries. The theory of increasing misery is the theory of the social revolution.

The question has been stated and the answer has been given. Nothing further would need to be added were the foregoing answer universally accepted. We find, however, that the advocates of the social revolution usually predict that the most developed countries will have the social revolution first, because they are riper for Socialism.

The belief that the social revolution is to take place first in the industrially more developed countries is based on the following passages of Marx:—

"The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed, the image of its own future." (P. 13, Marx' *Capital*, Kerr ed.)

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces, for which there is room in it, have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society." (P. 13, Marx' *Critique of Political Economy*.)

The first quoted passage is not permanently true. Because an

industrially more developed country can sometimes be overtaken by a formerly industrially less developed country. Industrial development is a continuous process which is not going on always and everywhere at the same rate. Various countries may even become alternately more developed, industrially. Hence it is difficult to predict in what particular country at what particular time the revolution is to take place.

Furthermore, the statement: "The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed, the image of its own future," cannot always mean either the same methods of production or the same products; because the less industrially developed country may not have the same material resources (e.g., coal, iron, and other minerals), nor fertility or climatic conditions like to the industrially more developed country.

Nor can the foregoing quotation mean that the capitalistically more prosperous country shows to the less prosperous one the image of its own future; because the very prosperity of the former hinders, due to capitalistic competition—by making unprofitable—the development of the latter, unless a more abundant supply or superior quality of raw materials can be had with less effort, in the less developed country than in the more developed one.

To reduce the statement: "The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed, the image of its own future," to an absurdity, by applying it as a prediction of the social revolution, we have this: If the working class is to wait with its social revolution until all inventions in the means of production have been made and until all capital will have been monopolised—for this is what the industrially most developed country would mean under capitalism—they may indeed wait with the social revolution for ever.

Should the reader find fault with the foregoing, let me ask: At what period of Capitalism and for what adequate reason does the following happen: "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property ends. The expropriators are expropriated." (P. 837, *Capital*.)

Let me repeat: At what period of Capitalism and for what adequate reason does "centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour . . . reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument"? Does it not seem more reasonable to suppose that "the knell of capitalist private property ends" in those countries first in which "centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour" has not been able to reach the point of the more successfully capitalistically competing country?

The social revolution in Russia surprised many revolutionarists. They denied the possibility of a social revolution in Russia, because they expected the social revolution to take place first in the industrially more developed countries. Some Marxian economists even now declare the social revolution in Russia to have been premature. To them the social revolution in Russia is non-Marxian.

The social revolution in Russia may be non-Marxian. But to

the extent that it is non-Marxian, to that extent is Marxism, non-economic and non-historical.

The proletarian revolution happened in Russia rather than in the United States, for example, just because Russia had at that time its industry less efficiently organized.

As well expect a more efficient industrial concern to go bankrupt sooner than a less efficient one, as to expect an industrially more efficient country to have a social revolution before an industrially less efficient one. (The industrially more developed country being also more efficient, I am substituting here for the purpose in hand the word efficient for the word developed.)

Can you conceive of an efficient concern giving up its so-called time-tested methods of doing business for some untried method suggested by "crack brained theoreticians"? Can you conceive a capitalistically efficient country establish collective ownership when the so-called ruling principle of civilisation, the individual incentive to possess property, is still in working order?

Marxians are correct in stating that the more industrially developed a country is the more fit it is for Socialism. This is true. But it is also true that, for the time being, the more industrially developed a country is, the more fit it is to continue Capitalism.

A Cleveland trade paper recently contained an article describing the industrial methods of one of the most efficient manufacturing concerns of the whole country. The article related a typical case of a girl worker gradually rising to higher and better paying positions and by that very process was kept disinclined to join the union. When an attempt was made to induce the girl to join the union, she replied: "I am satisfied." In a similar manner, when revolutionists have been urging American workers in the past to join the revolutionary movement the answer given was: "I am satisfied." Revolutionists and unionists are in the habit of looking upon those who refuse to join as if they were of inferior intellect. The explanation is to be found rather in material conditions.

The individual concern that is the most efficient now, and the country that is the most efficient now, will not always remain the most efficient. For the time being, however, the same conditions that in the opinion of the majority of the workers makes it needless for them to join the union or to join the revolutionary movement makes it also impossible to accomplish the social revolution in those places.

The capitalistically more efficient countries will not undergo the social revolution before the capitalistically less efficient ones, but rather the contrary. The capitalistically more efficient countries will become less efficient and will fail, when the communistically established countries will become more efficient than they.

Not the industrially more efficient but the industrially less efficient country is compelled to discard Capitalism, to undergo a social revolution, and to adopt the superior system of Communism, or an approximation of it, because the less efficient capitalist country fails first in world competition. (To treat of emigration as a possible alternative for revolution is outside the scope of this article.)

It does not follow that immediately after a country has undergone the social revolution it becomes more efficient than before. Nevertheless, such country may find it impossible to revert to Capitalism. Nor will the slow development of efficiency of the country that has already accomplished the social revolution deter

the less efficient capitalistic countries from undergoing a social revolution; because the introduction of Communism is due rather to the failings of Capitalism than to the achievements of the country that has already had its social revolution and is now undergoing the transition to Communism.

An apparent exception to the theory of social revolution as stated here is, when the workers of an industrially more developed country would revolt at the time of over-supply of the market, or, as some call it, over-production. At such time there are more workers out of work in the industrially more developed country than in the industrially less developed ones. And should the capitalists of the industrially more developed country refrain from relieving the misery of the unemployed workers, either by charity or by a subsidy (both of which are but postponements of the social revolution), then the revolution may break out first in the industrially more developed country. Even this apparent exception, however, is included in the theory of social revolution as given here. Because the fact that the capitalists of the industrially more developed country do not meet the demands of their workers, but, rather, let the country undergo a social revolution, shows that this industrially more developed country has, for the time being, become less efficient than those countries in which the social revolution has not yet taken place.

Yours fraternally,

DAVID S. REISS.
(Cleveland, Ohio.)

Re-birth of the French C.P.

BY E. VERNEY

SINCE the Tours Congress in 1920 the French Communist Party has traversed a very critical period in its development. The coming Congress of the Party at Paris in October will mark the final stage in the Party's early evolution.

British Communists can learn a great deal by studying the faults committed by the French Party during the past two years of its embryo existence, and the ultimate remedying of these errors.

Just as there had been a similar crisis among the German Communists which, after having been overcome by drastic action, left the Party sound and purged, so will the coming adjustment in the French Party weld it into a force meriting the praise and respect of the whole International.

I. THE SOURCE OF THE EVIL.

The fundamental reasons for the malady in the French Communist Party have their origin in the old Party previous to the scission. There, one had the Communist Left, grouped round Loriot and Souvarine, who at the Strasbourg Congress had partly brought round to their view the "reconstructors." But, whereas the Communists of the Comité de la Troisième Internationale were practically all consistent revolutionary Marxists, the "reconstructors," who were prepared to affiliate to Moscow, had not completely lost their petit-bourgeois mentality, seasoned with years of penetration by socialist doctrines. After the Tours scission the

Right and Centre had more control over the Party machinery including all the Communist Deputies. These latter, although some of them verbally revolutionary, were all more or less petit-bourgeois pacifists. These elements had let themselves be carried away by a wave of enthusiasm for the Russian Revolution, based more on mysticism and sentimentality than on any serious conceptions of the fundamentally revolutionary theses of the Communist International.

Thus it was that at Tours, although the new majority accepted all the twenty-one conditions of the Comintern, it was more of a theoretical acceptance than anything else. As Zinoviev remarked in a brilliant article on the Birth of a Communist Party which appeared in the *Bulletin Communiste* of August 17th, the Party during 1920 and 1921 was not so much a Communist Party as a Party "desirous of being communist."

At Tours the worst bourgeois and social-traitor elements like Mistral and Sembat, and the weak centrists like Longuet were excluded and the path was cleared for the building up and tempering of the new Communist Party. However, this could not be done all at once, especially as a great many of the new leaders including Cachin and Frossard still conserved their subservience to the Electoral idea. However, the consistent appreciation of the Revolution and "desire to be communists" of these latter has helped to hold the Party together in spite of their many errors.

II. PARALLELS WITH THE GERMAN PARTY.

It is advantageous to turn for a moment to the developments in the German Party from the time of its origin. There it will be seen that the evolution, although more complicated, was on similar lines. The early split in the German Social Democracy resulted in the formation of the Right or Majority Socialists and the Independents. Later the Communists, under Liebknecht, Luxembourg, Tyshko (Iogishès), and F. Mehring broke away from the Independents forming the Spartacusbund. One might compare the latter with the French Comité de la Troisième Internationale. Later still, in 1920, came a further split in the Independents at the Halle Conference, when the majority of the Party, following the Left wing broke away and joined the Spartakists in the United German Communist Party. This stage might be compared with the "reconstructors" at the Conference of Tours quitting the old Socialist Party and joining the Comité de la Troisième in the formation of the French Communist Party. The only difference is that the Comité de la Troisième had waited for the reconstructors, within the Party, instead of breaking away beforehand. This enabled the old Party to be better permeated with Communist ideas. A further development in the German Party was that two small groups of ex-Independents were excluded from the Party for acting against the Comintern, these groups were led by Levi and Friesland. Dr. Levi founded a so-called "Workers' Community," but both these groups inevitably drifted back into the Independent Party. They were now heated advocates of the policy of unity with Noske's Social Democrats of the Second International. The present Right wing of the French party will probably follow a similar course and return via Longuet's ante-chamber to the bridal-bed of the fat L. Blum. These phases of development are closely related to the

present "coming into being" of the French Party, and the crisis connected therewith.

Owing to the abolition of the Comité de la Troisième Internationale and also as the Left Communists, having under-estimated the danger from the Right had weakened their vigilance, alarming anti-Communist symptoms began to appear in the Party. Open opposition was made to the twenty-one conditions and the theses of the Comintern. The Third Congress of the International was left almost unreported in the Party press campaigns against the "autocracy" and "dictatorship" of Moscow were coupled with malign polemics against the French representative on the Executive, Comrade Souvarine. This stage of the crisis culminated in the stormy Marseilles Congress, where the ex-members of the Comité de la Troisième, who since Tours had thirteen votes on the Comité Directeur as against eleven reconstructors, once more were put in the minority.

III. THE MARSEILLES CONFERENCE.

At the Marseilles Conference of the Party at the end of 1921, already a year after the scission, the tendencies in opposition to the principles of the Comintern and which were also dangerously drifting back to the opportunism of the Reformist minority at Tours had reached the first stage of their development. Happily, however, the gangrene had not attained the masses of the Party, who were, and are, still quite sound. But the malady of the Direction of the Party rightly caused grave uneasiness on the part of the Left. The main bone of contention that caused the partial defeat of the Left—Loriot, Dunois, Treint, Vaillant-Couturier, etc., was the Executive's recommendation for a Præsidium (or centralised political direction), which these members now tried to introduce in order to save the Party from the inertia of the "reconstructors." The non-election of Souvarine to the Comité Directeur brought about the resignation of the other Left members elected to the Direction, or Party functions. These resignations were a protest against the anti-Communist orientations within the Party. The Marseilles Conference except for a fair thesis on the action in the Trade Unions, and also a passable agrarian thesis, showed no great step forward from Tours.

IV. THE UNITED FRONT.

The failure of the Comité Directeur to explain the real meaning of the United Front to the rank and file, and the weak and oscillating policy of its Right and Centre members, caused grave anxiety on the part of the Executive of the Comintern. At the conference of the enlarged Executive held at Moscow, 24th February—4th March, after searching analytical speeches on the United Front and the situation in the French Communist Party on the part of Trotsky, the French Delegation, including Cachin and Daniel Renoult, agreed to apply themselves to the re-adjustment of the activities and tactics of the Party, including the acceptance of the policy of the United Front. The necessity for the exclusion of Fabre was also agreed in principle. This was important as H. Fabre, Victor Meric, Verfeuil and other extreme Right "leaders" of the Party were, or had been, carrying on an open campaign in the *Journal du Peuple* not only against the United Front, but against the Comintern thesis generally. After the return of the French Delegation from Moscow, in spite of the engagements

undertaken by Renoult, an energetic campaign against the United Front and the Left members of the Party Direction was carried on in the Party press, especially in the *Internationale*, the Paris evening paper under Renoult's direction. Renoult also opposed the Berlin Conference of nine in spite of his undertaking at Moscow to observe strict Communist discipline. The Comité Directeur showed wonderful "discipline" by sending a Delegate to the Berlin Conference "by way of a special exception." Trotsky correctly points out that Renoult's opposition to the Berlin Conference falls very flat when one becomes aware of his appreciation of the demasking of Barthou at Genoa by Tchichérin. The cry against the United Front was continued by Meric and even Frossard, and the most malicious disparagements of its meaning were handed out to the rank and file. According to Renoult the United front was "Revolutionary disarmament," according to others it was the negation of the Tours scission, and to others the "Bloc des Gauches!" A fine attempt was made by Treint and his friends to point out the real meaning of the United Front, in citing examples of its successful reception in Germany, Tchecho-Slovakia, etc. But the Centre of the Party, in collaboration with the Right, held the field. The work of the Left was very difficult, among other reasons owing to the fact that Loriot had retired, from illness, and Souvarine was at Moscow. An article by Rosmer on the United Front brought a reply from Meric questioning his right even to use the columns of *l'Humanité* owing to his not being a "leader" of the Party. These currents made such headway that at the National Council of the Party held in April a resolution was carried by the Centre-Right bloc, led by Renoult, condemning the United Front in unequivocal terms. This was a significant omen, as also was the fact that the reintegration of the Left wing members, who had resigned at Marseilles, was only carried by a small majority in spite of the recommendation of the Comintern Executive. Verfeuil protested against this reintegration as being based on "personal motives." This, of course, in the *Journal du Peuple*. Thus the failure of the United Front Policy to gain ground in the French Party is clearly owing to the incapability and unwillingness of the Comité Directeur to demonstrate its historic necessity. However, all criticisms of the United Front either from the Right or the "extreme-Left" (puzzle: find the difference?) were pregnant with confusion and lacked the comprehension of the Marxist nature of this policy. The Centre still allowed full freedom to the Right in this campaign. Some of the latter pretended to see no difference between United Mass action and unity with the dissidents. They did not understand the elementary necessity for the complete solidarity of all working class organisations in the common fight against the Capitalist enemy. They failed to understand that the United Front means *Class Unity*; the unity of the working class against the capitalist class; the unity of the workers, irrespective as to whether they were members of revolutionary or reformist Unions, or whether they happened to adhere to organisations at present led by Yellow leaders. This proletarian Unity was also confusedly labelled as "Bloc des Gauches," which is a completely different matter. "Bloc des Gauches" means unity (chiefly for electoral purposes) with other Left wing Parties, including Radical or similar bourgeois organisations. With their usual inconsistency, the in-

ventors of this absurd fable forgot to attack certain Right members of the Comité Directeur who always having regretted the scission, *really* coveted the "Bloc des Gauches." Daniel Renoult, in his Revolutionary disarmament article remarked, "il faut que l'abcès crève." Trotsky in his speech at the Executive Conference on May 19th (*Bulletin Communist*, 17th August), pointed out that such opposition to the Comintern programme was as flagrant as the actions which had caused the exclusion of H. Fabre and his *Journal du Peuple*. Renoult called the United Front "Revolutionary disarmament," and forgot to attack the people like Pioch, V. Meric and Renaud Jean who, by their anti-all-militarism policy advocated *real* revolutionary disarmament (curiously like the inconsistency of the critics of the "Bloc des Gauches" mentioned above!) A further example of the inconsistency of these gentry is where the so-called "extreme-Left" opposition, who are all ardent federalists and think that a revolutionary mass party can be organised on "Soviet" lines, do not even realise that their beloved Soviets in 1905 and 1917 would not have existed but for a united front with the Mensheviks and S.R.'s. The bottom of the anti-United-Front dustbin fell out when the success of the magnificent May Day demonstrations became known. In Berlin alone 600,000 workers responded to the call of the United Front. Orators of the Independents were compelled to speak almost in the language of the Communists owing to their fear of losing what support they still had from the masses of their own Party. In Paris on May 1st, a different panorama. The Party sheltered behind the appeal of the C.G.T.U. afraid to violate the sacred virginity of Revolutionary Syndicalism. The supposed Proletarian Party refrained from calling out to the working masses with Communist slogans.

In England we have for the time being solved the United Front question by our Labour Party affiliation policy, but at any moment, should the situation become revolutionary, splits may occur in the Trade Union movement, and new tactics may be needed. Thus we must be on our guard; always learning from the faults and the achievements of our brother Parties. In this respect the French situation offers a very fruitful source of study.

One of the chief errors in the French Party's tactics regarding the United Front was the failure to capture the rank and file of the Reformist C.G.T. for fear of contact with the leaders. The slogan should be "Devil take the leaders, Back to the Masses!"

V. THE CASE OF HENRI FABRE.

The question of the exclusion of Fabre and his paper having been merely referred to the Party Commission des Conflits, the Executive of the Communist International, realising the danger of allowing anti-Communist propaganda to be carried on by a Party member, took the bull by the horns and expelled Fabre and his sheet without waiting for the decision of the Commission des Conflits. The Comité Directeur confirmed this piously, but the Commission not only refused to exclude Fabre, but actually censured the Executive of the C.I. for expelling him. However, as the expulsion was now a *fait-accompl*, the conflicts Commission was asked to resign. Nevertheless, the general indifference of the centre to the anti-Communist activities of the Right had reached such a stage that we find Verfeuil, member of the Comité Directeur, actually protesting

in the *Journal du Peuple* against the Executive's decision for Fabre's exclusion. The Comité Directeur had not bothered to explain to the rank and file of the Party the reason for this expulsion. This was a very grave neglect especially where so dangerous an agent of the bourgeoisie as Fabre is concerned. The correctness of the Executive decision was clearly proved by the fact that whereas the *Journal du Peuple* before had mostly limited itself to attacking Communist theories and personalities, Fabre now turned this paper into a free tribune for the mouthings of all those who had any mud to fling against Communism, the Russian Revolution, the Bolsheviks, or anything connected with Moscow or the Comintern. Anarcho-Syndicalists such as Besnard, and petit-bourgeois individualists like Verdier and Quinton all used this paper for black-guarding the Party and especially the Red International of Labour Unions. Needless to say, the S.R.'s were heartily supported in this worthy journal.

VI. THE PARTY AND THE UNIONS.

A characteristic weakness of the Party at this juncture was its action (or lack of action) in the Unions. After the Lille scission where the C.S.R. minority (Comiteas of Revolutionary Syndicalists) were excluded, and formed themselves into the C.G.T. "Unitaire," the syndicalist policy of the Communists began to waver, and, in spite of the determined fight of the non-party Syndicalist-Communists, such as Monmousseau, the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists began to get the upper hand. These elements wanted to make revolutionary syndicalism sufficient unto itself. The majority on the provisional Administrative Committee of the C.G.T.U., who were anarchists or anarcho-syndicalists, drafted statutes for the St. Etienne Congress which, among other things fantastic, advocated doing away with the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The Party was silent about this matter. Indeed, worse than silent, for side by side with an appeal of Lozovsky, Secretary of the R.I.L.U., was published a communication of the anarchists on the A.C. of the C.G.T.U. Although the syndicalists of the "Vie Ouvrière" tendency led by Monmousseau, together with the Communists on the Executive Committee of the Union of the Seine framed counter-statutes, the Party officially was silent. Under the influence of Renoult and Frossard, who still clung to the idea of the "autonomy" of the Unions, the Communist hold in the C.G.T.U. became less and less every day. Frossard based his views on the policy of Jaurès, but, as Trotsky pointed out before the Conference of the C.I. Executive, Jaurès' conception of the Trade Union movement was not revolutionary but a Parliamentary democratic one. The hackneyed phrases of the anarcho-syndicalists about the "subordination" of the Unions to the Party were now also trotted out by leading Communists in the C.G.T.U. Organic liaison, however, is far different from "mechanical subordination." The activity of the anarchists in their campaign against the R.I.L.U. grew greater and greater as the Communist policy drifted. The Berlin Anarcho-Syndicalist Conference was practically ignored in the Party press, and it was left to a little group of Syndicalists such as Rosmer, Tommasi, as well as Monatte of the "Vie Ouvrière" (who although not in the Party is a better Communist than a dozen Lafonts or Verfeuils), to point out the peril of the anarchist manipulation of the C.G.T.U.

through their majority on the Administrative Committee of that body. The sending of C.G.T.U. delegates to the Berlin Conference other than in a consultative capacity was a flagrant breach by the A.C. of their mandate. However, the Party still remained silent. Happily, Monatte's collaboration on *l'Humanité* and the inauguration of a R.I.L.U. journal under the direction of Rosmer, Tommasi, Godonneche and Tourette, enabled a fair amount of light to be thrown on the activities of the anarcho-syndicalists who were slowly sabotaging the C.G.T. Unitaire. This, in spite of the total indifference of the Comité Directeur of the Party. Thus it was that the actions of the freemasonry within the C.S.R., known as the "pacte," and who endeavoured to capture the C.G.T.U. for anarcho-syndicalism, were exposed in time before the St. Etienne Congress, as also was the scandal of the Berlin Congress. The way was already paved for the bloc at St. Etienne between the Communists and the Syndicalists of the "Vie Ouvriere" group, headed by Monmousseau and Semard. This bloc, in defeating the anarcho-syndicalists, and scoring the triumph of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat policy, and adhesion to the R.I.L.U., undoubtedly saved the C.G.T.U. But it was a very close run, for the Party had let things drift badly. Frossard's action in calling together all the Communist Delegates to the Congress certainly was hopeful although tardy. Had similar action been taken six months previously, the anarcho-syndicalists would never have been allowed to carry the C.G.T.U. so near to destruction. The Communist apathy had already lost the C.S.R. to the anarchists.

VII. FEDERALISM.

A tendency which had for some time been growing in the Federation of the Seine had given place to the changing of the statutes of this body. The "Extreme Left," carried away by its infantile and ephemeral dislike for the Democratic Centralisation advocated by Moscow, managed to foist on to the Federation clumsy and bizarre federalist statutes supposingly based on the "Soviet" principle. Actually, the "Extreme Left" as a potential factor in the Party was negligible, but for a group of long-winded talkers in the Seine Federation headed by Heine and Duret. The Centre of the Comité Directeur, as usual, benign to all but the Left, placed these people on a pedestal—to use the words of Souvarine.

With heedless regard for the revolutionary necessity for all Communist Parties to uphold strict internal discipline and strong centralisation, the federalists wailed about Moscow "domination," "national autonomy," the Soviet system and other imaginary evils. There again the petit-bourgeois nationalism and quasi-anarchism of these elements made themselves shown as a heritage from the pre-Tours period. The Federalists most certainly had either ignored Lenin's "Infantile Malady of Left-wing Communism" or only hurriedly studied this work. They repeated all the theoretical faults analysed by Lenin in his survey of the "autonomous" tactics of the K.A.P.D. (German Communist Labour Party—now defunct). The great difference between Party and State was not appreciated by those who drafted the Seine Statutes. This organisation with its Executive Committee of about 90, and frequent meetings, altogether superficially democratic, was not only a hindrance to propaganda and action but was like a Westinghouse

brake on the wheels of Communist activity in the Paris area. Confusion of the Party and the State is impossible by any Communist who has studied the tactics of the Bolsheviki. These people, who talk about the "Sovereign power of the masses," "Control from below," etc., etc., had they studied the thesis of the second Comintern Congress would have understood that the necessity for centralisation was a historic fact, and without which revolutionary action would be impossible. Federalism is incompatible with a revolutionary fighting organisation depending upon the possibilities for rapid decisions to be taken. In the fight against the centralised bourgeoisie the proletariat must also be centralised. Federalism would lead to the disintegration of proletarian unity, and the lack of cohesion and direction. The defeat of the Paris Commune was partly owing to the irresponsibility and uncontrollability of the *Fédérés*.

IX. THE "ARTICLE 9."

Not only was a hue and cry raised by this so-called "Extreme Left" against democratic centralisation, but also against Article 9 of the Comintern Statutes, which gives the right to the E.C. to exclude any member of the International during the period between two world Congresses. The objection to the Article 9 had its origin mainly in the exclusion of Fabre. Certainly some of the objectors had no sympathy for this person, but were acting on the principle of "autonomy." But these people in criticising Fabre's exclusion even from the point of view of statutes were giving support to a man who was now already devoting his journal to the abuse of the Party. But the Right wing members of the *Comité Directeur*, unheeded by the Centre, used the pretext of theoretical objection to the Article 9, for a cloaked condemnation of Fabre's exclusion. This action of the Executive not only aroused the ire of Verfeuil and Co., but brought forth cries from the "Extreme Left" about abuse of authority, etc., and the danger of allowing the powers of the Executive to threaten to destroy the possibility of criticism. The holding of the National Congresses after the International Congress also brought forth criticism from the demagogues. Objection to Article 9 as being interference in the "National" affairs of the Party is in itself a negation of the Communist truism that the Party is but a *local section* of the Comintern, which is an International *Party*. Thus, claims for independence and autonomy in the International field fall just as flat as do the demands for "federal autonomy" within the Party, as opposed to democratic centralisation.

X. BOURGEOIS PACIFISM.

Another bad tendency in the Party has been pacifist anti-militarism as preached by Pioch, Renaud Jean, and Verfeuil, which, when analysed, proves to be anti-Red just as much as anti-White. That is to say, it is the pacifist anti-militarism of the Liberal-Quaker type.

A tactical error criticised severely by Trotzky was that of Renaud Jean (editor of the Party agricultural organ, *La Voix Paysanne*), whose policy among the peasants is based on anti-militarism. His error, according to Trotzky consisted in classing the peasants within the proletariat, whereas they are actually petit-bourgeois. In an article in *l'Humanité*, Renaud Jean rejects the policy of the United Front as not being suitable to the needs of

the "peasant section of the proletariat." This liability, through the alarming tendency led by Renaud Jean to attempt the capture of the peasants first, in sacrificing the demands of the industrial proletariat, is, as Trotzky points out, dangerously similar to the policy of the S.R.'s. Anti-militarist propaganda among the peasants, if apparently based on opposition to *all* militarism, becomes pure petit-bourgeois pacifism and therefore worthless. No objection is made by Renaud Jean to the Red Army so long as the military intervention of the Allies rendered it necessary. This view neglects the possible need for the Red Army for the suppression of counter-revolution within the country, such as peasant risings, etc. To cite another pacifist, Pioch, at the Marseilles Congress, talked about Communists "dishonouring pacifism," and the only possible anti-militarism being the "education of children." Pioch's *rapport morale* at the Seine Federal Congress came in for scathing criticism by Trotzky in a speech before the Executive on May 10th. He pointed out, amid roars of laughter, the confusionism of the "Extreme Left" Federation of the Seine in tolerating an Extreme Right Secretary. Among others, Trotzky quoted the following startling utterance of Pioch: "Communism is the organised and pacific force of love." Frossard actually supported Pioch at the Congress in question, as against the Left who managed to secure his dismissal.

Then we have Verfeuil, who says, "We are told it is necessary to have an army to make the Revolution. The Revolution would be easier if there were no army." He also uses the anti-Communist theory that all armies—Red or White—are unnecessary and opposes revolutionary force.

These petit-bourgeois currents also met with no opposition from the Direction of the Party.

XI. THE EXECUTIVE DECISIONS.

By the middle of May of this year, the anti-Communist currents and the discord between the Executive of the Comintern and the Comité Directeur reached their climax. The regime of the reconstructors had brought down the effectives of the Party from 120,000 to 70,000. This was not surprising when one realises that the Party's Central Press was devoted for six months to internal discussions and personal polemics. However, the situation rather frightened the miscreants, and it was hoped by everyone that Frossard, delegate to the second meeting of the Enlarged Executive would bring about a change and come back with a remedy for the Party's malady. The severe criticism of Trotzky, Souvarine, and the Executive, also began to make itself felt at about this time. At the May and June sessions, Trotzky, in a series of remarkable analytical speeches on the French Party (*Bulletin Communist*, August 17th, 24th, 31st), examined minutely all the errors of the Party, proposing at the same time the remedy. Although confessing some of the Party weaknesses, Frossard defended Renoult, and apologised generally for the Comité Directeur. However, he emphasised his determination to help the Executive to put an end to the crisis. The Executive having heard a similar statement from Cachin in February were perhaps sceptical. The Executive, after lengthy discussions, submitted to the French Delegation a thesis for the readjustment of the Party. This thesis illustrated the condition for bringing the crises in the French Party to an end, and

was accepted unanimously by the Executive and, with certain reserves, by the French Delegation.

For the general programme and tactics of the Party and internal reorganisation, the Executive proposed, in view of the next Party Congress at Paris in October, the elaboration of projects for such adjustment in the Statutes as would bring the Party into line with the other sections of the International. The reconstruction of the Comité Directeur, which should henceforth consist of at least half workers, bound to the Proletariat by their trade, would rid the Party of its former direction of lawyers, journalists, deputies, etc. A permanent political bureau for the direction and administration of the Party is also projected, this bureau to be under the control of the Comité Directeur. The latter body is to be invested with powers for exclusion, which would thus rid the Party of that superfluous organisation, "the Comité de Conflits." The Executive explains that the Seine Federation, including as it does the Paris district, is destined to play a leading rôle in the coming revolutionary struggle. The federalist Statutes of this organisation must therefore be changed if it is to remain the leading active force in the Party. In regard to the syndicalist question, the Executive recommends the purging of the Party of all the petit-bourgeois individualists opposed to the R.I.L.U. and liaison with the Party. The Communists in the Reformist C.G.T. should form nuclei, in order to capture the C.G.T., irrespective of current relations between the C.G.T. and C.G.T.U. The Executive explains the grave extent of the misrepresentation of the United Front tactics by the Comité Directeur (especially the representation of the "Comité de 9" as an authority superior to all the three Internationals).

It recommends the studying of the Paris Commune where all the workers' organisations formed a United Front against the bourgeoisie. An adjustment in the regime of the Party Press is also proposed, giving more access to the rank and file of the Party as against the personal opinions of journalists. With regard to the factions within the Party, the Committee points out the urgent necessity for a *bloc* of the Centre and Left, against the Right and the Extreme Left, with constitutes dangerous elements in the Party. With regard to the actions of Daniel Renoult, Director of *L'International*, blame is registered against him for his opposition to and misrepresentation of the United Front, and general tactics of the Comintern. As to Fabre, the Comité Directeur is to explain in the Party Press and organisations the real interpretation of his exclusion. In the terms of the Executive, "the exclusion of Fabre and his journal is a step in the struggle against the anarcho-journalistic spirit of intellectual Bohemianism, which, particularly in France, takes successively all forms and colours of anarchism and opportunism, and inevitably ends with a knife-thrust in the back of the working class." The work of the coming Congress should be one of organised consolidation against all such petit-bourgeois tendencies as pacifism, anarcho-syndicalism, federalism, etc.

Frossard, in his closing speech at the Enlarged Executive, professing his desire not to become a French Serrati, undertook to devote himself seriously to the curing of the Party's ills. The Executive, realising that the tide had been stopped in time, and that

the rank and file of the Party was still sound, expressed its hope that the Party to which all the International looked with hope would carry out the tasks before it.

XII. THE REDRESS.

The first stage in the renaissance of the Party's Communist activities started with Frossard's appearance, soon after his return from Moscow, at the St. Etienne Conference of the revolutionary C.G.T.U. Here the organisation of a meeting of the Communist delegates to the Congress, in order to decide on policy and tactics, was a healthy demonstration of Communist activity. It may be remarked that the "Communist" Deputy E. Lafont openly attempted to sabotage this work by distributing leaflets to the Conference delegates which were couched in terms directly in conflict with the Party's Marseilles Syndical Thesis. This was an attempt to prejudice the delegates against the R.I.L.U. Mayoux, a member of the Party prominent in the Trade Union movement, also violently attacked the Communist delegates and ranged himself with the anarcho-syndicalists. Except for these two examples, however, the Communist action at St. Etienne was quite successful.

Other signs of the recuperation of the Party included the commencement by the Comité Directeur to put the Executive decisions into action. The first step was the change in the Statutes of the Seine Federation. The Comité took part in the drafting of project A for the Seine Federal Congress on August 20th and September 3rd. Project B, drafted by Heine and his supporters, was a compromise between the former Federalist Statutes and the Executive decisions, whereas project A followed more closely the Moscow decisions. The C.D. also produced, in view of the coming Congress, the project for a revision in the regime of the Press as well as the draft statute for the Political Bureau as advised by the Executive. The Party will probably adopt these projects as well as the amendment to the Constitution empowering C.D. to expel members when necessary. If this be so, the Paris Congress will have achieved a remarkable victory against the petit-bourgeois Right and the Extreme Left, and the crisis will thus be ended. The forming of these projects, as well as the drafting of the Project A for the Seine Statutes, already showed a collaboration between the Left and Centre. Therefore, one can be optimistic as to the results of the Paris Congress. The banishing of discussion from the front page of *L'Humanité* and the inauguration of a weekly Party page for internal debates is also a happy change for the better. This space will at present be devoted to the coming Congress. The return of Souvarine from Moscow had evidently improved matters. The Comité Directeur, at last beginning to use a little "Direction," dealt fairly drastically with the cases of Verfeuil, Mayoux, and Lafont, cited above. Mayoux was referred to the Conflicts Commission with a recommendation for expulsion as a result of his anti-Communist action in the Unions and his open sympathy with the so-called Russian "Workers' Opposition." Lafont was severely censured for the St. Etienne leaflet, and Verfeuil threatened with expulsion if he collaborated further in the *Journal du Peuple*.

The *bloc* of the Centre* and Left of the Party, which will probably triumph at the Paris Congress, will really be the tardy consummation of the Tours Conference, and will mark the real adhesion to the 21 conditions instead of the former sentimental lip service. Thus, this period of two years' birth pangs should nevertheless result in the delivery of a healthy Party.

In spite of all its tactical faults and weaknesses, the French Party, inheriting the tradition of the Commune, is a grand revolutionary movement in the making, and there is every reason to be optimistic for the future. The French Communist Press is alone a great achievement. When will we, in England, have a daily Communist paper with a circulation of 150,000?

Why Lloyd George Fell

BY R. W. POSTGATE

THE last of the war-time Premiers has gone. All the "men that won the war"—Orlando, Clemenceau, Venizelos, Wilson—had preceded him, but it seemed as though he would stay for ever. Yet now that it has come, the fall of Lloyd George has excited much less surprise than the fall of Carpentier. The general feeling was, on receipt of the news, that he had held on so long that he must have gone soon anyway.

But the mere fact that people were tired of him, and that the governing classes were probably a little sick of "always Lloyd George," is not a good enough explanation. None of the Conservative politicians who are disputing for his place have anything like his ability to mislead and delude the electorate. Lloyd George is unequalled in that respect, and yet he has been unceremoniously dismissed.

He has been dismissed because he has been defeated, and the power that defeated him was, ultimately, the United States. The hand of the United States did not appear openly in the Near East disaster, but it was a United States influence that defeated him, as sure as rain comes from clouds.

It is fairly generally known that there has been a conflict between France and England over the question of Turkey. The dividing up of the Near East had given Britain Mesopotamia, and France, Syria. To the north of Mesopotamia, very near to the dangerous foothills of the highlands of Asia Minor, was Mosul, reputed to be one of the richest single oilfields of the whole world. To the north of Syria was Cilicia, a flat land at the foot of the Taurus Mountains, of no economic value, but essential for the defence of Syria. Very little time had passed before the French troops in Cilicia found themselves in great difficulties with the Turkish irregular troops, who had been disregarded, and had no allies but the Russians. It looked very likely that General Gouraud and his troops

* There is hardly any need to remind readers not to confuse the Centre of the Party with the Centrists. Centrists are the people of the Longuet type, who, with the 2½ International, oscillate between Revolution and Reformism, finally landing in the arms of Vandervelde and his Second "International."—E.V.

might be seriously involved, and it was clear that France had either to come to an arrangement with the Turks or set out to conquer the whole of Asia. France took the former course, and came to an agreement with the Turks—the Angora Pact.

But the Angora Pact was more than an agreement safeguarding the Syrian frontier. It committed France to large support of the Turks with arms and munitions. That is to say, it committed her to waging war through the agency of the Turks—with her ally Britain. For it was well known who was the Turks' real enemy. Islam's worst oppressor has always been Great Britain. The Union Jack flies over Cairo, Jerusalem, Mecca, Medina, Bagdad, Delhi, and Constantinople, and there is little question who has seized most of the old lands of the Caliphs. The Turks made no secret of their intention to seize Constantinople, which was for all practical purposes in British hands. Why should France set this dog on at Great Britain?

The answer is that it was not France that did this, but America. During the war, and right up till 1921, British oil interests had been predominant in France. Amicable arrangements were made throughout the war concerning the fate of the Mosul oilfields, and France consented to their practical seizure by the British oil interest, Shell. Shell Oil controlled at least one large French bank and one news paper. It had a representative in most of the shifting French Cabinets, and had two minor companies of its own in France under French names. In most of this Sir Basil Zaharoff acted as agent.

In 1920-1 this period came to an abrupt end. France no longer continued to be docilely led by Shell Oil. The great American Trust, Standard Oil, took the place of Shell. It, too, took over a large bank, ran its own newspaper, started subsidiary companies. Odds might have been equal, if it had not been for certain political considerations, which gave Standard Oil the victory. The various quarrels continually occurring over all Europe had made French politicians quite anxious to teach Britain a lesson. On top of this, the United States Government gave France clearly to understand that no financial assistance or accommodation whatever would be forthcoming from across the Atlantic until Standard Oil was definitely given first place in all French oil concerns.

Therefore, the Angora Pact handed to France not merely the exploitation of all Turkish railways, etc., but in a secret Annex, all oil deposits in Turkish territory, present or future. That meant that Standard Oil would have any oilfields that Kemal Pasha could recover. Therefore the Turks were sent out to fight the British and their servants, armed with the best munitions that French factories could provide.

Standard Oil looked to Mosul first, but Kemal Pasha looked to Constantinople. He intended to recover Turkey's position in Europe before he struck south and east. His armies, therefore, marched west. There they came into conflict with the Greeks, and behind the Greeks were the British. The British ever since 1918 have been in effective occupation of the Straits, and for all the "internationalization" of them, they will not leave. They dare not. The opening of the Panama Canal, and the growth of the United States Navy have made the high seas less of a British lake. The Atlantic and the Pacific are not in British hands any more. Britain has to think of the narrow seas. Most of her possessions lie in Asia and Africa, on

the shores of the Indian Ocean, and the way to them lies through the Suez Canal and the Mediterranean. This sea route has become the spinal cord of the British Empire. Now, look at a map of the Mediterranean, and just observe how the Straits and Constantinople lie on its flank. In the hands of a hostile power—such as an ally of Russia or America—they are poised like an axe ready to descend and sever the British lines of communication. From the Dardanelles ships can dart out and withdraw again, and make the Gibraltar-Port Said route impossible.

Britain took the Straits for herself, therefore, and sheltered behind her satellite power, Greece. But she occupied them with a relatively small force. This was because Mr. Lloyd George was much under the influence of Sir Basil Zaharoff, who is a Greek. Greek merchants, also, have for very many years held in England a



COPYRIGHT GEOGRAPHIA LTD 55 FLEET STREET LONDON E.C.4

position far higher than would be expected. He believed them when they told him that the Turks were useless. Guerilla troops and the Greek Army could eat them up. Therefore he did not send more troops to Constantinople.

That was Mr. Lloyd George's first blunder.

* * * * *

His second blunder caused his fall. He was unceremoniously booted out after it, because it was a gross and monstrous military error, and one which has seriously injured the position of British capitalism in the East. It was the occupation of Chanak. Practically no notice has been taken of this in the daily Press, so it is worth while considering it a little more in detail. Why the occupation of Chanak meant disaster will only be clear if these remarks are read in connection with a map.

In order to hold a narrow stretch of sea like the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, it is necessary to control the land for a considerable distance on either side. In the old days naval power was enough, but with aeroplanes and long range artillery to fight, it is not. To control the Dardanelles, the British must control Constantinople, the Gallipoli Peninsula, and a good half of Thrace on one side; on the other a broad strip of territory along the Dardanelles, and the coast facing the Bosphorus.

In the face of the approaching Turkish forces, Lloyd George did the wrong thing. His capitalist masters were anxious at the moment to avoid war. He did not care to reinforce the Straits enormously and concentrate there an army that the Turks dare not fight. What he did was to send a small and insufficient reinforcement into Chanak, a place on the Asiatic side of the Dardanelles.

The arrival of this force at Chanak gave the Turks all they wanted. Mustapha Kemal of course poured in his troops in enormous numbers. They occupied the heights above Chanak, the positions around it, the shore below it. They occupied or commanded the rest of the forty mile shore of the Dardanelles. Chanak was immediately a hostage in their hands, while as for holding the Dardanelles, the occupation of it "was like holding the front door of a house in which a number of large ground floor French windows stood wide open to the gardens on every side." When the British delegates arrived, the Turks said in effect: "If you do not give us what we want, we shall attack Chanak. Our new campaign will be celebrated by the defeat and wholesale surrender of the largest British force in these regions. How do you think that news will be celebrated in Constantinople, Cairo, Bagdad, and Delhi?"

The British answer, in effect, was "What will you take?" And they took Thrace and Constantinople and all that Turkey had lost in the war in this area. And therefore the British task of holding the Straits for herself is thirty times more difficult.

That is the story of how Mr. Bedford, of Standard Oil, scored his first point over Sir Basil Zaharoff, of Shell, and of why Mr. Lloyd George left Downing Street suddenly after seven years of power.

Buy ALL your Books and Periodicals from the

Communist Bookshop

16 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2.



**HISTORY
FICTION
ECONOMICS
SOCIOLOGY**

BOOKS OBTAINED TO ORDER

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW



THE COMINTERN

Zinoviev on the Split in Italian Socialist Party

I have just received from Rome the following telegram, dated October 4th:—

“The Italian Socialist Party, after expelling the reformist centrist bloc, reaffirms unanimously its adherence to the Third International.”

“MAFFI.”

The telegram refers to the present Congress of the Italian Socialist Party in Rome in which, at last, the break between the reformists and the centrists on one side and the maximalists on the other, has taken place. Comrade Maffi is one of the three comrades who were present at the Third Congress of the Communist International and represented till now the small fraction of the Communist International in the Socialist Party of Italy. They seem at the present time to have conquered the whole party, at last cleansed of all avowed reformists and centrists.

At the time when we write, we do not know the details as yet. It is very probable that the Maximalist Party, even after the breach with the reformists, will find the greatest difficulties before it becomes a true Communist Party. The acceptance of the 21 conditions of the Communist International will be brought before the Italian Maximalists. The Italian question will probably be debated most carefully before the Fourth World Congress. At any rate, the event which took place within the Socialist Party of Italy is of great importance for the whole International. The great moral victory of the Communist International leaves no doubt.

The I.S.P. went through two hard years of errors before it adopted the right way, which the Communist International had long shown it. During these two years the bourgeoisie, in league with the reformists, inflicted a severe blow to the Italian proletariat. The position of the Italian working class has been greatly weakened as a result of those mis-

takes of the Socialist Party. But with the honest desire to correct those mistakes, all may be well again.

Let us recall the basic facts. In 1919 the I.S.P., under the influence of the masses, was one of the first parties to signify their adherence to the Third International. The reformists with Turati and D’Aragona at their head did not dare to oppose this decision. In 1920 a large Italian delegation came to Moscow. In it were the future Communist leaders, Bordiga and Bombacci, as well as the chief leaders of the reformists, D’Aragona, Dugoni and Company, and the leader of the maximalists, Serrati.

The whole delegation at first unanimously accepted the Communist International. It is only towards the end of their stay in Russia that D’Aragona and Company came out openly with the reformist programme. The first difference of opinion with Serrati and his group became apparent at the Second Congress of the Third International. D’Aragona and Company returned to Italy and began there a pernicious campaign against Soviet Russia and the C.I.

In the fall of 1920 a most important movement appeared in Italy which finally took form in the occupation of plants and factories by the workers. At the most decisive moment, the reformists betrayed the working class. The bourgeoisie celebrated its victory. Serrati and his adherents, instead of overthrowing the treacherous reformists, attempted to defend them.

The Communists were too weak to take an independent stand. The bourgeoisie had won its first great victory over the proletariat. The offensive of capital developed. Fascism became daily more arrogant. The leaders of the I.S.P. sank lower and lower. It became apparent at that time that the international working class movement had

become weakened. The reformists gained power. Led by the reformists, the I.S.P. sank to an agreement with the Fascisti. The bitter cup of humiliation had been drunk to the dregs.

And now, after two years, the I.S.P. seems to have found the right way again. At the Leghorn Congress, the reformists presented only a small minority. Of 160,000 party members they counted only about 40,000. The mistakes of Serrati's adherence made it possible for the reformists to become a respectable power. The vote in Rome gave 29,000 votes for the reformist-centrist bloc and 32,000 for the maximalists of the C.I.

The reformists were supported by the trade union bureaucracy, by the co-operative officials, by the majority of the Parliamentary leaders, and all the petty-bourgeois sympathisers. In the summer of 1922, the reformist leaders believed their time to have come. Turati went to the king. The Parliamentary fraction declared that it no longer recognises its subordination to the Central Committee. D'Aragona and other reformist trade union leaders openly broke the agreements of the trade unions with the I.S.P. The understanding between the reformists and Fascisti went on. The entrance of the reformists into a bourgeois government was openly discussed.

This overran the patience of the Socialist workers. The work of the young Communist Party of Italy has not been in vain. The eyes of the vanguard of class-conscious workers have been opened and the reformists finally driven out of the Socialist Party of Italy. The expulsion of the reformists was one of the most important of the 21 conditions which the Communist International had put up to the Italian as well as to other parties. Two years of defeats had been necessary to convince the Italian Socialists how justified were the demands of the Communist International.

Italy is not the greatest country of the working class movement. But certain tendencies, especially characteristic for the international working class movement appear with unusual clearness in Italy. This fact may be explained in that this country has always stood objectively next to a possible revolution. The counter-revolutionary role of the Second International has nowhere been so apparent as in Italy. D'Aragona, the leader of the Italian reformists, declared recently in the heat of debate: "We reformists have never-

theless accomplished our purpose. We remained in the party to prevent that it go the way of revolution. We have been successful. The revolution has been avoided, and Italy spared the horrors of a civil war."

Never before has a reformist stated so openly why the reformists remained in the ranks of the Socialist Party.

The Italian example also reveals the danger of the vacillations of those honest Socialists who up to now could not accept a final break with the reformists and half-reformists and are often convinced that the 21 conditions of the C.I. are a result of dogmatism and unnecessary impatience.

We told the members of the Independent Social Democratic Party in Halle that they would again fall into the nets of the Scheidemann Social Democracy if they did not accept the 21 conditions of the Communist International. This prophecy has been fulfilled. Two years ago the C.I. had declared to the Italian Socialist Party that they must either follow the traitors D'Aragona, Turati and others, or return to the ranks which the C.I. was pointing out to them. The whole working class International may now see that the C.I. was right.

The decision of the Rome Socialist Congress is a significant sign of the times. The labour movement of the world is proceeding forward in spite of all obstacles. One year, half a year ago, our enemies spoke of the "decline of the Communist International." The class-conscious worker will now see that the really revolutionary forces of the whole world are gathered only under the banner of the C.I.

The decision of the Rome Congress of the maximalists is a moral victory for our young Italian Communist Party. This young party is still suffering from many of the sicknesses of the growing period. But this party has done much for the Italian labour movement. Its splendid, heroic work accomplished a very responsible task and saves the honour of the Italian working class movement.

We wish success to all honest and earnest adherents of Communism in Italy.

The way of the Italian proletariat is difficult and thorny, but the most difficult has been accomplished. The reformists, the agents of the bourgeoisie, will be defeated in Italy also. Their mask will be thrown down. Better days are coming for the Italian working class movement.

We hope that the Italian example will be a lesson to the revolutionary proletariat of all countries. We especially advise the French Communist Party, meeting in Congress on the 15th of this month in Paris, that they think long and clearly about it. There is only one way open to all workers fighting against capital—a way over temporary retreats, over small and large mistakes, over partial defeats—the way of the Communist International.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SPLIT BY A. BORDIGA (ROME).

[The article by Comrade Bordiga, which was printed in *l'Ordine Nuovo* of October 7th, represents not merely his own personal opinion. As this question will now occupy the attention of the Third International, we desire to make the standpoint contained therein known to wider circles.—*The Editor.*]

THE critical attitude which the Italian Communist Party exhibits towards the Socialist Party and its successive crises, follows from an objective theory and tactics which only foolish people could regard as constituting personal animosity and antipathy. This shall be established in view of the recent split in the Socialist Party of Italy.

It is the case here of a practical question with which our party is confronted; the question of its relations to the left wing of the present split party. This question cannot be dealt with without taking up a critical standpoint. It seems to us that on the basis of the constitution and organisation of the Communist International, there is only one body competent to solve this question: the congress of the Communist Party of Italy. Problems of a "fundamental" nature, the structure of the party, and perhaps also its name, are items which stand upon the agenda (but certainly not in the sense of the ludicrous proposal to dissolve the party and "return" to the Italian Socialist Party), and only a congress can decide on the alteration of the general rule which permits only individual affiliations. At this congress and during its preparation the problem of eventual unification will be discussed. For the present moment we will not concern ourselves with the admissibility of fusion which would bring with it a complete change in the party organism.

On the other hand, the Executive Committee of the Communist International has already dealt with this question, and the next World Congress will also deal with it. This

question can only form the topic of a prepared discussion at our congress after the approaching Fourth World Congress is over. It goes without saying that no Italian Communist would take up an attitude of opposition towards the proposals of the International regarding this question.

We shall restrict ourselves here to objective criticism of those political powers and resources constituting the Maximalist Party, and shall consider the question whether as a result of the split which has taken place, the Maximalist Party has changed in the sense of approaching the principles and methods of Communism. The question of its eventual incorporation into the Communist Party clearly depends upon this.

At Bologna, the whole of the I.S.P. affiliated to the Third International and made unity the basis of its programme. We observed clearly at the time that it was a gigantic error that the party remained in its theoretical outlook, in its methods and in its organisation and leadership a traditional Social Democratic party. Right from the beginning there was formed in the lap of the old party a distinct Communist tendency which criticised the negative direction of the prevailing Maximalist method. This method—as events have proved all too clearly—was the method of a revolutionary burlesque in which a high sounding phraseology sought to conceal the terrible fact that the party was incapable of keeping pace with the events that followed the war by an effective development of revolutionary factors.

What share did the right wing of the Social Democrats have in the criticism directed against the Maximalists, which will not be expounded here in detail? Will Italian and international Communists perhaps say that the Maximalists were Communists, that they had to separate from the Social Democrats in order to be in a position to function on the field of Communist methods? That would be a vulgar and superficial view of the thing. In fact, we proved clearly and beyond a doubt that the *Maximalists were not Communists*, that they did not understand that they must separate from "those who rejected the dictatorship of the proletariat and the use of force."

The International plainly declared that after such an action the Maximalists had proved their opportunism even to the blind, and that they would go to the right and end finally with opportunism—a prophesy which was very soon fulfilled by the com-

plete solidarity between the Maximalists and the reformists in the I.S.P., in their methods of action and chiefly in the campaign against the Communists.

Have later events come to light which would prove that the Maximalists set their course towards the right in order to swing it over to the left and to approach nearer to Communism? Our answer is: No!

We shall certainly not play with words. In regard to the Maximalists it is necessary to hear its authorised leaders so long as they retain control over the movement of the masses. When we shall speak of the workers who are in the ranks of the party, our critical attitude will certainly change. They can become Communists, but only when they forsake the traditions and the influence of their present leaders.

We assert that the latest attitude of the Maximalists towards the right wingers who are striving for collaboration with the bourgeoisie, affords no sufficient basis for pronouncing that it is now going more to the Left.

One might say that it must be tested in the field of practical action. This method, however, would, in the first place, be too protracted, and, secondly, it has always, up to the formation of blocs with the reformists against the Communists and against the adherents of the Third International in the trade unions, given us a negative answer. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves merely to estimating the importance of the rupture in the I.S.P.

The split does not prove that the Maximalists have at last grasped the simple truth that a common existence with the Social Democrats is impossible. Serrati is right when he defends the *consistency* of his attitude. His present attitude does not contradict that of Bologna, Leghorn and Milan. In reality, it is the Right that has altered its course. The Right has thereby realised its well-known principles, and there remains, now as before, the responsibility of the Serratiens, who warmed the collaborationist serpent in their bosoms in spite of the fact that they knew that it would bite. The banished from Rome have now committed sins which they had not yet committed in Bologna; at Leghorn and Milan, however, Serrati wished to shelter them. The recent conference gives us no document which is not a confirmation of the most brutal violation of discipline by the Right.

We see on the part of the Maximalists no formulation of programme, no acknowledgment of mistakes, no

attitude which would prove that they desired to escape from the past snare. If the reformists had continued in the course of Bologna, the Maximalists would now still be with them. The symptoms are unchanged, the opportunist sickness shows no signs of improvement.

Serrati, who insists upon his consistency, and thereby repudiates every recognition of the theses of the Communist International, plays upon a change in the situation which gives the present attitude of the Maximalists the appearance of a Left attitude. The unchained reaction demands to-day a revolutionary purification of the party. This failure to critically grasp the situation and the task of the proletariat, signifies the continuation of the former vagueness and vacillation.

The chief argument of Serrati at Leghorn was that the situation was tending to the Right, and that the strategic position for defending the proletariat also had to be maintained in those strongholds occupied by the reformists. But since the situation to-day is tending still more to the Right, in which case the quality of the party must be opposed to the quantity, the bankruptcy of the method adopted at Leghorn is clearly revealed. This has to be admitted, and one cannot claim to continue the former policy. The attitude of Serrati demonstrates his misunderstanding of the revolutionary task which led to the collapse of Maximalism. Serrati and his followers do not know and are less likely to know the relation between an altered situation and the tactics of a proletarian revolutionary party.

With the ascending line of the objective situation it was necessary to use the same to make clear the actions of the party in regard to theory and organisation, and to abandon all vacillation, in order to rouse the maximum of revolutionary energy in the masses—at the moment of the bourgeois offensive, even if it were only for the purpose of mere defence.

The lack of necessity for a clear statement of questions concerning theory and programme, by which the toleration of actions which ran counter to principles would have been impossible, was always a symptom that the actions of the party did not correspond to its academically accepted pledges. A clear theoretical basis is an indispensable condition for a movement capable of deeds and action; it is certainly not sufficient; the remaining conditions are yet more difficult of ful-

filment; but if the first condition is lacking the rest of the structure collapses. And as a matter of fact *the theoretical vagueness of Maximalism enabled us to foresee what subsequent facts have proved: its futility in practice and its anti-Communist attitude in all cases of proletarian action.*

As the Communists very well foresaw, the Maximalists at Leghorn preferred unity with the Social Democrats to unity with the Italian and International Communists.

Maximalism to-day, more than ever, lacks every clear conception of revolutionary tasks and the practical capacity to lead the defensive struggle of the masses.

Maximalism has not come over to the Left.

It has, as was foretold by Moscow after Leghorn, gone to the right and approached the reformists. The latter, however, proceeded too quickly, and have thus lost contact.

Hence the reason of the split which for an objective critic denotes no tendency to the Left, but only shows a demagogic taking advantage of the efforts of the masses, which serve the reformist leadership not to build up a truly revolutionary political position, but is used exclusively for defending certain persons and certain groups.

The split is a result of the bankruptcy of Maximalism and of its general staff.

Every optimistic illusion would be a fault in the face of our tasks. The Communist Party has gone a long way forward in the last two years, and in spite of all unfavourable conditions it has reasons for satisfaction.

We must carry on with our work. We require for this a consciousness of strict fidelity to our line of theory and practice, for which the comrades have sacrificed so much labour in the past two years, and which they will under no circumstances relinquish.

AMONG THE BOOKS

VIEWS & REVIEWS

SOMETHING GOOD.

Out of the Past. By R. W. Postgate. 123 pp., paper covers, index. 3s. 6d. Labour Publishing Company.

It was only to be expected that, sooner or later, Postgate would give us some of the rich material which he came across when digging up the historical data for his now famous work on *Revolution*. The revolutionary sketches which compose his latest book could not, very well, have appeared in *Revolution*, which is a cold but brilliant historical analysis of the law of economic-historic causation in its relation to the growth of the international Labour movement. In *Revolution* Postgate was mainly interested in movements and masses and did not, for the reason that he could not in such a work, devote very much attention to the brilliant and courageous personalities who played their part in the revolutionary struggles of the twentieth century. In *Out of the Past* our author is no longer a cold analyst: he becomes a warm-hearted sympathiser with the struggling and heroic individuals whose life story he so dramatically unfolds.

The largest study in the book, and, in our opinion, the most important one, is devoted to dauntless Louis Blanqui. It is a piece of powerful writing and cannot but hold the in-

terest of any ordinary reader. We always admired Blanqui. We knew his real greatness and worth by the desperate effort made by the French Government to get him out of the road during the revolutionary crisis in Paris, in 1871, that culminated in the Commune. While the Churchills and the Thiers denounce Labour for having no brains it is interesting to note how readily these reactionaries are to imprison Communists during any crisis. The greatest tribute ever paid to the revolutionary ability of Louis Blanqui was when Thiers kept him in prison and refused to exchange him for a whole crowd of bourgeois prisoners held by the Commune. Among these were such important personages as an Archbishop, a well known financier, etc. "To give you Blanqui," said the head of the French Government, "would be to give you a force equal to a *corps d'armée*." Better a dead Archbishop and financier than a live Blanqui in Paris during the Commune!

It is not very well known, in this country, that Blanqui made several important contributions to the revolutionary theory of the class struggle. Postgate is of the opinion that Blanqui was the first revolutionary to most clearly outline the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Regarding this there are more claims between the Blanquists and the Marxians.

The most important thing, however, is not a question of dates regarding Marx and Blanqui; it is that the needs of a proletarian dictatorship was realised, by those who actively participated in the class struggle, as an indispensable weapon in the conflict of the workers to end capitalism. In a very clear and interesting manner Postgate shows the difference between Blanquism and the tactics of the modern Communist movement. He also shows how several of our Marxists, and even Marxist organisations, still sustain ideas and methods advocated by Blaqui.

Another thrilling episode is that which recounts the facts of the sailors' mutiny at the Nore and Sheerness in 1797. Very little is known of Richard Parker who was elected by the rebel sailors, through their ship committees, as their admiral and leader. Of equal interest is the brief biographical sketch of Mr. Smith who hailed from the Clyde. He was the Owenite who edited *The Crisis* and who, in 1834, proclaimed the futility of a parliamentary or geographically elected form of government as an instrument for serving the industrial masses, and who contended that the real House of Commons would be a House of Trades.

Several of the chapters in *Out of the Past* appeared in the *Plebs* and in the *Communist Review*. Many of the articles which appear in these monthly journals are so important that they are worthy of being published in book form; this is amply demonstrated now that we read the sketches brought together in Postgate's new book.

It is the traditional function of book reviewers to make complaints. Since there is little to find fault with in the book we enter our protest against the price. The Labour Publishing Company is issuing splendid books, many of which are of the utmost importance to proletarian students of the revolutionary movement. The Plebs League publication department and the Communist Party publication committee are able to issue 200 page books, beautifully

bound and printed, at 2s. 6d. per volume. The Labour Publishing Company charges 3s. 6d. for smaller books. The Plebs League and the Communist Party publish their 2s. 6d. books in editions of 3,000 and sell them. From the point of view, both of business and propaganda, the large edition at a low price is a much safer proposition than a small edition at a high price.

W. PAUL.

STUDY IT.

The Communist Party, The Labour Party, and The United Front. 16 pages. One Penny. Published by Communist Party, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2.

WE recommend this unanswerable statement to everyone interested in the Labour movement. This powerfully-written statement is the most important pamphlet that has yet been published by the Communist Party. It is a brief but cogent examination of the present condition of the organised Labour movement in this country. It states plainly and candidly why the Communist Party desires to enter the Labour Party, and why, in the best interests of the masses, it should be there. The argument advanced is such that nothing more need be said upon the subject. It gives the MacDonalds and Hodges something to ponder over and likewise it will be a hard nut to break for the ultra-revolutionaries on the extreme outside Left.

BOOKS RECEIVED AND TO BE REVIEWED.

A World History for the Workers, by Alfred Barton. 128 pp., index. 2s. 6d. Labour Publishing Co.

Britain's Decline. Her Economic Disorder and its only Remedy, by J. W. Lea. 79 pages, index. 1s. Cornish Brothers, Birmingham.

The I.W.W. A Study of American Syndicalism. By Paul F. Brissenden. 438 pp., index. Paper covers. 3½ dollars. Columbia University, U.S.A.

Our Enemy The State. By Gilbert Sadler. 129 pages. 3s. 6d. net. Daniel, London.

IS THIS REVIEW TO YOUR TASTE? — IF IT IS SEVEN SHILLINGS WILL ENSURE 12 ISSUES

Pen Pictures of Russia

By JOHN S. CLARKE

*One of the Most Popular Books about Soviet Russia.
Now in its second edition*

PRICE

4/6

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



Ancient Things

have their charm. ¶ And they enable us to understand the Past & its People

¶ What of the Present & the Future? For Things Modern, for Tendencies of To-day that involve To-morrow, for Ideas & Information on Communism and the Labour Movement at home & abroad, read *The Communist* weekly

VOLUMES ONE AND TWO OF THE
Communist Review

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

PRICE **5/6** PER VOLUME

☛ Order from any Labour Bookseller

JUST OUT

**SECRETS of MENSHEVIK
GEORGIA by J. SHAPIR**

With authentic copies of Documents taken from
the Archives of the late Menshevik Governors
PRICE 1s. 6d. or 1s. 8d. POST FREE

*From the COMMUNIST PARTY OFFICES at
16, KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2.*

HAVE YOU READ THIS BOOK ?

“Communism & Society”

By WM. PAUL, *Editor of Communist Review*

200 PAGES PACKED WITH FACTS

PRICE **2/9** POST FREE

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