

INTERNATIONAL

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 3 No. 1

whole no. 17

16th Jan. 1923

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

CONTENTS

HOOPER WAR COLLECTION

The Economic Situation of Soviet Russia. By <i>L. Trotsky</i>	1	In the R.I.L.U.	
Politics		The Second Congress of the R.I.L.U. By <i>A. Lousovsky</i>	8
The British Government and the League of Nations. By <i>J. T. Walton Newbold</i>	4	Yesterday and To-day. By <i>Gaston Monmousseau</i>	10
Mosul and the Straits. By <i>R. Louzon</i>	5	In the Colonies	
Economics		The Political Somersault in Egypt. By <i>M. N. Roy</i>	10
The Russian Rouble and the German Mark. By <i>Sokolnikov</i>	5	Fascism.	
The Labor Movement		The Fascist Danger in South Germany. By <i>H. Tittel</i>	12
The International Conference of Revolutionary Metal Workers. By <i>W. Waxow</i> (Moscow)	6	Appeals	
The Eight Hour Day in France. By <i>Georges Levy</i> (France)	6	„Peace on Earth”	12
The Capitalist Offensive and the Working Class in Belgium. By <i>J. Jacquemotte</i> (Brussels)	7	The E.C.C.I. and the R.I.L.U. to the Workers of the World	14
In the International		The 10th All-Russian Soviet Congress to all Peoples of the World	15
Proletarian Alliance of France and Germany. By <i>Lauridan</i>	8	In Memoriam	
		To the Memory of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. By <i>Ernst Meyer</i> (Berlin)	15

The Economic Situation of Soviet Russia*)

By *L. Trotsky.*

1. The question of the direction taken by the economic development of Soviet Russia must be understood and estimated from two different standpoints by the class conscious workers of the whole world: firstly, from the standpoint of interest in the welfare of the first workers' republic in the world, its permanency, its strength, its enhanced well-being, its evolution towards socialism; and secondly, from the point of view of the lessons and conclusions to be drawn from Russian experience, by the proletariat of other countries for application to constructive activity after seizure of state power.

2. The methods and rapidity of the economic constructive activity of the victorious proletariat are determined by: a) the stage of development which has been reached by the productive forces, not only in the general economy, but in its separate branches, and especially in the relations between industry and agriculture; b) the level of culture and organization of the proletariat as the ruling class; c) the political situation subsequent to the seizure of power by the proletariat (resistance of the fallen bourgeois classes, the attitude of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, the extent of the civil war and its consequences, military interventions from outside, etc.).

The more developed the productive forces of a country, the higher, the level of culture and organization of the proletariat, and the weaker the resistance of the fallen classes, the more rapid, systematic, regular, and successful can the transition from capitalist to socialist economics be carried out by the victorious proletariat.

A remarkable combination of historical circumstances has willed it that Russia is the first country to tread the path of socialist evolution, and this, although Russia, despite the far-reaching concentration of the most important branches of its industry, is economically backward, although its masses of workers and peasants, despite the extraordinarily admirable revolutionary political quality of the proletarian vanguard, are backward in culture and organization.

*) These theses formed the foundation of the report given by me, at the 4th congress of the Comintern, on the question of the economic position of Soviet Russia. L. T.

These contradictions in the economic, social, and political structure of Russia, and the fact that the Soviet republic has been, and remains, surrounded by capitalism during the whole of its existence, determine the fate of the economic constructive work of the workers' and peasants' government, determine the changes made in this constructive work, and the reasons for adopting the present so-called New Economic Policy.

3. The complete expropriation not only of the larger and middle bourgeoisie, but also of the petty bourgeoisie in town and country, was a measure necessitated by economic expediency and political necessity alike. The continued rule of capitalism over all the rest of the world, had the effect that not only the Russian large bourgeoisie, but even the petty bourgeoisie, did not believe that the workers' state could be maintained, and this disbelief led to the formation of reserves for the bourgeois large-agrarian counter-revolution. Under these circumstances the resistance of the bourgeoisie could be broken, and the Soviet power maintained, only by the complete expropriation of the bourgeoisie and of the exploiting upper strata of the village population. Victory for the workers' state was only secured by this determined and ruthless policy, which forced the vacillating masses of the peasantry to choose between the restoration of the land-owners and the workers' state.

4. The workers' state thus came into possession, immediately on beginning to exercise its power, of the whole of the industrial undertakings, down to the very smallest. The mutual relations of the various branches of industry to one another, had already been thrown completely out of balance and order long before the revolution, by the reconstruction of industry during and for the war. The personnel of the main apparatus of economic administration had either emigrated or was occupied at the White fronts. In so far as certain elements were still present in Russia, these sabotaged where they could.

The conquest and maintenance of power by the working class was purchased at the price of rapid and ruthless destruction of the whole bourgeois apparatus of economic administration, from top to bottom, in every department, and all over the country.

These were the conditions under which the so-called "war communism" originated.

5. The most urgent task of the new regime consisted in securing the food supply for the towns and for the army. The imperialist war had already forced the change from free trade in corn to monopoly. The workers' state, having destroyed all the organizations of trading capital under the pressure of the civil war, was naturally unable to make a beginning by reestablishing free trade in corn. It was obliged to replace the commercial apparatus which it had destroyed by a state apparatus, this working on the basis of compulsory collection of the surplus produce of agricultural undertakings.

The distribution of food-stuffs and other articles of consumption took the form of giving out a uniform state ration almost completely irrespective of the qualification and productivity of the receivers. This "communism" was rightly named "war communism", not only because it replaced economic methods by military ones, but because it served military purposes above all others. It was not a question of securing a systematic development of economics under the prevailing conditions, but of securing the food supply for the army at the fronts, and to prevent the working class from dying out altogether. War communism was the regime of a besieged fortress.

6. In the sphere of industry a roughly centralized apparatus was created, based on the trade unions; this apparatus pursued the immediate aim of at least getting out of the industrial undertakings—totally ruined by the war, the revolution, and the sabotage—the minimum of products necessary to enable the civil war to be carried on. Something resembling a uniform plan was obtained only by utilizing the existing productive forces to an inconsiderable extent.

7. Had the victory of the Russian proletariat been speedily followed by the victory of the Western European proletariat, this would not only have shortened the civil war in Russia to an extraordinary degree, but the resultant closer relations of Soviet Russia's economy with those of the more highly developed proletarian countries would have unfolded new possibilities of organization and technique for the Russian proletariat. In that case the transition from "war communism" to real socialism would doubtless have been carried out in a much shorter time, and without the convulsions and retreats which isolated proletarian Russia has had to undergo during these 5 years.

8. The economic retreat—or, to speak more correctly: the political retreat at the economic front—was perfectly unavoidable as soon as the fact was finally established that Soviet Russia was confronted with the task of constructing her own economy, aided solely by its own organizations and technical resources during the indefinite period required to prepare the proletariat of Europe for the seizure of power.

The counter-revolutionary events in February 1921 showed that it was quite impossible to further postpone the better adaptation of the economic methods of socialist constructive work to the needs of the peasantry. The revolutionary events in Germany, in March 1921, showed that it was absolutely impossible to further postpone a political "retreat", in the sense of a preparatory struggle towards winning over the majority of the working class. These two movements of retreat were contemporaneous, and stand, as we have seen, in the closest reciprocal connection. They can only be designated as retreats in a qualified sense, for what they demonstrated was the necessity, in Germany as in Russia, of a certain period of preparation; a new economic course in Russia, a fight for transitional demands and for the united front in the West.

9. The Soviet state turned from the methods of war communism to the methods of the market. The compulsory collection of agricultural surplus was replaced by taxes in kind, the peasantry thus being given the possibility of freely selling its surplus in the market; monetary traffic was restored, and a number of measures taken to stabilize the rate of exchange; the principles of commercial calculation were re-introduced into the state industrial undertakings, and wages were again made dependent on the skill and output of the workers; a number of small and medium industrial undertakings were let to private persons. The essential character of the "New Economic Policy" lies in the revival of the market, of its methods and systems.

10. After five years of existence of the Soviet republic, its economics can be roughly outlined as follows:

a) All land and ground belongs to the state. About 95 per cent of the arable land is at the disposal of the peasantry for cultivation; the taxes in kind paid to the state by the peasantry in the course of the past year amounted to over 300 million puds of rye from one crop, approximately three quarters of a medium pre-war crop.

b) The entire railway system (more than 63,000 verste) is state property. The employees and workmen

numbering more than 800,000 perform at the present time, about one third of the work done before the war.

c) All industrial undertakings belong to the state. The most important of these (more than 4,000 undertakings) employ about a million workers, and are conducted by the state itself. About 4,000 undertakings of second and third rank, employing about 80,000 workers, are let on lease. Each state enterprise employs on an average 207 workers, each leased undertaking an average of 17 workers. But of the leased undertakings only about one half are in the hands of private persons; the other half have been leased by separate state bodies or cooperative organizations.

d) Private capital operates at the present time chiefly in the sphere of commerce. According to the first calculations which have been made, but which are only approximate and unreliable, about 30 per cent of the total commercial turnover falls to private capital, the remaining 70 per cent consisting of sums owned by the state organizations and the cooperative organizations closely connected with the state.

e) Foreign trade, amounting during the current year to one quarter of the pre-war import and a twentieth of the pre-war export, is completely concentrated in the hands of the state.

11. The methods of war communism, that is, the methods of an extremely crude centralized registration and distribution, are replaced by the new policy: by market methods; by buying and selling, commercial calculation, and competition. But in this market the state plays the leading part as the most powerful property owner, and buyer and seller. The overwhelming majority of the productive forces of industry, as well as all means of railway traffic, are directly concentrated in the hands of the state. The activity of the state economic organs is thus controlled by the market, and also to a considerable extent directed by it. Commercial calculation and competition serve for ascertaining if the separate undertakings are working profitably. The market serves as the connecting link between agriculture and industry, between town and country.

12. In so far as a free market exists, it is inevitable that private capital should function in it, and that this should enter into competition with state capital, at first in commerce only, but later it attempts to penetrate into industry. Civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is being substituted by competition between proletarian and bourgeois industry. And just as one of the main points of contest in civil war is the political conquest of the peasantry, in the same manner the present struggle revolves chiefly around control of the agricultural market. In this struggle the proletariat has mighty advantages on its side: the most highly developed productive forces of the country, and the state power. The bourgeoisie, on the other hand, possesses the advantage of greater skill, and to a certain extent of connections with foreign capital, especially that of the emigrants.

13. Special emphasis must be laid on the taxation policy of the workers' state, and on the alliance of the credit institutions in the hands of the state—these being powerful mediums for securing the ascendancy of state forms of economics, that is, of forms socialist in tendency, over private capitalist forms. The taxation policy is one permitting increasingly greater portions of private capitalist incomes to be utilized for state purposes, not only in agriculture (taxes in kind), but also in commerce and industry. In this manner even private capital (the concessions!) is compelled by the proletarian dictatorship to pay tribute to the socialist accumulation now beginning.

On the other hand the commercial industrial credit concentrated in the hands of the state, supplies (as is proved by the statistical data of the last few months) the state undertakings to the extent of 75%, the cooperatives 20%, and the private undertakings 5 per cent at most.

14. The assertion of the social democrats, that the Soviet state has "capitulated" to capitalism, is thus an obvious and crude distortion of the actual facts. As a matter of fact the Soviet state is following the economic path which it would doubtless have pursued in the years 1918-1919, had not the imperative demands of the civil war obliged it to completely expropriate the bourgeoisie at one blow, to destroy the bourgeois economic apparatus, and to replace this by the apparatus of war-communism.

15. The most important political and economic result of the new economic policy is the real and permanent understanding attained with the peasantry which is stimulated to extend and intensify its operations by admission to the free market. The experience of the last few years, especially the increase of winter crops, afford every reason to expect a continued and systematic betterment of agriculture. This signifies not only the creation of a reserve of foodstuffs for

Russia's industrial development, but a highly important reserve of goods for foreign markets. From now onwards, Russian corn will appear in ever increasing quantities in the European market. The significance of this factor for the socialist revolution in the West is obvious.

16. The branches of industry working for immediate consumption, and especially for the rural market, have made undoubted and very noticeable progress during the first year of the new economic policy. The situation of heavy industry is admittedly still extremely difficult, but this backwardness of heavy industry, caused solely by the conditions obtaining during the last few years, will be relieved in proportion to the progress made in the reconstruction of the exchange of goods; real impetus can only be given to the development of machine building, metal working, and fuel production, which are naturally sure of receiving the utmost attention from the state, after the first successes have been obtained in agriculture and light industry. The state will extend its economic sphere, concentrate an ever-increasing turnover capital in its hands, and then renew the fundamental capital by means of state, (the original socialist") accumulation. There is absolutely no reason to assume that state accumulation will proceed more slowly than private capitalist accumulation, and that private capital is thus likely to come out of the struggle as victor.

17. In so far as foreign capital is concerned (mixed companies, concessions, etc.) the role played by it in Russia, apart from its own extremely hesitating and cautious policy, is determined by the considerations and calculations of the workers' state, which invariably preserves the limits required for the maintenance of the state economy when granting industrial concessions or entering into commercial contracts. The monopoly of foreign trade is in this respect an extraordinarily important security for socialist development.

18. Despite this transference of its economics to the principles of the market, the workers' state does not renounce the plan of systematic economics, not even for the coming period. The fact alone that the whole railway system and the overwhelming majority of industrial undertakings are exploited and financed by the state, renders a combination of the centralized state control over these undertakings with the automatic control of the market inevitable. The state concentrates more and more attention on heavy industry and means of traffic, as economic fundamentals, and adapts its policy with regard to finance, revenue, concessions, and imposts, to a very great degree to the requirements of these factors. Under the circumstances of the present period the state economic plan does not set itself the Utopian task of substituting universal provision for the elementary effects of demand and supply. On the contrary: starting from the market as the fundamental form of distribution of economic produce and of regulation of production, the present economic plan aims at securing the greatest possible dominance of the state undertakings in the market by means of combining all factors of taxation, industry, commerce, and credit, and at establishing the reciprocal relations between these undertakings on the highest possible degree of previous calculation and uniformity, so that, supported by the market, the state can progress rapidly, especially in the sphere of the reciprocal relations between the state undertakings.

19. The inclusion of the peasantry in the systematized state plan of economics, that is, of socialist economics, is a still more complicated and tedious task. Cooperative organizations controlled and directed by the state are paving the way towards this by satisfying the most imperative needs of the peasant and his enterprises. This process will be carried out with the greater economical rapidity in proportion to the increased quantity of the products of town industry which can be allotted to the villages through the intermediation of the cooperative societies. But the socialist principle can only be completely victorious in the province of agriculture after the electrification of agriculture has been accomplished, and the barbaric disunity of agricultural production put an end to. The plan of electrification thus forms an important constituent of the collective state economic plan, and as its importance will increase in proportion to the increase of the productive power of agriculture, it will gain in ascendancy in the future, finally rendering it the fundamental of the whole socialist economy.

20. Economic organization consists of the correct and purposeful distribution of forces and means among the various branches and undertakings, and in the rational, that is, the most economical utilization of these forces and means within each undertaking. Capitalism attains this aim by supply and demand, competition, favorable markets, and crises. Socialism will attain the same aim by the conscious construction of the

national and then of the world economy, as a uniform whole, on a general plan founded on the existing means of production and on the existing requirements, and thus completely comprehensive and at the same time extraordinarily elastic. Such a plan cannot be made a priori; it has to be worked out in accordance with the economic inheritance bequeathed to the proletariat by the past, and systematic alterations and reconstructions are to be made, with increasing boldness and decision, in proportion to the increase of economic experience and technical powers of the proletariat.

21. It is quite clear that a long epoch must inevitably elapse between the capitalist regime and complete socialism, and that during this epoch the proletariat must make use of the methods and forms of organization of capitalist intercourse (money, exchange, banks, commercial calculation) for the purpose of gaining an ever increasing control of the market, to the end that this may become so centralized and unified as to be finally abolished, and repaced by a centralized plan based on the whole previous economic evolution, and forming the prerequisite for the further development of economics. The Soviet republic is now treading this path. But it is only at the beginning of the path, and still far from the goal. The fact that the Soviet republic was compelled by conditions to adopt war communism, and forced by the delay of the revolution in the West to beat a certain retreat—a retreat however more formal than material—has veiled the picture, and has afforded opportunity to the petty bourgeois opponents of the workers' state to speak of a capitulation to capitalism. In reality however, the course of evolution in Soviet Russia is not from socialism to capitalism, but from capitalism—temporarily pressed against the wall by the methods of so-called war communism—to socialism.

22. The assertion that the decay of productive forces in Russia is a result of the irrationality of the socialist or communist economic methods is completely untenable and historically absurd. In reality this decay was above all a result of the war, further a result of the revolution in the form it took in Russia, that of a protracted civil war. The French Revolution, which created the premises for the mighty capitalist development of France and of the whole of Europe, had for its immediate result the greatest devastation and economic ruin. 10 years after the beginning of the French Revolution, France was poorer than before the revolution. The circumstance that in the Soviet republic, industry did not produce more than a quarter of the average pre-war productivity during the past year does not prove the failure of socialist methods, for it has not even been possible to apply these yet, but solely the greatness of the economic ruin inevitably attendant on revolution as such. But so long as human class society exists, every great advance will have to be paid for by the sacrifice of human lives and of material, whether the transition be from feudalism to capitalism, or the incomparably more far reaching transition from capitalism to socialism.

23. The above answers in itself the question as to the degree in which the economic policy designated as new in Russia, forms a necessary stage of every proletarian revolution. Two elements must be distinguished in the new economic policy: a) the moment of "retreat" characterized above; b) the economic management of the proletarian state on the basis of the market, with all its methods, procedures, and arrangements.

a) As regards the "retreat", this can also occur in other countries as the result of purely political events, in consequence of the necessity, in the rush of civil war, of depriving the enemy of a considerably greater number of undertakings than the proletariat is economically able to organize. The partial retreats resultant on this are likely to occur in every single country, but in other countries they are not likely to bear so severe a character as in agrarian Russia, where the actual civil war did not actually begin until after the proletariat had seized power. To-day we can no longer doubt that in the majority of capitalist countries the proletariat will only come into power after an obstinate, severe, and lasting civil war, in other words, the proletariat of Europe will have to strike at the roots of the enemy's power before conquering state power, not after this conquest. In any case, however, the resistance of the bourgeoisie—military, political and economic—will be weaker in proportion to the number of countries in which the proletariat has already seized power. This means that the moment of armed conquest of industry, and the following moment of economic retreat, will probably play an incomparably more insignificant rôle in other parts of the world than in Russia.

b) As regards the utilization of methods and organizations made by capitalism for regulating our economics, all workers'

states will, in a greater or lesser degree, have to pass through this stage, on the road from capitalism to socialism; in other words, every new workers' government, after unavoidably destroying in a greater or lesser degree the capitalist economic organizations during the civil war (the exchanges, banks, trusts, syndicates), will restore these arrangements again, subordinate them politically, and after having ordered them in the organization of the collective mechanism of the proletarian dictatorship, will have to master them by creative work, in order to gradually carry out with their aid the reconstruction of economics on a socialist basis. The greater the number of countries in which the proletariat is already in power, and the more powerful the proletariat seizing the power in any country, the more difficult it will be for capital, or even the capitalists, to emigrate, and the weaker will be the support afforded for sabotage on the part of administrative and technical intellectuals, and as a result the slighter will be the derangement of the material and organized capitalist apparatus, and the easier the work of restoring it.

24. The speed with which the workers' state runs through this stage, during which the socialism coming into existence is still enveloped and developing within its capitalist chrysalis—this speed, as already indicated, will depend upon the military and political situation; further, on the level of organization and culture which has been reached by the working class, and on the degree of development and the condition of the productive forces existing when the workers' state comes into power. The further advanced the degree of evolution of these factors, the more rapid, obviously, will the workers' state pass through the transition to socialist economics, and from here to perfect communism.

POLITICS

The British Government and the League of Nations

By J. T. Walton Newbold.

During the first short session of the new parliament recently elected in the United Kingdom, there has manifested itself very clearly a tendency to attach increasing importance to the League of Nations. This is not only to be accounted for by reason of the greater numbers of the Labor Party, nearly all of whose members have an obsession for this most menacing institution of international autocracy. Every party in the House of Commons, except the party of which I am the sole direct representative, has shown a disposition to glorify the League and not the least among them being the spokesman of the new Tory Government and its supporters who, of course, constitute the parliamentary majority.

It may, at first sight, appear strange that the Tory Party, the party of reaction, should thus champion the cause of the League of Nations. Yet, in reality it is not so. It is as natural for the Tory Government to seek to enhance the reputation and extend the authority of the League as it is for it to seek peace and pursue a policy of "tranquility".

The Tory Party, the party of reaction in Great Britain and in Northern Ireland, is not representative primarily of a class having its interests in great landed estates within the British Isles, but of a class whose landed property consists of town lands at home and of town and agricultural lands in the great self-governing dominions of Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and in the great republics of the United States and Argentina. This class consists of persons who have sold or who have not further developed their family properties at home but have, joining together in mortgage, land and cattle ranching companies, become an impersonal and international type of land exploiters. They have, in order to be such landowners, to be capitalists. Being capitalists they own not only or even so much land, as railway stocks and shares at home and all over the world. They have taken their accumulated rents and bought government — British Colonial and Foreign — loan stock and municipal, mining and all kinds of miscellaneous international stocks and shares.

It is this class, a metamorphosed landed class, a class of passive rather than of active proprietors of both land and capital, that is represented by the Tory Party, the party now ruling Great Britain.

The passive proprietors of land and capital, having entrusted the custody of their possessions to the banks, the insurance and the finance companies, who handle their money transactions for them, are in truth in the hands of these concerns and, as poli-

ticians permit themselves to be advised and guided in home, colonial, and foreign policy in such ways as best fit in with the interests of the great credit institutions.

The British Government, under the leadership of Bonar Law, reflects the interests and the desires of the great banking, insurance, and investment houses.

Lloyd George fell from political office because the interests which he represented had, from the autumn of 1920 to the autumn of 1922, become increasingly mortgaged to these credit houses, had, in other words, involuntarily abdicated economic power.

Lloyd George, supported by Austen Chamberlain, the son and political heir of his great father, and by the Earl of Balfour, the one time leader of British Toryism in its heyday of imperialist militancy, stood for a policy of British ascendancy in world politics, for all the old assertiveness of British imperialism, for the maintenance of British sea-power, and British leadership, especially in the East.

The banks and their clients the Tories, were, however, determined at all costs to maintain their class security and to oppose to the menace of Bolshevism, which they know will follow upon the collapse of Central European credit, a united class front of international, impersonal bourgeois property.

Having broken the jingoistic government of British imperialism and installed in its place a tranquility government, more acceptable to the reactionary bourgeoisie of France and America, they are busily strengthening the defences of international class domination. When, about the beginning of the century, the social democrats and the Laborists threatened, though their victory as still remote, to capture the old popularly elected local educational authorities, the Tories took steps to make direct working class control of education much more difficult. When, after the war, Laborists gained control over certain country authorities, the Tory elements in the late government removed from the county to the central authorities, control of the police forces and checked the activities of labor majorities on Poor Law bodies by the veto of the central government.

When revolution was striding across Europe the governing class, notably the Conservatives Earl Balfour, Lord Robert Cecil, and Viscount Grey — for he is, really, a Tory, — interested themselves in the League of Nations as a new form of governmental institution, in which these subtle serpents saw a means to check Labor from conquering power in sovereign independent states. They busied themselves about that delusion and deception, the International Labor Office.

They looked to and found support from the Labor leaders — those one-eyed politicians who, seeing a superficial antagonism between Geneva and Paris, thought the League of Nations must be the thing to advocate and advance. Now that, by the skilful use of their economic power, the credit houses have aggravated the difficulties of the industrial magnates whose capital, locked up in unprofitable and non-negotiable means of production, has become a liability rather than an asset and have put them into virtual if not always nominal liquidation, all economic power has passed into the hands of these same credit houses and their clients, the passive capitalists whom they use as political catspaws.

The passive elements in capitalism, whether mere investors or investment agencies, deal in the title deeds and mortgage bonds and war-loan certificates and share-warrants of properties situated all over the world and under any form of bourgeois administration.

To them, the League of Nations appears, therefore, the same admirable instrument as that "tranquility" administration which, entrenched behind lines and lines of policemen, they regard as the acme of domestic bliss.

To the Laborists, the League of Nations is that international counter-part of parliamentary government which to their myopic vision only requires themselves to be duly installed in a majority in every parliament, to realize the coming to earth amid trailing clouds of celestial glory, of the Prince of Peace.

It is probable, indeed it is almost certain that to maintain the illusion that the League of Nations is not a mere court of revision and of appeal from their own national "parliamentary" institutions, the British Tory and other bourgeois governments will not too openly associate themselves with its deliberations and its decisions.

The British Government, for instance, will continue the make-believe of keeping at arms length their back bench "critic", Lord Robert Cecil. This aiming schemer, the most hypocritical, that the British bourgeoisie has at its beck and call, this is the man to watch.

It is not only those actually in office but those liaison officers of capitalist statecraft who, out of a job, are always

doing a job, that one always needs to watch in order to know exactly the kind of rascality to which the British governing class is up to at any given time.

Mosul and the Straits

By R. LOUZON.

On the 30th of March, 1865 in Paris, England forced the acceptance of the principle that the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles should be open to the merchant ships of all powers; but closed to war ships. The Turks, established on the banks, were charged to enforce the decision. They were assigned the role of guardians of the Black Sea.

In 1922, at Lausanne, England strenuously resists the continuance of this state of affairs. She mobilized Greece, and has now mobilized herself, to prevent the reestablishment of the conditions which she herself proposed and which prevailed for half a century to the general satisfaction of all nations.

Why, then, this change of front?

In the Nineteenth century there was already a question of the East and of India, but there was not yet the question of petroleum.

Great Britain caused the closing of the Straits to war ships because she was afraid that the Russian Fleet, finding an outlet into the Aegean Sea, would come to menace her naval bases in the Mediterranean and by penetrating the Suez Canal, interrupt her communications with India and the East, and also, because there was no need for her fleet to penetrate into the Black Sea. For at that time the petroleum in the Caucasus roused no interest in the owners of the Welsh coal fields.

But the technique of motor production has changed profoundly during the last twenty years. The development of the automobile, the manufacture of aeroplanes causes the consumption of continually growing quantities of petroleum each year.

Especially the coming into use of heavy and powerful oil burners, permitting the use of petroleum in the navigation of ships, has made the question of naval supremacy one of petroleum resources.

The use of petroleum in the navigation of battleships, permits an important reduction in fuel space, and consequently increases the amount available for arms and munitions. More essential still, the use of petroleum renders a fleet invisible at a distance, for at present, it is the coal smoke which exposes a fleet to the discovery of the enemy, even at a considerable distance.

These advantages are so great that one is justified in saying that a navy driven by petroleum has the same advantages over a navy run by coal as an iron-clad has over a wooden vessel.

Under these circumstances, the possession of the splendid Welsh coal, with its excellent quality, expressly destined, it seems, for stoking the furnaces of the navy, no longer confers any special superiority upon Great Britain. England must either secure the new fuel for herself, cost what it may, or resign her position of supremacy on the high seas.

England's interest at this moment in the Black Sea is neither Odessa nor Sebastopol, it is Batum and Novorossisk, outlets of the petroleum basins of Baku and Groszny.

When England is able to obtain the free passage of her cruisers and dreadnoughts into the Black Sea and to train her guns upon the entire coast of the Caucasus, it will be easy for her to land her troops at the first favorable occasion and to occupy that narrow isthmus which separates the Black Sea and the Caspian, and which contains the richest flow of petroleum known at present.

Lord Curzon has no other reason for desiring that the Straits be demilitarized, that is that the obstacles which might oppose the passage of his ships and his troops be removed. *In demanding freedom of passage through the Straits for men-o-war, or, what amounts to the same thing, the demilitarization of the Straits, England has publicly admitted her intention of seizing upon the Caucasus and its petroleum fields.* That is why the question of the Straits is no different from that of Mosul. In the one case, as in the other, it is concerned exclusively with petroleum. All other reasons given by the diplomats are mere pretexts to hide the reality.

Thus the sole question which is being discussed in Lausanne is one of petroleum, petroleum in the Caucasus and in Armenia. And it is for this reason that the United States is so interested.

ECONOMICS

The Russian Rouble and the German Mark

By Sokolnikov (Moscow).

Gold currency has been replaced not only in Russia, but almost all over the European continent, by paper currency indicating every stage of falling rates of exchange. Even the bank-notes issued by the bank of England have maintained an unaltered value of 9 per cent lower than gold, ever since the war, and have shown but slight upward and downward fluctuations. The Dutch paper florin, although Holland remained neutral in the war, has also lost value by about the same proportion as the English bank-note. The French rate of exchange is much more unfavorable: the paper franc sinks in value from year to year, and the attempts made by the French government to improve France's financial condition at the expense of German reparations only lead to the further depreciation of the French banknotes, following on the catastrophic and feverish depreciation of German paper money. The depreciation of paper currency is accompanied by important economic and political consequences all over Europe. In France the small peasantry, which had kept its savings in paper money, has lost more than half of these savings. In Germany and in England the depreciation lays the heaviest burdens on workers and intellectuals. In all these countries the uncertainty of monetary values involves rapidly rising prices, rapacious greed for profits, and complete uncertainty of what the next day may bring; in short, it involves the complete disintegration of all economic relations, and this is also expressed politically in the continual governmental crises. This financial breakdown is naturally only the result of the acute political and economic crisis into which Europe has been plunged by the war.

But the depreciating paper money of Europe was able to console itself for a time with the fact that its Eastern neighbour, the Russian paper rouble, was falling more rapidly still. Conscious of their advantageous position, the countries trafficking in paper currency declined to recognize the Russian paper money as a member of their family: they refused it all acknowledgement whatever as monetary value, precisely as the European governments have refused to "recognize" the Soviet government as a government. Now the situation is beginning to change: the rate at which the German mark depreciates has not only exceeded that of the paper money of the Austria strangled by the Versailles dictators, but is now even more rapid than that of Soviet Russia's paper currency, which is now beginning to take firm ground after long years of war, blockade, and famine. If we compare the price of the dollar (that is, of the only money in the world possessing full value) in marks at the German exchange, and in rubles at the free Moscow exchange, since January 1922, we observe the following:

In January the dollar had a value of 192 marks in Berlin, 43.5 roubles in Moscow (bank-notes of the year 1922). In July the dollar cost 493 marks in Berlin, in Russia 411 roubles, so that the mark had depreciated by two and a half times, the rouble by nine and a half times; during the first half year of 1922 the rouble thus depreciated four times as rapidly as the mark. The second half year however, shows quite another picture. At the end of the first week in December, 8390 marks were paid in Berlin for a dollar. (At the end of November the rate of exchange even exceeded 9000.) In Moscow (at the free exchange) the dollar cost 2750 roubles at the end of the first week in December. The mark, calculated at its rate of exchange to the dollar, had thus depreciated by 17 times its value between July and December, the rouble 6.7 times only. The mark is thus depreciating 2½ times as fast as the rouble.

This more rapid depreciation of the mark, of course corresponds to the issue of paper money, which has increased proportionately more in Germany than in Russia. If we take the rate of bank-notes issued in January 1922 at 100, the following comparison of issues is obtained:

	Russia	Germany
January	100	100
February	145	222
March	261	633
April	370	583
May	681	650
June	848	1011
July	1224	1283
August	1755	3244
September	1726	3778
October	2413	8500

In actual figures the German issue was not great during the first few months, but the supplementary issue in May was 2 milliards, in June 18, in July 23, in August 59, in September 83, and in October 153 milliards (that is, about one half of the total amount of paper money in circulation up till October).

Naturally, it is a source of but little pleasure to Soviet Russia that the Germany monetary standards are worse off than its own. But as the conditions of valuta represent a peculiarly concentrated expression of the general political and economic situation of a country, the fact that Soviet Russia is now able (and very willing) to give the first place to capitalist Germany with regard to rapid depreciation of rate of exchange is a sign that Eastern Europe is beginning to show greater economic and political stability than Central Europe. The country of the greatest revolution of the world can confidently assert that it is not going to take part in the paper-money bankruptcy, and can recommend to its enemies to heal themselves of the paper-money "disease".

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The International Conference of Revolutionary Metal Workers

By W. Waxow (Moscow).

Our second conference was held in Moscow from December 4. till 7. Strictly speaking, it was the first conference, for last year we had only a consultation of the metal workers' delegates of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U.

46 delegates, representing 18 countries, took part in the conference; 38 of these delegates, being official representatives of the revolutionary minorities of metal workers' unions, and of the central organs of metal workers' unions affiliated with the R.I.L.U., had deciding votes; 8 delegates, not possessing special authority, were admitted with advisory votes.

The delegates belonged to the following countries and organizations: United States of America 2 delegates (1 from the minority of the Engineers' Association, 1 from the Union of United Metal Workers of America); Canada 1 (local union); England 5 (minority of the Amalgamated Engineering Union); Germany 7 (minority of the German Metal Workers' Union and the section of the Union); France 4 (Unitarian Metal Workers' Federation and the Federation of Aviation Workers Cartwrights, and Smiths); Italy 2 (minority of the Metal Workers' Federation); Australia 1 (section of the Amalgamated Engineering Union); Belgium 1 (minority of the Metal Workers' Union); Sweden 2 (minority of the Metal Workers' Union); Austria 1 (minority of the Metal Workers' Union); Czechoslovakia 2 (section of the Metal Workers' Associated Union and minority of the reformist Metal Workers' union); Yugoslavia 1 (Metal Workers' Union); Bulgaria 1 (Metal Workers' Union); Japan 1 (Metal Workers' Union Tokio); Finland 2 (Metal Workers' Union); Estonia 1 (Metal Workers' Union); Russia 10 (All Russian Metal Workers' Union); Latvia 1 (Metal Workers' Union). There were thus represented at the conference: 11 independent organizations with a membership of about 550,000, and revolutionary minorities comprising, at the most modest estimation, about 600,000 organized metal workers.

At the conference the fundamental questions of the further struggle, and of the agitative and organizatory work of the revolutionary metal workers were discussed. The theses accepted show the conference to have completely rejected the idea of a split in the metal workers' union, and of the formation of an independent international. The conference took due note of the obvious aggressiveness of the Amsterdamers against the revolutionary workers, of their reactionary course during the ever-increasing attack of the capitalists of all countries against the vanguard of the international proletariat, the metal workers, and at the same time confirmed the correctness of the united front tactics and of the conflict against the schismatic tendencies of the Amsterdamers. This resolution was passed unanimously by all delegates. Only the delegate of the French Unitarian Metal Workers' Union — a syndicalist, and in addition to this just freshly impressed by the conflict at Le Havre and by the treachery of the reformists, who laid the blame for the victims of Le Havre on the revolutionists, and not on the bourgeoisie — demanded the immediate formation of a revolutionary metal workers' international. The unanimous persuasions of the whole conference were however successful in inducing the French delegate to join the majority. The conference, although expressing opposition to a split, and to the formation of an independent international, emphasized in its resolutions that the time is come

for the utmost endeavour towards gathering together the revolutionary elements among the metal workers of all countries.

The process of accumulating class-conscious revolutionary forces now developing in the revolutionary metal workers' unions, and outside of these, must be expressed in the union of all revolutionary elements on the basis of a uniform program of action.

The resolutions of the conference require that the activity of the revolutionary metal workers' groups is not to consist entirely of anti-reformist propaganda under general political slogans. Various concrete and essential demands of the present-day labor movement must be taken up and fought for. As a first task the revolutionary metal workers must attain the abolition of the craft form of union organization, and the transition to the most advanced form of union organization, to the principle of industrial unions. A characteristic comparison may be made between this conference resolution and that submitted to the metal workers' international, by its general secretary Konrad Ilk, on the question of organization. According to his point of view, the question of form of organization can be determined by the International merely by means of comrade-like advice (Swiss metal workers' periodical of Nov. 25, 1922). This comrade-like advice, which represents in its essence nothing more nor less than lack of desire and capability competent to fight, must be opposed by the clear demand of the revolutionary metal workers: one industry, one union.

Finally, an indispensable factor is the fight for the shop stewards, and the enhancement of the significance of the shop stewards as important organs of the labor movement. The German conditions, for instance, imperatively demand that the revolutionary metal workers take part in the shop steward movement, while French and English conditions demand that initiative be taken for introducing shop stewards councils as institutions fully capable of offering resistance. It is a matter of course that in the daily conflicts against the attacks of capital, in which the fight is for the defence of the rate of wages and of the eight hour day, the followers of the R.I.L.U. among the metal workers must fight in the first ranks. These are the lines indicated by the international conference.

The conference formed an international fraction centre; without in the least presuming to adopt the name or rôle of a metal workers' international, and with the intention of setting an example of international proletarian solidarity. This centre will contribute to the establishment of the closest relations and nearer acquaintance between the revolutionary metal workers of all countries. It will follow with the closest attention all events of the class war over the whole world, and will make it its endeavour to render every conflict between metal workers and capital the common cause of all the metal workers of all countries.

We reiterate: The international centre of the revolutionary metal workers does not in the least aspire to the rôle of a metal workers' international, but it is doubtless possessed with the ambition of fulfilling the rôle of an ideal example of a future international, that is, of a genuine revolutionary international metal workers' organization, already developing within the old Berne International.

Computed in years the Berne International is not old. But it was condemned at birth to ideological senility and impotence.

The Eight Hour Day in France

By Georges Levy (France).

In France, as in all countries at present, the fight against the eight hour day continues. Capitalism has just come off victorious in the merchant marine and on the railways. In the merchant marine, the law of August 2, 1919, which came into effect on February 24, 1920, decreed that the hours of labor of employees of both sexes and all ages, working on a ship, including of course, general employees, should not exceed either eight hours a day, forty eight hours a week, or any equivalent limitation established over a period of time other than a week. (Law of April 23, 1919, over the eight hour day. Art. 1.) It was an eight hour day for all ship workers. By the new decree of September 4, 1919, the twelve hour day and the substitution of two shifts for three shifts became legal for all employees except those at work on machines. It is the return of the law of 1907. The seamen have attempted to resist by a strike, but in spite of their organization and their unbroken unity, they have been defeated. The question has come before the chamber of deputies, the government has obtained its majority, and the eight hour law has been abolished in the merchant marine.

The eight-hour-day law was introduced on the railways in 1919 by common consent, by so-called agreements entered into

by the representatives of the railways and the unions. These agreements were signed by an underdirector of the P.L.M. (Paris-Lyon-Marseille) Company, by the secretary of the National Federation of Railroad Workers and a representative of the Minister of Public Works. These agreements had the force of law. They established the eight hour day for the great majority of railroad workers. There were, it is true, certain specified exceptions where the twelve hour day and even the fourteen hour day was permitted, but they were exceptions. But with the decree of September 14, 1922 modifying these agreements, the eight hour day becomes the exception and the ten, twelve and fifteen hour day the rule. But in adding to this allowance for overtime and seasonal labor, the working day may be as much as sixteen or seventeen hours. This is actually an aggravation of conditions which prevailed in the rail-roads before the introduction of the eight hour day. The syndicalist federations of railroad workers have protested, all unions, from the Christian Federation to the railroad unions of the C.G.T.U. have entered their protests. But the lack of unity in the trade unions and their weakened condition since the strikes of May 1920 permit no stronger resistance. The question has been carried before parliament, but the minister of public works has been supported by a majority of the national bloc. This means, the abolition of the eight-hour day on the railroads.

In both of these cases the government has not dared to abolish the law openly, but has succeeded in doing so by introducing in the application of the law the distinction between "Actual labor" and "Time spent at work". The latter term does not exist in the eight hour law of April 23, 1919, it only appears in paragraph 4, article 8: "Permanent allowances should be permitted for preparatory or subsidiary work which must necessarily be executed outside the assigned limit of general work of the establishment, or for certain categories of workers for whom work is essentially intermittent." It is an abuse of this paragraph which has permitted the minister of public works to abolish the eight hour day on the railways. Now the struggle is especially directed against the eight-hour day in the mines. One legal proposal for its suppression has already been placed before parliament. It concerns the introductions into the law of June 24, 1910, regarding the duration of labor in the mines, of allowances which practically amount to the establishing of a nine hour day for the miners.

The industrial and general commercial organizations which already violate the eight hour day by illegal over-time work do not doubt that, once the law is suppressed under the pressure of the great economic organizations, it will be easy to obtain a general abolition of the law by abusing the privilege of exceptions.

The Capitalist Offensive and the Working Class in Belgium

By J. Jacquemotte (Brussels).

In Belgium, as in all other capitalist countries, the bourgeoisie is striving to restore the economic equilibrium of its system by destroying the ambiguous peace pact between capital and labor, and by taking up an open offensive against wages, the eight hour-day, the right to strike and the right of combination of the workers.

As early as 1921 capitalism began to utilize the beginning economic crisis for opening the fight, this crisis throwing many thousands of workers out of work in all the factories and workshops throughout the industrial centres.

In May 1921 the number of officially registered unemployed amounted to 204,119. Of these 91,582 were completely unemployed, the remaining 112,537 being on short time. This is 32.9 per cent of all the workers participating in the unemployed insurance scheme. A comparison with other countries shows that in Belgium, unemployment is greater than anywhere else. Unemployment amounted in:

Belgium in May 1921	32.3%
United States in December 1920	29.2%
Sweden in November 1921	28.2%
Denmark in December 1921	25.2%
Norway in June 1921	24.5%
Great Britain in June 1921	23.1%
Holland in January 1921	16.5%
Canada in March 1921	16.5%
Australia in January 1921	12.5%
Germany in February 1921	4.7%

Against wages and the eight hour day.

This economic crisis, unheard of in the annals of capitalism, was regarded by the Belgian capitalists as an exceedingly

favorable opportunity for a concentrated attack upon wages and the eight hour day. This offensive was rendered particularly dangerous for the workers by reason that the reformist trade union leaders recognized the principle of reduction of wages.

Although wages in large industry were regulated on the basis of the index figures as to cost of living, the employers now refused to keep to the engagements they had entered into, and reduced wages quite arbitrarily, giving as a reason that this would bring about a general reduction in the cost of living!

But capital had still further aims in view, besides the mere reduction of wages. A special attack was prepared on the eight hour day. Capital was well aware that, to a certain extent, the best way to suppress the resistance of the workers to longer working hours is to reduce the hourly wage. But to-day the attack on the eight hour day is being openly attempted. First a preparatory campaign has raged through the bourgeois press, and now the bourgeoisie openly demands from parliament that the law regulating working hours shall be suspended for five years. A bill having this object has just been introduced into the chamber, though without the signatures of the clerical and liberal deputies. In an award regarding an extension of the law—provided in the law itself—to various categories of the proletariat excluded from its effects, the bourgeoisie represented in the supreme Industrial and Commercial Council makes the following declaration, amongst others:

"Once and for all an end must be put to the chimeras pursued by our trade union leaders and politicians, who prefer mere phrases to useful productive work."

One can clearly see from this what kind of treatment the Belgian capitalists accord to their allies of yesterday and to-day the reformist trade union leaders.

The following conclusion reveals their aims even more clearly:

"The war has not only swallowed up the tremendous and incalculable masses of capital accumulated by former generations, but at the same time the equally tremendous masses of capital which the coming generation has still got to work for, and which the war has bequeathed in the form of debt. This burden on future work is imposed by means of raising loans, and by the issue of gigantic amounts of paper money. As the tremendous burden of interest weighing upon capital effectually prevents its revival, European civilization will collapse into chaos, and will irrevocably bury beneath its ruins workers and employers alike."

The real import of this utterance is that the workers are to pay the whole cost of the imperialist war by an enslavement of daily increasing acuteness.

The first signs of awakening.

After a certain period of steadiness, the cost of living now continues to rise, a fact which has been felt with particular acuteness since the month of October 1922.

For this reason we are experiencing at the present time an unmistakable revival of the fighting spirit among the proletarian masses, who are pressing forward to the offensive in every part of the country. In the mining industry, the 8 per cent wages reduction forced upon the workers, in May 1922, by the mutual action of the employers and the social-democratic trade union leaders, has been withdrawn. The miners have been drawing their original wages again since the 15th of October. But the communist miners, who committed the frightful crime of signing a proclamation issued by the Communist Party, in which the miners were called upon to demand the withdrawal of the forced reduction of wages, have been threatened with expulsion from the trade union by the reformist leaders.

In the meanwhile, the further increase in the cost of living, as established in November, has again swallowed up the effects of the recovery of the 8 per cent wage reduction. In the metal industry the majority of the metal workers had also permitted a 10 per cent reduction of wages to be imposed upon them, this reduction being carried out in two instalments, on May 1. and June 1. At the present time however, they are demanding the restoration of their former rates of wages, but are being resisted by the employers. These latter indeed proclaim their intention of entirely disregarding the index figures when fixing wages in the future, and of paying a social wage in accordance with the size of the families. There is no doubt whatever that there will be great conflicts in the metal industry in the near future. A mill workers' strike took place recently, involving 10 mills and 1000 workers out of the 85 power-driven mills existing in Belgium employing 25,000 workers. The employers succeeded, however, in finding sufficient black-legs. Technicians and clerks sprang to the aid of the capitalists, and the strike was lost.

The case of the teachers in the Brussels municipal schools is one of great interest. The salaries of the teaching staff are

regulated by a scheme of payment applied to the whole country. The teachers of the Greater Brussels district demanded, however, from the municipal authorities, that they pay a substantial addition to them, beyond the salary paid by the state. The authorities of the city of Brussels refused however to consider this request, in view of the necessity of keeping down municipal expenses, but at the same time they decided to grant the abolition of the head tax on employees, and the road-making levies, this abolition being carried through by the clerical-liberal majority of the municipal council, and entails a reduced revenue of 8,500,000 francs for the city. These two taxes had been combatted with the utmost ferocity by the industrial undertakings, manufacturers, and house owners. The taxes on illuminated advertisements were also reduced by 40 per cent, again lessening the municipal revenues by 80,000 francs.

Upon this, the teachers carried out a one hour's strike in a great number of schools on the 6th, 7th and 8th of December. The workmen and employees of the city administration in Brussels also demanded increased wages, basing this demand on the increased cost of living.

On the 11th of December the municipal council had to decide on certain disciplinary measures moved by the magistracy. During the consultation the whole of the municipal staff demonstrated before the town hall. The mayor ordered police and gendarmes to the spot in order to maintain the law and order which was threatened by nobody, but no recourse to force occurred. The strikers were punished by being locked out for three days, with loss of salaries during this time.

The dispute is however by no means ended by this. Mere measures of "authority" are absolutely powerless to banish misery and want from the homes of the teachers and of the municipal employees.

The entry of these proletarian strata, who have hitherto held aloof from direct participation in the class war of the working class, into the arena of social struggle indicates a fresh stage on the road to the destruction of political equilibrium among the classes.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Proletarian Alliance of France and Germany

Concerning the program of action of the French Communist Party—the immediate work of uniting forces in both countries against the international bourgeoisie and for the Revolution.

By Henri Lauridan (Tourcoing).

In drafting a program of action, the delegates of the Left have tried first of all to recall the militant communists to a sense of their immediate responsibilities. This program is a landmark in the history of the French movement. One point in that program should attract the most lively attention and should determine the party to rapid action. It is paragraph 7, which treats of the solidarity of French and German workers.

The tragic history of the workers in both countries is bound together more closely than ever before. There is no misfortune of the German workers which has not its reflection in the moral and material life of the French, there is no neglect of the French proletariat which has not its sad consequences on the other side of the Rhine. The trail of conquest and of blood which follows the imperialism of both countries has been the never-ending Calvary of two peoples made to understand one another, destined to be united. The Calvary continues today, terrible for the German workers, dangerous for their brothers in France.

It is the Treaty of Versailles, that criminal and anti-proletarian consecration of the infamous war, which saw the failure of the workers' Internationals, the treason of the Socialist and Syndicalist chiefs, the auctioning off of the workers by the trade union bureaucracy, which they had themselves created with their struggles and their miseria.

The problem of reparations presses upon the German worker more heavily every day. Picture a proletarian tied to a notched wheel, which tears his flesh shred by shred every time the capitalists of both countries get together and plan their route, while pretending to devour one another in the bourgeois press, and you have a rough idea of what the German proletariat suffers and undergoes. The French worker knows nothing of this situation, except through oratorical or journalistic formulas such as "Germany will pay" or "Germany must pay", the one originated by Klotz, the other by Jouhaux. So they are blinded by

these formulas while the allied bourgeoisie of both countries profit by the situation without scruple or shame.

It is the military occupation which degrades the civilian population bound hand and foot to the caprice and exploitation of commercial merchants and industrial magnates. Tomorrow will come the occupation of the Ruhr and the enslaving of the miners in the Ruhr valley.

In short, it is the pitiless death of children, the degradation of women, the enslaving of men, it is the same class, the workers, which pays for the horrors of capitalism in every country.

The French worker passes on, indifferent. Not that he is antagonistic, nor that he retains any hatred whatever, from the war. The war? . . . Those fifty-two months of mud, of cowardice, of crime? He retains nothing from the war, that worker, except a wish that it may never come again; but he has not yet acquired the feeling of international solidarity, or the idea of his class responsibility.

Yet that worker possesses an innate generosity and an instinct of revolt which could soon rouse the French proletariat to a sense of its political mission and duty. But how to do this? Fix his attention at an important moment and guide his desire to act when the time is opportune.

The material is in the worker's reach and it is up to the revolutionaries of both countries to realize this and to profit by it. Then the union of militant Germans and French would no longer be a fantastic program but an article of faith for each and a supremely important reality.

This alliance should unite the most unknown corners of Germany and the most secluded corners of France. The least of the Communist Federations and the departmental unions of the United Syndicalists, the tiniest revolutionary provincial organs and Paris, should respond to the voice of the German workers. A special commission of communists and syndicalists should spread their propaganda by word and by mouth, through the ranks of the French proletariat.

This propaganda will disregard the stupid boundaries of frontiers. It will slip into Germany where the French militants will meet their German comrades, where the journals will reproduce articles by French revolutionaries.

And so the militants will become acquainted. They will learn to know and to respect one another, to fight together as the brothers in arms that they are. They will say in Germany "The cause of the French workers is ours", and in France, "What concerns the German workers, concerns us as well". Thus the proletariat of both countries will follow the same idea, concentrate their efforts in the same way, and prepare themselves for the same hour and the same goal.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

The Second Congress of the R. I. L. U.

By A. Lozovsky

The Second Congress of the Red Trade Union International summed up the achievements of a period of development of the international revolutionary trade union movement. The activity of the R.I.L.U. has shown how great are the difficulties with which the revolutionary labor movement is confronted in all countries. The international labor movement is extremely variegated, has different forms, many traditions and many old prejudices only being gradually overcome in the course of severe struggles. It has been the task of the R.I.L.U. to crystallize a solid revolutionary centerpiece out of the whole of this variegated international trade union movement, to collect all revolutionary experiences, and to place this at the common disposal of the international proletariat. This is a task requiring work of a most tedious nature, the greatest exertion, and the most perseverance.

At the same time the Second Congress extended our sphere of work, and unfolded a great number of practical questions and problems, upon which the revolutionary workers of all countries must concentrate their attention. There were four questions in particular which aroused the special attention of the whole congress. First the question of the united front, secondly the question of the unity of the trade union movement, further the task of organization to be carried out by the revolutionary federations, and finally the relations of the R.I.L.U. to the anarcho-syndicalist.

Those objections which have hitherto been raised against the united front, and against the unity of the trade union movement, were no longer to be heard. Some months ago voices may still have been heard against the united front, but at the congress

itself this was no longer the case. Life has proved the severest teacher. It has shown that the tactics of the united front are no empty imagining of the Moscow Bolsheviks, but the sole escape from the desperate position in which the workers of Europe and America find themselves. And if the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have been the first to resort to the united front, all honor is due to them for it. At the Second Congress the united front was no longer discussed merely as a general question, but the practical execution of united front tactics was debated, the question was raised as to what problems form the main points of interest for the working class, and what concrete problems are to be set up as a central point for our propaganda and agitation. The resolution moved on these points opens out a number of practical questions, and proposes that all revolutionary workers shall concentrate the attention of the proletariat on the concrete practical tasks of the daily struggle.

The Congress further occupied itself particularly with the question of the unity of the trade union movement. The participants in the congress felt clearly, that any further split in the trade union movement would mean the greatest possible weakening of the forces of the working class. The R.I.L.U. has, on its part, adopted every possible measure for preventing this split. With this object it has applied several times to the Amsterdam International with proposals for putting an end to the split. But at every point it has encountered the desire for a split on the part of the Amsterdammers, and has thus been forced to take up the fight not only against capital, but also against the Amsterdammers.

How can unity be attained? In all its resolutions, declarations, and references, the R.I.L.U. has expressed itself willing to enter into any kind of agreement. Naturally unity is only possible if the workers of the Left receive at least a minimum guarantee of freedom of action. The Amsterdammers shouted at the top of their voices about unity, but when the French C.G.T.U. proposed to the reformist confederation that they convene a common congress based on proportional representation, the reformists, who are in the minority in France, replied with a cynical resolution stating: we are in the majority; anyone wishing to complain can do so in our own organizations. The Amsterdammers in Czecho-Slovakia behaved in a similar manner. We for our part were, and still are, ready to re-establish unity on the condition that the minority — alike whether we or the reformists be the minority — receives beforehand a guarantee that it has the liberty to propagate its ideas — strict discipline being at the same time observed in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. The resolutions passed by the Second Congress on this subject are formulated with the utmost clarity and precision. We shall fight obstinately for the union of the parallel trades unions, for the re-admittance of the expelled, and for the creation of a real united front for the fight against bourgeois reaction.

The question of unity also occupied the leading place in the discussion of questions of organization in the trade unions. The congress had to reply to all questions on the organizational structure and work of the revolutionary trade unions. The congress was clearly aware that the slogan of strengthening the trade unions may easily be misinterpreted, and that the strengthening of the trade unions may easily signify a temporary enhancement of the influence of the reformist leaders. But the congress relegated these considerations to the background under the conviction that the strengthening of the trade unions implies a strengthening of the organization of the working class, and that the strengthening of working class organization establishes the basis of the social revolution. If the reformists derive a passing advantage from this work, this is no reason to hold us back from it. This standpoint could also be observed in the treatment of the other practical questions on the agenda. The practical tasks in the most important countries were dealt with from this point of view. The congress discussed the situation in one country after another, at the same time showing what practical tasks lie before them, when they begin to adopt the general principles and lines of action of the R.I.L.U. in their respective countries. The congress placed in the forefront of battle for all workers the united front, the strengthening of the trade unions, and the gathering together of the working masses to fight for communism by means of fighting for the daily needs of the working class.

The congress had to give a practical reply to the question of the international industrial federations. It is well known that the international federation secretariats, being under the influence of the Amsterdam International, systematically exclude the revolutionary trade unions. These tactics are excused by the statement that the trade unions in question are affiliated to the R.I.L.U. These international federation secretariats, which however only represent European federations, have thus no

scruples about isolating a considerable part of the revolutionary European workers and the revolutionary workers of the rest of the globe from the other part of the proletariat.

From the first day of its establishment, the R.I.L.U. expressed itself opposed to the immediate founding of international revolutionary trade union federations. And the whole activity of the R.I.L.U. has been in accordance with this line of action. But the R.I.L.U. cannot look on and see the revolutionary trade unions scattered, and thus even at the First Congress the question of the creation of international propaganda committees, to be arranged according to the different branches of industry, and around which all revolutionary federations could gather, was placed on the agenda.

The task of the revolutionary propaganda committees was to unite the revolutionary trade unions, and to strive to create a united international in each branch of production. Although a number of the revolutionary workers expressed the wish to form industrial and craft internationals, the congress rejected this plan. The Second Congress again emphasized the urgent wish of the R.I.L.U. to create united industrial internationals, and made it the duty of all revolutionary trade unions to exert every endeavor to attain this end. The revolutionary federations recommended the congress to keep to the corresponding international propaganda committees, and to continue their struggle on the same lines as before the Second Congress. The creation of united internationals now depends on the secretariats belonging to Amsterdam. We for our part have done all that lies in our power towards creating an international for every branch of industry.

The congress had also to solve the question of the relations of the R.I.L.U. to the Comintern, or rather that of the relations between communists and syndicalists. As is well known, the anarcho-syndicalist organizations subjected the resolutions accepted by them at the First Congress to severe criticism, especially that part of the resolutions establishing close connections between the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. The French syndicalists headed this campaign against the resolutions of the 1st congress, but themselves split up into several groups on the matter. One tendency, the so-called unity syndicalist, found the results of the First Congress sufficient cause for the formation of its own international, and was joined in this by many small syndicalist groups in some countries, with whose aid it then combatted the R.I.L.U. The German localists, and the Italian, Swedish, and Dutch syndicalists, agitated for the creation of a new international. They used as a pretext the alliance of the R.I.L.U. with the Comintern, and the necessity of founding an "independent" and in every respect "autonomous" international.

All this time the anarcho-syndicalists have been carrying on their fight against the R.I.L.U. under the flag of independence and autonomy. But among the syndicalists there existed another fairly powerful tendency, having the closest affinity with the communists, being in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and of working in common with the communists. This tendency however held the opinion that the co-operation of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. should not be an essential part of the organization, but should take place as occasion required. This group of syndicalists, whose tactics were based on the assumption that the syndicalists, and not the communists, form the vanguard of the labor movement, showed a decided wish to establish the united front with communists against the bourgeoisie. This wish permeated the resolutions of the congress of the C.G.T.U. held at Saint-Etienne. The proposals made by the French delegation at our congress were also further evidence of this wish.

The communists had come to a definite conclusion on the subject. For the communists, the connection between Comintern and the R.I.L.U. is a matter of course. We were aware that our syndicalist comrades were still under the influence of old prejudices. But as these are the prejudices of revolutionary workers who are earnestly and ardently willing to fight, and as they are not the prejudices of single individuals, but have been held by a fairly large number of labor organizations, the communists have here made perfectly conscious concessions for the purpose of enabling them to form a united front with the syndicalists against reformism and capitalism. The resolution moved by some of the delegations was based on this sentiment. We are desirous of forming a revolutionary bloc with the syndicalists, and thus we make concessions in the hope that in the course of the struggle the correctness of our point of view will become apparent. With this resolution the congress put an end to the debates between the R.I.L.U. and the anarcho-syndicalist organizations. In order that this question should be even better cleared up, the congress made a special appeal to the anarcho-syndicalist organizations of all countries, and to the Berlin bureau of the syndicalists, asking them to work no longer at splitting the international trade union movement, but to enter the *Rilu*, and to

fight within this organization, with the revolutionary workers of all countries, for the emancipation of the working class.

Mention must also be made of the trade union question in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. We must take into consideration that the R.I.L.U. is a really international organization, while the Amsterdam international is merely an European one. During the past year the Russian revolution set a new world in motion. The labor movement is developing rapidly in Java, China, Japan, and India. The Russian revolution called fresh forces into existence. In these countries the labor movement is still tinged with nationalism; especially where a struggle against foreign rule has to be carried on. But nevertheless in the midst of this gigantic revolutionary stream class strivings may be seen with ever increasing clearness. And the R.I.L.U. and the Comintern are alike confronted with the task of giving this class movement form, of imparting to it an actually revolutionary character, of filling it with the spirit of communism, that the movement may be enabled to attain the greatest possible success in the struggle with foreign and national capitalism.

The Second Congress was above all a practical congress. It centred around questions of organization, questions of practical activity. The general principles had been already laid down by the First Congress. Our program had already been drawn up in its main outlines, the revolutionary workers of all countries know our aims; the present question is as to the best method of attaining these aims. The Congress confirmed the program of action worked out by the First Congress; it confirmed it because it contains the concentrated experience of the revolutionary-trade union movement in all countries. The Second Congress has not attempted to conceal the difficulties confronting the revolutionary trade union movement. There are many tens of millions of workers still under the influence of the reformists. There are millions still under the influence of the Catholics, the democrats, the protestants, etc. And there are ten millions still outside of any organization whatever. As we are faced by a working class of which a large organized part still supports capitalist rule, the Congress has been obliged to work out its tactics and program of action accordingly.

The Amsterdam International, which represents the conservative part of the working class, is in the habit of boasting of its millions of members. We are ready to admit that the numerical strength of the R.I.L.U. is less than that of the Amsterdam International, but the R.I.L.U. is an international organization, while the Amsterdam International is merely a European one; the R.I.L.U. is composed of workers, possessing in general the same program, the same tactics, the same desire to fight against capitalism, while the Amsterdam International has many passive and reformist elements in its ranks, and on the other hand many workers in actual sympathy with us. We have followers even within the Amsterdam International while it has none in our ranks. This strengthens us and weakens the Amsterdamers. We do not over-estimate our powers, but do not want to underestimate them.

The Second Congress of the R.I.L.U. showed how great is the influence which has already been won by the revolutionary idea in the international trade union movement. The workers of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia gather round the flag of the R.I.L.U., for on this flag there is inscribed the motto of fight to the death against capitalism, and of conquest of power for the working class. How long it will be before this victory will be attained the Second Congress could not and must not say. It could only say one thing: our goal will be reached by systematic and persevering work towards gathering the masses together, uniting the workers beneath revolutionary watchwords, and untiring combat against the bourgeoisie.

The Second Congress has been a step of the utmost importance along the long road of struggle of the international proletariat for its emancipation. The international proletariat is a stage further towards organizing its forces. It will still have to suffer many single defeats in battle, but these battles and defeats only serve to steel the international organizations of the working class, the Comintern, and the R.I.L.U., and will lead the working class to final victory.

Yesterday and To-day

By Gaston Monmousseau.

In France we have been proud of our past. The revolutionists of the whole world have derived strength from the lessons of our history. But for some years we have fallen behind the other countries. We had believed that it would be ours to bear the torch of revolution, but in reality we are belated stragglers, limping on the crutches of the old world along the new path pointed out by the Russian revolution. Everyone has his turn.

And now we are in Moscow, somewhat torn from our environment, somewhat confused by new methods, but nevertheless we are in Moscow.

Once, in the year 1793, we made a revolution, and now it seemed to us that after this experience the bourgeoisie, convinced of the unconquerable power of the proletariat, would submit to it on the first day of the coming fight. We even believed that the voice of reason would induce the bourgeoisie to bow to the new order. Our ideal revolution was to come about as result of the class consciousness of the masses of workers and peasants, won over by the lessons of the new gospel, and so permeated with creative spirit that it would only be necessary to give them freedom to build up a new world.

This was the conception of the social struggle worked out by the French revolutionists, this was their strategic plan in the class war, and the federalist spirit of the anarchists was still implanted in this conception.

The revolutionists of the old school still employed the old formulas of the democratic republic: Liberty, fraternity, equality. The liberal bourgeoisie united with the anarchists in the endeavor to fill the proletariat with the false idea, that revolution is an act of sentimentality and idealism.

The French revolution overthrew the feudal regime by force. To-day the proletariat must fight through the second stage of its emancipation, and purchase its freedom with the blood of its heroes, by the sacrifice of a whole generation. These are the lessons which we draw from the Russian revolution.

The old International fell into decay through pacifism. In the name of pacifism and of fraternity among the peoples it created for itself a charmed circle and inhaled the chloroform of national sentimentality, instead of consolidating its structure with the spirit of class antagonism. In Moscow we feel as if transported into another world. At every step we lose something of our old prejudices, the vestiges of our old ideas are dispelled.

No pacifist speeches were delivered at the congress of the Profintern, but speeches on fighting and strategy. The paths of the proletariats of Germany, Russia, Bulgaria, France, America, and Japan, all lead in the same direction. In every country our class enemy reveals the same features the same will, the same strategy, and uses the same weapons, against the international proletariat.

In Moscow one is on a world peak which far out-tops the mountains and frontiers of one's native land. The army staff of the international revolution follows the manoeuvres of the enemy, and makes preparations for the fight. Various theses contend with one another, and all nationalism is shattered on the platform of the congress.

At this congress each one of us discards something old, be he German, Russian, French, Italian, or Pole; we French cast away our romantic syndicalism, but we do not abandon the whole of our syndicalism. There is much that is excellent in our syndicalist methods, and they correspond to many psychological peculiarities of the French proletariat; a harmony must be found between them and the experience and peculiarities of the labor movement of other countries.

There is a science of revolution, but this science originates solely out of revolutionary experience. The revolutionary international is the great laboratory in which we work at the common task of laying down the main strategic lines of the class war.

In France we have done everything possible to develop our movement in the direction of revolution. We are discarding the crutches of tradition, and creating a firm basis for the international movement. We shall do our utmost to give back to the revolutionary fighters who sent us here, everything which we have seen, and everything which we have learnt during our brief sojourn in Red Russia.

It is only since I have been here that I grasp the reason why the reformists, the bourgeoisie, and the so-called "ideologists" of revolution, hate the red International so intensely; i. e. because it compels our functionaries to think, it forces them to unite for action.

Thus the tares will be separated from the wheat.

THE COLONIES

The Political Somersault in Egypt

By M. N. Roy.

The correspondent of the London "Times" wrote on December 3. from Cairo reporting the resignation of Sarwat Pasha and the consent of the pro-Zaghlulist Nessim Pasha to form a new cabinet. Zaghlul himself is reported to have wired from Gibraltar, protesting loyalty to the King, whose authority as the sovereign he had before refused to recognize. It looks very

strange; and the changes are all too bewildering. But a retrospective glance at history proves that this political somersault of bourgeois nationalism was to be expected.

It is evident that the government, controlled by the Sarwat-Aly clique, is overthrown by a new combination of forces, namely an unexpected alliance between the Palace and the *Waft-el-Mosri* (Zaghlulist Deputation). The event that immediately preceded the resignation of the Sarwat Cabinet was a manifesto issued by the Waft. This manifesto, which was exceptionally hostile to the government, was launched immediately after the acting president of the Waft had had a long and mysterious interview with the King. What is the moral of this apparently strange combination? The none too comfortable experience of the last twenty months has convinced the Imperialist of the necessity of striking his roots deeper into the organism of the native society. It has been found that the thin strata of feudal lords and upper bourgeoisie, represented by those Pashas, who signed the agreement of "Independence", is not a strong enough support for the continuance of British domination. The concessions made to this class failed to reconcile the rich agrarians and bourgeoisie represented by the Zaghlulist Waft, not to mention the rebellious lower middle and small peasant operating through the militant ranks of the *Khizb-el-Watani* (Nationalist Party). The mysterious interview in the palace was evidently held for the purpose of intimating to the Centrist Zaghlulist Waft that embarrassed Imperialism, was now in the market bidding for its support. What is amazing was the quickness with which the bargain was struck. King Fuad has proved himself to be a clever bargain maker. But there have been other reasons of deeper social significance which led up to the successful conclusion of this bargain.

The social composition of the Zaghlulist Party proves that the present compromise was logically to be expected of it. Zaghlul Pasha, who had taken part in the Nationalist rebellion led by Colonel Arabi in 1882, was one of the leaders of the *Khizb-el-Uma* (Peoples' Party) organized in 1906. This first political party of Egypt was mainly composed of big landowners, high officials and the intelligentsia. It also included in its ranks a considerable number of the upper middle class, rich agrarians, merchants, students and some sections of the clergy. The object pursued by this party was not a revolution against British Imperialism, but the sharing of the right of exploitation and power with the latter. The *Khizb-el-Uma*, at least its leading elements, was very closely connected with Khedive Abbas II, who exploited its anti-British agitation in order to strengthen his position as the absolute ruler of the country. His policy was secretly to help and encourage the landowning and official elements, but to persecute the more democratic middle class leaders. The compromising policy of the Right Wing became too much for the middle class democratic elements, when Zaghlul in 1907 became a Vizir (minister) of the reactionary monarchy.

The social differentiation in the ranks of the nationalists was then marked by a split in the *Khizb-el-Uma*. It was found that the "people" were not a homogeneous whole with identical interests. The middle class found its interests incompatible with those of the landlords and upper bourgeoisie, and repudiated the latter's leadership. The radical Left Wing of the People's Party broke away and formed the *Khizb-el-Watani* (the Nationalist Party), with a program of revolutionary struggle against the British occupation. Although he could not remain in office for long in the midst of rank feudal reaction, Zaghlul did not, however, sever his political connection with the bankrupt *Khizb-el-Uma*, because his social affiliation did not permit him to endorse the petty bourgeois Extremism of the new party. He waited for the chance of playing a Centrist role. In spite of the heavy load of repression that came down upon it from the very beginning, the *Khizb-el-Watani* carried on a strong anti-British propaganda both at home and abroad, but only to be proved impotent in actual revolutionary struggle, as is always the case with petty bourgeois nationalism, which is prone to pronounce formidable phrases, but ever incapable of putting them into action. Therefore when, on the morrow of the Imperialist War, a spontaneous mass revolt broke out all over the country, the talkative petty bourgeois extremists were found entirely lacking in political leadership.

The moment came for Zaghlul to appear on the field. He wanted to utilize the acute revolutionary situation in order to impose upon England the demands of the class of progressive landlords, agrarians and upper bourgeoisie, which he represented. These classes demanded more than could satisfy the reactionary feudals, in league with the corrupt ruling dynasty. The *Waft-el-Mosri* headed by Zaghlul, was formed in order to bargain with British Imperialism over the "independence" of Egypt. In order to secure the backing of the rebellious people, the Waft had to take up such demands as would reflect their revolutionary will.

Thus, we found the Watanists putting forward such radical slogans as "Abolition of the Protectorate", "Removal of the British Army of Occupation", "Complete Intern. Autonomy", etc. But the fact that the agreement subsequently arrived at between the Zaghlulist Waft and Lord Milner differed essentially very little from the "Independence" accepted by the Adly-Sarwat combination, proves that the *Waft-el-Mosri* was not serious in putting forward these slogans. It was done simply to secure popular support.

The British government however, was so terrified by the revolutionary mass upheaval, that it failed to see the artificial tie that bound the popular movement with Zaghlulist leadership; consequently, it took some steps which strengthened that tie. The Delegation was refused permission to proceed to England. This stupidity of Imperialism made of Zaghlul, who only wanted to negotiate a *modus vivendi*, a popular hero. The mandate of the nation was immediately given to the Zaghlulist Delegation, in the form of a declaration. The subjective blunder of Imperialism, coupled with the objective situation, forced Zaghlul and his colleagues to head a revolutionary movement. They were arrested and deported to Malta. This was simply fanning the fire. The discontent of the masses broke out into open revolt which spread all through the Nile Valley. But the Zaghlulist Waft, which was brought into the limelight by a queer combination of forces and became the formal leader of the Nationalist movement in those eventful days, did not by any means constitute the dynamics of the revolt. The peasant uprising was the crucial situation, and the leadership of this agrarian revolt was in the hands of the Left Wing of the *Khizb-el-Watani* which, as a party however, was swallowed up by the Waft. This revolutionary factor in the nationalist movement, which subsequently forced Zaghlul to break up his negotiations in London, was composed of de-classed intellectuals, (students) the economically bankrupt lower middle class; the pauperized peasantry, and above all, the city workers.

During the revolutionary struggle of 1919-1920, a social re-grouping took place in the nationalist ranks; the Right Wing of the *Khizb-el-Watani* joined the Centrist Waft, whose program was to force the British government to compromise under the pressure of mass revolt, while the Left Wing understood the necessity of coming closer to the toiling masses, in order to carry out its program of complete destruction of British Imperialism. It was the revolutionary action of the latter that forced the British government to release Zaghlul and his Delegation and let them proceed to London. It was not long before Imperialism recognized its mistake, and started on the astute policy of exploiting the conflict of class interests within the nationalist ranks. There was very little in common between the landlords, rich agrarians and upper bourgeoisie, represented by the Waft, and the reorganized and rejuvenated *Khizb-el-Watani*, whose social foundation had been shifted onto the petty traders, pauperized intellectuals, exploited artisans, poor peasantry and the proletariat. Lord Milner recommended that the first should be bought off with some concessions.

But this was not to be. The revolutionary movement was still very strong and Zaghlul did not dare accept the conditions without risking his popularity, which it was yet too early to do. The present somersault of the Zaghlulist Waft ceases to be a mystery when it is known that the agreement reached in August 1920, hardly differed from the present "independence" and that Zaghlul Pasha would not have rejected these compromising conditions had he not been forced to do so under the pressure of the revolutionary mass movement at home. The Left Wing of the *Khizb-el-Watani* was quick in understanding what would be the result of such a half-way measure: it would satisfy the demands of the big bourgeoisie, rich agrarians and higher officials represented by the Zaghlulist Waft, but the condition of those classes represented by the revolutionary nationalists of the *Khizb-el-Watani*, would not be improved in any way. Therefore, the Watanists carried on their agitation among the peasant masses, and compelled Zaghlul to break up the diplomatic negotiation and return home. The policy of the Zaghlulist party during the risings of 1919-1920 also reveals how far from revolution was its object. On many an occasion, it restrained the rebellious masses from active armed struggle, on the ground that it was harmful to the nationalist cause. It shows that the bourgeoisie was very anxious to see that the movement did not go so far as to make negotiation and compromise with Imperialism impossible.

The politics of bourgeois nationalism were at a crisis when the Waft returned to Egypt. By rejecting the agreement arrived at with Lord Milner, the Waft had practically committed itself to revolution, because a greater measure of self-government could not be conquered without a violent struggle, and such a struggle could not be carried on unless the social basis of the

movement was shifted to the working and peasant masses. But such a revolutionary step was not to be expected from the Zaghulist party. It failed the movement at this critical period, and the leadership passed to the petty-bourgeois *Khizb-el-Watani*, which talked in violent terms, but could only take very feeble steps towards organizing a revolutionary mass struggle. All the Watanists could do was to declare a boycott of British goods and banks, and to make some half-hearted attempts at organizing Trade Unions. The deportation of Zaghul eliminated the social class represented by him from the political arena, and the reactionary feudal and corrupt bureaucratic elements appeared on the scene, to become the prop of Imperialism. Or in other words, the Kingdom of Heaven conquered by the Zaghulists was inherited by their political opponents. Hence the opposition of the former to the "independence" accepted by the Adly-Sarwat combination. It was not the revolutionary question of national liberation, but the conflict of class interests that underlay this opposition. It is a struggle for power. The real question is, which section of the propertied upper class shall reap the fruits of the compromise with Imperialism,—the feudal bureaucrats or the capitalists and agrarians? There is a third factor intervening in this struggle for power. It is Imperialism, which has found in bourgeois nationalism a more powerful ally. An alliance was concluded behind the closed doors of the Palace, and led to the resignation, more correctly dismissal, of the Sarwat Cabinet.

The latest political events in Egypt signify the collapse of opportunist centrism. They prove how history has deprived the colonial bourgeois of a consistent revolutionary role. In fact, its unwillingness to head a revolutionary struggle on its return from London in September, 1920, marked the exhaustion of the little revolutionary significance that the Zaghulist party possessed. It was not long before the revolutionary social forces repudiated its leadership. A general strike of the railway workers, called on the occasion of the second deportation of Zaghul Pasha in December, 1920, was not responded to by the workers. This was the first sign of the breach between bourgeois nationalism and the forces of mass revolution, which alone are capable and destined to win the independence of Egypt. Therefore, bourgeois nationalism eventually landed in the lap of Imperialism, after a spectacular career of a few eventful months, during which it was caught in the whirlwind of a spontaneous revolutionary struggle.

In a rather peculiar way, Egypt is enjoying all the sensations of a bourgeois revolution. Feudalism and reactionary bureaucracy are defeated; imperial exploitation will be carried on in the future through the medium of the native bourgeoisie. The basis of imperial rule is widened, but the revolutionary consciousness of the anti-imperialist hosts will also be quickened. Thus grows the struggle, and the day is drawing nearer when the people of Egypt will be free, in spite of the fact that British Imperialism, embodied in King Fuad, has secured the loyalty of Zaghul Pasha. It will simply help the revolutionary forces to lose another illusion.

FASCISM

The Fascist Danger in South Germany

By H. Tittel.

In South Germany, above all in Bavaria, and more recently to an increased extent in Wurtemberg, the efforts being made by the National Socialist Labor Party are most conspicuous. The latest events in Wurtemberg, the bloody occurrences at meetings in Stuttgart and Geislingen, and the shooting affairs at Goepfingen, show how immediate is the danger of a rising Fascist movement. For some weeks the followers of the hooked cross (an anti-Semitic organization) have been holding a systematic campaign of meetings in Wurtemberg. They are striving to gain ground all over the country. The national socialists carry on their propaganda with a flood of placards and leaflets. These facts show that the movement is supported by groups possessing capital.

The meeting campaign of the hooked cross followers is a systematic offensive on the part of reaction. Reaction has learnt many lessons from its defeats. It is aware that it can only be victorious when its endeavours meet with the sympathy of the broad indifferent masses. Its so-called program shows that it understands excellently how to adapt itself to the mentality of the indifferent, and to the vacillating petty bourgeois strata of the population. The national socialist movement is anti-Semitic, it is a national Greater Germany movement. It has unfortunately found a willing ear among the disappointed masses with its demagogic catchwords against Jewish capitalists, against usury and profiteering. Although the movement is militarily organized

and highly centralized, it denies having a party character. This attitude is adopted for the purpose of gaining possession of all those masses of workers who went over to the socialist parties at the time of the November revolution, and have there been disappointed with them as well as with the trades unions, by the passivity of the bureaucracy.

The adherents of the national socialists are recruited for the most part from the middle classes. Tradespeople, students, teachers, and discharged soldiers, are the most active members. But workmen join as well. Although it has been demonstrably proved that the movement is financed by the great agrarians and great industrial capitalists, still it would be wrong to assume that the organization is kept going merely by generous monetary support. On the contrary, the movement is based on a very strong idealistic (although reactionary) view. Money alone would not suffice to build up a party possessing the strength of the national socialist labor party.

This party possesses a military organization. It has, in a certain sense, active and passive members. The active members are organized in troops based on military formations. Each troop has its particular number. These troops are composed of ordinary soldiers, corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, and majors. Rank is marked on a red sleeve band decorated with hooked crosses, and with stars corresponding to the military rank. There are reasons to believe that these troops maintain close relations with the military formations of the regiments. The members of the troops are bound by oath to support each other to the death.

The spirit permeating these troops is best illustrated by the bloody events in Goepfingen. Here the Munich troop (number 247) was threatened by a crowd of workmen. The major thereupon gave the command: "Weapons out, load!" The threatening attitude of the crowd caused the troop to hesitate. Upon this the major shouted: "Will you not keep your oath?" This appeal to conscience called forth the reply: "We keep our oath!" The shooting then began. The troops are armed with rubber cudgels, revolvers, and army pistols. The arms are carried legally. The Munich troop which caused the blood-bath in Goepfingen was properly provided with licences permitting arms to be carried, and after it had been separated from the crowd by superior numbers of police, it was allowed to retain the weapons, and was escorted out of Goepfingen with the full escort of the police and placed in a special carriage attached to an express train.

The following is characteristic for the convening of hooked-cross meetings:

All the armed members of the National Socialist Labor Party, from all over the country, are ordered to appear at every meeting, so that even in places where they have no followers whatever the meeting is always comparatively large.

The occurrences in Wurtemberg show that the government of this province — the social democrat Wilhelm Keil is a member of this government — is working hand in hand with the Bavarian reactionary government. Even after the Rathenau murder no prohibition was issued in Wurtemberg against reactionary formations. It is true that NSLP meetings have now been prohibited. The national socialists will however continue to hold meetings, and the passivity of the government will enable them to do so under some other name.

The leading tactics of the national socialists are, above all, to render themselves popular among the vacillating strata of the middle class, and among the indifferent masses. We must not close our eyes to the fact that their determined attitude will gain for them a number of followers rendering them extremely dangerous to the working people.

The workers of Wurtemberg have hitherto adopted an almost indifferent attitude with regard to the national socialist movement. The proposals made by the communists in the trade unions towards organizing proletarian self defence received no attention from the great masses. But the bloody events in Stuttgart, Goepfingen, and Geislingen (in Geislingen a social democratic editor was severely wounded) have been the means of opening many eyes to the necessity of these proposals.

APPEALS

"Peace on Earth"

The Amsterdamers will deliver you over again defenceless to the wild beasts of war.

Fellow workers!

Between December 10. and 15. the conference of the Amsterdam Trades Union International and of the 2. and 2½ international was held at The Hague for the purpose of considering the best means to be adopted by the international working class against the dangers of a new imperialist war.

Such a congress was never more suitable than at this precise moment. The wretched agreement made at Washington, on the limitation of armaments in the Far East, has not been ratified up to now. At Genoa the proposal of the Russian Soviet government, to place the question of limitation of armaments on the agenda, was unanimously rejected by the great capitalist powers. At the very time when the Hague conference was holding its sessions, Poland, Finland, Esthonia, and Latvia these vassal states of the Entente, refused to reduce their armaments, although the Soviet government proposed to reduce the Russian army to 200,000 men, that is, by 75 per cent.

In all capitalist countries energetic work is being carried on towards developing air fleets and gas weapons, mediums which will play a decisive part in the next war. In September the world stood on the verge of war, when the Turks were victorious over the Greek vassals of England, and proceeded to march towards their own capital city, Constantinople, and to occupy the Dardanelles as the passage leading to this capital. Had Turkey not renounced the obvious right of being master in her own house, the world would have been plunged into a fresh Balkan war, which would have developed into an Anglo-French war.

The reparations question, that is, the question of how the Entente should best set about the work of fleecing the German people, has been transformed into a wrestling match between England and France as to who should dominate in Europe, and the relations between these two countries become more acutely antagonistic from day to day. While the position of the workers becomes daily more wretched, while the states have no money to provide the unemployed with a morsel of bread, while all cultural work is being neglected to an extent hitherto unknown, the capitalist states are expending more on armaments than ever they did before the war. Among the broadest masses of the workers the feeling is growing that it is not possible for matters to continue as they are. And all bourgeois politicians speak openly of the danger of a new world war.

An alliance with bourgeois pacifism instead of a proletarian united front against war.

The Hague congress was confronted by a great task: To gather together all the forces of the working class against the capitalist attempt to use the proletariat as cannon fodder again. But unfortunately the Amsterdammers, and the representatives of the 2. and 2½ Internationals, renounced beforehand every idea of mobilizing all the forces present in the working class for this struggle for life itself. Although there can be no actual struggle for peace unless the masses of the peoples of the Near and Far East participate in the conflict, and so long as capitalist and militarist cliques are doing as they like in these countries, still the leaders of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, of the 2. and 2½ Internationals, never even thought of inviting the representatives of the labor organizations in these countries to the conference. There are trade unions in Constantinople, in Japan, in China, and in India, which have already conducted extensive strikes, and which are permeated with the will to fight in the interest of the working class. But the arrogant representatives of the Western European labor aristocracy did not even move a finger towards getting these peoples to participate in the congress. And more than this: they deliberately kept away from the congress the three million members of the communist parties belonging to the Communist International of the whole world, although these parties have been formed by precisely those proletarian elements who fought most bravely against war during the war. They deliberately excluded from the congress the millions of workers behind the Red International of Labor Unions. They invited the Russian trade unions only.

The representatives of the Russian trade unions immediately proposed that the representatives of all communist parties and of the red trade unions be admitted to the congress, and declared to the Amsterdammers and social democrats: "We are divided from you by great antagonisms, but if you are willing to fight against war, we are with you. In this case we are prepared to ally ourselves with you despite your shortcomings, and to fight side by side with you against the dangers of war. For every other antagonism must retreat before the danger of war". The reply of the Amsterdammers to this was abuse of the communists, of whom they allege that they cause the split in the trade unions. Hereupon the representatives of the Russian trade unions answered: "Every child knows that we are opposed to the split in the trade unions. It is not we, but you, who expel minorities holding different opinions from the trades unions. But whoever may be at fault for the schism in the trade unions, we offer our help towards overcoming this schism. For strong and united trade unions are necessary for the war against war. We propose that

committees of action be formed for healing the split in every country, and for making all further schism impossible; if you will only give us the possibility of agitating for our ideas in the trade unions, we are ready to submit to trade union discipline in the conflict against capital." This proposal was scornfully rejected by the Amsterdammers.

And at the same moment when they were preventing the formation of a proletarian united front against imperialism, they allied themselves with the bourgeois pacifists. For the first time in the history of the present day labor movement, the trade unions and the political labor organizations held a congress in common with the representatives of a part of the bourgeoisie, and thus gave the bourgeoisie the possibility of participating in decisions affecting the most important questions of the labor movement.

The united proletarian front is opposed by the alliance of the Amsterdammers, the 2. and 2½ Internationals, with the representatives of a part of the bourgeoisie.

It is attempted to justify this procedure by the statement that all forces directed against war must be collected for the conflict. But this assertion is a pure swindle. The Amsterdammers have refused to ally themselves with the revolutionary workers, the only real opponents of imperialist war. They only ally themselves with the bourgeois pacifists, the overwhelming majority of whom went over into the camp of nationalism, precisely like the Amsterdammers, during the war, and aided imperialism to tear the flesh from the bones of the proletariat.

Words in place of deeds against the danger of war.

When the Amsterdammers and the 2. and 2½ Internationals, rejected the united proletarian front, and formed an alliance with the bourgeoisie, they pronounced the condemnation of the Hague conference. People who refuse to join the revolutionary proletariat, and who prefer to ally themselves with the bourgeoisie, do not really want to fight seriously against war. Imperialist war serves the interests of the bourgeoisie, and those who ally themselves with the bourgeoisie enervate and weaken the working class, and render it impotent to fight against the danger of imperialist war. And thus we have witnessed that the Amsterdammers, the 2. and 2½ Internationals, actually went so far as to make speeches for the war against war, oblivious to the fact that at the same moment in Lausanne, the allies were throwing a noose around the necks of the Turkish people endeavouring to force a new Versailles peace on the Orient, the sure forerunner of a fresh war. The intervention of the representatives of the Russian trade unions was required as a reminder that in January there will be fresh decisions made by the great powers in regard to the reparation question, which may render the situation very acute all over the world. But all the endeavours of the Russian delegates failed to persuade these remarkable pacifists

to organize even so much as a demonstration strike,

which should show the international bourgeoisie that the proletariat is beginning to gather its forces against imperialism. Instead of organizing the fight against the danger of war, the Amsterdammers threatened an international strike in case of war. To these threats the representatives of the Russian trade unions replied that an international strike against war would be a trial of strength demanding the complete equipment of the proletariat. When war breaks out, every nationalist passion is unchained, military laws are proclaimed, and self-defense is only possible to a proletariat equipped and trained by years of uninterrupted class war. How can the proletariat be prepared for a revolutionary fight against the outbreak of war, when years of coalition policy have yoked it to the chariot of the bourgeoisie, when it has become accustomed to renounce all revolutionary propaganda against the bourgeois idea of defense of native country, when it possesses no illegal organizations, when it has delivered all weapons into the hands of the bourgeoisie?

Break with the policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie!

Fight to the utmost against the policy of defense of the native country!

Prepare the working class for the war against war, agitate in the army!

Open up relations with the working masses in the Near and Far East, and in the colonies!—

These were the watchwords of the Russian trades unions. These are the watchwords of the Communist International and of the Red International of Labor Unions. These watchwords were replied to, without causing the slightest protest in the congress, in a speech by Emile Vandervelde, former chairman of the 2. International and subsequent royal Belgian minister, in which he expressed himself in favor of defence of native country, and defended the reparations policy.

And in the commission of the congress the former secretary of the 2. International concisely declared that, should war break out, the social democratic parties and the trades unions would be obliged to act as they did in 1914, that is, betray the proletariat.

Camille Huysmans told the truth about the sort of conflict against war carried on by the Amsterdamers, the 2. and 2½ Internationals. At present they threaten with the international general strike against war, but they do this solely to keep the working masses quiet, and will deliver these over to imperialism, bound hand and foot, for they have no intention of fighting against the bourgeoisie. Those who have for years renounced all idea of fighting against the bourgeoisie, will not rise against it when it is an actual matter of life and death.

The united proletarian front against the danger of war.

Fellow workers! The Hague conference has proved that the leaders of the Amsterdam Trades Union International, of the 2. and 2½ Internationals, are not ready to fight against the growing danger of war, that on the contrary they are doing everything to make such a fight impossible. If you do not want to be dragged defenceless on to fresh battle-fields and annihilated in millions, you must gather together in factories, workshops, and mines, in town and country, even against the will of your leaders, to form a united front of the fighting proletariat. You must gather together in one united proletarian front, without thought of party differences, or another unity may be your lot — the unity of death on a common battle-field. You must overcome the paralyzing influence of the reformist leaders, who split your ranks and ally themselves with the bourgeoisie. You must begin to-day to fight the war danger in every country, with the greatest energy; you must liberate the masses from the influence of imperialism, you must render them capable of rising like one man against the danger of war. The masses of workers in the victorious capitalist countries must learn to recognize that they are no less defeated than the masses of the vanquished capitalist countries. They must recognize that if they do not oppose the rapacious raids of their governments, it is not the bourgeoisie of the conquered countries that will pay tribute, but the masses of the working people in these countries, that these will sink to the level of Chinese coolies, and will be driven by want and misery to work on terms of slavery, enabling the bourgeoisie of the victorious countries to force their workers to accept starvation wages. The workers of the vanquished capitalist countries must recognize that it is not in coalition with their own bourgeoisie, but only in

unity wit the proletariat of the victorious countries, that the chains of Versailles, Trianon, and Neuilly can be broken.

The whole international proletariat must gather around Soviet Russia, the sole proletarian state power opposing the organized power of 150 million human beings to the rapacious policy of international imperialism.

Down with the imperialist policy of the capitalist governments!

Down with the Versailles treaty of peace!

Long live the united front of the proletariat against the danger of war!

Away with the coalition with the bourgeoisie!

Away with the reformist leaders, who render the proletariat incapable of fighting!

Long live the Communist International!

Long live the Red International of Labor Unions!

Moscow, 19. Dec. 1922.

The Executive of the Communist International.

The Executive of the Red International of Labor Unions.

The E. C. C. I. and the R. I. L. U. to the Workers of the World.

Just recently two international proletarian congresses, held in Moscow, finished their work: one, the Congress of the Communist International, and the other, the Congress of the Red Revolutionary Trade Unions. More than sixty Communist Parties from all parts of the world and representatives of the Revolutionary Trade Unions from both hemispheres drew up a plan of immediate operations against the increasingly arrogant aggression of capital.

Workingmen and women: You have felt the weight of the capitalist attack. There is hardly a country where the employers' organizations are not, with all their might, oppressing the working class. The bourgeoisie is striving to restore its collapsing industry undermined by the criminal, imperialist war. It is striving to meet its monstrous war debts, to reestablish its shattered financial system, to preserve its huge profits and protect itself against any outburst of discontent on the part of the proletariat. It seeks to do all this at the expense of the labor, of the health and welfare of the working class. With ruthless cynicism the capitalist class lengthens the working day, cuts wages, imposes ever-increasing taxation, suppresses the resistance of the workers by lock-outs, and endeavours to establish a state of war for the workers by mobilizing its armed gangs of Fascisti.

Instead of doing away with the huge expenditures upon armies and fleets, on the maintenance of armed gangs, of hordes of police, instead of adopting a policy of peace and thus releasing enormous sums of money for ameliorating the condition of a tortured and ruined population of unemployed invalids of war or peace, hungry children and proletarian mothers, the bourgeoisie is feverishly building new instruments of destruction, and the menace of war once again hovers over the world. Simultaneously the bourgeoisie is sucking the last drop of blood of the proletariat and is snatching the last crust of bread from the children of the workers.

While in Soviet Russia, ruined by imperialism, life is becoming easier, in capitalist countries it is becoming more difficult and painful. In spite of the frequent proposals of the Proletarian Republic to disarm, the capitalist states in all countries are fostering militarism. The position will become hopeless unless the working class mobilizes all its forces.

Both the congresses mentioned above therefore call upon you, Comrades, to form a United Front against capital!

Form a United Front against those who lock you out; form a United Front to secure an eight-hour day; to prevent the capitalists from taking your last farthing from you; to prevent them throwing you out on the street, and to prevent them from imposing heavier burdens of taxation upon you.

Unless you form this United Front you will be beaten in sections. For that reason our Congresses resolved to strive in the first instance to bring about the unity of the industrial movement at all costs. The bourgeoisie, however, has very useful assistants — the Social Democrats and the Labor Leaders. Just at the moment when it is necessary to unite all the forces of labor, these gentlemen, who have sold the proletariat to Stinnes, unite in the Hague with the bourgeois pacifists and expel the Communists from the Trade Unions. This is an infernal conspiracy against the working class. Could the bourgeoisie themselves think of any better method than to disorganize the forces of the workers just at the moment when the capitalists are hurling a savage attack against them?

Comrades! We call upon you all, irrespective of Party; we call upon all honest workers and all suffering working women to rally to the defense of the unity of the Trade Unions. Do not permit the agents of capital to disrupt the unity of the working class. Protect this unity with your firm proletarian hands.

The Reformist Socialist Parties and the labor leaders are acting on the direct instructions of the bourgeoisie, which is endeavouring to beat the working class in sections. At the same time, however, they are endeavouring to deceive the working class by cunning manoeuvres.

In Germany, the Social-Democrats are playing at being in the „Opposition” while the head of the Party, Ebert, is the President of a Stinnes Republic. In Italy the Reformists are pretending to oppose the Fascisti when, as a matter of fact they are supporting them. In England the leaders of the Labor Party defend the British Government which is crushing Ireland with blood and iron. As a matter of fact all the Reformists desire to restore civil peace at the expense of the working class. For that purpose they must split the Trade Unions. That is why they must split the Labor Movement.

Our Congresses have united the revolutionary Trade Unions much more strongly than they ever were before. Our Congresses have instructed their executive bodies at every opportunity to appeal even to the Amsterdam organizations, even to the Social-Democrats, to take up the joint struggle against

aggressive capital. But in this we must have the assistance of the masses of the workers.

Bring pressure to bear upon your leaders! Compel them to form a United Front, and if they continue to resist, form this United Front without them, and remove all obstacles in the path of the United Struggle.

The experience of the struggles of the Working Class has shown that the capitalist governments refuse to touch even a part of capitalist profits. They refuse to introduce a single reform or make a single important concession to the Working Class. Therefore we say:

You Must Unite to Secure a Workers' Government!

You must fight for a government of Labor organizations. Put your faithful representatives at the Helm of State. Drive out the henchmen of the capitalists, the bankers, the stock-exchange brokers, and trust magnates.

The Labor Youth is with us. At the last Congress of the Young Communist League, recently held in Moscow, our watchword of combat against attacking capitalism was supported with burning enthusiasm in the name of millions of young workers.

The poor peasants and agricultural laborers should march with us. The IV. Congress of the Communist International has imposed the obligation upon all Communist Parties to unite and organize the rural reserves of the Revolution, who in their struggle against the landlords cannot but come into conflict with the existing capitalist government.

The oppressed colonial peoples are coming to our side, including the young proletariat of Japan and China. Only the Communist International and the Red Labor Union International support the movement in the colonies against the money bags of London, Paris and New York.

Our motto is:

**Unity with the Labor Youth; Unity with the Rural Poor;
Unity with the Oppressed Peoples in the Colonies. All
Forces against the Monster of Capitalism.**

Our Congress also discussed the question of fighting the most shameful thing of our day, — the Versailles Treaty — and other so-called peace treaties. Against these treaties, which are supported by Vandervelde, one of its authors, against these treaties, which the Stinnes Social-Democrats dare not attack, we have decided to conduct a ruthless war.

Comrades! Rise against these hellish treaties!

They bear the seeds of new wars. Already new fleets, new guns, and new aeroplanes are being built. We must get ready to resist new impending destructive wars.

At the Hague we, in the name of the Comintern, proposed that a United Front be formed against war, but our proposal was rejected. The leaders of the Second International passed a resolution about a general strike, but this is a base deception, for they have not repudiated the principle of national defense, i. e., the defense of the bourgeois state. Through the mouth of Huysmans they declared that in the event of a new war they would do again what they did in 1914. They formed a bloc with the bourgeoisie, and refused to form a bloc with the revolutionary wing of the Labor movement.

Comrades! Proletarians! Which path will you take? For which bloc will you fight? Will it be for unity with the bourgeoisie, which is attacking you, which is crushing you and taking your last from you?

Say No!

Say you will fight for the *Unity of the Working Class!*
Down with the capitalist offensive!

Long live the Unity of the Working Class!

Long live Unity with the rural poor and the oppressed colonial peoples!

Long Live a Workers' Government!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Zinoviev.	Smeral.	Carr.	Katayama.	Neurath.
I. Selund.	Stürmer.	Souvarin.	Gennari.	Schefflo.
Zetkin.	Gramsci.	Pruchniak.	Safarov.	Hörnle.
Kuusinen.	Bukharin.	Schatzkin.	Kolarov.	Schüller.
	Mac Manus.	Garden.		Radek.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U.

Lozovsky.	Watkins.	Dimitrov.	Georg.	Tomski.	Pruchniak.
Garden.	Kalinin.	Andersen.	Kunitaro-Ando.	Haiss.	Josa.
Nin.	Monmousseau.	Heckert.	Foster.	Tresso.	

The 10th All-Russian Soviet Congress to all Peoples of the World

The 10th All Russian Soviet Congress, the supreme legislative organ of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, once more solemnly reiterates, in the name of millions of proletarians and peasants, its will to peace and to peaceful work.

The workers and peasants of the RSFSR, again raise a warning voice against the renewed threats of war, the orgy of armaments among the capitalist governments, the disgrace of the Versailles treaty, and the colonial machinations of the bourgeois states.

Workers of the world! All of you who long for peaceful work, join your forces to those of Soviet Russia for the attainment of our goal of peace, of salvation for humanity from annihilating war.

The soviet power, rising out of a revolution, began its activity in the year 1917 with an appeal for the conclusion of a just and universal peace. Since that time it has continued to emphasize this fundamental principle of its foreign policy. In the year 1919 it applied to the United States with proposals for peace. In February 1919, when troops of the "great powers" occupied our revolutionary land, it proposed to take up peace negotiations with all the "allies". It made repeated overtures of peace to Poland and Roumania. At Genoa Soviet Russia and her allies proposed general disarmament. When this proposal was declined, the proletarian government attempted to carry out the policy of disarmament at least within the limited sphere of the states lying nearest Soviet Russia, with the hope of later extending this sphere. But even this hope was blasted by the refusal of Russia's neighbours to agree to an actual limitation of their armies.

Despite all this, Soviet Russia trod the path of disarmament alone, and within a short time reduced her army from 5 millions to 800,000, and is continuing to disarm by a further reduction to 600,000 men. She has thus proved her will to peace by actual deeds. Not by words, not by resolutions, not by promises, but by deeds.

To-day, when the peoples are languishing under the consequences of the imperialist war, when the greatest economy in all materials is of the utmost necessity the policy of the bourgeois governments is doubly criminal, for they plunge the peoples into ever increasing misery instead of aiding them to peace and peaceful work.

The 10th Soviet Congress solemnly confirms the peace policy hitherto pursued by Soviet Russia, and appeals to all to support this policy. All peoples must demand peace from their governments. The workers of the whole world must unite to defend themselves against the danger of threatened war. Peace at all costs must be ensured for humanity, tortured and tormented, exploited and starved.

Chairman of the 10th Soviet Congress: M. Kalinin.

Secretary of the 10th Soviet Congress: A. Enukidze.

IN MEMORIAM

To the Memory of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht

By Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

The fourth anniversary approaches of the day on which Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, together with a large number of the German proletariat, testified their loyalty to Communism with their lives. Although four years have gone by, the event remains in our memory as fresh as the first horror at the news of the murder of our leaders through the police of Scheidemann and Noske.

If our hearts still bleed, if we continue to miss our murdered leaders more keenly than ever, it is because we admire Rosa and Karl, not simply as revolutionary martyrs, but also as great revolutionary tacticians. Memorial days and traditions are not matters of indifference to us Communists who wish to abolish Capitalism and replace it with Communism. For we know that the bourgeoisie is determined to check us by the most brutal means, that we will only succeed by employing the strongest measures of defence; therefore we recall with pride every attempt at revolutionary rebellion, and honor those of our revolutionary champions whom the bourgeoisie spattered with blood. At the present juncture, when the most important duty of the communists is to unite the masses and to prepare them for the struggle, we

have a special reason to consider how Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht succeeded in leading the masses for the Revolution, even at a time of the greatest apathy and of sterile reformism.

The indignant outcry against the treachery of Social Democracy on August 4, 1914, the courageous struggle against national slaughter and persecution, despite martial law and in spite of trenches and prisons, the unselfish devotion to the first revolutionary struggles of the working class after November 1918, all these were only the consequence of a generation of stubborn, unremitting toil in the service of revolutionary enlightenment under the most difficult conditions. Rosa Luxemburg relentlessly hunted down Opportunism and Reformism to its very roots. Energetic practical opposition and thorough theoretical annihilation of reformism supplemented and served each other. No one saw more clearly than Rosa Luxemburg, the threatening danger of an imperialist war, she pointed out these dangers and, at the same time scathingly attacked the Social Democratic Party for its failure to take measures to avoid these dangers. In order that the masses should better understand her warning, she combined her propaganda with an attack upon Imperialism, to which the masses were themselves in opposition. In particular she turned her attack upon militarism which, by its treatment of the soldiers, aroused against itself the most apathetic proletariat. It was in this propaganda that she found herself fighting side by side with Karl Liebknecht, who, in his active work in the Youth Movement, fought this same enemy of youth. Liebknecht pointed out, at the same time, the close connection between militarism, armaments and heavy industry, and by the revelation of the Krupp scandal, achieved remarkable success in arousing the great mass of the people to an understanding of the close connection between these phenomena.

How little Comrade Luxemburg confined herself to a purely negative resistance to reformism is shown by the way in which she connected her fight against the Social Democratic Bourgeoisie coalition policy (militarism) in France, with an exposure of the inner hollowness of the policy of mere demonstration and obstructionism of the Social Democratic Party in the Reichstag. No one before had demonstrated so forcefully and convincingly the necessity of preparing for the revolutionary barricade-struggle through a really revolutionary conquest of the masses. She proved in a masterly fashion, that an apparently purely parliamentary question of the three-class suffrage in Prussia, (a suffrage which conferred votes according to taxation) could be used as a revolutionary propaganda vehicle. What the Social-Democratic bureaucrats would have treated as a mere farce, she tried to turn into a serious beginning of the mass struggle. What was

degraded by the bureaucrats of the trade unions and the party to an empty threat of a general strike, she attempted to use as a live weapon of class strike for concrete ends which the masses understood. Even when the flood of revolution surged high, she did not allow herself to be carried along, but, in spite of her glowing heart, warned the *Spartacus Bund*, at its initial conference in December 1918, against all illusions, and declared herself emphatically in favor of a revolutionary application of trade union and parliamentary work. She had as little to do with the fanatics gathered about Otto Rühle, as with the spineless slaves of the bourgeoisie from Heine to Scheidemann. Above all she hated those who were neither warm nor cold, such as the learned Ausiro-Marxists gathered about Kautsky, who, in that decisive period, threw themselves into the camp of the Scheidemann Social Democracy and hence of the bourgeoisie.

The work of Karl Liebknecht was no less fruitful. Of a similar temperament but of less theoretical clearness, he hesitated or exaggerated here and there. His keen perception of the real state of consciousness of power on the part of the proletariat balanced his zeal for the Revolution. No one understood as well as he, both during and after the Revolution, how to talk to the masses and to sweep them along with him. Despite the sharpness and pointedness of his criticism in the *Spartacus* letters, it was he who held together the roughly organized opposition elements. Only shortly before his death he struggled vigorously to keep solid the alliance of the revolutionary workers and the Independent Socialists. He was, even more than Rosa Luxemburg, during the war and after that November day of 1918, the genial spokesman of all revolutionary minded workers.

To the Social Democrats, tactics come before principle. In the case of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, as with every true revolutionary, sober knowledge and tactical shrewdness were in the service of principles and their development.

For Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, like Leo Jogisches and Eugen Leviné, had learned directly and indirectly from the revolutionary activities of Russia. Thus they made use of this precious knowledge which only the Russian Bolsheviki had had opportunity to acquire. But through the Communist International, this knowledge continues to bear fruit amongst the revolutionary workers of the entire world. The decisions of the third and fourth congresses of the C.I. concerning revolutionary strategy, contain fundamentally the very lessons which Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht taught and acted upon. To continue in the spirit of the martyrs of the German Revolution today, we must prepare for the final struggle of the revolution with all means which lie equally far from disintegrating reforms and mere word-propaganda.