

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

---

Official Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International



## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

After the British Empire Conference.

Was this Conference the great success it was advertised to be? Is the Empire splitting up or has it been pulled together?

J. T. Murphy

The Consequences of the Miners' Lockout

"Spectator"

French Socialists and Imperialism

15th February, 1927  
Vol iv. No. 2,

3d.

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

English Edition Published at 16 King Street, London, WC2

## C O N T E N T S

A WEB OF LIES Editorial ... ..	2	FROM "THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION" TO COUNTER-REVOLUTION J. Duret ... ..	16
THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE BRITISH MINERS' LOCKOUT "Spectator" ... ..	6	THE NEGRO PROBLEM William Pickens ... ..	19
FRENCH SOCIALISTS AND THE COLONIAL QUESTION J. Duret ... ..	10	PILSUDSKI AND THE QUESTION OF UKRAINE AND WHITE RUSSIA G. Turin ... ..	21
AFTER THE BRITISH EMPIRE CONFERENCE J. T. Murphy ... ..	13	"VENERABLE" OPPORTUNISM L. ... ..	22

## A Web of Lies

THE dress rehearsal of the plot to provoke war, arranged by the leaders of the German Social Democracy on the direct instructions of the international bourgeoisie has proved a failure. The masses have such confidence in and sympathy towards the Soviet Union that the provocators have failed in their principal aim—to sweep the masses off their feet by the suddenness of their attack, to stun them by the "sensational" character of their "revelations," and to use the consternation sown among the masses to take such aggressive measures as would inevitably lead to the catastrophe of war.

The experience of all wars and interventions that have taken place since the proletariat first came out on to the arena of history as a class conscious force, shows that unless preliminary moral preparations are made to paralyse the will of the masses, the bourgeois general staffs cannot begin operations. There is no doubt that future wars between various imperialist groups, a fresh attack against the U.S.S.R., or open military intervention against the Chinese Revolution will be preceded by similar preparatory moral poison-gas attacks. There is no doubt also that the international bourgeoisie will impose the duty of preparing "public opinion" in this way upon the leaders of Social-Democracy and upon the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

This, among other things, explains the exceptionally tender feelings which the most bellicose circles of the bourgeoisie, particularly of the British bourgeoisie, entertain towards the German Social-Democratic leaders. The secret entente cordiale which binds Lord Birkenhead with Scheidemann, and the mutual services rendered to each other by Breitscheid and the British Intelligence Department are by no means accidental; for British imperialism is systematically striving to utilise the German Social-Democratic leaders as their cannon-fodder contractors.

The "hand grenade campaign" is not the first and, of course will not be the last page in the shameful history of the activities of the German reformists. It can be foretold with certainty that the failure of one campaign, however complete it may be, will not induce the German Social-Democratic leaders to lay down their weapons of slander and provocation, for the simple rea-

son that the assassins of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the executioners of the proletariat in the German revolution, these professional blacklegs have no other "historical" mission to fulfil in the epoch of revolution.

THE failure of the anti-Soviet campaign is not only due to the fact that Scheidemann failed to give even a superficial appearance of probability to his sensational allegations that there was some connection between the Soviet Union and the reactionary German militarists. Not a single Scheidemann in the world, however much he may believe in the potency of slander, could hope that the masses, if they understood anything about affairs at all, would not contemptuously reject this revolting and provocative lie. They hoped, however, to pull the trick over before the masses realised what was happening. The aim of the "hand-grenade campaign" was to repeat the trick of the notorious Zinoviev letter the effect of which lasted only about a day, but long enough to help the Baldwin Government to reach power.

But the aims which reaction strove to achieve in circulating this Social-Democratic forgery were much more complicated than the winning of an English General Election. Their aim was to enable the Social-Democrats to join the Government of the "big coalition" in the capacity of the sworn agents of British imperialism and to perform this operation amidst the roll of pacifist drums. German Social-Democrats have before this accepted confidential commissions from the British Foreign Office, but because the bellicose plans of British imperialism are acquiring a more active character, the obligations of service of the Social-Democrats are becoming more and more complicated and their contact with the British Intelligence Department more direct. The entry of Scheidemann and Wels into the big coalition under these circumstances would imply that the organisation of intervention against Russia would become their direct practical task. Under such circumstances it becomes particularly essential for them to don the mask of pacifism.

In order to conceal the real aim which induced the Anglo-French bourgeoisie to drag the German Social-

**A Web of Lies**—continued

Democrats into the Government, it was necessary for them to substitute some other motives.

Why, indeed, does the diplomacy of London and Paris try so hard to get the Social-Democrats to join the Government? Why are they trying to impose these allies upon Stresemann? It seems, if we are to believe the "Vorwaerts," that this is done because it is intended to commission them to fulfil the functions which hitherto have been fulfilled in Germany by the Entente Control Commission. According to "Vorwaerts," Scheidemann's demonstration was intended to show that "the biggest party in Germany stood with unqualified determination for the observance of existing treaties and maintained relations of sincerity with neighbours . . . This made the continuation of control superfluous. . . ." ("Vorwaerts," December 17.) But control of what? and against what? What are the special tasks that European reaction sets itself in relation to the German Government, that it cannot content itself with the servile superloyalty of Stresemann and must re-insure its interests with the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party?

**T**HE real meaning of Scheidemann's demonstration was to show the unqualified readiness of Social-Democracy to go to any length to "protect" peace-loving, pacifist, adored Anglo-French imperialism against the attacks of the bellicose Soviet Union. The hand-grenade provocation was intended to make the masses believe that the Soviet Union was preparing for war, that it was the attacking side, that the imperialists were imbued with the most altruistic and tender sentiments. The extent to which Social-Democracy serves as a direct agent of the British General Staff, and directly sets itself the task of intervention, is seen from the statements made by the Russian Mensheviks, who as is known, are with Otto Bauer on the "Left flank" of the Second International. The following, for example, is what the "Sotzialistichesky Vestnik" of December 20th writes concerning the "Soviet Hand-grenades."

"As is known, two motives are intertwined in the foreign policy of Bolshevism. One, so to speak, bears the character of an ideological striving, by methods peculiar to Communism, to force the development of a world social revolution. The other bears a directly practical character—the fight against England, which is to some extent the continuation of the traditional Anglo-Russian rivalry in Asia. In the flourishing period of Russian "Communism" this made itself felt in the Asiatic policy of the Soviet Government, the principal instrument of which, as is known, is "the revolt of the oppressed peoples." In the interests of the struggle against England, Communist propaganda of rebellion came to a halt on the frontiers of Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey. Its place was taken by aid to the Governments of these countries. . . .

"But the flourishing years of Communism have passed long ago. The task of forcing the world social revolution has dropped into the background. . . . On the contrary, rivalry with England becomes an end in itself, for which the world social revolution serves merely as a pretext. Rival-

ry with England becomes the axis of the foreign policy of Bolshevism."

This passage contains the whole philosophy of the Social-Democratic "grenadiers." A direct agent of British imperialism, officially receiving pay from and openly maintaining contact with the British Intelligence Department, could not say more than these leaders of the Second International. On the basis of this theory, the Scheidemannists collected and circulated their "horrible revelations" for the purpose of scaring petty bourgeois philistines.

If the situation was actually as it is described by international Menshevism; if indeed the only guarantee of peace lies in the Christian sentiments and lofty virtues of British, American, French, Italian, German and other militarists—worthy recipients of the Nobel peace prize!—and if the only malignant power which disturbs this pacifist idyll is the Soviet Union, for whom "rivalry with England has become an end in itself," then anti-Soviet military intervention is not only permissible, but even obligatory. In that case the leaders of the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals are quite right in striving to strengthen the power of and protect the poor peace-makers, i.e., the international imperialists, in order to weaken and destroy the wicked disturbers of peace, i.e., the Soviet Union.

Then the indignation of "Vorwaerts" over the fact that the Red Army takes the liberty, without even asking the permission of Austen Chamberlain and his Social-Democratic agents, to improve the technique of its power of resistance and fighting capacity is perfectly "legitimate." Then the revolting cynicism with which the Chamberlains, Hindenburgs, MacDonalds and Scheidemanns call upon the Soviet Union to disarm and humbly to wait for the imperialists to come with their air squadrons and poison gas to put an end to the proletarian dictatorship in the country, is quite appropriate.

The "exposers" are so blinded by their hatred towards the Soviet Union, however, that they fail to observe that this philosophy exposes them to the world as the malicious agents of intervention and destroys all confidence in what they say against the Soviet Union, even among reformist workers. Can the workers be expected to believe what these agents of intervention say about the Red Army, that in a sort of blind preparation for self-destruction, it is helping to arm the forces of reaction, i.e., the very forces which represent a danger to the proletarian revolution and particularly to the fortress of the proletarian revolution, the Soviet Union? The "exposers" fail to observe this "trifle." They are so detached from the masses that while carefully working out all the details of their anti-Soviet campaign they lose sight of a factor like the affection which the broad masses of the workers of all countries entertain towards the Red Army!

The failure of the campaign, however, does not mean that the Scheidemannists will refrain from making further preparations for war against the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, they will endeavour to rectify their mistakes by fresh "revelations." They will resort to the aid of the white guard forgers of documents, and, no doubt, will find some new "sensation" to thrust upon the world. It has been reported in the press that the heroes of the Second International propose to transport the grenade corpse from Germany to France, apparently with the hope that the miraculous talents of Grumbach and Ren-

**A Web of Lies**—continued

audel will be able to revive it for the benefit of the French. The Socialist sheet "Populaire," in its quest for new sources of financial inspiration, with the aid of which it hopes to resume daily publication, is preparing to decorate its first number with the Berlin sensation!

But whatever further efforts and tricks the provocators may resort to, the hand-grenade campaign stands self-exposed. Its educational value as a dress-rehearsal for the war consists in that it objectively demonstrated the alignment of forces that will exist at the moment immediately preceding a military conflict. This experiment has provided the masses of the workers with the opportunity of seeing what role the reformist leaders will play at the critical moment, and to become convinced that the bourgeoisie dare not begin open intervention against the U.S.S.R. until Social-Democracy has prepared the minds of the masses for it. The military forces of the bourgeoisie will go into action only after their Social-Democratic agents have managed by a furious political attack to break the bonds of proletarian solidarity which bind the masses of all countries to the Soviet Union; until it has wrecked the centres of unity of the Labour movement in all countries—which by now have become more or less strong—and have drugged the minds of the masses.

**T**HE second and not less instructive lesson to be learned from the recent campaign is the obvious role of the ultra-Left leaders as active provocateurs of war. Of course, there was no reason to doubt, even before this, that the deliberate policy of the present ultra-Left wing was inevitably leading them into the camp of the counter-revolution; but it was hardly possible to foresee that they would rush into this camp so quickly and in so revolting a manner.

Practical experience in the struggle has shown that the ultra-Left "Communist" leaders are as necessary to the bourgeois General Staffs, for the purpose of preparing for war, as the reformist leaders. The speech delivered by Schwarz in the Reichstag was not simply the garrulous outburst of a miserable reactionary who does not know what he is talking about, but a carefully prepared and essential part of the general plan of provocation. It is not an accident, of course, that the Left Social-Democratic press publishes a verbatim report of Schwarz' speech, any more than is the care which "Vorwaerts" is exercising to conceal its connection with the Fischer group. For example, in a leading article on the "hand-grenade" campaign it quoted extensively from a report made by Fischer which, it is alleged, was intended "only for the members of the group," and "Vorwaerts" carefully explained that this document came into its hands "quite by chance." The political police of course, will forgive Schwarz and his comrades for counterfeiting Left phrases, however red-hot they may be, for the sake of their provocative attacks against the U.S.S.R. It is worth it.

The Communist Parties of all countries must see to it that these lessons of the "hand grenade" campaign are learned by the masses of the workers.

It would be an unpardonable mistake, however, if we thought that the failure of the Scheidemann cam-

paigned indicated that the military preparations of the bourgeoisie were inadequately thought out. On the contrary, events of the last few weeks have shown that these preparations are being made systematically and in all directions, that the menace of the military plans of international reaction is very real indeed. At the very height of the "hand-grenade" campaign in Germany, a Fascist revolution was brought about in Lithuania and a complicated manoeuvre was begun by British imperialism in China. The bourgeoisie is rapidly unfolding its plans for an offensive against the revolution on an international scale.

It would be superfluous to attempt to prove that Great Britain and the bellicose Polish reactionaries were at the back of the Fascist revolution in Lithuania. The smoke-screen which the Fascist diplomats of Lithuania tried to set up, by declarations of irreconcilable hostility towards Poland and of loyalty toward the treaty with the U.S.S.R. will, of course, deceive nobody. The British Government openly inspired the conspirators, demonstratively refused credits to the former government of Slazhevitch, and more than hinted that these credits were refused as a punishment for Lithuania's refusal to join in the armed encirclement of the U.S.S.R. The present Fascist Government of Lithuania did not long continue its efforts to calm public opinion, by assiduously concealing its slavish dependence upon British capital and pretending to refuse to come under the yoke of Pilsudski. The heads of the four executed Communists were a peace offering to the International Stock Exchange, and the price Voldemaras and Smetona paid for the confidence of London and Warsaw. This gift will be followed by others. Savage terror against the Communists and the trade unions, against the workers' and peasants' organisations will perhaps satisfy completely the most exacting Birkenheads.

But the bloody sacrifices of the Lithuanian terror will serve to remind the workers and peasants of all countries of the price British imperialism compels its vassals to pay for its "friendship." The fate of Lithuania is the fate that directly menaces a number of other countries, particularly Finland and Latvia. Only the untiring vigilance and organised activity of the proletariat, unity of the trade union movement, contact with the peasantry, and international solidarity of all toilers can avert the bloody menace of Fascism and war.

**T**HE "new" policy of British imperialism in China has also been very rapidly deciphered by the Chinese people. Sir Miles Lampson arrived in China with a most tender concern for the Chinese people, but with a disproportionately long tail (even for a British diplomat) of cruisers and destroyers. British naval and armed forces soar like hawks over the most important centre of the national revolutionary struggle. The "conciliatory" memorandum sent out to the diplomatic corps in China by Mr. O'Malley, which was taken to signify the official inauguration of a new British policy in China, has already been given its proper valuation in the note of the Canton Government. In this memorandum the British bourgeoisie, under the mask of a desire for peace and conciliation, desired to legalise the financing of the Mukden counter-revolution, and to open for Chang-Tso-Lin and Sun-Chuan-Fang new sources of financial supplies in the form of customs revenues.

**A Web of Lies**—continued

The British "peacemakers" are striving to bring about a split in the revolutionary movement; they are trying to utilise the vacillating elements of the Chinese bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union and develop military intervention on a much wider scale. This "new policy" finds particular expression in the British bourgeois press which, in chorus, as if guided by a conductor's baton, assiduously points out that there are various elements in the national revolutionary movement in China. Even the "Daily Mail," in shouting headlines, talks about "Anti-British Demonstrations," and "Chinese Workers Demonstrate against Britain." In this way the workers of China, as hardened sinners, are separated from the "nationalists" who can be morally healed by O'Malley's memorandum and Lampson's cruisers. The same newspaper, in reporting the alleged attack on the British concession, consoles its readers with the fact that this attack was made by the "common soldiers" and that the Cantonese officers saved the lives and property of the foreigners and thus "averted a tragedy."

The same policy of contrasting the workers of China to the other classes which are taking part in the revolutionary movement is being adopted by other newspapers, particularly by the "Times." British diplomacy is openly relying upon a split in the revolutionary movement in China, which it hopes to bring about by playing up to the bourgeoisie, and the wavering elements and to crush those who refuse to submit to its charms (i.e., the best forces of the Chinese people) by armed force.

This policy is being conducted in the guise of a campaign against "Moscow Bolshevism," i.e., the Bolshevism which, according to the impartial opinion of the experts of the Second International, is the sole cause of the misfortunes of the imperialists in China.

Is British imperialism convinced that it will succeed in deceiving the Chinese people, who are the constant witnesses of the sanguinary practices of the British "peacemakers"? Hardly. If they did harbour such hopes, then the wave of mass meetings which spread over China in reply to the British Memorandum should have disillusioned their minds. But the bait of the "new policy" is intended not so much for the Chinese people as for the British workers. It is the British workers that the British Government is trying to convince that a new policy of conciliation is being adopted in China.

Hence this policy represents, in different circumstances of time and place, of course, a repetition of the "hand-grenade" campaign of the German Social-Democrats. In order to further their plans of war, the British bourgeoisie must break up the solidarity that exists between the German proletariat and the Soviet Union, and for this purpose calls in the services of Scheidemann and Schwarz. In order to further its plans for intervention in China, the British bourgeoisie must break up the solidarity that exists between the British proletariat and the Chinese Revolution. And for this purpose calls in the services not only of Miles Lampson, but also of Ramsay MacDonald. The pacifist and Christian MacDonald pretends that he does not see the armour-clad tail of Miles Lampson and tries to convince the British workers that the Foreign Office "has been doing its best

to get into amicable contact." ("Socialist Review," January, 1927, p. 1.)

But, if the British are "doing their best" to reach an agreement, then the responsibility for the failure of an agreement being reached must fall upon the Chinese. This will provide the British Government with the opportunity of coming forward as the injured party and charge the Chinese people with being the attackers. In fact, MacDonald is already saying this. In a previous article he says:

"If the Canton Government refuses to accept the agreement [offered by the British Government] it will have to bear the responsibility for all unpleasant incidents. For the time being the British Labour movement must adopt an attitude of caution and not allow itself to be carried away by demonstrations and utterances by Communist intriguers. These utterances and demonstrations not only will not lead to peace, but on the contrary will strengthen and encourage those elements in the Canton Government and in China generally, which are trying to make a conflict with England inevitable."\*

In order to prepare the ground for war against the U.S.S.R., Ramsay MacDonald is striving to break up the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee. In order to prepare the ground for intervention in China, he is trying to persuade the British workers to adopt a cautious, i.e., a passive and treacherous attitude towards the Chinese revolution. In both cases the reformist leaders are striving to break up the solidarity of the workers in order to free the hands of predatory imperialism.

The VII Enlarged Executive of the Communist International referred with great emphasis to the approaching danger of war, and reminded all Sections of the Comintern of their duty, in their everyday work and on the basis of concrete demands, systematically and persistently to prepare and organise the masses of the toilers for the fight against this danger.

The theses on the international situation and the tasks of the Communist International which were passed by the Plenum say in this connection: "It is necessary to bring to the forefront of the everyday agitation a campaign against the menace of an imperialist war and it is necessary to explain to the proletariat the extreme danger of war, and the need to be prepared to convert the imperialist war into civil war."

The events which have unfolded themselves in the brief period since the VII. Plenum show how real the danger is.

The proletariat of all countries must be on their guard!

\* Retranslated from the Russian—apparently the original is in MacDonald's articles in the "Socialist Review" for December, 1926, or in "Forward." Similar phrases about "Communist intriguers" occur in the "Socialist Review" article for January, 1927.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**

The subscription rate for the new edition of the "Communist International" is 8s. 6d. per year, post free.

# The Consequences of the British Miners' Lockout

By "Spectator"

THE British miners' lockout assumed greater dimensions than any conflict between labour and capital that has yet taken place. One need only point out that the maximum number of working days lost during one year through strikes and lockouts in England occurred in 1921, when there was a three months' strike in the mining industry and 85.87 million working days were lost. As a result of the miners' lockout alone the number of working days lost in England up to the end of October, 1926, already amounted to 126.15 millions, and by the end of November was probably much more. If we add to the miners on strike those workers who were compelled to stop work as a result of the shortage of coal, we find the number of working days lost in connection with this strike exceeds by far the number lost during all the social conflicts since the war taken together! For the years 1919-25 this loss comprises altogether 194.42 million working days, while for the seven months of the strike the number of working days lost amounts to 220-240 millions.\* The "Economist" is right in saying that the losses as a result of the mining lockout alone exceed by 12 times the losses caused by conflicts between labour and capital in England on the average for the last 25 years. This shows what dimensions the class struggle reached during the past year!

## British Capitalism's Strength

Such a shaking of the whole social organism of the country was naturally bound to influence its economic system, and one can only be astonished that on the whole British capitalism withstood this most violent attack. Indeed at the beginning of the strike it seemed that in Great Britain, where capitalism is undoubtedly on the decline and all post-war crises are being very painfully experienced, capitalism would not be in a condition to withstand a further and continuous blow such as that received from a long strike. However, this most decrepit system not only withstood the blow, but as the first months since the end of the strike have shown is gathering new forces in order to fight the capitalists on the European continent, who have endeavoured to seize her markets during the time of the strike. Therefore, an analysis of the influence of the strike should not only show the consequences that this strike will inevitably have for the subsequent destiny of British capital; it should also show the sources from which British capitalism gathered its strength during the time of the struggle, and what ultimately enabled them nevertheless to withstand the economic upheavals caused by such a long strike. The last question is important for us because it throws special light on the political and social significance of such encounters as the one that has just come to a finish.

\* Reckoning that during 7 months on the average 1,500,000 workers were not working.

Above all it is necessary to establish, in so far as this is possible, the exact dimensions of the strike. Without counting the General Strike, there were 1.1 million mineworkers drawn into the strike. By the end of the strike this number had decreased. If we are to believe the British economic press, by the middle of September about 100,000 miners were at work, in October about 160,000 and by the end of November about 390,000. Thus until November there were about one million miners on strike.

Further, the total number of unemployed increased as a result of the strike. Whereas the number of unemployed in England prior to the strike and not including the miners on strike amounted to about one million, by the end of May there were 1.6 million and in November still 1.55 million unemployed. Of the workers unemployed owing to the strike 350,000 were completely unemployed and 250,000 partially unemployed. In general, the "Economist" considers that as a result of the strike from one and a half to one and three-quarter million workers have been unemployed. If however it is borne in mind that in Great Britain the total number of workers employed is about 17 millions, the figure of one and a half to one and three quarter millions amounts to about 10 per cent.; as compared with the number of workers insured against unemployment it amounts to from 12.5 to 14.6 per cent. The Minister for Labour even reckons the labour loss during the time of the strike as 15 per cent. ("Times," Sept. 15, 1926.) If we take the whole yearly balance of labour of the entire working class of Great Britain, we have an approximate decrease of work of 6 to 7 per cent.

## Losses due to Lock-out

The "Economist" gives various calculations of these losses in values. While at the beginning of October the Chairman of the Board of Trade calculated the losses from the strike as £250-£300 millions, the "Economist" reckoned them at £350 million, adding another 15 millions for special expenditure in connection with the strike. What proportion of the total income of the country does this sum comprise? Estimates of the total income vary greatly: the most competent estimate amounts to £3,600,000,000 per year. This would mean that the losses from the strike amounted to almost 10 per cent. of the entire income. This is very probable, as the productivity of labour in those branches of industry which suffered most from the strike—mining, iron smelting, engineering and cotton—is highest of all, and as a result the difficulties in these fields of production, were bound to reflect on the general position of the country.

How was this expenditure covered? It should be borne in mind that those workers who lost work as a result of the strike, not taking part in the strike itself, received unemployment grants to an extent of 18s. per

**Consequences of Miners' Lock-out**—continued

week for adults and 7s. 6d. for juveniles, with an additional allowance for families. On the average it is considered that every unemployed worker received £1 a week. As about 400,000 families became unemployed as a result of the strike, they received £400,000 per week relief or £12,000,000 in thirty weeks, of which the Government advanced £11,000,000 to the insurance funds. As far as the striking miners are concerned, they received no support from the insurance fund and by special decision of the judicial authorities they were also deprived of the right of receiving poor law relief, only their families having the right to receive this. During the strike the number of people receiving poor law relief increased by 1,200,000 in England and Wales alone. On an average this relief amounts to 12s. a week for the women and 4s. for a child. The "Deutsche Allgemeinezeitung" of October 27, from which we take all this information, reckons that during the first six months of the strike the State and the Guardians granted £20,000,000 in various forms of relief.\* This paper, like other organs of the employers, at the same time forgets that from the losses of the strike as calculated, there should be deducted at least 40 to 50 per cent. on account of wages. Consequently, the losses of the workers even if we take the figures of the "Economist" as an average and most likely to be correct, amount to between £140,000,000 and £175,000,000.

**Decreased Consumption**

How did the workers cover this loss of wages? They endeavoured to make up the loss with their former savings, the support of the remaining trade unions, through the co-operatives which granted them goods on credit, and most of all by reduced consumption. There are not yet any accurate data on consumption by the masses, but this fact cannot be doubted. This is shown by the decreased imports of cotton, wool, butter, cheese, etc. In other words, the same thing happened as during the imperialist war, which obtained its resources at the cost of reduced consumption on the part of the masses of the people. So now also the decreased consumption on the part of the workers enabled British economy not only to withstand the decreased home production but also the decrease in imports.

Consumption on the part of the ruling classes, as also the accumulation of capital, hardly stopped at all. This is shown by the fact that the receipts of British enterprises for the third quarter of the present year increased. Although this was not very much, at any rate they grew by 2.8 per cent. as compared with the previous quarter and comprise (according to the calculations of the "Economist") £24,000,000. Consequently whereas the tempo of increase of the income of enterprises was not so rapid as during the preceding quarters, when the increase was 8.3 per cent. or 7.6 per cent. for the first quarters of 1926, it was nevertheless considerable.

In exactly the same way we see that the accumulation of capital did not stop, as in the third quarter of 1926, the new capital issues put out were double those

for the same period of last year. Whereas during the past year the issues for the three quarters amounted to £22.8 millions, this year they amount to £36.0 millions and during October and November, to £55.1 millions.

**Capitalist "Prosperity"**

Further we see that shares in Great Britain also showed an upward movement. (The shares of 20 large companies in October, 1926 were higher than the corresponding rates of shares in October, 1925). In the same way the bank deposits remained at a very high level and do not show a tendency to decrease. This shows that the receipts of the employers, in spite of the tremendous strike, either did not decrease at all or only decreased to a small degree. Nevertheless there is no doubt that entrepreneurs suffered certain losses. However, as a result of the strike they will rapidly make up for these losses. According to certain calculations (Stein, London correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt," of Nov. 22, 1926), the increase of working hours in the mines and the reduction of wages amounts to 20 per cent. According to our calculations, miners' wages have been reduced by about 10 per cent. and the working hours lengthened by three-quarters to one hour. It is not difficult to explain what significance this will have. In 1925 the total coal produced cost £180,000,000, of which £137,000,000 or 76 per cent. went to wages. A decrease on wages by 20 per cent. means, therefore, saving £27.4 millions per year. Further, there is no doubt that other employers will also try to lower wages and place all the burden on the working class, who will have to bear the expenditure of this social struggle just as they had to shoulder the burden of the losses caused by the war.

Another question is—how could the country get on without coal and iron during such a long period? We have been accustomed to consider these things the fundamental elements in the country's economy. It would seem that their absence would deal a fatal blow to the entire organism. The production of coal and iron stopped almost completely during seven months. Nevertheless not only was no progressive disintegration of economic life noticed, but on the contrary a strengthening was to be observed. There has been a decrease of unemployment during the last few months, while the export of manufactured goods, above all of machinery, has increased.

**The Deficit of Coal**

Let us first examine how the deficit of coal was covered. We must reckon that the total decrease in production amounted to 130,000,000 tons (according to the "Manchester Guardian Commercial") as a small quantity of coal was extracted in the mines near to the surface (about 10½ to 11 million tons). During this time export decreased approximately by 27.2 million tons, counting from May to October. Besides this the export of coke and briquettes also decreased, so that on the whole we must consider the decrease of coal exports to be 30,000,000 tons. Deducting this amount from the total deficit, we get as a result approximately 100,000,000 tons. On the other hand the import of coal for this period was approximately 18,000,000 tons. Thus the deficit is reduced to a little over 80,000,000 tons. Fur-

\* The editor of the "Economist" in "Wirtschaftsdienst" of November 26th estimates the poor relief given by the Guardians as altogether £6,000,000.

**Consequences of Miners' Lock-out**—continued

ther, a certain increase in the import of oil is to be observed, which amounted to 240,000,000 gallons.

The reduced consumption is still of more importance. The coal consumed at the pits themselves is about 9% of the total extracted and the consumption of the miners themselves is 3.7 per cent.. Thus, as neither the mines nor the workers were consuming coal, the consumption of coal decreased by 13 per cent. or approximately 11,000,000 tons. As the strike took place mainly during the summer months, the consumption of household coal was also not considerable. Only after October did the demand for household coal increase, and at the same time prices rose, reaching four times the cost in November. Further, the consumption of the iron-founding industry, which amounts to 7.8 of the total, greatly decreased.

It should also be borne in mind that in Great Britain there were reserves not only at the pits, but also in various depots. As is well-known, the distribution of coal in the country was centralised and conducted in the same manner as during the time of war, i.e., according to the card system.

**The Effect on Industry**

One may sum up the total result of reduced coal consumption on British economy as follows: the production of cast-iron was reduced most of all. The number of blast furnaces working decreased from 147 to five. The production of steel, which before the strike amounted to 661,000 tons per month, decreased to 46,000 tons in May, to 34,500 tons in June, and to 32,000 tons in July, rising again to 92,900 tons in October. Other branches of industry also suffered, but to a much smaller degree. This may be seen by the export of manufactured goods. For instance the export of cotton goods decreased during the period May to October from 2.48 to 2.19 milliard yards and the export of cotton yarn decreased from 105 to 91 million yards—by 13 per cent. The export in woollen goods decreased from 75.8 to 69.9 million yards—8 per cent. Meanwhile the export of cast-iron dropped by 264,500 tons to 97,400 tons, i.e., to one-third, the export of steel and iron goods in general from 2,160 to 1,430 tons, and the export of railroad material from 253,000 to 136,000 tons. Here we have a much more considerable reduction of productivity than in the remaining branches of industry.

We thus get the following result: coal for domestic purposes which is usually only consumed in the winter (comprising about 34,000,000 tons) was consumed during these months to an extent of not more than one to two million tons. The gas and electricity works and railroads, which usually consume 38 to 40 million tons, could only satisfy their demands by one-half; so that for industry substantially speaking there ought to have been no coal left. But, we observe that it continued working, this was partly by replacing coal by oil, and partly because it had sufficient reserves with which to maintain its existence.

**Reserve Stocks**

This shows that in present day society, reserves created by production enable the capitalists to hold out during a long struggle. From the example of Germany

we saw that during the imperialist war this country was in a position to conduct an extremely destructive and costly war for two years mainly at the expense of the reserves of various kinds of goods and raw material in the country. The same thing has evidently been repeated in Great Britain. There is no doubt that British capitalism was saved thanks to the reserves of coal which were not at the pits but in the hands of private persons. As we have already said, after October a sharp rise in prices began, which pointed to the exhaustion of these reserves.

In other fields of national economy it was much easier to become adapted to the situation. The stoppage of the production of raw material and of semi-manufactures actually led to their being imported from abroad, and to an increase in the development of the manufacturing industry! For example, we observe that the export of machinery from Great Britain during the first four months of 1926 shows a very considerable increase as compared with the corresponding period of 1925. And then from May to November there is a fairly considerable increase, almost of 35 per cent.! This field of British economy was saved by the over-production existing in world economy. Great Britain was able to obtain relatively easily the materials she needed, in order to maintain the most important branches of her manufacturing industry.

**Effect on World Industry**

We have already said elsewhere (in our article in Vol. III., No. 2 of the "C.I.," 1926) that world production during the first few months did not entirely cover the decreased production in England. This was not because it was unable to raise its own production to such a height, but because it consciously limited production in order to be in a position to raise prices, and also in order not to have to refuse to keep on workers after the end of the strike; this in view of the social and economic consequences is not always advantageous for the employers. But on the whole the British strike had a tremendous influence on world economy. It is sufficient to point out for instance, that the German mining industry before the strike was on the verge of bankruptcy. The national economy of Poland and in a number of other countries was in an extremely serious state. The influence of the British strike on national economy was first of all shown in the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse" of Nov. 21, 1926. It wrote:

"The million British miners who from May 1, stopped working the mines and prevented sufficient production, these million British workers have determined the fate of world economy to a greater extent than all the international negotiations, Leagues of Nations, conferences and 'good-will.' For the direct results which every country has had from the British strike, whether in the form of increased production, improved export, improved financial balance, decrease of unemployment, improved currency, increased shipping receipts, better utilisation of merchant shipping, increased purchasing power, etc.—the various forms of their influence will only be seen a few months after the end of the strike, and only then can it be taken into account. Since the first month of last year, immediately before the strike, the crisis



**Consequences of Miners' Lock-out**—continued

of over-production which was caused by over-industrialisation, particularly in Europe, took such a serious form that one might have supposed that this over-production would lead industry to an impasse. For it was just in those countries in which industrialisation had reached the highest level and which had the greatest reserves of coal and iron, that this crisis was the most sharply felt. . . ."

The paper then goes on to enumerate the advantages which all these countries obtained from the British strike. Among these observations the following should be pointed out: "When in May of this year, the British General Strike broke out, there was a complete currency chaos in the money market. Polish, Roumanian, French, Belgian, Italian and Spanish currency fell from day to day. There were some weeks when it seemed that at least some of these countries would have to experience the same currency catastrophe which Germany and Austria had experienced. The British strike saved them. . . ."

"Finally, attention should be given to a new factor which (it is true not practically, but morally) played an important role. In exactly the same way as the British General Strike, so in the present instance with the miners' strike, capitalism and socialism measured their forces in a contest in which the victory of the Labour Party would have imbued all other Socialists with the hope and courage for proceeding on the same path. The experiment, however, did not succeed and it transpired that it was better to agree to a less favourable compromise without a strike than to resort to pressure by means of the trade unions. This lesson should make the responsible leaders of the trade unions refuse big strikes and occupy a more peaceful position in conflicts with capital. If, thanks to this, tranquility reigns between capital and labour, this will not be the least important result of the great seven months' strike of the British miners."

**Support for International Capitalism**

That is how the capitalists estimate the strike, and that is why the international capitalists actively support the British employers. That is what gives them assurance in themselves for the future attacks against the workers. Hence it is quite clear why the stock exchanges were so triumphant at the defeat of the British miners.

It is evident that the hopes of this newspaper and of stock exchange circles are hardly destined to be realised, as the competition of Great Britain on the coal market is already beginning; competition in the iron-founding market is not felt as Great Britain is slow in taking over the production of raw material and semi-manufactures, in utilising cheap foreign semi-manufactures. But there is no doubt that in this field also the situation is getting worse, the crisis is becoming accentuated, and social conflicts will break out anew.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the strike in Britain did not achieve its purpose to a considerable extent owing to the support the British employers received from the world capitalists. Of course, this support was displayed in the form of money-lending exploitation of the situation, the sale of coal to Great Britain at extreme-

ly high prices (in April the price of coal to England was 14s. per ton, while by the end of October the price of Ruhr coal had reached 75s.). In exactly the same way prices rose for all products of the iron-founding industry. But nevertheless the possibility of being able to receive a sufficient quantity of products such as coal and iron and semi-manufactures helped British industry to hold out during the long strike.

Another question is—how was Great Britain in a position to pay for such greatly increased imports? During 1925, Britain's financial balance was not very favourable. This year, according to the calculation of Keynes, there should be a deficit in the balance. According to Keynes there should be a favourable balance of 38 millions during the first three quarters, while in the fourth quarter there should be an unfavourable balance of £21,000,000. Where could Great Britain still find resources for the export of capital, since during the first three quarters it exported capital to an extent of £72,000,000? The answer to this question is probably to be sought on the one hand in accurate calculation of income from capital abroad, and on the other hand in the support which the banks of other countries, especially America, gave to Great Britain, supporting the rate of the English pound on the world stock exchanges by their credits. A certain role is also played here by speculation on increased prices in Great Britain owing to the decrease of wages, and the purchase of British bonds abroad (which is just the same as the import of foreign capital).

**Political and Economic**

Consequently there is an extremely intricate network of mutual relations between British and world economy thanks to which the blow dealt to British economy could be parried. The direct result is that the smashing of British capitalism or of capitalism in any other country, exclusively on economic grounds, is inconceivable. It is quite evident that the struggle must be carried on to another plane, the political plane.

Here we will not deal with the question as to what difficulties would confront the British proletariat in order to maintain power in its hands if it were to defeat its enemy politically, as this question lies on quite another plane. Here we will merely assert the fact that a victory over British capitalism on purely economic grounds was inconceivable, on the one hand because of the tremendous reserves at the disposition of the British capitalists, and on the other hand in view of the strong support they received from the international capitalists, whereas the international proletariat, with the exception of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. and the Communist vanguard, did not show sufficient solidarity.

*The Weekly Paper for All  
Communists*

**WORKERS' LIFE**

*Temporary Address:*

**254, Grays Inn Road, London  
W.C.1**

# French Socialists and the Colonial Question

J. Duret

**F**RENCH and Belgian Socialists have for some time been devoting a good deal of attention to the colonial question. The reason for this can be easily seen. Communism has acquired great popularity among the colonial peoples. Nationalist movements are developing and becoming more and more of a menace to the capitalist world.

The Social-Democrats, true to their role of supporters of the existing regime, have thus been forced to try to find political formulæ capable of: (1) attracting a certain number of natives to the Socialist Party, thereby counter-balancing Communist influence; (2) preventing the colonies severing connection with the "mother" country, and safeguarding exploitation of the former by the latter, which is indispensable if a crisis for capitalism is to be put off.

Recently the imperialist ideology of Social-Democracy came very much to the fore among the Belgians in connection with Chinese events.

The Socialist ministers of the King of the Belgians protested emphatically against the audacity of China, daring to break the treaty which since 1865 placed China in a state of absolute servitude. In order to call China to order they did not hesitate to appeal to the great imperialist powers declaring that not only Belgian interests but the interests of entire European capitalism are at stake. We quote here the declaration which Debrouckère,

a Socialist (he belongs to the Left Wing of the Party and is the Belgian delegate to the League of Nations) made in connection with this:

"In 1865 we concluded with China, just as the French and the British did, one of these famous treaties which are termed 'unequal.' It secured to us just as to the other powers, a privileged regime. . . . On this basis we developed big economic interests in China—railways, electrical power stations, tramways, road and street services, banks . . . . The treaty of 1865 left to us Belgians alone the power to denounce it—no reciprocity for the Chinese; but on April 16, 1926, the Chinese representative in Brussels wrote to me repudiating the treaty by October 27th. This is a downright violation of international law."

And further:

"We are convinced of the righteousness of our cause; this is a matter not only for the Belgians but for the whole of Europe and its future in the Far East."

Still further:

"China for the Chinese, just as a little while ago in Angora it was Turkey for the Turks, and we Belgians are nothing but scapegoats in this affair. By standing up for our rights we defend the interests of the whole of Europe." (La Liberté, December 11, 1926).

Thus "Comrade" Debrouckère confesses that he represents in China the interests of European imperialism.

## Books YOU Must Read!

### On The Road To Insurrection *N. Lenin*

140 pages  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free, 1/8]

**I**N the pages of this brilliant book we follow the mighty genius of Lenin through that intense period in Russia following the "July Days" until the final seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in November, 1917. The problems that the Russian working class met with, and, under the guidance of Lenin, solved during these months, are akin to the problems that the working class in every other country has also to prepare to face.

### The Political Meaning of The Great Strike

*J. T. Murphy*

138 pages  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free 1/8]

**T**HE only book on the General Strike. A convincing explanation of the reasons for the Strike, of its "failure" and of the changes it must bring in the whole of the Labour Movement in this country.

### Ten Days That Shook The World *John Reed*

368 pages  
Paper covers, 2/6 [post free, 2/9]  
Cloth covers, 4/6 [post free, 4/10½]

**T**HE book which Lenin read three times and of which he said: "Unreservedly do I recommend 'Ten Days That Shook the World' to the workers of the

world. Here is a book which I should like to see published in millions of copies and translated into all languages . . ."

### The State and Revolution *N. Lenin*

Second Edition  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free 1/7½]

**T**HE book that more than any other gives the essence of Lenin's theory of the transition to Socialism. Lenin finished the book a few weeks before the October Revolution of 1917 confirmed the correctness of his analysis.

Order your copies from the  
**Communist Bookshop**  
16 King Street WC2

**French Socialists and Colonial Question**—continued

The speech delivered lately by Vandervelde in reply to the interpellation of our comrade van Overstraten is in the same strain, but not so outspoken.

The French Socialists, who are not yet in power and who do not have to keep strictly to the language of "statesmen," need not for this very reason, take up such a definite attitude. But the underlying intentions are the same.

To give an adequate characterisation of the attitude of the Socialist Party with respect to this question, we will analyse the speech made by Lagrosilière (an expert on the colonial question) at the National Congress of the Socialist Party, May 26, 1926, a speech which was very much applauded by the whole Congress.

The speech contained three essential theses:

1. That the ties between the colonies and the mother country are becoming closer and closer, hence impossibility of separation.
2. A criticism of the slogans of internationalisation of the colonies and of their evacuation.
3. The slogan which should be advocated by the Socialist Party: assimilation of the colonial peoples (natives must become Frenchmen and must be given equal political rights).

The following quotations will throw light on the first point: "It is obvious that the colonies have become part of world economy, but they enter into it through their capitalist mother countries with which they are closely linked up, at least from the economic viewpoint, and will become more and more linked up, going necessarily through their evolution within the framework of the present social order, until this framework is broken up by the transformation of capitalist ownership into social ownership." Thus it is made perfectly clear that up to the establishment of the Socialist regime, the colonies will be closely linked up with the mother country. Therefore, all movement for independence is Utopian and must be combatted.

Social-Democracy is fulfilling its mission.

And further down, to demonstrate that the colonies could no longer do without their mother countries:

"Just as the population of these mother countries, proletariat or bourgeoisie, could not at present do without the produce of the colonies, the natives of these colonies, the populations of which are mostly much bigger than those of their respective mother countries, will be less and less able to do without the manufactured products of their brothers, the workers of the colonising states."

We can see that it is for their own good that the colonies must remain tied to the mother country.

Let us now examine the second point:

Lagrosilière is making an energetic stand for the retention of France's colonies:

"To place the colonies under the ægis of the capitalist condominium which calls itself the League of Nations seems to me as Utopian and as calamitous as the formula of evacuation pure and simple proposed by the Communists.

"To evacuate the colonies means to deliver them to the greed of all the capitalist States without restraint. (Cheers.)

"Their subordination to the 'protection' of the

League of Nations means to substitute for the tyranny of one colonising State, which weighs heavily on them to-day, the collective tyranny of all the colonising States. (Applause.)

"The principle of mandates generalised and applied to all the colonies? Just look at Syria: imagine Tunis placed under the direction of Mussolinian Fascism, and you will understand the apprehensions which the denationalisation of the colonies under capitalism suggest to us. . . .

". . . . As to the colonies which are already within the pale of their mother country, who does not see that their denationalisation just as their evacuation are impracticable and irrational and that, if it were ever attempted, it would cause more conflicts and more disruption than was ever caused by their colonisation."

Translated into simple language Lagrosilière's grandiloquence means:

It is all very well for the Socialists of countries without colonies to demand the internationalisation of the latter; we French Socialists do not believe it, France has too many colonies.

Finally Lagrosilière brings forward the slogan which should be that of the Socialist Party: assimilation.

He begins by attacking the slogan of autonomy:

"The natives are just like other people and that is why we want justice for them as much as for the others. But being human beings just like others, they have their passions, their hatreds, their fanaticism. (Applause). It is not so certain that they would not use their autonomy in order to persecute, destroy or eliminate in their turn the colonising element, which is far less numerous than their own element.

". . . . Therefore there can be only one formula to explain and designate the Socialist colonial policy: that of assimilation. . . .

"It is the policy which has the object to gradually raise the natives with all the concern, the precautions and transitions demanded by their mentality, their customs and their respective civilisation to the same political intellectual and moral level as the children of the nation, to give them the same means as the colonists and the other French citizens have to defend their interests, to participate in the management of public affairs, to get attached to their mother country with their hearts as well as with their minds, with their feelings as well as with their interest, in order to establish in close collaboration with it, that political and economic confederation of which I spoke just now and which will have to be the last stage of their evolution in capitalist society, prior to the transformation of the latter into a collectivist or Communist society.

"This assimilation is something more than the form of the Socialist colonial policy which we advocate—it is its substance; it fuses with it. Moreover, the fact that it is the traditional policy of Republican France should give it all the more value in the eyes of Social-Democracy.

"Moreover, every people can only colonise according to its temperament or according to the genius inherent in it.

"Great Britain has been autonomist. France, a Latin country, has always been, with a very few exceptions, assimilationist."

**French Socialists and Colonial Question**—continued

We hope that what we have given above puts the question clearly. We will try to analyse it.

No doubt this slogan of assimilation can be tempting to the natives.

When they are deprived of all rights and treated like beasts, or pariahs—to be given the same rights as Frenchmen must be bliss indeed. But is it a bliss which can become a reality within the framework of the capitalist regime? We answer with a decided "No!"

Imperialism can only exist through fierce exploitation of the colonial peoples.

The reverse of the medal of "democracy" in the mother country is generally the reign of the cudgel and the stick in the colonies.

To-day in the period of disintegration of the capitalist world, this oppression cannot help becoming more acute. Efforts are bound to be made to shift the burden of the crisis which is descending upon France on to the shoulders of the colonies.

In order to demonstrate the Utopian character of this slogan we have only to refer to the speech of this same Lagrosilière. The latter is one of those people who can be designated as colonial aristocrats.

The inhabitants of Martinique have been enjoying for some time the rights of French citizenship.

Translated into concrete language the slogan of assimilation means: give the other colonists the same position as the inhabitants of Martinique. Well, this is what Lagrosilière has to say:

"The latest form of this policy can be seen in Martinique and Guadeloupe—it is Fascism pure and simple . . . . The courts are there only to sentence and throw into prison citizens who arrogate to themselves the right to criticise their actions (the actions of the rulers), or on the other hand to condone the worst crimes of those who praise them . . . .

"The dissolution without legal reasons of Municipal Councils and of the States General, to replace them by assemblies of Mamelukes who know no other moral law

but that of vileness, servitude and denunciation; the organisation of masquerades in the form of assemblies to consult the people, suppression of all control over electoral practices by the use of armed forces, keeping away electors from the ballot boxes, the manufacture at the end of the ballot of false votes, from time to time the shooting down, without the shadow of a pretext, of electors who have the naiveté to believe in French justice—all this has happened in the Canton of Ducos in Martinique, where two of our Socialist councillors, brave and worthy active workers, were shot in the back by a gendarme for whom the Governor who had ordered this crime asked the Cross of the Legion d'Honneur immediately afterward."

"In the Diamant Canton in the same colony and on the same day twelve workmen were assassinated in a most cowardly fashion and twelve others were injured for the reason that—an imaginary reason to boot—a gendarmerie officer in command of a machine-gun corps had had his cap cut with a penknife!"

Well, that is what we witness in an "assimilated" colony, a real idyll, an earthly paradise—and this is the ideal which the Socialists propose for the colonial peoples.

But the slogan of assimilation is not only impossible of realisation, it is profoundly counter-revolutionary.

What is in fact the role assigned to it? That of a weapon against the Nationalist movement.

If one is for assimilation, one must oppose everything which nationally differentiates the natives, their customs and habits, their hatred for the invader, one must prevent any attempt at revolt, one must help the army of teachers, missionaries and priests who endeavour to develop in the natives a love for the mother country, one must clearly and consistently oppose all attempt at insurrection. Once more the Socialists appear as the best agents of French imperialism.

The French Communist Party will be able to frustrate this Socialist manoeuvre. It will give full support to the national separatist movement, which is accelerating the disintegration of French imperialism.

## BUILDING UP SOCIALISM

By N. Bukharin

Obtainable from  
The Communist Bookshop, 16 King Street,  
Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

**N**IKOLAI BUKHARIN  
is now acknowledged as  
the most outstanding  
theorist of the Communist  
International. His latest  
book, just published in a  
shape uniform with our  
"Lenin Library," deals  
with the problem of how  
to build up Socialism in  
Russia in spite of all the  
difficulties & dangers  
that surround the  
Soviet State.

Price 1s.

Post free  
1/1½d.

# After the British Empire Conference

J. T. Murphy

SINCE the conclusion of the proceedings of the British Empire Conference the British press has been full of praise concerning the strengthening of the "bonds of Empire." Grand rolling phrases about the "British Commonwealth of Nations" have filled columns upon columns of the newspapers and magazines. The Tories have dined with the Ministers of the Dominions and delivered complimentary speeches to each other. Leading Labour members have dined with the Ministers of the Dominions and joined in the chorus of Empire worship. The leaders of the British Co-operative movement have invited the Dominion Premiers to dine with them and hailed the "new concord." Such a universal adoration of British imperialism has never been known in the history of Britain. The press has done its work well. Having staged the Empire Conference in the most hypocritical way it is possible to conceive, it has made the great mass of politicians drunk with phrases.

This campaign was conducted with the purpose of glossing over the real state of affairs and spreading illusions among the masses. We will therefore attempt to analyse whether the British Empire Conference has strengthened "the bonds of Empire" or indicated a new stage in the crisis of British imperialism.

The Conference in the main confined itself to the problems exclusively concerning the Dominions, and completely ignored the teeming millions of the Empire who have not the slightest measure of self-determination or independence. These were referred to only as material for exploitation. Where were the representatives of Nigeria, of the Gold Coast, of the masses of India, of Malay, of Burma, of Egypt, of Mesopotamia, of Irak? They were simply not there. They were left to reflect upon the efforts being made to secure their independence, to remember the bombs that had been dropped in Irak, the reply of Britain to the aspirations of the Egyptians for independence and to contemplate the Amritsar of India and the violence adopted to all uprisings of the oppressed.

## Tory-Labour Praise

Yet this is how the respective parties spoke of the Empire Conference: Tories—"The Conference of 1926 has made explicit and unmistakable the latest stage in the Empire's evolution. Down to a certain point it was possible to think of the Mother Country and the Dominions linking themselves in a species of Federation with a central authority for certain purposes . . . It has long been evident that the political maturity of the Dominions and many other reasons had diverted the stream of destiny from that course, and that the future of the Empire and of all its parts must rest upon a perfectly free co-operation under the stimulus of the common ideals and of common interest." ("Observer," December 19th). The Labour Party says in its monthly organ—"The Labour Magazine" for December—that there has

been established "a new constitutional relationship between the Dominions and the Mother Country which promises to conserve the unity of the British Commonwealth of Nations far more effectively than appeared once to be possible . . . There will be less reason to talk the anti-militarist cant which pictured the British Empire as a monster of oppression and greed; the Empire has become a voluntary partnership in which no member State can be held against its will." The accord between the Tory Party and the Labour Party on this question of Empire relations is therefore well established.

## Division, Not Unity

But does this fulsome praise of the proceedings and conclusions of the Empire Conference compel us to revise our conclusions concerning the process of disintegration of the British Empire? It is necessary to ask this question in view of the striking contrast of the Comintern estimation of the situation as compared with the estimation of the reformists and bourgeoisie of Britain in respect of the future of the British Empire. The quotations we have made acknowledge that there has been a definite change established by this Imperial Conference. What is this change? For the first time in the history of the British Empire a number of its parts have succeeded in imposing upon the Central Government a degree of independence which leaves the Central Government unable to impose a united foreign policy as hitherto, and deprived the Central Government of the right to interfere in their domestic affairs. It has been asserted that these decisions are only registering what previously existed before the Conference, but this we think is an under-estimation of the situation. Prior to the Conference neither Australia nor South Africa had contemplated appointing foreign ambassadors to other countries, whilst only a few weeks before, the interference of Lord Byng in the domestic affairs of Canada had produced a crisis, brought about the downfall of the Canadian Government and thrust this question to the forefront of the Imperial Conference. General Hertzog, according to the "Times" of December 21st, holds himself free to go ahead with his Flag Bill and for the "people of South Africa to haul down the Union Jack the minute they think fit." We think it therefore beyond question that the Empire Conference decisions mark a new stage in the internal development of the Empire, and a stage which gives greater freedom to the Dominions to pursue their own political course unrestrained by the British Government. If any doubts exist on this question then they would seem to be disposed of by the action of the Australian trade commissioner to the United States. According to the "Daily Herald" of December 4th, 1926, Sir Hugh Denniston told the New York Chamber of Commerce that "Australia proposes to send a diplomatic representative to Washington to follow the good or bad example of the United States by building a tariff wall, and to let America inside in return

After the British Empire Conference—continued

for reciprocal privileges." He further declared that "Australia was the only one of the British Dominions having its own Navy. She was prepared to join hands with the United States in making the Pacific Ocean pacific in fact as well as in name." Here we conclude, are separatist tendencies, and not unity of Empire.

Nor are these tendencies at all affected by the demonstration of protest against the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations. For whatever there was of a common front on this question was dissipated by the reluctance of the Dominions to have anything to do with the Locarno pact. On this question their views coincided with those of America in their anxiety to be free from the "entanglements of European politics."

These things, conflicts and changes in diplomatic affairs and constitutional developments only reflect the differences and contradictions in the economic relations of the Dominions and the "Mother Country." They reflect the fact that Britain is fast losing her economic, financial and, hence, political hegemony over these countries. The separatist tendencies, so clearly manifest in the Conference itself, are related to the decline of British capitalism and the growth of industrialisation of the dominions. There is no need to repeat here a mass of figures to establish the economic decline of Britain. These figures are now well known. Mr. Baldwin himself had to adopt an apologetic tone to the Conference and attempted to console the Dominion Premiers for Britain's inability to supply capital to-day by reference to the capital she had poured out in the past. But this kind of consolation does not solve present difficulties. The Dominions want capital, population, markets, and Britain is less able than ever to provide these things.

Britain Cannot Export Capital

Mr. Baldwin told the Conference that up to 1925 London had lent 850 million pounds to the Dominions. But he did not remind the Conference of the embargo on capital export from Britain in 1925 and the virtual embargo now existing, or the fact that this year instead of having a surplus for export there would be a deficit of 30 to 40 million pounds in the national balance sheet. At the same time the "Canadian Monetary Times" gives the following figures concerning the sale of Canadian bonds.

CANADIAN BOND SALES.

	Canada Amount	United Kingdom Amount	United States Amount	Total
1910	39.3	188.1	3.6	231.0
1913	45.6	277.5	50.7	373.8
1919	705.4	5.1	199.4	909.9
1921	213.3	12.2	178.1	403.6
1923	427.9	2.4	84.5	514.8
1924	336.8	3.6	239.5	579.9
1925	234.0	31.0	205.0	470.0
First half 1926	146.7	—	180.1	326.8

Is there any wonder that Mr. McKenzie King says: "We want capital. We would take it from Britain; but if we cannot get it here, we must find it elsewhere"? And so say all of them, and the reason is quite clear. The industrialisation of the Dominions demands it. The following table illustrates the process:—

CANADA. (a) Manufacture.

	No. of Manufacturing establishments	No. of workers in thousands	Total capital in mil. dol.	Gross value of production in mil. dol.	Total population in mil.
1900	14,650	339	125	480	5.3
1910	19,218	515	847	1,166	6.9
1915	21,291	512	1,985	1,393	7.9
1923	22,642	525	3,380	2,781	9.1

The above figures show first, an increase in the numbers of factories and of workers, and secondly, an enormous increase in capital invested and value of products. Canadian manufacturing industry has increased 300 per cent. in the last ten years, according to the High Commissioner of Canada ("Manchester Guardian Commercial," 11.10.23). In 1880, 95 per cent. of the area of Canada was agricultural, in 1920 only 67 per cent.

(b) The development of MINING shows the same tendency:—

	Value of mineral output, mil. dol.	Coal output, thousand tons	Lead, mil. pds.
1913	114.0	13,600	33.3
1920	217.8	13,590	34.0
1924	209.5	16,991	111.2
1925	238.4	13,135	253.6

  

	Zinc, mil. pds.	Nickel, mil. pds.
1914	7.2	45.5
1917	29.7	61.1
1922	56.4	69.5
1925	111.0	73.1

The same tendencies are to be observed in Australia.

(1) INDUSTRIALISATION IN AUSTRALIA.

	No. of establishments	No. of workers	Value of plant and machinery (in millions of pounds)	Value of output	Amount of horse power used
1909	13,197	266,661	26.9	106.0	—
1913	15,550	337,162	37.3	161.6	442,154
1919-20	16,291	276,700	60.0	292.0	660,016
1920-21	17,113	386,639	68.7	324.6	742,481
1921-22	18,023	395,400	78.1	320.3	798,093
1923-24	20,189	429,990	99.6	348.6	1,110,774

(2) INCREASE IN TOTAL PRODUCTION IN AUSTRALIA.

	1901	1911	1921	1924
	(In millions of pounds)			
Agriculture	23.8	38.8	81.9	81.1
Pastoral	36.9	69.8	69.3	145.0
Dairying, Poultry, etc.	—	—	44.4	—
Forestry and Fishery	—	—	10.4	—
Mining	21.9	23.5	20.0	24.7
Manufacturing (Value of output)	—	51.3	320.3	348.6

(3) PRODUCTION OF WOOLLEN MILLS IN AUSTRALIA.

	1901	1911	1921	1924
	(In thousands)			
No. of workers	1,619	3,030	6,101	7,532
	(In millions of pounds)			
Value of machinery	214	437	1,850	3,000
	(In thousands of lbs.)			
lbs. of wool used	6,024	8,827	26,153	—
	(In millions of pounds)			
Value of output	—	—	4.1	4.9

According to the Department of Overseas Trade of the British Government, in its report for June, 1925, in some cases the establishment of British factories in Australia has not been successful. This, the report says, is partly due "to the fact that the home market has not proved big enough to absorb the product of works whose efficiency demands a considerable output. It will soon be necessary, even if it is not now necessary, for Australian industry in certain sections to find an export outlet in order to overcome this difficulty."

**After the British Empire Conference**—continued

According to the "Manchester Guardian Commercial," 21st June, 1923, "Australia in the matter of woollen goods is rapidly becoming self-supporting," as besides existing firms English firms are rapidly becoming established.

These tables illustrate the rising competition in manufactured goods, and the problem with regard to the export of raw materials from the Dominions. The chronic industrial depression in Britain has caused a decline in the home market, and the Dominions are compelled to sell out of the Empire and therefore also to buy out of the Empire. Witness the statement of the Australian Trade Commissioner already quoted, and the statement of the South African Trade Commissioner in London last year on the demand for new markets to absorb the exports. Whilst the "Times" of December 23rd, 1926, reports the placing of a £400,000 order for locomotives in Germany as against a £100,000 order to the English engineering firm of Beyer Peacock. The question of markets in relation to the developing forces of production is fundamental.

**"Flight" of Capital**

This problem is not made easier by the export of capital to the dominions, even when there is surplus capital to export. Still less is this the case when the export of capital assumes the form of a "flight of capital" to the dominions or elsewhere. And this is the stage which has been reached in the decline of British capitalism. Leading capitalists now openly propose and are actually beginning to transfer their industrial apparatus to the sources of the raw material, a policy advocated by Sir A. Mond, the head of the new chemical trust, and which has become a feature of leading bourgeois journals (see article by McCurdy in the December 26th "Contemporary Review"). When capital takes flight in this form it is difficult to conceive how it can strengthen the "bonds of Empire," whatever its effect may be on parasitism in Britain itself. It is not parasitism that stimulates the development of the economy upon which the great masses of Britain depend, but the development of markets, demanding the full utilisation of the apparatus of British industry.

This process, however, whilst moving the capital and industrial apparatus, does not take with it the masses who are thrown out of employment. Only a small proportion of skilled labour is transferred, whilst the army of unemployed swells in Britain itself. The possibility of unloading the millions of unemployed workers on to the dominions is out of the question, whilst in the colonies there is a teeming population to be drawn into industry under slave conditions.

**Growing Parasitism of Britain**

The growth of parasitism in Britain is therefore not the sign of developing unity within the British Empire, but the very opposite—the hall-mark of decline. For the continuation of the impoverishment of the masses of Britain, the shifting of her capital and industry to other countries does not strengthen Britain's position as a

market, but the very opposite. Colonial development can only strengthen and develop the power of Britain just so long as it takes the form of lending money to an industrially backward country for the purchase of British manufactured products. When the development of colonies has got past this stage, every step forward in the industrialisation of dominions and colonies accentuates the contradictions of the Empire and tends to pull it asunder, as the problem of markets in relation to the forces of production becomes more acute.

**Colonies and Markets**

Much is made of the high purchase per head of population in the Dominions, and of the fact that 40 per cent. of Britain's exports go to the dominions, as pointing the way to salvation. It is argued that this proves the correctness of developing Empire trade, forgetful of the fact that the high water mark of purchases has been reached by the comparatively small population. This problem has been stated by the British Shipping industry in a Memorandum submitted to the Board of Trade. It says:

"To find markets for our exports [it is pointed out] the greater the purchasing power of the individual the better it is for us, but we must have a large body of purchasers. For example, New Zealand takes from us, at £16, the highest average value of imports per head of population, but as her population is only 1½ millions she needs and takes under 3 per cent. of the total value of our exports. On the other hand, the United States shows, at 9s., one of the lowest average values of imports per head of population, but as that population is 105 millions, she needs and takes nearly 7 per cent. of the total value of our exports. Again, it is claimed that both Canada and Australia have the land and the climate to enable them to produce all the imported wheat and most of the imported meat and dairy produce consumed in this country; but with a population of under nine millions in Canada, and about 5½ millions in Australia, it is obvious that even if all the imported food we consumed were raised there we would never buy it, as there is not a sufficient number of buyers in those countries to consume the only things we could offer in exchange, namely, our manufactures."

**Insoluble Contradictions**

This at once presents us again with the problem of emigration, which Mr. Baldwin declared to the Empire Conference "transcends all others in importance, so far as many of us represented here are concerned . . . ." For six years there have been from one to two millions unemployed in Britain. Nevertheless there is less emigration to-day than before the war, although emigration receives State aid now and did not previously. These facts alone demonstrate that there must be a tremendous obstacle which prevents emigration. What is the obstacle? Plainly it can only be that the Dominions do not want the impoverished masses of Britain, but immigrants with capital, and they neither fall from the skies nor rise from British pauperism.

On every fundamental question before the Conference similar insoluble contradictions were evident.

# From "The Proletarian Revolution" to Counter-Revolution

J. Duret

**R**EADING the last few issues of the "Révolution Proletarienne" (The Proletarian Revolution) and comparing them with the first numbers of this review, one cannot help being struck by the change which has taken place, by the rapidity with which a free-lance Syndicalist-Communist group has transformed itself into a clearly counter-revolutionary group.

All the articles of the "Révolution Proletarienne" can be practically divided into three main categories: articles which attack the Comintern and C.P.S.U., articles which attack the C.G.T.U., and articles which attack the Soviet Union.

As the fractional struggle of the Russian Opposition developed, this last category came to the fore.

It is Boris Souvarine who informs the readers of this review of what is going on in Russia.

This peevish, ignorant and self-infatuated petty-bourgeois lets loose a flood of calumnies and insults against the Soviet Union. Russia is nothing but a miserable country groaning under the yoke of a few short-sighted and ignorant leaders, who lead the revolution to perdition—and how could it be otherwise? If the present leaders of the Russian Communist Party and the International had a wider political outlook, would they not have immediately realised that the only salvation for the Communist movement is to place Boris Souvarine at the head of the French Party and make him one of the leaders of the Communist International?

How could these people lead the revolution anywhere but to perdition when instead of realising this obvious truth, they are definitely driving Boris Souvarine out of the Party?

It goes without saying that Boris Souvarine cannot but sympathise with all the oppositions.

Nevertheless, it is only slowly and gradually that he manages to overcome some of his resentments and to ally himself completely with one of the oppositions, one of the chiefs of which is the ex-Chairman of the Communist International.

The following "compliments" are addressed in the August number to the most intimate followers of comrade Zinoviev: "Guralsky under the name of Klein in Germany and of Le Petit in France has done his best to sabotage the two parties, and has indulged in actions, the character of which beggars description. It was he who in 1924 dared compare Trotsky to Danton, revealing at the same time his crass ignorance of history and the blackness of his soul . . . . As to Vuyovitch, it was he who performed in the Y.C.L. what the other did in the Party . . . ." etc. But in the November issue all the resentments are forgotten and Souvarine is heart and soul with the Opposition.

In spite of our consideration for our readers' sense of smell and taste, we are compelled to place before them several quotations from Souvarine's prose in order to

## The Future of Indian Politics

M. N. ROY

PRICE 1s. 6d.  
Post free for 1s. 8d.

Obtainable from the  
Communist Bookshop  
16 King Street  
London WC2

*An application of Marxist methods to the analysis of India to day. The first section is devoted to the "New Economic Policy of Imperialism"—the policy of alliance between the British exploiters and the Indian industrial capitalists. The second section is "The Politics of Compromise." The third might be said to deal with the question that is stirring now in the minds of all real Nationalists in India—CAN INDIA FOLLOW CHINA?*



**"The Proletarian Revolution"**—continued

make them realise to what depths of vileness an ex-Communist can descend.

"The omnipotent fraction, alarmed at the tenacity of an Opposition which cannot be overcome by the ordinary procedure of intimidation and corruption, has made use of provocative tactics from which it expected retaliation, which could serve as a pretext to sanguinary repression: a classical method which is certainly not original and which, if it had succeeded, would have given to some former Bolsheviks security for a few months or a few years. The only choice of the Opposition, deprived of all rights to exist, was between insurrection and submission. It surrendered without departing from any of its views in order to prevent bloodshed . . . ." (R.P., November, 1926.)

**" Everything that is Clean "**

Further on, in the same number, with respect to the Bolshevik Party:

"Everything that is clean, sincere, worthy and revolutionary in the world Labour movement" (i.e., everything of the Souvarine type) "is profoundly disgusted at the spectacle of this medley of political combinations, the partners of which have become utterly unscrupulous . . . and have come to the stage when they are no longer intoxicated by the homicidal struggle, when they have leisure and opportunity to bethink themselves and realise that by repudiating all notion of proletarian ethics and giving up all self-control, under the pretext of sacrifice to a clique discipline, by confounding their personal or fractional aims with the aims of the proletariat in order to vindicate the theory that 'the end justifies the means,' by substituting for the doctrines of Marx and Engels those of Saint Ignatius Loyola and of Machiavelli, by trying to get out of a tight corner by means of cunning, deceit and craftiness—they are losing their mutual respect as well as self-respect and certainly the respect of all thinking revolutionaries. Struck with blindness and deafness, these parvenus intoxicated with power . . . ."

" . . . . It is the Party as a whole, it is degenerated Bolshevism which comes out of this last crisis, as out of the three preceding ones, reduced, reviled and vanquished."

**Accusations by Souvarine**

Souvarine informs his readers about the manner of the victory of the majority as follows:

"Even the pogrom atmosphere created by the press of the Stalinites could not checkmate the Opposition, disarmed, deprived of a platform, mechanically reduced to impotence—other and bigger means had to be resorted to in order to gag it and bind it hand and foot, leaving only two fingers free to sign anything that was required. These methods were borrowed from Italian Facism. Groups of excited brutes were despatched in motor lorries to the meetings where Opposition members were announced to speak, with the order to drown their voices by discordant whistling and groaning, then to attack the representatives of the Opposition, to throw them out of the hall if the noise and threats were not

efficacious enough. To make the affair complete, only castor oil was needed, but probably it is too expensive over there.

"Such things cannot be explained merely by an analysis of the social character of the contending forces and of the economic causes of the crisis, as some narrow pseudo-Marxists are inclined to assert. Psychopathological phenomena are at work there which should be studied. One is justified in asking oneself if the struggle between 'comrades' (*sic*) could have taken such forms if it had not been for the re-introduction of Vodka, the ravages of which the official press dare no longer conceal. Delirium tremens, the effects of which are reflected in the newspaper quoted above [the 'Leningrad Pravda'], has its roots in alcohol."

Souvarine also charges the "Stalinites" with incitement to anti-semitism in order to down the Opposition: "Anti-semitism is nothing new in Russia. Driven underground by the revolution, it lifts its head again in a new and special form adopted by the Stalinite fraction to suppress the opposition. . . . Engels called anti-semitism a Socialism of imbeciles; one might as well call the present Russian anti-semitism a Leninism of brutes. . . ." When dealing with hooliganism, Souvarine endeavours to prove that it emanates from the Party: hooliganism is ripe in the Party itself. . . . "Non-morality and immorality, for which the Party cadres set the example, certainly accelerate the demoralisation sprung from other causes. When former Bolsheviks violate the statutes, the programme, the resolutions of the Party, the statutes and the decisions of the International, when they violate the Soviet Constitution and the laws as well as the texts in 'Pravda,' why should not members of the Young Communist League violate young girls in the street"?

**Abuse of the Party**

Thus, according to Souvarine, it is the Communist Party which is morally responsible for the ignoble case of violation which took place in Leningrad. One would imagine that to collect such a series of ignominies one would have to peruse Souvarine's complete works, but nothing of the kind—all these quotations are culled from one article in the November number "The Defeat of

---



---

READ

**THE COMMUNIST**

FOURPENCE

MONTHLY

Obtainable from the  
**COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP**  
16, KING STREET, LONDON, W.C 2

---



---

**“The Proletarian Revolution”**—continued

the Opposition.” The preceding articles are very similar to this one. Because of shortage of space we will limit ourselves to two brief quotations from the article in the September number entitled “Prior to the October Conference,” which contains the following statement: “A considerable majority of the C.C. of the Party consists of persons chosen by the Secretariat. Moreover, those among them who hold power have a variety of means of pressure, repression and corruption at their disposal to retain this power in their hands. Having command over the budget, all the posts, the police, administrative deportation, the prisons and the rest of it, the Secretariat of the Party can practically do as it pleases.”

And later on . . . “the Soviet Constitution, the Party and trade union statutes, the Congress resolutions, none of them avail against this *de facto* rule which has not been formulated, but is very real and effective, and which is:—The Secretariat of the party can do as it pleases.” It would be truly difficult to find among all the counter-revolutionaries anyone who besmirches the Russian Revolution more fiercely than Souvarine. Therefore, one cannot help feeling astounded that comrade Zinoviev wanted to reinstate this man—after a short expiatory journey to China or America—at the head of the central organ of the French Party. Is not it clear to anyone who has the courage to read these quotations that a man like Souvarine can go to India or Peru, to Abyssinia or to the moon and even to the devil without ceasing to be for all that Boris Souvarine, a petty-bourgeois devoured by ambition—shallow and counter-revolutionary?

**Dare he be Logical?**

The strangest thing in the whole matter is that Souvarine has neither the courage nor the audacity to draw the only logical conclusion from his own assertions. If the Soviet Union is really a nest of corruption where despotism reigns, where vices flourish; if it is governed, as Souvarine asserts, by a caste of bureaucrats who do not care a rap for the interests of the workers; if this nest of corruption has come to the stage of demoralising the revolutionary proletarian movement of all countries, every honest revolutionary must do his utmost to destroy as soon as possible this vile regime. If Souvarine really believes in what he writes he should without any hesitation whatever advocate a new revolution, an armed rising against those who, according to him, have robbed the proletariat of the fruits of its October victory.

By not doing so, Souvarine shows that he either does not believe what he writes and deliberately lies when he besmirches the Russian Revolution for personal aims, or that he is devoid of all logic, all consistency in his ideas, that he is devoid of all political courage.

As far as we are concerned, we know full well that Souvarine, who speaks Russian, who reads Russian newspapers and has lived a long time in Russia, lies and misrepresents facts in the interests of his fractional work.

But it would be wrong to imagine that Souvarine is the only one to indulge in this kind of thing in the “Revolution Proletarienne.”

The August number contains an article by Louzon entitled “The Bonapartist Peril.” Here are a few quotations from it: “The peril which always threatened the Russian Revolution and which is now imminent is—Bonapartism. Bonapartism consolidated the results achieved by the French Revolution in the agrarian sphere, and at the same time it suppressed all possibility of a post-revolutionary development in favour of the class which had, after all, played the most active role, the class of the urban workers whose position remained just as it was before. In Russia we witness an analogous phenomenon. The Russian Revolution was made by the workers and peasants just as the French Revolution; the former played the most active role and the latter, thanks to the former, became masters of the land. Having become masters of the land, the Russian peasants, just like the French peasants, would like to bring the Revolution to a standstill, to stop at what has been achieved: “their” revolution is accomplished.

“It is against this peril presented by Stalinism, the Russian form—conscious or unconscious—of French Bonapartism, that all the oppositions—the workers’ opposition, the Trotskyite opposition and the Zinoviev opposition—have united.”

**Landing in the Mud**

Thus Louzon beats all records—whilst the fiercest oppositional elements talk of Thermidor, he talks of the 18th Brumaire! Apart from the Russian question, the “Revolution Proletarienne” deals also with international questions which shows that it is willing to shake hands with oppositional elements of all shades. Thus the August number contains a two-page article on the Katz group in Germany.

The “Revolution Proletarienne” was founded by Monatte and Rosmer who, disgusted with political activity, returned to their “first love”—syndicalism. The aim of the review is to help to establish side by side with the two contending forces: reformism and Communism—a third force—renovated syndicalism. This attempt is doomed to failure. At present one is either for or against the Russian Revolution, for or against Communism. Sooner or later one will be carried away by the stream and will land in one of the two contending camps.

Even if people like Monatte, who from the moral viewpoint cannot be compared with a Souvarine, resist longer and do not so easily make up their mind to besmirch the Russian Revolution—if they persist in their attitude they will inevitably come to the pass which leads from the “Revolution Proletarienne” to counter-revolution.

**A Report of the  
Eighth Congress  
of the C.P.G.B.**

*is now on sale at the  
COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP*

*Price 6d.*

*Post free 7d.*

# The Negro Problem

William Pickens

[WILLIAM PICKENS, the author of this article, is not a Communist. He is one of the few Negroes who have succeeded in ascending the social ladder in capitalist America. He is a professor, a bourgeois-radical journalist, and one of the leaders of the Negro liberation movement.

Mr. Pickens is the author of a number of books imbued with passionate hatred for race oppression. ("The Heir of Slaves"; a collection of speeches and studies entitled "The New Negro"; a volume of short stories, "The Vengeance of the Gods," and others.) He is also a member of the "Civic Club" in New York, and of the American Negro Academy. At the present time he is organiser for the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured Peoples, of which he has been a member since the inception of this organisation.

The author is not a Communist, but the Editorial Board takes all the more pleasure in publishing this article, which discloses the hypocrisy of democracy and shows that even bourgeois-radical leaders of the national liberation movements are beginning to understand that only in alliance with the victorious proletarian revolution is real emancipation of the oppressed peoples possible.—THE EDITORIAL BOARD.]

## I.

### INDEPENDENCE OF THE OPPRESSED

AS communication and transportation between different parts of the world become more frequent and more rapid, the political and social problems of the world tend to become more interdependent. When it took six months for a shipment of goods from New Orleans to reach Berlin and twelve months for Berlin to send an order to New Orleans and get a response, then sweating black labour of Louisiana had less in common with sweating white labour in Germany. But when electric communication and steam transportation reduced the communication time to a few minutes and the transportation time to a few days, then a great common interest sprang up between the black labourer in the southern United States and the white labourer in the heart of Germany, whether they have yet conceived a sense of that common interest or not.

Inasmuch as the products of American black labour can reach the European markets only a day or so later than the products of European white labour, the effect is the same as if the New World blacks had been brought across the Atlantic and put to work side by side with Old World whites. The conditions of these two groups of labourers must henceforth have a determining influence on each other. The workers of the world are now competing with each other, which they must change into co-operation in order to survive. The belated and antiquated statesmanship of the world has thought only to erect the pitiful defences of immigration acts, passports and tariff walls. It has not occurred to some that the only finally effective remedy must be a co-ordinating of the conditions of the labourers of the world.

Evidently our social advancement lags far behind our industrial and commercial technology. Otherwise

the labouring masses of England and Germany would be more interested in the conditions of labour in Mississippi and Minnesota. Negro cottonfield peons in America are helping to create the status of millhands in Germany. Hindu women working for three shillings a week in the mines of a British nobleman in India are helping to determine the wages of vainly-fighting mine labourers in England and Wales.

Such world social relations make it logical for the oppressed and dominated peoples of the world, colonial and national, to confer and compare notes. In Brussels, Belgium, on February 5, 1927, will assemble the preliminary commissions of the first world conference of such peoples and classes: the negro of the Americas and of Africa; the Hindu of Africa and Asia; the struggling Chinese nationalist; the Egyptian patriot; and hundreds of others. For in the light of the new relationships brought about by the scientific advance of the human race, "domestic problems" and "domestic affairs" are phrases which must have a wider, perhaps a world-wide significance. The last war showed clearly enough that no two nations can start even a strictly "private" fight which will be without interest and consequences to other nations.

In the United States there are between twelve and fifteen million people with negro blood—many of them having less negro blood than have some of those who are in the white group and do not know or do not acknowledge their negro blood. These negroes have been in the country for more than three hundred years, practically the same length of time as the white inhabitants—for as soon as the whites came, they welcomed somebody to do the work. For the first two hundred and fifty years these blacks were slaves, in name and in fact—and for the last sixty years they have been freemen in name.

Their constitutional emancipation was brought about by the fundamental economic conflict which arose between their slave labour in the south and the labour of free white men in the north—which conflict was further stimulated by those who opposed slavery on moral and religious grounds. The development of technique made this conflict more and more unbearable. And the emancipation of the negro people from oppression can be brought about only through the elimination of antagonisms which exist between oppressed and underpaid labour in any part of the world, and labour struggling to be free and fairly paid in any other part of the world.

Those who suffer economic or political oppression in other parts of the world must oppose their influence to the segregation, lynching and disfranchisement of negroes in America, and also to the effort to create a politically emasculated and permanently inferior black caste in South Africa.

Equal opportunities for all races of men should be the first principle of the working class, and the weight of its influence should be opposed not only to oppression in the colonies, but to violent and discriminatory barriers erected against racial minorities or dominated races everywhere in the world.

## II.

**LYNCHING IN THE AMERICAN STATES**

During the year 1926 nearly forty human beings were "lynched" in the United States of America, several of them being burned alive and others tortured and killed in the most horrible fashion. These victims were nearly all negroes, although two or three defenceless poor whites were also lynched during the year. Some of the victims were women. Some of them had already established their innocence of any crime whatsoever, and others would have been proven innocent of crime if they had been tried in courts of law.

A negro may be killed by a mob for any offence or any virtue in the southern part of the United States. A few years ago one old man was lynched in Georgia because he tried to prevent white men from raping two young girls. The old man had not hurt the men, but simply threatened them with his old hunting gun to scare them off the attack on the girls—and the other whites of the community later turned out and helped these two rapists to lynch the old black man.

In the last forty years nearly four thousand (4,000) persons have been lynched in the United States, according to the record, and many others have been lynched where no record has been made.

These 4,000 victims do not include the uncounted hundreds who have been killed by mobs in street riots, nor the uncounted thousands who have been murdered by dominant whites who have gone unpunished for the murders. It is the common practice to free white men who murder negroes in the southern part of the United States.

Only six states of the total 48 have remained free from lynching during the last 40 years, although the great bulk of the lynching has been done in the southern states.

The only organised and uncompromising effort to fight lynching during all this time has been the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, which has been in existence for 18 years. This Association has fought the lynching evil by publicity, by seeking to convict lynchers in the courts. It has passed laws in the State legislatures and in the national congress to punish lynchers as other murderers should be punished. Some states have passed such laws and enforce them. Some southern states have passed anti-lynching laws, but seem to attempt to enforce them only when the victim of the lynching is white.

The national Congress at Washington has so far refused or failed to pass a national anti-lynching law, which could be better enforced than local state laws against lynching. Local prejudice generally controls local courts, and when a negro is lynched it is next to impossible to find twelve white men to make up a jury that will agree upon the conviction of any of the lynchers. Usually the white men on the jury have relatives or friends who were members of the mobs. And in southern states, by tricky administration, all the jurors are white, even when a negro is one party to the suit or even when negroes are both parties to the suit. A national court could take a man out of his immediate home town and try him, where he could not get his friends and relatives on the jury. But in spite of the awful record,

the Congress of the nation has so far refused to act, largely because of the votes of southern white men in the Congress, who form an active and powerful minority whenever the rights of the negro are up for consideration in that body.

And this inactivity of Congress is due to another cause: that there are no negroes in the Congress, because they are cheated out of their right to vote or bullied away from the polls, especially in the south. One-tenth of the population of the United States is of negro blood, so that if the negroes had their fair share of representation in the national Congress, there would be about 60 negro congressmen in the House and in the Senate. In a number of the southern states half the law makers, or nearly half, would be coloured people, if they were not deprived unlawfully or by tricky discrimination of their votes. This political emasculation of the coloured population makes its much harder for them to fight lynching.

By scientific attack on the evil, and by careful and courageous investigation, the officers of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People have succeeded in making lynching a disgrace among the nations. The horrible facts about lynchings have been published all over the nation and all over the world, and the campaign still goes on. In one year over 200 people were lynched, and in one year after the world war 14 men and women were burned by mobs, 11 of them being burned alive.

**The Economics of Lynch Law**

Practically all lynchings can be explained by some form of economic trouble; perhaps the negro was demanding more wages, or pay for past work, or better treatment as a labourer, or a greater share of the crop which he helped to produce; or perhaps he has built too fine a house or bought too good a farm and has thereby aroused the jealousy of his white neighbours; or perhaps he has defended his own goods or the women of his house against attack by white men. A few months ago two boys and a young coloured woman were horribly lynched at Aiken, South Carolina, because they defended their home and their persons against an unprovoked attack of white men, whom they did not even know to be officers of the law. The attack was perhaps inspired by the desire of certain whites to embarrass the farming success of the white man for whom these negroes and their family worked. Thus an economic war even between two powerful whites may bring the lynching terror upon the negroes, who happen to be economic slaves of one of the opposing whites. It is to be noted that the greatest number of lynchings and the most horrible forms of torture take place in those sections where there is the most exploitation of negro labour. It is doubtful whether an economically exploited class can ever have equal protection of the laws, in spite of the written letter.

The publicity against lynching in the last five or six years has shown some tendency to reduce the number, but it is hardly to be hoped that the evil practice can be entirely eradicated without national legislation and such social reforms as will better protect the negro in his economic rights.

New York, N.Y.

# Pilsudski and the Question of the Ukraine and White Russia

G. Turin

**T**HE attack against the U.S.S.R. which Fascist Poland is undoubtedly preparing, under the dictatorship of its present protector, England, demands a number of preparatory measures; the main task is to prepare a "Hinterland," a base for operations in the Eastern border district. Poland is not united from the national point of view. Almost half the population, certainly not less than 42 per cent. consist of alien nationalities, and amongst these the most hostile to Poland are the Ukrainians and the White Russians (numbering about eight millions). Therefore, it is quite clear that the Polish replica of ramshackle Austria, which even in peace time is kept together only with the aid of bayonets and bullets, must feel particularly insecure in time of war. The success of this attack against the Workers' and Peasants' Republic may to a certain extent paralyse the separatist tendencies of the oppressed national minorities. Consequently, it is clear that a component part of the adventurist plans of the present Pilsudski Government must be to safeguard the border districts.

"An attack upon the Soviets," writes Consulibus, adherent of Pilsudski,\* "implies first of all the proper safeguarding of our frontier from within, i.e., the regulation of border affairs so that they may not become the Achilles heel of Poland. Who knows but that our lack of desire to raise this question is the source of the policy of compromise with the Soviets? The Soviets create the atmosphere in our border districts that they desire. For that reason we must regulate our relations with the Eastern border districts irrespective of the various conceptions of the tasks of the Polish State, for the present conditions prevailing in these border districts merely give our enemies the chance at an opportune moment, to incite these districts against Poland."

Whatever turn the question of regulating relations between Western Ukraine and Western White Russia may take, it is necessary to confirm the following indisputable fact: the Ukrainian and White Russian question is the Gordian knot of Polish politics and its disentanglement is extremely problematical. Bourgeois aristocratic Poland, stretched on the Procrustean bed of internal national contradictions and revolutionary irreverentism roused by the existence of the Soviet Republics and their correct national policy (Ukrainisation, etc.), turns desperately from plans of incorporation (National Democrats) to plans of federation (Pilsudski and the P.P.S.), but as a matter of fact, continues the old policy of "zoological" nationalism and White Terror. In an article written in the Government organ "Novi Courier Polski" entitled "Problems of the National Minorities," Vladimir Srokovski is obliged to admit that "Polish democracy is incapable of solving the national problem, which is becoming more and more complicated into a desperate tangle and apparently can-

not be solved by any single practical measure." Unsupported phrases about autonomy put out by this "democracy" will hardly ever assume concrete form, because autonomy would be tantamount to diminishing Polish power in the border districts, and to this the national democrats, the P.P.S., Stanislaw Grabski or Pilsudski would never agree.

This fact is not concealed to-day even by the P.P.S. which is most generous with its phrases about autonomy. For example, Holuvko prior to the May coup was a most zealous apostle of autonomy for the Eastern border districts; his tone is now a whole octave lower. At a debate that was held at the Institute for the Study of National Minorities,\* which took place on the 16th of June, he stated that autonomy was not an urgent question because the old administrative apparatus hampers it. In his opinion it is necessary to start from "real politics." It is necessary first of all to remove the obstacles that stand in the path of autonomy, and to "create the necessary psychological conditions so that Ukrainian public opinion may be prepared to compromise." How these "psychological conditions" are to be created Holuvko does not say. We are left to presume by means of the Institute's tea parties.

## Proud Words at a Parade

The May coup of Pilsudski caused the Petlurist camp to bestir itself. At a parade of Legionaries arranged in Coltsi, on the occasion of the twelfth anniversary of Pilsudski's march from Cracow into Congress Poland, the remnants of Petlura's forces rallied together under the slogan of "We are menaced by a common enemy" in order to swear allegiance to the White Eagle: "We Ukrainians in an alien land profoundly believe that the White Eagles led by their leader would help us to break the chains of Moscow and liberate our holy Ukraine."

The Petlurists and Pilsudski-ists recalled their old friendship of 1920, and although this time Pilsudski "out of politeness" to the national democrats does not make any open promises to the remnants of the Ukrainian national revolutionaries, "secretly" he does not forget them for a moment. It is proposed to give the Petlurists rights of citizenship; Petlurists must be our first choice in appointments to government positions including also the secret service (where in fact they are employed at the present time). The Petlurists will be organised into a military reserve, which in the event of war may be formed into Ukrainian regiments. In short, the Petlurists must serve as the material with the aid of which the "government of moral purification" will be able to extend in the Western European territories a network of parties connected with the secret service after the manner of those established by its predecessors.

\* Cf. Consulibus' "Evidences of our Mistakes in our Foreign Policy," Warsaw, 1926.

\* This Institute was formed in Warsaw a month or so ago and "works" under the supervision of Tugut. Its activities are confined to "tea parties" and "friendly discussions."

**Pilsudsky and White Russia**—continued

The Western Ukrainian petty bourgeois parties—the Ukrainian National Democrats\*—and the Radicals† do not lag behind the Petlurists. The assassination of Petlura has revealed how piffling is the distinction between the clerical Ukrainian national democrats and the rich farmer Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionary Party, between the compromisers D. Devitski and V. Batchinski and the “activists” of the Socialist Revolutionary camp like Shopoval. The whole of this company in unison exalt Petlura into the national “holy of holies” and represent a united anti-Semitic pogrom in their campaign of lies and slander against the U.S.S.R.

**A Britisher in Charge**

The assassination of Petlura has clearly shown how at the command of the London Stock Exchange via Warsaw, the Western Ukrainian petty bourgeois camp, in conjunction with the Petlurist emigrés are prepared, in return for a mess of pottage, to offer their services to Western European capital and to take the path which they trod in 1918-20.

Ukrainian nationalists are following the advice of Stead, the representative of the British Foreign Office with whom they carried on negotiations in Warsaw. In these negotiations Stead made no concrete promises to anyone, but simply advised all the anti-Soviet groups to unite around Pilsudski. The representatives of the Ukrainian National Democrats, Dmitrov Levitski, Tsilevitch, Lutski and Peliev, have come to agreement with Pilsudski; the latter will make concessions to the Ukrainians after he has consolidated his position in Poland and broken the resistance of the National Democrats. Until that has been accomplished the agreement between Pilsudski and the Ukrainian National Democrats is to be kept secret. At the present time, in agreement with the Ukrainian National Democrats, a number of prominent Petlurists are establishing themselves in Volhynia; these include the well-known co-operator, Baranovski. Alexander Kovalevski is proceeding there in the capacity of bank manager, etc. There are persistent rumours to the effect that in agreement with Pilsudski the Podebriatsk Academy will be transferred from Czecho-Slovakia to Volhynia and will be subsidised by the State.

\* The Ukrainian National Democratic organisation. The Right Wing, the Dilo group represents the clergy and the well-paid State officials, trading bourgeoisie, etc. They stand for fighting the Communist Party and strive to reach a compromise with reactionary Warsaw. The Left Wing, the Rada group, representing the working intelligentsia and certain groups of the exploited peasantry, tend towards the Soviets and are opposed to compromise with bourgeois Poland.

† The Ukrainian Radical Social Party. This also is not a united party. In it there are three tendencies: (1) the Right Wing, representing a section of the Party leadership, led by Batchincki, which strives to co-operate with the Ukrainian National Democratic Party; (2) the Centre which is under the influence of the Ukrainian emigrés and Socialist Revolutionaries (Shopoval) and supports the platform of irreconcilable struggle with the Communists, and alleged struggle against the Ukrainian National Democrats and (3) the Left Wing represents the lower ranks of the peasantry in the Radical Party, who are discontented with the policy of the Party leaders, particularly in the Rogatinsk, Stanislaw, Colominsk and other areas. These incline towards the Communist Party of Western Ukraine.

The White Russian nationalist parties do not lag behind the Ukrainian nationalists. The group of Pavlokevitch and the remnants of the Balohovitch group are to-day putting forward the slogan of the unification of Eastern White Russia with Western White Russia. The independents, under the banner of Kremitch and the Priest Stankevitch, “regard as their ideal the independence of the united territories of the White Russian peoples and friendly relations with neighbouring peoples in the form of a federation with them.”

However, this time the hopes of the Ukrainian and White Russian counter-revolutionaries will be disappointed. The appearance of opposition tendencies in the ranks of the Ukrainian national democrats and the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionary party and the appearance of a tendency towards amalgamation on a platform of class struggle among the Ukrainian Lefts, the peasant party, the “Seliansk League” in Volhynia, and “The will of the people” group in Galicia, the strengthening of the influence of the White Russian “Gromada” among the peasantry, all serve to indicate that the masses are swinging to the Left and strive to establish a united front with the proletariat of Poland. If the Ukrainian and White Russian lackeys of Western European “civilisation” (read “Capital”) dare to raise their hands to support fresh military adventures against the U.S.S.R., they will be lopped off in the struggle for emancipation of the workers and peasants.

**“Venerable” Opportunism**

SOZIALISTISCHE MONATSCHEFTE, published by Joseph Bloch, 32nd year, Vol. 63, Nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13. (October—December, 1926.)

THE October number of this venerable periodical of German opportunism contains an obituary note by Severing on Ernst Mehlich, the Social Democratic Commissioner for the Ruhr district. Mehlich made himself particularly obnoxious by his activity as arbitrator. In all Labour conflicts he was always on the side of the Rhenish-Westphalian industrialists, whose manipulations are no secret to anyone. With regard to Mehlich, there was complete agreement among the workers of the Ruhr district. He was hated there as only Noske was hated elsewhere.

Nevertheless, Severing has to sing the praises of Mehlich, who, just like himself, belonged to the bureaucracy of the Social Democratic Party, which for its part belongs body and soul to the bourgeois State. To Severing, Mehlich is “a builder of society.” “Mehlich’s task”—says Severing—“in this particular district” (the Ruhr district) “was to prevent unnecessary interference with production; it was by no means an easy one. . . .” According to Severing, it was a question of “making ineffective the so-called direct action for the enforcement

**"Venerable" Opportunism—continued**

of a six-hour shift in the mines." This statement might just as well have appeared in an employers' organ.

The "Sozialistische Monatshefte" always represented an openly social-imperialist tendency. During the war it advocated quite a definite orientation for German imperialism, the so-called "Continental" orientation. It assumed that Great Britain was the most important and the most bitter opponent of German imperialism in the world war. Its editors were aware that German imperialism could not get the best of all its enemies, and demanded, therefore, an understanding with France and Russia which was to open a way to German imperialism's final victory over Great Britain.

**Enthusiasm for Thoiry**

During the war this programme could not take firm roots, for the driving power of German imperialism, German heavy industry, was interested in the annexation of the Lorraine iron districts, i.e., in the dismemberment of France, at least quite as much as in victory over Great Britain. But to-day, when the German bourgeoisie is again engaged in creating for itself an imperialist world position, the development of the foreign policy of Germany seems to go in the direction which has always been represented by the "Sozialistische Monatshefte."

There is first of all the Pan-Europe movement. But with respect to this movement there is much ado about nothing, and it is probably not taken seriously anywhere. For the "Sozialistische Monatshefte" a "Continental" policy is not a Utopian plan for a capitalist United States of Europe, but, above all, the alliance of German and French capital. There is further, the Thoiry Conference, which is of real world political importance, and which is praised to the sky by Schippel, Quessel and Cohen. But as the Franco-German rapprochement initiated at Thoiry has—as everyone knows—come to a standstill in its first stage and has not produced any concrete results, Quessel is carrying on a campaign in every number of the "Sozialistische Monatshefte" for Thoiry and against Great Britain's sabotage, which might frustrate Franco-German co-operation.

Enthusiasm for Thoiry within the German Social Democracy is certainly not a monopoly of the "Sozialistische Monatshefte." Social Democracy as a whole is pledged to rapprochement between German and French imperialism, and the Left Social Democratic "Leipziger Volkszeitung" recently attacked the "Minister of missed opportunities," Stresemann, who out of consideration for Great Britain, is hesitating to get into close alliance with French imperialism.

**Not all anti-British**

German Social Democracy thinks now that its role consists in taking sides in the squabble as to which power-group capitalist Germany should enter, with the renewal of imperialist "Great Power" politics. It considers it to be one of its tasks to enlist the support of the workers who follow it for a definite imperialist orientation. But the anti-British attitude which the "Sozialistische Monatshefte" make the basis of their advocacy of Thoiry, is certainly not taken up by the other Social Democratic organs, for the following reason. The struggle between the British and the French orientation within the German bourgeoisie is not yet fought out. Against the Thoiry Conference there is the arbitration agreement with Italy; against the Franco-German steel cartel, the conference at Romsey, where German industrialists under the leadership of Duisberg (the head of the chemical trust, at present the most influential German capitalist group) endeavoured to come to an agreement with British industry. The Franco-German understanding depends on France making certain concessions to Germany with respect to the occupation of the Rhineland and of the Saar district, etc., in exchange for definite compensation on the part of Germany. If for no other reason

than capitalist Germany's desire to obtain these concessions as cheaply as possible, it will not miss for the present any opportunity for playing off Great Britain against France.

**Russia of course to Blame**

All this makes the attitude of the "Sozialistische Monatshefte" to the Soviet Union perfectly clear. When the Quessels, Schippels and Cohens began during the war to adopt a "Continental" orientation, Russia, in their eyes, still belonged to the European continent. This was Tzarist Russia. To-day, when Russia is a Socialist State, the social-imperialist geography has undergone a change; just as for the "Pan-Europeans" Russia is outside continental Europe (see Max Cohen's "Eastern and Continental Orientation" in No. 12). This means—and no Eastern-orientation phraseology of Cohen's can get over this—that these Social Democrats are for tying Germany up with French imperialism and against closer collaboration with Russia, against an "Eastern orientation," for one cannot really ally oneself to a Russia which, according to the latest geography, does not belong to Europe. It goes without saying that, following famous examples, Cohen is placing the blame at Russia's door; it is the Soviet Union itself which does not wish to join a "Continental" combination.

It is, of course, true that the Soviet Union refuses to join an imperialist alliance. But that is not the question: the real thing is—even the whole of "Continental" geography cannot conceal the fact—that the German bourgeois, and with it Cohen, Schippel, etc., who had to choose between Western imperialism and the Soviet Union, chose to lean towards the former. When Cohen advocates co-operation with France and an imperialist alliance, he certainly does not do so for geographical reasons, but because he sees in this the way to a new imperialist policy on the part of Germany, renewed acquisition of colonies, etc. The other articles of the "Sozialistische Monatshefte" make this perfectly clear.

This social-imperialist "leit motif" runs through the articles by Cohen, who advocates recapture of the German colonies, and those by Schippel, who continues his old protective tariff propaganda in a new form. Schippel no longer demands a German but a "Continental-European" protective tariff policy, i.e., removal of the custom walls within the "Continent of Europe" (as far as the "Sozialistische Monatshefte" is concerned, this means Germany and France), and erection of higher custom walls with respect to non-continental competitors, i.e., Great Britain, the United States, etc. This Schippel propaganda (the new edition of the war-time Naumann "Central Europe") is the logical outcome of international cartelisation. National protective tariffs, the building of national cartels, are not enough in the present stage for the development of capitalist productive forces to secure for capitalist industry an adequate home market and a dumping ground abroad. The formation of stronger international capitalist groups is to provide capitalism with a way out. The Schippel Continental protective tariff is to subordinate whole groups of countries to the dictatorship of the cartels, in order that they should be able to compete on the world market. The struggle of such powerful capitalist groups on the world market is bound to increase the acuteness of capitalist antagonisms and to lead to big conflicts and struggles.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Letters to Engels**

In an obituary on Richard Fischer, Bernstein publishes Richard Fischer's letters to Engels, which the S.P.G. commissioned him to write in order to give the reasons for the apprehension in regard to the original text of Engel's preface to "Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich." In the first letter Fischer writes: "We were actuated by the idea that the statements to which exception is taken might easily add grist to the mill of our opponents, and this is precisely what we ought to try to avoid to-day. Available evidence goes to show that the overthrow proposition does not seem to make any 'headway.' If so, you are rather hard on the Rintelens and Sparns. You will probably admit yourself that any ill-intentioned opponent would find it very easy to represent as the quintessence of your arguments: (1) the avowal that

### “ Venerable ” Opportunism—continued

we do not make revolution to-day because we are not yet strong enough—quod erat demonstrandum for the overthrow proposition and (2) that in the event of war or other serious complications analagous to the Commune, we would raise the banner of rebellion even if the enemy were invading our country, etc. To-day such “material” would be “a good find” and all explanations on our part would only be interpreted as an attempt to make excuses for denials.”

### A Peppery Answer?

Engels seems to have given a rather peppery answer to this, for eight days later Fischer wrote again to him: “You seem to base your remarks on utterly wrong assumptions. None of us intend ‘to sell ourselves body and soul to law and order’ . . . You are quite right when you say that no one would believe such a statement on our part, least of all at the present juncture. But even if this were only a silly game, it would be foolish on our part to demonstrate our strength just now by continually uttering the threat against the enemy who has us by the throat with this overthrow proposition: ‘Wait a bit, as soon as I can bestir myself I will cut your throat without much ado.’ You do us also an injustice by assuming that we allowed ourselves to be driven by the opponents into recognising the obligation to law and order also as a moral obligation. Certainly no one has done that. On the contrary, the old man (Liebknecht) as well as August (Bebel) have just lately pointed out most emphatically that breach of law and constitution from top to bottom does away with all obligations from bottom to top . . . And you will also see that we shall give the French, Italians, etc., no occasion to turn up their noses at us with regard to this matter. Neither shall we forget or deny that in Wyden we struck out ‘lawful’ from the programme and did not reinstate it in Erfurt. But of course you know all this, otherwise you would not have given your consent to the corrections.”

### Adoration for Law and Order

Thus Fischer endeavoured, in his second letter, to get out of a tight corner by saying that Social Democracy has not given up its basic attitude to bourgeois law and order, and that it was merely not expedient in the concrete case and under the concrete circumstances to unfold the whole programme. But, of course, although no party is ever under the obligation to thrust its intentions at its opponents, the old Social Democracy should have certainly removed subsequently any doubts concerning its basic attitude to bourgeois law and order, to application of violent means. Has it done so, has it always brought this home to the consciousness of the masses? Certainly not. Adoration of law and order at any price went on increasing, and only every now and then did one come across a remark such as that made by Kautsky on the occasion of the December rising in Moscow—that the time had come to revise the old conception that barricade fighting was obsolete. But in the discussion with Rosa Luxemburg on mass strikes, Kautsky

referred to the text of Engel’s preface “corrected” by the Managing Committee of the Party—although he knew that it was out of keeping with Engel’s real conceptions—in order to substantiate tactics which were merely juridical and parliamentary. History has given the lie to Fischer’s second letter.

In an essay, “On the History of Marxism,” Paul Kampfmeyer states: “In addition to the well-known statements from the first edition of the ‘18th Brumaire,’ in which Marx deals with the importance of the peasantry for the revolution, a plan for new statutes for the Communist League. This plan was drawn up after the disruption of the Communist League in 1850, and is reproduced in the book by Stieber, the Prussian spy chief, on ‘Communist Conspiracies’ in the 18th century.”

It is very interesting to compare them with the first statutes of the Communist League drafted in 1847. The new statutes laid stress on the political struggle as a means for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Whilst in the statute of 1847 a member was simply required to make a “confession of faith in Communism,” the statute of 1857 says: “A member can only be a person who fulfils the following conditions: (a) freedom from all religion, practical dissociation from any church and from all ceremonies not prescribed by bourgeois laws, (b) insight into the conditions, the trend of development and the ultimate aim of the proletarian movement, (c) abstention from all connections and partial efforts inimical to or impeding the aim of the League, (d) capacity and enthusiasm for propaganda, unshakable loyalty, conviction, revolutionary energy, (e) strict secrecy with respect to all League affairs.”

### Insults for A. J. Cook

Here we must single out, apart from the clear emphasis on atheism, the stipulation that every member must show “capacity and enthusiasm for propaganda.” This point reminds one of Lenin’s formulation of the first paragraph of the organisational statute of the Russian Social Democracy, the famous paragraph which led in 1903 to dissociation from the Mensheviks. Like the Russian Social Democracy at that time the old Communist League was practically an organisation of professional revolutionists.

When Kampfmeyer endeavours to prove that in later years Marx and Engels had given up their old standpoint, that they were no longer absolute opponents of religion, that they had amended their conception of the role of the peasantry in the Social Democratic sense, we can only say that this is too old a trick to be taken seriously by anyone.

In conclusion, we should like to mention an article by Schippel on the “Lessons of the British Coal Strike,” which has at its head as motto a quotation from the “Manchester Guardian.” The quotation is to the effect that the miners’ leaders, namely, those who, like Cook, urged perseverance in the struggle, only played into the hands of the mine-owners. Schippel defends this conception and heaps insults on Cook. Praise for Mehlich, the agent of the employers, and insults for the British miners—this is characteristic of this Social Democratic periodical.

L.

