

INTERNATIONAL

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 95

3rd Nov. 1922

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

CONTENTS

The October Revolution and the IV. World Congress of the Communist International	727	Economics	
Politics		The A.E.G.—the German Electrical Trust.	
Lloyd George's Resignation. By <i>Karl Radek</i>	729	By <i>G. Fink</i>	735
In the International		The Labor Movement	
The French Communist Party and its Paris Congress.		The Lessons of Havre. By <i>A. Treint</i>	736
By <i>Franz Dahlem</i>	731	In Soviet Russia	
In the R.I.L.U.		Episodes in the Economic Counter-Revolution. By <i>Victor Serge</i>	737
The Perspectives of the Second Congress of the R.I.L.U.			
By <i>A. Nin</i>	734		

The October* Revolution and the IV. World Congress of the Communist International

Speech by Comrade Troitzky at the Session of the Moscow Party Functionaries

Comrades! The fourth congress of the Communist International will assemble on the fifth anniversary of the Soviet Power.

An anniversary is of course, purely an item in the calendar, and events do not occur according to the calendar. The fifth anniversary of the Soviet Power constitutes no landmark denoting the end of an historical period, the less so in our revolutionary epoch when everything is undergoing a process of change, when everything is in a state of flux and cannot for the present assume a final form. Nevertheless, every intelligent person and particularly every Communist should strive to consider intelligently the recent past and to analyze the actual situation presented by this formal date in the calendar, the fifth anniversary of the Soviet Power, and of the fourth congress of the Communist International.

I recently had the opportunity of being present at a session of a factory fraction of the Party. Here a comrade put the question to me: "In which country would the revolution be most favourable from the point of view of Communist interests?" I thought a little and replied that from this point of view the revolution would be most advantageous in the United States. This country is, in the economic sense the most independent country. Agriculture and industry so balance each other, that the country would be able in the event of a savage blockade to carry on a perfectly independent economic life. In addition it is the most wealthy country in the world and has at its disposal the best industrial technique and almost half of the world's gold supply.

If, therefore, the proletariat of this country were to capture power, the material foundations, the organizational and technical prerequisites for the establishment of Socialism would be extremely favourable.

The second country in line is Great Britain. But Russia, though she does not occupy the last position in this re-

spect, (because there is also Asia and Africa) she at any rate occupies the last position within the borders of Europe. Yet, if we examine the actual state of affairs, we are compelled to say, that the political pre-requisites in this most powerful and leading capitalist country, that is, the pre-requisites for the creation of an appropriate class party are lacking the most. In our country history began to unfold the scroll of revolution, and we were compelled during these five years to labour at Socialist construction in the economically backward country, under the continued domination of capital, which was deadly hostile to us, in the economically advanced capitalist states.

This is a fundamental fact, and from this arose the terrible bitterness of our civil war.

The Lessons of the Russian Revolution.

If we wish to speak of the lessons of the Russian Revolution, we must in the first place mention with pride *our Party*, which gave the most magnificent example to the proletarians of all countries, of how to fight for power and how the conquered power is to be defended by most stringent measures—with the help of the hardest, most merciless dictatorship if need be—hesitating before no step that will destroy the bourgeois hypocrisy, when it is a question of retaining the state power in the hands of the proletariat.

The workers of all countries must in the next few years learn from the teachings of the Russian Revolution. Whether we have or have not made mistakes in the civil war (of course, one can find mistakes if one seeks), we have left the classical part of our revolutionary activity behind us. As to our economic activity we often spoke of mistakes which necessitated concessions,—the one great concession called the New Economic Policy. The fact that at first we advanced steadily forward, then retreated, and are now digging ourselves in in definite positions, confuses the perspective, not only of our enemies but also of many of our friends. Journalists who are well disposed towards us and many European and American Communists mentioned at the journey of our delegates to Genoa as well as today, that

* (=7th of November, new calendar).

much has changed in Moscow, that it has become very similar to a European or American city, and they ask what guarantee is there that we Communists will make a halt on the road of concessions and lead the development in the direction of Communism and not in that of capitalism? Upon superficial observation it would appear as if the Socialist gains of the first period were now in some way disappearing automatically and as if there were no evidence of those forces which are capable of holding them fast.

But Comrades, the question can be reversed. Let us forget for a moment that previously we proceeded along the way of so-called *War Communism* and then went back to our present position. Let us compare the present position with the position on October 25th, 1917. If our foreign friends and the comrades of Europe and America ask us this question, then we can reply as follows: The railways, mines, factories, workshops and a very great portion of the land was at that time in the hands of private owners. Today, all the railways, the overwhelming majority, or at least all important factories and workshops, all valuable mineral resources are in the hands of the State, in which the working class governs, supported by the mass of the peasants. That is the result which we see after five years of our rule. *We advanced and we retreated, but the result is that the most important means of production in industry and a considerable portion of the agricultural means of production are under the immediate administration of the Workers' State.*

What, however, were the causes of the retreat? This question is very important, as the fact of the retreat is calculated to obscure the perspective. How do you picture to yourselves the process of nationalizing the means of production and the process of organizing Socialism. Our teachers in all our old books, and we too in our own books, repeatedly said and wrote, that the working class, after taking over the state power, would carry out the process of nationalization step by step, beginning with the most essential means of production. Does this rule remain in force today? Most certainly. At the fourth congress which will consider the Communist program, the question whether the working class, when it takes over power in England or France, shall destroy the organization apparatus of the technical means of commerce and set in its place a universal method of accounting, must be answered in the negative. The working class must employ the bourgeois methods of payment, of calculation, the methods of the exchanges, of the banks, and only gradually, in accordance with its technical strength and capacity, pass to a Socialist economic system.

In this lies the greatest difference between the Russian proletarian revolution and the future proletarian revolution, for example in America. The working class there, will have enormous difficulties to overcome until the capture of the state power, but when it will have seized power, the pressure on all the fronts on which we had to fight will be much less, because in our country with a very strong petty bourgeoisie and a very strong peasantry, there were quite other prerequisites to the revolution, and because our revolution took the bourgeoisie by surprise. We not only disarmed the bourgeoisie before the 25th of October and in the night from the 25th to the 26th, but in the three years after the 25th of October. The bourgeoisie, the land owners, and the officers only saw the real situation after the 25th of October and began a war against us with the aid of European capital. In Europe this process is going on quite differently than with us. In Europe the organization and arming of the counter-revolutionary forces—side by side with the preparation of the Communist parties for this struggle—is now going on, and the struggle will be much harder,—not after, but before the 25th of October.

Of course, Socialism receives its practical as well as theoretical justification when it is able to furnish labor power for a greater quantity of products to satisfy its social needs than capitalism was able to. And it is a fact that Soviet Russia is one of the poorest countries. The French representatives at Genoa impudently reproached us with the assertion that Europe had nothing to learn from us, as Russia was in a state of perfect ruin, which means that we ought to have shown to Europe a much higher economy than that which we took over in the year 1917. That is out of the question. But this is the price we paid for the revolution. Not a single revolution has been carried out without a reduction of the economic level of the country, and the bourgeois conservative historian *Taine* asserts that eight years after the great French Revolution, the French people were much poorer than before the Revolution. And that is true.

Hence, we see in our country, for the time being, *more capitalist ruin than Socialist construction.* The time elapsed is still too short. We must emphasize this once more at the fourth congress of the Communist International. The five years which were devoted to the task of replacing Capitalism by Socialism, the greatest historical revolution, when we began to build up Socialism in the most backward country (while the great French

Revolution broke out in the most advanced country on the continent, which stood higher than all the remaining states except England) could not suffice to bring about the necessary modifications of our social life.

These, comrades, are the conclusions, which we, in the name of our Party, shall present to the 4th congress, and there we shall have to ask our European and American comrades and also ourselves, what is the position and the prospects for the development of the European world revolution, for it is perfectly clear, that the rate of our further construction will depend to a considerable extent upon the development of the revolution in Europe and America!

The European Communists Must Win Over the Working Class.

We now ask, whether European and world capitalism is collapsing or whether it is still capable of living? During the year 1920, the world economic system passed through a terrible crisis. Such a crisis was unprecedented in the history of capitalism. This crisis began in the early part of 1920, extended throughout the whole of Europe, and in the first half of 1921 reached an unheard of depth and intensity. The 3rd Congress met just at the time when the crisis extended throughout the world, when in America there were about 5 to 6 million, and in England about 2 million unemployed. Many comrades were of the opinion that this was the last and final crisis which would lead to the collapse of the capitalist system and to the proletarian revolution, to civil war and the conquest of power. The tactics of the March days in Germany arose out of such a psychology.

Many lively debates raged round this question, not only among the European comrades but in our own ranks. And now the Communist International is issuing as an official document the economic report of Comrade Varga, which is based on the fact that the period of prosperity arose in the second half of 1921 and ended in the first half of 1922.

At the Third World Congress the German Communist Party with its March Action occupied the central point of discussion. The International was compelled to issue new slogans and to declare that the task of the European Communists did not consist in capturing power today or tomorrow, but in winning the majority of the working class and in creating the political preliminaries for the seizure of power. The German section is making very good use of this lesson.

In France we are politically in a much more backward position than in Germany. I am speaking of the Communist Party itself. This is shown by the fact that the French Communist Party—although in a smaller scale—repeated the March errors of the German Party. The International is in general a most beautiful thing and the instruction of one party through another is also an invaluable thing. But we must say that each section of the working class possesses the tendency to test each error upon its own back. The International can only help in the direction that fewer scars remain on these backs, but history cannot proceed without some scars.

We saw this recently in France at the port of Havre, where the C.G.T.U., the federation of the revolutionary trade unions which is in close connection with the Communist Party, called the working class to the general strike after the shooting of three insurgent workers. But there was no sign of a general strike. If in Germany, (in March) a quarter, a fifth or a sixth of the working class responded to the call for a general strike, in France, a still smaller fragment of the French proletariat participated in the general strike. And if we read the reports of this affair in the French papers and how it was arranged we are compelled to perceive how young and in-experienced the Communist parties of Western Europe are.

At the 4th Congress, the French section will appear as an inwardly disunited party just as the German Communist party appeared at the 3rd Congress. At that time the Communist International played an important rôle in restoring the unity of the Party, and contributed very much to the capacity of its leadership. I believe that the French Communist Party is in the same stage as the German party was in the early part of last year.

The situation in *Italy* is still more acute. In September, 1920, the Communist wing separated from the old Socialist Party, about a third of the old Socialist Party. The old Socialist Party, i. e. the Centre and the Right continued to exist. Under the attacks of the bourgeoisie who placed the executive power in the hands of the Fascisti, the reformists marched more and more to the right and sought to enter the government. This led to a breach with the so-called Right wing of the Socialist Party, the Serrati group. The Serrati-Party decided at its congress to affiliate to the Communist International. We will therefore have two parties at the 4th Congress: our Italian Communist Party and the Serrati-Party, which after a long detour wishes again to enter the

Communist International. The majority of this party are without doubt striving after real revolutionary work.

A word with regard to England. The Communist Party there is still a successiul agitation and propaganda organization and not a party which is able to assemble the masses behind it. But in England the circumstances are becoming continually more favourable for us, not only within the limits of the Communist Party, but with the whole working class.

Lloyd George's Gift to the Soviet Government.

Today we received a telegram announcing the resignation of Lloyd George. His was the only government that was older than our own (laughter). It is evident that of all governments we are the most firmly established. That is a charming present from Lloyd George to our anniversary in order not to grieve us (laughter). That probably means a new election in England. The new election means the conflict of three main groups, the Conservatives, the Unionists and the Independent Liberals, as a result of which it is not impossible that the power goes into the hands of a coalition of the Labor Party with the Independent Liberals.

In France the policy of the *Bloc National* with Poincaré at the head, resembles the policy of Lloyd George and differs in nothing from it, although the English journalist *Harden* said to me today that the policy of Lloyd George and the policy of Poincaré differed as the heavens from the earth, and that while Lloyd George enjoyed a great popularity in Russia, Poincaré was very much hated. To which I replied that Lloyd George was hated—at least by our working masses—just as much as Poincaré. This caused him great astonishment and he promised that he would report this declaration in the English press (laughter).

In the two European countries, in England and France a change is taking place in the regime. In England this is already accomplished. In France the regime that arose out of the war and out of the victory is facing liquidation, and the inner collapse of those states which were restored or half restored after the war is now following, and opens many wider perspectives for our Communist sections.

But, comrades, all these underlying facts of which I speak arise from the one fact that we in Europe are still in the period of preparing the inner organization of the Communist parties, in the period of struggle for influence over the working masses. This means that we, the Soviet Republic, must give to the Communist Parties of Europe 1, 2 or 3 years for work of preparation, and this preparatory work is much harder than with us, because there, the enemy is much more clever and rational; in all European countries we see the formation of counter-revolutionary Fascist bands, which was not the case with us. Fascism has ceased to be a purely Italian phenomenon. It is spreading in all countries. In Germany it is the *Orgesch* and those bands which only change their sign boards. In France, Fascism appears under the sign of Royalism. In France there is a Royalist Party headed by *Leon Daudet* the son of the writer Alphonso Daudet. This Daudet is a malicious swindler, something like our *Purishkevitch*.

We see the same in all countries. What has been said gives us a picture of the enormous difficulties through which the Communist Parties must force their way, even after they have won the majority of the workers. They have not yet won them. They have to do so first. Hence, a long, but by no means hopeless process is before us.

The "Kiebitz"-Sickness.

Parallel with this runs the long drawn-out process of our Socialist accumulation, of our Socialist construction; and for this reason we must turn from a temporary method of existence to a more permanent mode of life, and from haphazard work to systematic, methodical work. We must change from our absolute generality—in which I am in entire agreement with Comrade Bucharin—to specialization, to perfecting our knowledge in all spheres, and we must strongly combat that type which arose during these five years, that is, the type that looks on at things from the outside and knows everything better than anyone else.

I lived a year in Vienna as an emigrant and there I have heard the word which I found in no other language: "*Kiebitz*".

Keep this word in your mind, you need it. This word means a man who, when he sees two men playing chess, cannot resist sitting beside them; he always knows what is the best move; but when he begins to play himself, he loses after the first move. And we see this sort of thing not only in regard to chess playing, but everywhere in the questions of technique, of industry, etc.

This *Kiebitz* complaint is very prevalent with us. This arises out of our circumstances. We were thrown hither and thither and this provisional situation was endurable, unavoidable.

But in so far as we are dealing with the permanent work of economic reconstruction of the Republic, the transition to planned and methodical work plays an immense role and involves the important question of replacing the losses in the ranks of our own party from the young generation.

The Education of our Youth is a Vital Question for the Party.

It is difficult to imagine the new generation, which has grown up within the frame of the consolidated Soviet Power, anywhere else than in the frame of the Soviets. The new generation seeks our leadership, groups itself about the various societies and has an appetite for culture. The party can mould this generation as it will.

This is not a piece of rhetoric. I assert that the question of the education of the young is a vital question for our Party.

At the 4th Congress of the Communist International where we shall again consider the international situation, we will reassert that we stand firmly upon our feet, and we were able to do so first, because we have learned to manage and manoeuvre the Soviet apparatus, and secondly, because we learned and are learning to control the membership of our Party. A new government power will not appear on the European horizon before the lapse of some months or some years, and we will then be able to work under better conditions than in the last five years. We are not, however, assured against a recurrence of capitalist madness, even against a renewal of war. The increase of the revolutionary pressure in Europe can only be the signal for a new assault upon Soviet Russia. The rise of the proletarian power in Germany—and history apparently will unravel the threads from Russia over Germany to the West—faces us with tasks which extend far beyond the limits of our own interior reconstruction.

For the solution of these tasks it is necessary to rejuvenate our Party, to create a mighty reserve of youth. And when we shall repeat to the Communist Parties: "Before you European Communists seize power you must go to the masses, you must learn to correct your faults, you must learn to influence the masses!", then we must say to our own Party: "Before us we have a young Party which we must retain in our hands for the maintenance of our Soviet citadel, until the proletarian revolution extends to Europe and then throughout the whole world."

POLITICS

Lloyd George's Resignation

By Karl Radek.

After being sixteen years in the English government and six years at its head, Lloyd George has handed in his resignation.

His resignation is the result of the vote in the Carlton Club, the organization of the leading circles of the Conservative Party.

This club, the financial and capitalist oligarchy of Great Britain has by a two thirds majority pronounced in favor of an immediate election, in which the Conservative Party has decided to take part as an independent party. And this suffices in a country which calls itself democratic, to bring about the resignation of the Prime Minister, Lloyd George, the only bourgeois politician in Europe who shows the faintest understanding of the international situation.

The overthrow of Lloyd George appears as one of the greatest historical events. Its importance can only be estimated when one attempts to portray, at least in general outline, the political development of England during the last thirty years.

Petty-bourgeois Radicalism against Imperialism.

Lloyd George, the son of a village school-master — brought up by his uncle a shoe-maker in a remote corner of Wales — grew up in circles of petty bourgeois radicalism. The peasants, shopkeepers and hand-workers of Wales belonged to the non-conformist Baptist Church. They opposed the dependence of the Church upon the State; they were petty bourgeois democrats. Lloyd George was drawn into the excitement of the discussions and struggles against the payment of taxes to the State Church. His uncle, a shoe-maker was a Baptist preacher, and Lloyd George prepared himself for the same calling. As however, the Baptists required that their preachers shall engage in work, he was sent to a small provincial lawyer. And after practical acquaintance with the profession he prepared himself for examination. At the same time he toured the country as an agitator. From his childhood on Lloyd George lived under conditions of the greatest poverty. And until recent years he has remembered in thoughtful hours, the misery and the hard work of his mother, who after the death of her husband had to bring up her children.

These recollections were also the source of his efforts after social reform.

In the year 1890, in his twenty-eighth year he was elected Member of Parliament for the constituency of Carnarvon in which he was educated. At the same time he worked in a barrister's office in London and lived with a colleague together in one dwelling. He was so poor that he was unable to practice as a barrister, solely because he did not possess the necessary money to buy his robes. His friend at that time relates, that never in his life had he heard such blatant accusations against the capitalist order as he heard from Lloyd George during these years.

When Lloyd George appeared in the political arena, England was passing through a very severe inward crisis. The period of the Manchester school was over, the period in which the whole of the English bourgeoisie stood for free-trade, for liberalism and for peaceful relations with all countries. German competition and the development of American capitalism, pushed the bourgeoisie on to the open road of imperialism.

During the period following the reform of the customs in the year 1846, England was the only strong capitalist power and she could rely upon the success of her cheap wares. The English bourgeoisie was therefore against the annexation of new colonies, against protective duties. Now, however, when the policy of protection was actually adopted in all European countries and in America, when English goods everywhere were faced with competition, there increased in England the effort after retaining the English colonies for English industry through a policy of protection. At the same time there increased the need for a strong fleet to defend the existing, and to conquer new colonies.

At the head of this movement which won the English bourgeoisie, stood Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. The Boer War was a result of this policy. Lloyd George entered as its strong opponent. During the Boer War he fought strongly against "Jingoism", against the "religion of blood and iron", against "the religion of imperialist robbery". He repeatedly spoke at meetings in the face of the enraged crowds and even placed himself in danger of being mobbed.

The policy of Chamberlain did not achieve its aims. The opposition of the agricultural population of the English colonies who desire industrial products regardless of where they come from so long as they are cheap, is one of the chief hindrances to the economic union of English imperialism.

The interests of the broad masses of the English workers and of the English petty bourgeoisie developed in the same direction. The English petty bourgeoisie, apart from the high standard of capitalist development in England, occupied a higher position than the petty bourgeoisie of other countries, thanks chiefly to the cheapness of the most necessary articles of consumption. The "cheap breakfast" appeared as the means by which the bourgeoisie dampened the aspirations of the English working class. The policy of Chamberlain threatened high prices and the working masses were against this. Supported by the broad mass of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers, the English commercial bourgeoisie, the English textile industrialists, who owing to the cheapness of their products had succeeded in retaining the world markets, took up the fight against the imperialist policy of protection. Manchester, the chief centre of the textile industry fought against Birmingham and Sheffield, the centre of the metal industry, against the chief basis of imperialism.

In the year 1906, the policy of the liberal bourgeoisie and of petty bourgeois radicalism was victorious. Lloyd George, one of the proponents of this policy entered the government as President of the Board of Trade. In 1908 he occupied one of the most important offices in the government, the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer where he remained until 1916. The first years Lloyd George spent in this office belong to his heroic period.

Against the imperialist program which claimed by means of a protective tariff to ensure high wages for the English workers, and to fill the coffers of the English government through import duties, Lloyd George proposed taxation of the great bourgeoisie and the aristocracy. Against the imperialist ideal of armaments Lloyd George proposed social reform which should improve the lives of the broad masses of the workers. On the 29th April 1909 he brought his budget into Parliament which he introduced by a speech lasting four hours. He concluded his speech with the following words: "This is a war budget. It must provide money for the unrelenting fight against poverty and the depression of the standard of living of the mass of the people."

In order to get an idea of the spirit of agitation which animated Lloyd George at this time we will quote but one passage from one of his speeches: "No land which permits the sick, the incapacitated workman, the widows and orphans to starve, has the right to be called civilized. Society has already

some hundreds of years ago abandoned punishing even the greatest criminals with hunger and even in the barbarous stages of humanity the children of criminals were not subjected to hunger. What do we see now? In his riper years the worker loses his strength. Now he can do no more. Is it to be permitted in this rich country to reward him and his children with starvation?"

This spirit is expressed in all the speeches of Lloyd George at this period, the whole of which appeared in a book entitled *Better Times*, a book that one can regard as splendid propaganda material.

The bourgeoisie decried Lloyd George as a Socialist. But Lloyd George was never a Socialist. He never sought to abolish capitalism. He was a petty bourgeois radical who endeavoured to abolish ground rents and to limit profits. Lloyd George's budget evoked a mighty struggle in the House of Lords. The Upper House without right rejected the budget and characterized it as undermining the English Constitution. The new election resulted in a fresh majority for the Liberal Party. Lloyd George then carried through his budget and a whole number of social reforms.

The Victory of Imperialism over Petty-bourgeois Radicalism.

The times of the victory of petty bourgeois radicalism are gone; gone also are the times of the victory of bourgeois social reform. England rejected the imperialist policy of Chamberlain, but she could not altogether abandon the stream of imperialism.

England in 1902, after she had concluded a treaty with Japan against Russia who threatened English imperialism in Central Asia, pursued the road of feverish armaments. After the collapse of Russia, England saw herself face to face with German imperialism which, freed from the pressure of Czarist Russia, enlarged its fleet. In the year 1904 there began the Anglo-French rapprochement which in fact was an Anglo-French alliance against Germany. The building of dreadnoughts strengthened the chances of German imperialism, because they reduced the importance of the old ships in which England had the superiority. The attempt of the Asquith government to come to an arrangement with Germany for the limitation of armaments led to no result.

English imperialism could not give up having a fleet at its disposal which should be as strong as any two other fleets in the world. Petty bourgeois radicalism could not retain its pacifist positions. And when in the year 1911 Germany sent her warship the *Panther* to Agadir on the West coast of Morocco, in order to show to the world that it would not permit France and England to hinder the expansion of German imperialism, the liberal government of Asquith took up the defence of the British Empire. The German base on the West coast of Morocco could threaten the ocean routes by which England received raw materials and food.

At the time of this Morocco crisis, Lloyd George delivered his celebrated speech, in which he—the leader of petty-bourgeois social-reform-pacifism—threatened Germany with war. This speech of Lloyd George is not only a turning point in his history, but a turning point in the history of present day English liberalism. This speech meant the capitulation of petty-bourgeois pacifism before the interests of heavy industry, before the interests of the imperialist annexation policy.

When in July 1914, the English liberal government found itself faced with the open danger of world war, it already had no choice. When the Foreign Secretary of the English liberal government informed Parliament on the 3rd of August that England was not formally allied with France, but that there were moral obligations on the part of the English General Staff to the French General Staff, the question of England's participation in the war was decided. The "defence of Belgium" was only an excuse. England could not possibly permit the victory of the strongest European power. And she entered into the imperialist war.

In this war the "Pacifist" and "Social Reformer" Lloyd George occupied the post of War Minister.

And he became the soul of the Entente. With the same passion with which he had but recently led the war for social reform against need and misery, he now brought all the forces of England into movement and organized her for the imperialist war. In the work of organizing the war industries he came into close relations with the actual leading circles of the English heavy industry, of English imperialism. And these, in 1916 made him chief of the Coalition Government, which not only united commercial capital with heavy industry but even connected these with leaders of the "Labor Party".

In this government there was a leader of the "Labor Party", *Henderson*, who helped George to influence the working class to renounce all social reform and to bend all its energy to secure victory. Lloyd George became the darling of English

capitalism. No one possessed so much organizing capacity, no one understood so well as he how to persuade the broad masses that it was not a fight for capitalist profits, but for democracy, for the establishment of peace upon a firmer foundation in the future, for equal rights to development for all. No one understood so well as he how to fight against every attempt to end the war with Germany by treaty.

After England had succeeded in dragging America into the war, he turned Henderson out of the government, only because this leader of the Labour Party, out of apprehension of the pacifist tendencies in the working class, had ventured to concur in the convening of the Stockholm Conference of the social patriots who were to prepare a compromise between the combatants.

In November 1918 the Entente defeated Germany. Lloyd George was at the height of his fame. Liberalism lay with shattered limbs on the ground.

The Downfall of English Imperialism.

With the instinct peculiar to him, Lloyd George perceived that the end of the war was pregnant with the greatest dangers for international capital. He saw the blaze up of the Russian Revolution and understood that the working masses returning home from the war would present their demands. And he attempted to preserve the unity of the bourgeoisie at all costs. He dealt most drastically against those liberals who desired the independence of the Liberal Party at the election. When some of these liberals under the leadership of Asquith entered the election as independent liberals, Lloyd George scored a magnificent victory over them. At the general election in December 1918 the Independent Liberals—the opponents of the coalition—obtained 31 seats, at the time when the Conservative Party received 358 seats and the Coalition Liberals 124. There were recorded for the coalition conservatives and liberals 5,295,000 votes while the Independent Liberals only received 1,298,000.

This victory of the coalition not only expressed the intoxication of victory and the wish to lay the whole cost of the war upon Germany, but also the deep social reaction which the war had brought about. English industry which was very badly organized before the war, formed itself into one great organization which held the political rudder in its hands. Lloyd George became the representative of the speculating elements of English capitalism.

When the anonymous author of the book, *Mirrors of Downing Street*, indicates as a sign of the moral downfall of Lloyd George that he associates with doubtful personalities, (the author points to the friendly relations of Lloyd George with such speculators as Lord Sassoon or Vassily Sakharov), so this moral downfall is also an expression of the fact that the man who won the war has won a leading influence upon English capitalism. Lloyd George was their prisoner. And although he knew very well that the murderous Peace of Versailles would only be the starting point for new armaments and further wars—he declared so in his memorandum to the leader of the Versailles Conference,—he could not fight against the robber capitalist aims because, after the break up of the petty bourgeois radical party he was left with no support save the chauvinistic majority in Parliament.

The whole policy of Lloyd George after the Versailles Treaty, the domestic as well as the foreign, was full of contradictions, mostly favorable to the imperialist elements. In his attitude towards the working class Lloyd George played the part of a master of trickery. His sole concern was how to pacify and deceive the working class. At the beginning of 1919, when the miners rebelled and demanded the nationalization of the mines, he appointed a *Commission of Enquiry* which in the course of six months conducted a public investigation of the exploitation rights of the Coal Kings. The Commission evoked the great enthusiasm of the working masses. They rejoiced when Smillie, the leader of the miners clearly proved to the Duke of Northumberland that the sole source of right to the ground in which he held the workers in servitude was a 16th century document of an infant English king. The Commission decided on nationalization. But in the meantime, the danger was already past and Lloyd George had nothing but gibes for the miners. All the promises of Lloyd George over the free development of democracy were only barefaced lies. Never before did such an exclusive little clique rule England as in these times of "Democracy".

In foreign politics Lloyd George followed well-defined aims. He clearly understood that England, who was faced with the greatest competition on the part of America, and on the Continent was faced with a struggle for hegemony with France (who was supported by an army of 800,000) must unconditionally seek support in Russia and Germany. He was an opponent of the intervention policy and of the strangling of Germany. Yet he was the captive of the imperialist forces and had to repeat like a

parrot: "Germany must pay!" "The Soviet robbers must be annihilated."

But it was evident that Germany was incapable of paying and that the "Soviet robbers" were very tough and did not surrender easily. Lloyd George took advantage of the victory of Soviet Russia, put an end to interventions and concluded a commercial treaty. He lacked all power, however, to make the English Government honorably execute the arrangements with Soviet Russia. He had not the power to overcome the sabotage of his Foreign Minister *Lord Curzon*, the champion of the Beaconsfield policy of weakening Russia. He came to Genoa with a program that permitted no agreement with Russia because—the conference was convened under the slogan of the economic restoration of Europe—it demanded of Russia that she should assume liabilities which would convert her into a colony of the allies. He appeared as the supporter of the revision of the economic demands of the Allies upon Germany. Behind the scenes he sought to persuade France against slaying the hen that should lay the golden egg. Yet whenever France threatened to proceed independently against Germany he gave in as if the imperialist element in England feared the break-down of the Entente, as being a leap in the dark.

In his speech at Manchester on October 14, Lloyd George even seemed to have perceived the madness of England's Turkish policy. But this policy was carried through by him and its bankruptcy was the last stone over which he stumbled. The crisis in the East and the bankruptcy of the policy of the English Government was, however, only the last thrust by which Lloyd George fell.

The real causes of this overthrow are first, that the war strengthened the capitalist reactionary elements of the English bourgeoisie and they believe that the Lloyd George mask is no longer necessary for them; secondly, the extreme danger of English imperialism in the Near East and in Asia, where the revolutionary forces of nationalism are being mobilized against it. In the Far East it runs the danger that in its attempt to sit on the Japanese and American stools it will fall between both, on to the European Continent where England was several times faced with the danger of a breach with France; the profound economic difficulties in connection with the inter-allied debts and the new protective tariff of America,—all these dangers demand drastic remedies.

The Conservatives are ready to give up the magnificent intellect of Lloyd George for the price of a man with a stronger hand, though also with a stupid head.

The last gifted leader of imperialism has retired. The last leader who possessed constructive ideas for the salvation of capitalism, no longer found so much power as could have helped him to carry out these ideas. The bourgeoisie requires the stupid but strong politicians. Yet these will not be able to save it.

The overthrow of Lloyd George will open the way for a new grouping. It will bring in its train an intense sharpening of the international situation.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The French Communist Party and its Paris Congress

By *Franz Dählem* (Berlin).

The convention of the Communist Party of France was held last week (15th to 19th October) in Paris. The task set to the conference was the solution of the acute crisis under which our French brother party has been suffering during the past year.

This task has not been carried out with entire success. On the contrary: Five days of heated debate only served to heighten the crisis to the acutest possible degree, to show differences of opinion with a clearness that left nothing to be desired. Moments of dead silence were followed by storms of passion, when the speakers plumbed the utmost depths of their differences, and attacked antagonistic opinions and their representatives openly and without regard for persons, forcing those attacked to give immediate reply. It is perhaps the first time that delegates from every part of France have seen their party as it really is. Until this congress the totality of the French party has never been fully conscious what it means to be a section of the Third International. For the first time the delegates heard severe judgments, out of the mouths of representatives of the International itself, on the rôle played by their own party. The debates of this Parisian Congress have roused the C.P.F. to its innermost depths. The party feels that it must break with its

autonomism, that it has to learn, and to carry out: *an iron and international discipline.*

The Roots of the Present Crisis.

Two years ago, at the party conference at Tours, the majority of the old Social Democratic Party of France joined the Third International. The defeated minority left the conference and reconstituted itself, acting in the same manner as the minority at the conference of the German Independent Social Democratic Party in Halle. Renaude, Blum, and Longuet, were joined by a number of intellectuals, journalists, and lawyers. These were almost without exception deputies of the Chamber. Thousands of municipal councillors, mayors, etc. took sides with the dissenters.

Despite this, the young Communist Party started life heavily laden with the traditions of the old French Socialism. Its ranks were filled with contradictory elements, held together by a common enthusiasm for the Russian Revolution. The Communist core, represented by the Committee for the Third International, possessed in itself no unity. It succeeded in setting the Party on the road of the Third International through its work since the congress at Strassburg (1919). But when the executive demanded the dissolution of this committee after Tours, it disappeared in the mass of other elements without having exercised any decisive influence on the Party.

The C.I. itself, realizing the difficulties under which the French section was developing, exercised particular caution in France. The reservations made by the old majority in the Socialist Party, grouped around Frossard and Cachin, against the 21 conditions, were accepted. The C.P.F. thus maintained a certain autonomy. In consideration of the peculiar situation of the French trade union movement, the C.I. made the concession not to interfere with the autonomy of the French trade unions.

This policy, relinquishing as it did strict adherence to the 21 conditions, resulted in the appearance at Tours of a number of elements, belonging to the French section of the C.I., but possessing political views deviating in important points from those of the International, and incapable of ever submitting to strict international discipline. Verfeuil, for instance, who had left the conference hall at Tours with the dissenters, was called back into the session by Frossard amidst the applause of the delegates.

Thus the autonomists, a part of the Second International, remained in the C.P.F.

Another element which remained were the representatives of a trade union tendency, maintaining the principle that economics are solely the sphere of the trade unions, and that the political party has no right to interfere in trade union activities. Finally, there remained pacifist elements, Wilsonians, driven into the Socialist ranks by the horrors and terrors of war and comprehending little of the changing conditions of the proletarian class war. These elements made use of their position in the Party solely for the purpose of agitating against any exercise of force, against all militarism.

When the victorious forward march of the proletarian revolution began to slacken its pace, when the proletarian government of Russia expended the whole of its energy in struggling against its enemies at home and abroad, and against the famine catastrophe, when the German Social Democracy shamefully betrayed and sold the German revolution into the hands of the bourgeoisie, and thus enabled a fresh wave of reaction to sweep over Europe while the wave of revolution ebbed, then, all these elements were no longer carried away by the élan and enthusiasm of the masses. They had their posts in the Party and press, and now hung like leaden weights, hindering the further development of the Party towards the Third International. When the latter made concessions at Tours, it was only with the design of giving its French section time to develop. This initial sabotage on the part of the Right elements, aroused the opposition of the Communist nucleus, which, though weak, had already formed a group around the *Bulletin Communiste*. Boris Souvarine in particular, in his capacity as representative of the C.P.F. in the executive, sent from Moscow many severe and even biting criticisms of the party leaders. The crisis in the C.P.F. had begun.

The crisis broke out openly for the first time at last year's party conference at Marseilles. The majority of the delegates let Souvarine fall with obvious ostentation, failing to re-elect him to the new Central Committee. Upon this, four leading members of the left wing solidarized with him, and resigned their posts in the Central Committee. The executive declared this to be a false step, and proposed that the French section should reinstate these four comrades; this was done by the French Central Committee, but with a very slight majority.

This did not however stem the crisis. Verfeuil, Fabre, Méric, that is, the autonomists and pacifists, continued their

former course of action, as did also Mayoux and Lafond, who continued to maintain that the Party should not interfere in trade union matters. The attacks of these elements against the Communist International itself became more and more frequent. The most fundamental principles of the C.I. were questioned and brought up for renewed discussion; the schism of Tours was regretted, and the attempt made to create an atmosphere of enmity against the "Moscow Dictatorship".

The Question of the United Front Tactics.

Fresh difficulties arose after the III. World Congress, when the C.P.F. was confronted with the question of applying the new tactics of the International. The Party was divided into two new camps. In one camp was the great majority of the Party, without comprehension for these new tactics, and deeming them extremely dangerous; in the other, a small minority possessing an international outlook, capable of seeing beyond the frontiers of their own country, and seeing in the new tactics of the Executive the sole means of winning the working masses for Communism on a basis adapted to the international situation of the class war. We are well aware how difficult it was, even for the German Party, to adjust itself to the new tactics after the Third World Congress. The C.P.F. definitely refused to apply these tactics in France.

The chief reasons for this resistance are as follows: The French proletariat is dominated by a deep distrust of the political party as such, and of all "politicians". It has happened too often that the masses in France have looked on while the leaders of the Socialist Party have gone over into a camp of the bourgeoisie. The names of Millerand and Viviani suffice. During the war Guesdes, Thomas, and Sembat ratified the policy of war, and became coalition ministers. These elements were eliminated from the party at Tours, and the desire is to have nothing more to do with them. The united front tactics, misunderstood, intentionally misrepresented and garbled by their opponents, met with an opposition which was the more unanimous that the introduction of these tactics was regarded as an attempt to approach the dissenters once more, and even to restore organizational connection with them. There is no doubt that after Tours the C.P.F. comprised a part of the best elements of the French proletariat, and gained the confidence of wide masses of workers. And now the Party has been anxiously endeavouring to prove that it is something more than an electoral club, than a refuge for lawyers and journalists, a spring board for future ministers. The united front, under suspicion of being an enormous electoral stratagem, was rejected for this reason also.

After this the "French question" appeared more and more frequently at the sessions of the Executive. The French comrades were able to formulate their standpoint precisely in Moscow. They were, however, opposed by every section of the C.I. The totality of the International demanded that the French section carry out the resolutions of the Executive, not only with regard to combatting the right elements within the Party, but also as regards the application of the united front tactics. When Fabre and Verfeuil rebelled openly, the delegates of the C.P.F. in Moscow declared that the Party would exclude them from its ranks, Frossard, Cachin, and Daniel Renoult undertook, at a meeting of the Enlarged Executive, to make a beginning at last with the united front tactics.

But on returning to France, these comrades did nothing whatever to put a stop to Fabre's proceedings. The Executive itself was obliged to effect Fabre's exclusion. In the question of the united front Daniel Renoult organized further resistance, while Frossard kept his word, and submitted to the Moscow resolutions on this question.

The Tendencies in the CPF.

It would go beyond the scope of an article to go into all the details of the various factors—especially the attitude of the Party towards the trade unions—which brought about five different currents in the CPF.

The extreme Right with Verfeuil and his friends, who rebelled openly, and for whom there can be no room in a Communist Party.

The group of the Right gathered around Daniel Renoult and Duret, and carrying on a systematic opposition to the tactics of the united front and against the trade union tactics of the C.I. In many cases these marched side by side with the outermost right; so for instance, they organized the violent attack against article 9 of the International Statutes, by the help of which Fabre had been excluded, and demanded its revision. According to their phraseology, they are advocates of "revolutionary action", but their "action" during the past year has consisted in paralyzing the Party.

The Centre gathered around Frossard and Cachin, men balancing between the various tendencies, unable to decide between Right and Left, and thus remaining in a passive

condition rendering them responsible for the latent crisis during the past year. This Centre forms the majority of the Central Committee. Its most prominent representatives hold the leading positions in the Party; Frossard is General Secretary, Cachin, editor of the *Humanité*. In the completely decentralized organization there is no trace whatever of initiative towards ad-those who have always marched in the line of the International, the central organ passes over or evades the questions of the greatest importance for the French proletariat, "theses being the business of the trade unions".

The Left, followers of Souvarine and Treint, consist of those who have always marched in the line of the International, who during the last few months have concentrated their powers, not only in Paris, but all over the country, and who will form the real heart of the Party. These are the comrades who have led the struggle for a political and trade union united front. It is thanks to them that the most powerful organization, the *Seine Federation*, has escaped the clutches of the Anarcho-Syndicalist Federation, and has been able to take its place, in the front ranks of the International. They are still in the minority, but it is their policy that the congress just held has agreed to adopt, and has already adopted by its acceptance of the theses on tactical and trade union questions.

The extreme Left can scarcely be said to exist any longer; its confused and decentralized system of organization having worked out its own decay in the *Seine Federation*. Its representatives are Heine and Lavergne.

The four first tendencies were represented in the *Comité Directeur*. Under these circumstances it was impossible to get a consistent leadership. Frossard (Centre), sought to gather all these contradictory elements under one policy,—a vain attempt. The Left attacked sharply. The demands of the Executive, that the international resolutions be carried out, became more and more pressing. "I was torn between antithetical ideas and antithetical policies. I was no longer certain even of myself". This was Frossard's declaration on the 3rd day of the Paris Congress.

The Agreement between Centre and Left.

In order to put an end to this situation, the executive suggested that Centre and Left come to an agreement under which the Party would be conducted under joint leadership. This agreement was made. The resolutions submitted by the Left, referring to the general policy and to the united front, were accepted without friction, and were submitted to the conference as Frossard-Souvarine motions. The Left was obliged to withdraw its trade union resolution, as a manoeuvre of the Renoult group resulted in a declaration from the leaders of the CGTU, that the acceptance of this resolution would signify war between them and the Party. The Left was thus forced into a compromise; a trade union resolution combining all the votes of the old Central Committee was patched up.

It was to be assumed with a fair degree of certainty that the great majority of delegates would advocate the Frossard-Souvarine resolutions. It was certain that no representative of the Right would have a seat in the new Central Committee. The solution of the latent party crisis was generally expected from the Paris Congress. This was the state of affairs shortly before the Congress opened.

Centre and Left were united on the Frossard-Souvarine resolutions. Both fractions had defended these resolutions against those of the Renoult fraction. It was a matter of certainty that the overwhelming majority of the Party would gather round the Frossard-Souvarine resolutions.

At this point, the *Humanité* published a declaration of the Centre, obviously directed against the Left. This declaration objected to the classification of the Party into a number of fractions although the existence of these fractions is a fact that even the Executive acknowledged in its letter to the Congress. Anyone reading the declaration was bound to receive the impression that the differences that caused the crisis were not matters of principle, but of a personal character. The publication of this remarkable declaration threw the membership into renewed confusion. Besides this, Marcel Cachin, one of the chief leaders of the Centre, wrote an article making reservations against the common resolutions. Paul Louis, another comrade holding a leading post in the Centre, failed to give the resolutions full support. The Left was induced to publish a counter-declaration, in which it demanded an explanation from the Centre, as to the object of its declaration. Comrades Souvarine and Treint wrote articles in which they declared openly that for them mutual work was only possible with comrades remaining faithful to the common resolutions, and defending these without reservation. This was the commencement of the Cachin conflict. Then Renoult attempted to drive a wedge into the Centre. All the members of this fraction received circulars requesting them to decide whether they were prepared to see the representatives

of the Renoult group excluded from the new leadership and let comrade Cachin fall. This strategy enabled Renoult to divert the important question of the reorganization of the Party, and of the necessity of cooperation between Left and Right, from a pure matter of principle to a mere personal "Cachin case". The Right elements in the Centre gained the upper hand.

Conflicts over Choice of Leaders.

The Left had drawn up the resolutions with regard to the general policy and the united front, and had submitted these to the Centre. They had been accepted without difficulty by the Centre, and countersigned by Frossard. The policy of the Left, fought for since the Marseilles Congress, had won the day.

Despite this, differences arose as soon as the two fractions began to negotiate respecting the choice of the leaders who were to take up the most important party functions. Last year the majority of the Central Committee were Centrists. On them alone fell the responsibility for the crisis in the Party, for the differences arising between the French section and the International. Its vacillation and hesitation had prevented the non-Communist and sabotaging elements from being excluded. They were responsible for the failure of the Party to carry out the resolutions of the Executive on the united front.

It was therefore more than natural, that the Left, now that its policy had been finally adopted, should insist upon receiving sufficient leading posts to ensure that this policy would be actually carried out. Since Tours, experience had shown often enough that it does not suffice for party congresses to declare in favor of the policy of the Communist International, if this policy is afterwards not carried out by the men at the head of the party.

Frossard wished to resign. The Left, acting in agreement with the Executive, held it to be absolutely necessary that Frossard retain his position. He is one of the strongest powers in the French Party, who has always succeeded in mastering the most difficult situations, and has proved himself, fully equal to cope with the duties undertaken by him at the Enlarged Executive Session in June. Frossard was therefore to remain General Secretary of the Party. The Left, acting on the principle of parity in the distribution of leading functions, claimed the leading post on the *Humanité*. It demanded that the position of *director* of the *Humanité* be done away with, as the paper was to be politically conducted by the political office in the future. The chief editor of the central organ, responsible to this political office, was thus to be one of the comrades of the Left.

A similar arrangement exists in the German, the Russian, and the Italian parties. It is the sole arrangement possible in the Communist Party. The central organ is not something which differs from the Party itself. The policy of the paper cannot and must not be other than the expression of the policy of the Central Committee of the Party.

The Centre declared this proposition to be unacceptable. To them it was an attack against the person of Marcel Cachin, up to now director of the *Humanité*.

As the two fractions could not come to an understanding on this point, the delegation of the Executive proposed perfect parity between the two fractions in all leading posts, that is equality, in the Central Committee, in the political bureau, Frossard as General Secretary, a member of the Left as Assistant Secretary, Cachin and a member of the Left as directors of the *Humanité*.

The Left declared itself in agreement with this proposition of the Executive. The representatives of the Centre reserved decision until their fraction conferred.

This was as far as the negotiations between the two fractions had gone by the third day of the congress. We have gone into these preliminaries into detail, as this is the critical point of the whole Paris Congress. The first three days had passed quietly. The organization and press reports had been debated, and the discussion on the general policy of the past year had begun. Comrades Henri Sellier and Marie Mayoux, confronted by impending exclusion, had done their utmost to poison the Party conference by repeated interventions. The representative of the Italian section had criticized the French section severely, and had awakened in the delegates the consciousness that they had a great deal of work before them before they could hope to form a fighting section of the Third International.

Breach of the Agreement by the Centre; Refusal of the Arrangement proposed by the Executive.

On the third day, Ker mounted the tribune. The Centre had resolved to attempt a trial of strength. The fraction meeting had decided to decline the arrangement proposed by the delegation of the Executive, and to bring the question of the occupation of leading posts before the congress, which, in

its sovereignty, was to decide. Ker supported this with arguments calculated to give every delegate the impression that the Party crisis consisted solely in a race on the part of the Left for leading positions, and of a personal attack on Cachin. He declared that the breach with the Left was already complete, and that the congress would have to decide whether the French party had or had not the right to choose the men who were to be placed at the head of its organizations.

The fat was now in the fire. The situation was poisoned, the delegates were thrown into a state of the wildest excitement. In this situation, and to wipe out the reproach of pursuing a personal policy, a declaration was made by Souvarine, spokesman of the Left, to the effect that, after the attitude adopted by the Centre, the Left preferred to abstain from being represented at all in the leadership of the Party.

Scarcely any more interest was felt in the actual congress debates. Comrade *Manouilsky* rose to speak amidst the unanimous enthusiasm of the whole congress. He demonstrated with the utmost clearness that the attitude of the Centre had created a second Leghorn in France. He retailed the history of the French Party since Tours, and told the French delegates a number of truths such as they had never yet heard from the lips of a representative of the Executive. He placed himself without reservation on the side of the Left, and declared that without their capable assistance it would be impossible to form a Communist section with actual fighting powers.

On the fourth day, the central point of the debates was formed by the speeches of Frossard and Souvarine. As Souvarine made comrade Frossard responsible for the party crisis, the latter explained his policy during the past year with the utmost candour. He declared that for two years he had been divided between his faithfulness to the International and the interests of the Party, and that he was continually striving to combine these. When confronted by certain decisions of the International, which he held to be impossible of execution, he had adopted the policy of trying to gain time, so as not to harm the Party. In the course of the past year the situation had however changed, so that he could now keep the promises which he had made in June at Moscow, and undertake to carry out the line of tactics of the International even in France. He declared himself prepared to continue this policy. He expressed himself in full agreement with Ker, and declared that the Centre was willing to assume the full leadership. After Frossard, comrade *Dahlem* rose to speak for the German party. He also told the French delegates candidly what the International thought of their party, and emphasized the great responsibility borne by the CPF. in the international proletarian struggle.

The decision was reached at the last session of the congress, which lasted all night until noon of the following day. The Left had brought in a motion in favor of temporary acceptance, until the IV. World Congress, of the proposition made by the delegates of the Executive. Cachin, for the Centre, submitted a list of 24 members of the Centre for seats in the Central Committee. When it was put to a vote, the result was as follows: *Centre motion: 1698 votes; Left motion: 1516 vot.s; 814 abstaining.*

After this, Vaillant-Couturier read a resolution of the delegation of the EC., addressed to the Left, and containing the words: "Faced by a French Leghorn, the International demands of the Left that they enter the Central Committee on a basis of equality, and that they accept every position with which the congress entrusts them." Having thus acceded to the will of the International, and after having obtained the agreement of your fraction to the step, you may declare that you reserve the right to appeal against the situation so created at the IV. World Congress."

A short interruption of the congress followed. Ker and Maranne, in the name of the left wing of the Centre, were now willing that Centre and Left should come to an agreement on this basis. The majority of the Centre decided, however, to hold to their original motion. Cachin declared this to the congress, upon which the Left made the counter-declaration that they would now abstain from voting on all questions, and would appeal to the Fourth Congress. Thereupon the 24 members of the Centre were elected by mandate, without voting, as it was merely a question of a temporary measure until the IV. World Congress.

Results of the Congress.

The Paris Conference has thus been unable to solve the crisis completely. The French question will occupy the IV. World Congress. We are firmly convinced that at this congress the crisis will be successfully met. The Paris Congress itself signifies a great step forward. The Party has excluded the elements assembled around Verfeuil, as well as those of the Mayoux faction, and has thus shown that there is to be

no more tolerance of sabotage on the part of anti-Communist and undisciplined elements. Further, the overwhelming majority of the congress has adopted the policy of the Left, by accepting the resolutions on the general policy, on the united front tactics, and on the trade union question. It is imperative that the comrades of the Left now see to it that this policy is really carried out, and that they assist in the leadership. The numerous resignations of comrades of the Left from leading party positions are perfectly incomprehensible to us. This resignation tactic is perfectly futile, and our comrades of the Left must permit us to tell them this in all friendliness. Temperamental demonstrations do not further the cause. The duty of the Left is to place all available power at the service of the Party. The proportion of the groups represented in the congress show that all over France, not only in the Federation of the Seine, but in every province, there exist good elements ready and willing to create a strictly disciplined Communist Party. The whole International will help them in this work. Long live the Communist Party of France!

IN THE R. I. L. U.

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

By A. Nin.

The first Congress of the R.I.L.U. has accomplished an important work: it has built the foundation of the international organization of revolutionary unions; it has formulated a program of concrete action and given a unified platform to the various tendencies of the left-wing unionism. After its constituent congress, the R.I.L.U. met with numerous difficulties which in a measure have retarded its development. We have overcome the greater part of these difficulties, and we have every reason to hope that after the Second Congress the final consolidation of the R.I.L.U. will be achieved, and put in a position to undertake its task of organization and revolutionary activity.

Against us, on the right, stood Amsterdam, and on the left, the Anarcho-Syndicalists. Amsterdam has conducted a relentless fight against us: it has excluded all the militants and the organizations which sympathize with us; it caused the split in the French working class movement; it is now preparing a split in the General Federation of Labor of Czecho-Slovakia, and in the most important organizations of Germany. The yellow Amsterdam International has set in full swing an offensive against us; this is a sign of the fear which our activity awakens among the reformist bureaucrats. In all countries we have conducted a tenacious campaign for trade union unity, and have opposed energetically all attempts at secession.

The offensive of the reformists has assumed such proportions, that the Second R.I.L.U. Congress will be forced to adopt a definite line of action for the coming months. We cherish unity as an idea but not as a superstition. The Russian General Federation of Labor, at its recent Congress, decided to bring up before our coming Second Congress the question of the formation of international trade or industrial revolutionary federations. The Russian Comrades who have gone to so much pains to gain admission within these federations and who have been systematically rejected, do not wish to remain isolated any longer. This proposition of the Russian unions is of tremendous importance and will doubtless call forth passionate debate.

Enormous confusion reigns in the syndicalist and the anarcho-syndicalist camps. We have to combat this confusionism, from the "pure" syndicalism of the *Besnard* group (France), to the abstract and counter-revolutionary anarchism of *Borghesi* (Italy), and the reformist anarchism, *Pestana* (Spain).

But a healthy transformation is taking place. The best elements of revolutionary syndicalism in all countries are evolving rapidly towards the acceptance of the principles of Communism and the Russian Revolution.

In *Italy*, the majority of the *Unione Sindicale Italiana*, grouped around Vecchi, has opposed those who attempted to convert this trade union organization into a branch of the Anarchist Federation.

A similar event took place in *Spain* where those elements opposed to the anarcho-reformist orientation of the present leaders of the National Labor Federation constituted themselves into revolutionary trade union committees for the propagation of the R.I.L.U. principles.

Labor (C.G.T.U.), at its St. Etienne Congress voted adhesion to the R.I.L.U.

The situation is now much clearer than at the time of our First Congress. All those who took part in it remember the sorry spectacle which the French trade union delegation, whose tendencies were as numerous as its membership, presented. At the Second Congress we face a relatively homogeneous trade union section which still makes certain reservations as to adhesion to the R.I.L.U. but with which we are sure to come to an agreement. This agreement will be greatly facilitated by the fact that no one opposes the collaboration between the C.I. and the R.I.L.U. Disagreement appears only when it comes to questions of practical application; but agreement on this matter should be easy. Once agreement has been established within the healthy sections of revolutionary trade unionism, the disintegration of Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism will be precipitated. Those who seem to fear strong, powerful organizations will be able to continue their sectarian work without danger to the revolutionary international unity, by creating what the Executive Committee of the R.I.L.U. calls a *pocket edition International*. It will be better that they remain apart from us, that they leave us definitely. The International working class movement will gain thereby in clearness, and the R.I.L.U., freed from the dead weight of subversive elements, will be enabled to devote itself entirely to its revolutionary work.

The R.I.L.U. has met with a certain lack of understanding on the part of certain Communist elements. As we know, there existed in Germany a certain secession tendency; its adherents believed it impossible to destroy the Amsterdam International and favored the abandonment of the idea of creating a Red International of Labor Unions. This tendency represented mostly by the followers of Levi has lost all standing, and has been in turn liquidated. The progress which the R.I.L.U. has made in Germany itself has convinced most Communists of the necessity of continuing relentlessly the work of penetration into the old trade unions. The Second Congress will give precise direction to the trade-union nuclei, so that their work may attain the maximum of efficiency.

Questions of organization will also demand the attention of the Congress. These questions are of the highest importance. During the period of confusion which followed the first Congress, many of the resolutions brought in by this Congress could be carried out only with the greatest difficulty. We have surmounted the obstacles of this first period; the situation is now much clearer; our forces after the Second Congress will be much more closely unified; a true international discipline will have to be established. It is no mere question of putting decisions on paper, but of adopting resolutions capable of application in the various countries.

Our International must not follow in the footsteps of its predecessors; it must not be a mere letter-box, but an international of action. A period of action will now begin after the necessary first period of formation. That is why we must define our doctrine and our tactics at our coming Second Congress.

ECONOMICS

The A. E. G. - the German Electrical Trust

The Biography of Rathenau. — How a Trust Develops. — A Formidable Apparatus of Capitalist Construction and Exploitation. — Its Foreign Connections.

By G. Fink (Berlin).

In the study of the lives of great men the biography of the capitalist tends today to replace that of the poet, philosopher, and scientist.

That should not cause surprise. Such a baron of finance and industry is today the real master of economic and political life. Society ought to know him. And he wishes to be known by society equally with the heroes of antiquity.

As for the working class, it is indifferent as to whether the man of prey was born in Hoboken or in Quimper Carentin; but it is mightily interested in learning the progress and transformation of capitalism.

Therefore, let us read the lives of great modern men,—great because of their exploitation of the toiling masses. The biography of a certain Mr. Kirdorf shows us how a coal magnate rules, enthroned in the Rhine-Westphalian trust, refusing on principle ever to treat with his employees or their organizations. That of M. Ballin, informs us of the development of the *Hamburg-American Steamship Company*, the strongest navigation company

in Germany. That of *Stinnes* introduces us to the history of the greatest German trust. Let us see what we learn through that of *Emil and Walter Rathenau*.

Doctor *Hermann Brinckmayer*, biographer of *Stinnes*, has also written the biography of the Rathenaus, and, through that, the historical development of the A.E.G. ("Allgemeine Elektrizitäts-Gesellschaft", or General Electric Company).

About 45 years ago *Emil Rathenau*, father of the statesman, laid the corner stone in the edifice of the A.E.G. He was one of the first to introduce into Europe the incandescent electric lamp invented by Edison. He began with a little store on *Wilhelmstraße*, Berlin, and another at the exposition in the Glass Palace of Munich. In 1885 he participated in the foundation of an anonymous society, the *Deutsche Edison Gesellschaft für angewandte Elektrizität* (German Edison-Society of Applied Electricity), capitalized at 5 million marks. But so many establishments had been opened in that period in Germany that it was easy to foresee a crisis. It was not long in coming.

The greatest competitor of the A.E.G. was and continues to be the firm *Siemens und Halske*. When Rathenau made his start this company was already important. *Emil Rathenau* was obliged by a contract to limit his industrial domain. First he specialized in the manufacture of incandescent electric lamps. Then, with the extension of the electric lighting system in Berlin, his business prospered. Rathenau was able to attack other fields of electrical production. He led the battle between the electric bulb and the gas-jet, the dynamo and the steam-engine. The A.E.G. built two plants in Upper Silesia which became two of the largest German centers for the production of electrical energy, and were consolidated with the *Schlesische Elektrizitäts- und Gas-Aktiengesellschaft* (Silesian Gas and Electric Corporation). During the same period *Stinnes* built the electric stations of Rhenish-Westphalia.

While continuing the manufacture of electric lamps throughout the country, the A.E.G. ventured into the electro-chemical industry, undertaking in particular the production of the aluminium electrolyte. It succeeded more and more in producing itself everything its various branches needed. It often cooperated with *Siemens und Halske*. Why should great exploiters destroy each other, when there is so much to be gained in agreement?

Their first joint work was the foundation of the *Akkumulatorenfabrik A.G.* at Hagen, Westphalia. Thus the A.E.G. acquired an ever greater interest in the construction of electric car lines.

Its activity was not limited to Germany. It acquired the tramways and furnaces of Genoa, where it installed a plant for the production of electricity. To finance these foreign operations it founded in 1896 the *Electrobank* with a capital of 30 million marks. A year later the A.E.G. was already working in South America, where it had gained the concession of installing electric lighting. Then it established, with *Siemens und Halske* and the German financial concerns which favored South American enterprises, the *Deutsche Ueberseeische Elektrizitätsgesellschaft* (German Trans-Atlantic Electric Corporation).

In this way the A.E.G., with relatively weak resources, placed itself at the head of a great trust and directed vast financial operations.

The crisis in the electrical industry broke out towards the end of the last century. In a period which saw in most industries in Germany the founding of all sorts of cartels and trusts to destroy competition, the latter was at its height in the electrical industry. Great enterprises were on the brink of ruin; more than a quarter of the existing concerns had to be liquidated. The A.E.G. which had created an excellent organization for foreign trade, remained firm and even profited by the general catastrophe, to absorb the more feeble competitors and to continue its work of concentration. It absorbed, among others, the *Union Elektrizitätsgesellschaft*. It made agreements with the house of *Brown, Boveri, and Cie.*, and with the *Thompson Electric Company*, to centralize its foreign branches. It did not succeed in absorbing the *Schuckert Concern* of Nuremberg, as the still powerful firm of *Siemens und Halske* got ahead of it. But finally, the A.E.G. engineered a fine coup by fusing with the house of *Fell. n and Guillaume Lahmeyer*, whose principal hold was at *Mühlheim on the Rhine*. Not to be outdistanced, the trust of *Siemens u. Schuckert* succeeded in subordinating the *Bergmanns Elektrizitätswerke* (The Bergmann Plants).

The A.E.G. did not stop its consolidating activities. It absorbed the *Automobil-Aktiengesellschaft "Vöhlstein"* (Kühlstein Automobile Corporation) and opened an automobile factory. After which it established a factory for the construction of locomotives at *Henningsdorf*.

At the beginning of the world war, the A.E.G. employed about 60,000 workers.

During the war most of the plants manufactured armaments. After the war, competition in the electrical industry returned in full force. Together with *Siemens u. Schuckert* the A.E.G. bought the *Aur Trust* which, combined with the electrical lamp factories of its two associates, became the *Osram Limited*. The A.E.G. then acquired the *Porzellanfabrik Rosenthal*, a porcelain factory, and the *Bing* plants of Nuremberg which were already trustified. The foundation of the *Société luxembourgeoise d'Entreprises électriques* (The Luxembourg Association of Electrical Enterprises) increased its foreign interests.

But the great struggle between the A.E.G. horizontal trust of the electrical industry and *Siemens-Schuckert* did not begin until the fusion of the Stinnes trust with the firm *Siemens-Rhein-Elbe Schuckert-Union*, which made possible a vertical trust, embracing oil, iron ore, and the production of manufactured articles.

The capital of the A.E.G., 20 million marks in 1918, has increased today to 1,100,000,000, and will be still greater in the future. The A.E.G. joined the large locomotive factory of *Linde-Hoffmann* at Berlin which, in its turn, controls an entire series of car factories. The future of the electrical trusts depends upon the electrification of railways. The A.E.G. has already obtained orders from the Soviet Government for the electrification of certain Russian lines.

The structure of the A.E.G. and its development allows us to grasp fundamentally the concentration movement in German industry. Let it be admitted, however, that the trusts, with the greatest ease avoid informing us of their strength, their ramifications, their trade,—things upon which the biography of the Rathenaus maintains a prudent silence.

The A.E.G. is today associated with the trust of *Siemens, Halske & Schuckert* by the accumulator factory at Havre, by the *Elektro bank*, by the *Osram Company*; it is related to the *Haniel* trust by the *Deutsche Werft* (German Maritime Works), and by the firm of *Fritz Neumeyer*; it is connected with the *Hamburg-American* by the *Aero Union* and the *Deutsche Werft*; to the *Friedrich Krupp* plants and the trust of *Otto Wolff*, which has just created the second great electrical-mining enterprise (the *Phoenix-Sachsenwerk*), by the *Rheinische Metallwaren und Maschinenfabrik*; finally, it is connected with the potash trust of *Wintershall* and the *Syndicat des Potasses*. In foreign countries the A.E.G. is tightly bound through the bank of *Cuhn, Loeb, and Co.* of New York to the American copper trust and the *General Electric Limited*. Through the company of *Felten et Guillaume* it is in contact with French steel plants, with *Schneider* of Creusot and with French coal mines.

The struggle between the A.E.G. and the Stinnes trust is becoming ever more bitter. The Stinnes-Lubersac Agreement has been a marked victory of the Stinnes Trust which threatens to cut off the A.E.G. from its sources of raw materials.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Lessons of Havre

By Albert Treint (Paris).

The Party's and the Communists' Right to Criticism.

Our Party which, through a very serious internal crisis, aims to become a real Communist Party, the clear-sighted and tested leader of the working class, must analyze the movement at Havre so as to draw from it lessons useful for the proletariat. A true Communist Party cannot for bear such criticism. As Communists conscious of our duty we must realize that all that is proletarian and revolutionary belongs to us. Our criticism, friendly towards those who possess the revolutionary will, should not be directed against the men who have conducted the movement at Havre. But no one in the working class movement should consider himself above criticism, or refuse to survey the battles of the past so as better to prepare for, and better to direct the battles of the future.

Throughout the episode at Havre we remained inactive. Not because we thought the Party ought always to stand aside, but because, owing to our internal crisis and consequent powerlessness, our criticism would have done more harm than good. But now it is up to us to make a primary analysis, and all Communists must agitate in the trade unions upon the basis of those criticisms the Party considers just.

We believe that, were the trade unions to unite, they would tackle the future battles of the proletariat with more clarity and cohesion, directing them towards the Revolution. And no amount of slander, no misinterpretation and twisting of the idea, whether from the avowed Anarchist organizers of the Lyon Congress, or

the Anarcho-Syndicalist organizers of the Pact can minimize the importance, the necessity of this principle. The trade unions are autonomous; that is, they decide their course of action according to their own will. Because of this freedom, because the Communists in the trade unions have equal rights of agitation with other members, we are certain that the trade unions, sooner or later, will use their liberty to favor the concrete solutions proposed by the Party and supported by the Communists within the trade unions.

Capitalism in the Metal Industry at the time of the Havre Strike.

Before the strike at Havre, and since December 1920, when France was drawn into the world capitalist crisis, the French metal industry had suffered a grave slump. Orders were rare. Many plants were forced to shut down, throwing a large number of men out of work. General establishments went into bankruptcy, and many were saved from that only by the unified power of the banking interests. To save their profits the metal lords began a savage attack upon the wages of their workmen, resulting in the strikes of Lille, Valenciennes, and Blanc-Miseyron. At that time the bosses favored the strikes, as they could thus dispense with paying wages until their plants resumed operations. Each strike, indeed, was opposed with the brutal menace of a lockout.

From time to time the return of prosperity seemed at hand, artificially produced. But it was shortly after the outbreak of the strike at Havre that activity in the metal industry actually did increase. Orders began to flow in, plants reopened. From August to September the production of steel increased 10,000 tons; of castiron, 15,000 tons. And that at a season in the metal industry usually slack. Before the war capitalism prospered. It developed along an ascending line with light depressions at long intervals. Capitalism after the war, on the other hand developed along a descending line with temporary relief.

Thus the strike at Havre, begun when capitalism in the metal industry was on the decline, developed during a period of the return of activity in the French metal industry.

The Solution.

This fact of primary significance, has been almost completely overlooked by the struggling workers and their organizations. It is indeed one of the gravest criticisms against the working class organizations of our country that they do not make any systematic, exact, objective study of the evolution of world capitalism, in the midst of which, the working class movements are developing. We know our proletarian forces; we do not know the organization of the forces of our enemy. We know our weapons, but we do not know where or how to attack the enemy.

One of the most urgent tasks confronting our Party is the daily analysis of capitalism. Whoever understood the situation in the metal industry at the time of the Havre strike, saw the solution clearly. It was necessary to conduct an intense agitation in all the metallurgical centers to acquaint the workers with this situation, highly favorable to an extension of the strike. It was necessary to show them that the employers, overwhelmed with orders, needed their workers, and that a proletarian united front was possible in the metal industry, provided that the operators' central body of the industry, the *Comité des Forges*, found it impossible to fill the orders in any part of France. The occasion was ripe to call out all the metal workers to a general strike.

I do not say this as what could be done in the future, but as what was immediately possible in France. But what was actually done?—The strike remained localized in Havre. It lasted 110 days, from June 19 to October 9, thanks to the solidarity of the entire proletariat in contributing funds. By isolated, local actions, trade union organizations such as the Industrial Union of the Seine (Union unitaire des Syndicats de la Seine) tried to prevent the execution of orders transferred from Havre to plants in the district of Paris. But after an admirable resistance the workers were compelled to submit to a 10 per cent reduction in their wages.

The Development of the Strike.

The strike at Havre began in a sympathetic atmosphere. The petty bourgeoisie of Havre sided with the workers against the *Comité des Forges*. The "radical" politicians of Havre, headed by the mayor, M. Meyer, and assisted by certain reformist trade union leaders, supported the movement so as to reap advantage from it for the policy of the *Left Bloc*. Through M. Meyer, commercial and financial capital tried to make use of the strike against the capitalist extremism of the *Comité des Forges*.

In France those trade union elements who have learned their lessons from the events of the past years have defeated the anarcho-syndicalist confusionists, and the Unified Federation of

As the movement, however, by its long duration, by the response it aroused among the entire proletariat of France, by local sympathetic strikes of other trade union bodies, assumed the character of a class battle, the various capitalist factions, as usual, ended by uniting against it. M. Meyer yielded to the Prefect, and agreed to accept responsibility for the actions of the Havre police in the city occupied by the armed forces of the government. Many workers were wounded, or were killed. M. Meyer advised the strikers to yield, and refused them the use of the municipal meeting-rooms.

On August 26, four workmen were killed by the troops. Under the influence of the Syndicalist Committee of Defence (an organization of the Anarcho-Syndicalists within the C.G.T.U.), the Building Trades Federation came out on strike. Thereupon the C.G.T.U. ordered a 24-hour general strike of protest for the 29th of August. Insufficiently prepared, numerous trade union bodies could not execute the strike decree. The reformist section of the C.G.T.U. decided that its adherents should not participate in the movement but should turn over one day's salary to the strikers, which was not done. Certain local reformist unions, however, took part in the strike. In the entire country two or three hundred thousand workers responded to the call of the C.G.T.U.

The 24-hour general strike was only half a success; that is, half a failure.

The Lessons of Havre.

From what has proceeded, the lessons are easily derived.

1.—When the working class defends its economic demands with persistence, it soon finds opposing it the coercive political force of the bourgeois State. In the world at present there is no struggle purely political, no struggle purely economic between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. There is only one politico-economic struggle between capitalism and the working class.

2.—The leaders of the workers' struggle must comprehend the objective conditions under which the proletariat is battling so as to find the best methods of conducting it.

3.—At the decisive moment of a class conflict the politicians of the Left Bloc turn against the workers.

4.—The proletariat cannot battle with its "gros sours" against the safes of the capitalists.

5.—In the present state of the labor movement of France, a general strike cannot be suddenly called, but must be prepared for, with time for agitation.

6.—By their presence, the Anarcho-Syndicalists and the federalists of the Syndicalist Committee of Defence influenced the leaders of the C.G.T.U. to practice the utmost centralization in ordering a 24-hour general strike to take place two days after the decree.

7.—As the united front had not been applied before, many reformist trade unionists did not participate in the movement. The lack of definite proposals did not make it possible to explain clearly to the local reformist organizations all the consequences of a refusal on the part of the C.G.T.

The Balance Sheet.

The metal workers were forced to yield, but their long battle increased the solidarity of the entire proletariat. The trade union organization at Havre, gained in strength. The workers returned to the plants in a compact bloc, with their trade union membership raised from 250 men to an active force of several thousand.

Moreover, the petty metallurgical establishments did not altogether willingly submit to the dictatorship of the *Comité des Forges*, and there was evident the beginning of a split among the employers.

In other branches of industry the capitalists were impressed by the power of resistance the proletariat manifested. The decision of the mining companies not to reduce the wages of the miners on October 15, was certainly due in part to the strikers of Havre.

The Role of the Communist Party.

In its press the Party supported the movement as a whole. Our organ *The Communist of Normandy*, however, did not conduct a strong enough campaign in the beginning. Furthermore, in *l'Humanité*, the Party emphasized that the movement was purely economic, and opposed its intervention in such a conflict.

Thus the Party, far from fulfilling its role as leader, acted as a follower of the trade union organizations. It should have pointed out to the workers the political class character which the strike at Havre assumed, offering concrete proposals as against those of other proletarian political and economic bodies. It should have agitated for the extension of the strike to the entire metallurgical industry, and warned the strikers at Havre against Mr. Meyer's exploitation of the movement in favor of the Left Bloc. After the assassinations of August 26th, it should have been the first to propose a general strike upon sufficient preparation. Nothing of all this was done.

Today the Communist Party must draw the lessons from the strike at Havre both for itself and for the entire working class. It must, through a vigorous application of the trade union resolutions adopted at the Congress of Paris, attempt to fulfill its role as leader of the working class. Let the Party always take the initiative in offering the best proposals! Then the entire proletariat, and all its organizations, will follow it. And not because it will command, but because it will inspire confidence.

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Episodes in the Economic Counter-Revolution

By Victor Serge (Kiev).

The judicial chronicle of the Soviet Republic is fertile in lessons for the revolutionary. We have not yet forgotten the curious Nobel affair, when we saw how Mr. Nobel, thanks to the numerous technicians who acted as accomplices, managed to retain the superintendence and, in fact, the management of his former petroleum establishments, which had been nationalized. We wrote at the time that episodes of this sort, showing the nefarious rôle of the petty-bourgeois elements in the State, their penetration, (peaceful, and hence more dangerous), into organs of socialized industry, were only too numerous.

Now we have received new information on the same subject. It was the humorist *Demian Biedny* who, in the *Pravda* of September 13th, severely criticized the imbeciles placed at the head of our administrations (and who are much more probably evil-doers belonging to the enemy) for having purchased, for the network of railways from Moscow to Petrograd, 3000 non-existent bricks; while three swindlers contracted to furnish the Commissariat of Public Health, 3000 poods of sterilized cotton per month, obtained an advance on the payments due, and received through the Moscow Council of Economy 445 poods of raw material!

On September 19, another case, still more typical, was argued before the Revolutionary Court of Moscow,—that of a swindler, M. I. Trauber, manufacturer of optical instruments. The matter is interesting because it constitutes clearly (and that is the opinion of *Izvestia*) an episode of the economic counter-revolution.

On March 31, 1918, when the storm of the revolution was at its height, Trauber bought out from capitalists on the verge of bankruptcy, the firm *B. S. Chversov and Co, optical instruments*. He removed the equipment, tools, machinery to another section, adapted himself to circumstances, founded the *Optical Society of the Nevsky*, on the basis, naturally, of collective labor. Of course without exploitation! Trauber is a petty producer altogether sympathetic.

And for four years—1918-1921—Trauber tried to extricate himself, set the most varied influences to work, sent well-intentioned little gifts, and applying himself more and more, better and better, succeeded in preventing the nationalization of his enterprise, despite the famous discipline of War-Communism.

That is not an easy matter. The Economic Councils of the Soviets cover entire Russia with their network of organizations. The *Tcheka* exercises no lenity towards petty and average manufacturers. But nothing disconcerted Trauber. He had friends of his class and his mentality everywhere. The regime will not last, they thought; the main thing is to last oneself.

Furthermore, the factory of optical instruments belonging to Trauber is the only in operation, it has a monopoly on the orders of the State. Everytime a Commissariat needs his services the crafty proprietor imposes these conditions: that he be given an advance, that raw materials be produced for him, that he receive aid in renewing his machinery. Thus he obtained the tools of several nationalized factories. He obtained all the advantages of a monopolistic enterprise recognized as a public utility to which nothing could be refused. The *paiki* (food-

rations) piled up in his bureau. When he receives orders, it is as a totally independent proprietor; when he needs food, machinery, money, raw materials, he is only the manager of a "nationalized" factory—except for a few formalities working for the State, it is understood . . .

Influential and important co workers of the Supreme Council of National Economy, professors, noted technicians, without whose complicity these brilliant operations, could not have been possible, are prosecuted together with Trauber. It will be worth while mentioning their status. Amongst them are M. J. Ochanin, former director of the Works' Committee of the railroads of the North-West (in construction); a professor, V. S. Chvestov, a member of the college of the *Glass Center* (and shareholder in the Trauber firm), a representative of the *Glass Center*, A. F. Karavin, formerly director of the Section for Raw Materials of the sicicate industry.

Finding the case much more complicated than had at first appeared, the Revolutionary Tribunal of Moscow has decided to, obtain additional information.

That is merely a clever bit of swindling, one might think. No. These cases are innumerable, and the frauds are often perpetrated, by honorable bourgeois or petty-bourgeois business men. The great majority of them regarded the revolution as an evil moment that would pass, and the Proletarian State as an enemy against whom everything was permitted. In 1918-19 these elements actively supported armed counter-revolution. When that was crushed, they adapted themselves, entered into Soviet administrations, installed themselves therein, turned them into bureaucracies—in a word, profited by the revolution.

The cases of these people are, then, episodes in the economic counter-revolution; the most dangerous perhaps; the ones to which the revolutionist ought today to pay the greatest attention.