

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 3

10th Jan. 1922

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

THESES

on the united front of the proletariat and on relations to the workers adhering to the Second, 2^{1/2} and Amsterdam Internationals and to the workers supporting the Anarcho-Syndicalist organizations.

(Unanimously adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist International on December 28th, 1921.)

1—At the present time the international labor movement is going through a unique period of transition which raises new, important tactical problems for the Communist International and its various sections.

This period is in the main characterized by the following phenomena. *The world economic crisis is growing worse; unemployment is increasing. In almost every country international capital has gone over to a systematic offensive against the workers, which manifests itself in open attempts of the capitalists to reduce wages and the entire standard of life of the workers. The bankruptcy of the Treaty of Versailles is becoming more and more apparent to the laboring masses. Washington has clearly shown the unavoidability of a new imperialist war or even of many such wars, if the international proletariat does not overthrow the bourgeois governments.*

2—Under the pressure of reality the revival of reformist illusions in the masses, which arose in connection with a number of other circumstances, is beginning to make way for another spirit. The "democratic" and reformist illusions of the working-class which arose again after the end of the imperialistic butchery (on the one hand the "aristocracy of labor", on the other, the most backward and politically least experienced workers) are beginning to fade before they really attain full bloom. The proceedings and the conclusion of the further "labors" of the Washington Conference will shake these illusions even more severely. If six months ago one could speak with a certain justice of a general swing to the right of the laboring masses in Europe and in America, there can to-day be no doubt of the beginning of a shift to the left.

3—Furthermore, under the pressure of the increasing attacks of capital, there has grown among the workers a spontaneous *striving for unity* which is literally not to be restrained and which goes hand in hand with a gradual increase of the confidence of the laboring masses in the Communists.

Ever-increasing numbers of workers are now beginning correctly to appreciate the courage of the Communist vanguard, which charged into battle for the interests of the working-class at a time when the whole immense mass of workers remained indifferent or were even hostile to Communism. Ever-growing groups of workers are now convincing themselves that only the Communists have defended their economic and political interests under the most difficult circumstances and sometimes at the greatest of sacrifices. The respect for and the confidence in the uncompromising Communist vanguard of the working-class are again beginning to grow since even the more backward workers have realized and understood the uselessness of reformist hopes and that the only salvation from the marauding attacks of capitalism is the fight.

4—The Communist Party can and should now reap the fruits of the battle it then carried on in the very unfavorable environment of the masses' indifference. But while the masses

are being permeated by ever greater confidence in the uncompromising, courageous elements of the working-class, the Communists, they manifest, as whole, an unprecedented desire for unity. The strata of the workers with less political experience, now awakening to activity, are dreaming of the union of all workers' parties and even of all workers' organizations and hope to increase their power of resistance to capital in this manner. New masses of workers, which often took no active part in political struggles before, are now beginning to test the practical plans of reformism on the basis of their own experience. Together with these new masses other important masses of workers which belonged to the old Social Democratic parties are no longer satisfied with the campaign of the Social Democrats and Centrists against the Communist vanguard and are beginning to demand the coming to an understanding with the Communists.

But they have not yet lost their faith in the reformists and considerable masses of workers still support the parties of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. These masses do not formulate their plans and desires clearly enough, but on the whole the new feeling in the masses can be traced back to the desire for the establishment of the united front and to the attempt to cause the parties and unions of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals to join with the Communists in the battle against the capitalist offensive. *Up to this point* this movement is a progressive one. In the present general situation of the working-class, any serious mass-action, even when it only is a fight for immediate demands, will unavoidably bring up for consideration general and fundamental questions of the revolution. The Communist vanguard can only win when new great masses of workers convince themselves by their own experiences of the illusoriness of reformism and of the inevitable fate of compromise.

5—In the initial period of the rise of a conscious and organized protest against the treason of the leaders of the Second International these latter had the entire apparatus of the organization of the workers in their hands. They utilized the principles of unity and of proletarian discipline in order ruthlessly to suppress the revolutionary proletarian protest and to place the entire power of the organization of the working-class at the service of national imperialism without opposition. Under these circumstances the revolutionary wing was compelled to obtain for itself at any price freedom of agitation and propaganda—that is, freedom to bring home to the workers the historically unprecedented betrayal of the workers by their own parties, a betrayal which they are still committing.

6—After having assured for themselves complete freedom of *intellectual influence* on the proletarian masses, the Communist parties of all countries are now aiming to attain a more comprehensive and more complete unity of these masses for practical action. The Amsterdammers and the heroes of the Second International preach this unity but in practice sabotage it. After the failure of the attempt of the Amsterdam compromisers

to suppress the voices of protest and of revolutionary appeal, they are now seeking the way out of the blind alley for which they are themselves to blame by the *introduction of splits*, of disorganization and of organized sabotage of the fight of the working masses. It is one of the most important tasks of the Communist Party to expose *in flagrante* these new forms of the old treason.

7—Profound inner processes, which have begun to develop in connection with the new economic situation of the working-class in Europe and America, compel the diplomats and leaders of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam International, however, to emphasize the question of unity on their part as well. Although the slogan of the united front really is the manifestation of the sincere desire of the broad masses of the inexperienced workers, now awakening to a new, conscious life, the setting up of the unity slogan is for the bureaucrats and diplomats of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam Internationals a new attempt to deceive the workers and in a new way to lead them back to the old path of collaboration of the classes. The nearing danger of a new imperialist war (Washington), the increase of armaments, the new imperialist secret treaties concluded behind closed doors—all that does not cause the leaders of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam Internationals to sound the alarm and to support the international unity of the working-class in word as well in deed. On the contrary, the same dissensions and divisions inevitably arise in the Second and Amsterdam Internationals as appear in the camp of the international bourgeoisie. This phenomenon is inevitable because the solidarity of the reformist "Socialists" with the bourgeoisie of "their" own country is the cornerstone of reformism.

These are the general conditions under which the Communist International and its various sections must formulate their attitude to the slogan of the united Socialist front.

8—In view of this situation, the Executive of the Communist International is of the opinion that the slogans of the Third World Congress of the Communist movement as a whole demand *the support of the slogan of the united front of the working-class* by the Communist parties and by the Communist International as a whole and require that they take over the initiative in this question. In this connection the tactics of the Communist parties must be made to conform with the conditions in the various countries.

9—In *Germany* the Communist Party at its last National Conference gave its support to the slogan of the united front of the workers and declared it to be within the realm of possibility for the Communist Party to support a "united working-class government", which would in some degree be disposed to take up arms against the power of the capitalists. The Executive of the Communist International considers this decision as absolutely correct and is convinced that the K.P.D. can make its way into the great masses without giving up its independent political position. In Germany more than in any other country the masses will with every day be more and more convinced, how right the Communist vanguard was when it refused to lay down its arms in the most difficult period and stubbornly emphasized the uselessness of the proposed employment of reformist remedies in a crisis which can only be gotten rid of by the proletarian revolution. By following this line of tactics, the Party will in time group around its banner all the revolutionary Anarchist and Syndicalist elements which today refuse to join in the mass-struggle.

10—In *France* the Communist Party has the majority of the politically organized workers in its ranks. As a result the question of the united front is of somewhat a different nature in France than in the other countries. But here as well it is necessary to make the entire responsibility for the split of the united battle front of the working-class fall on the shoulders of our enemies. The revolutionary section of the French Syndicalists is justifiably carrying on the fight against the split of the trade-unions, that is, the fight for the unity of the working-class in the economic struggle against the bourgeoisie. Unity is also necessary in view of the rise of the reactionary wave and of imperialist policies, etc. The policy of the reformists and centrists led to the split in the party and today also threatens the unity of the trade-union movement, by which it will only be demonstrated that Jouhaux as well as Longuet serves the cause of the bourgeoisie. The slogan of the unity of the proletariat in the economic as well as the political struggle against the bourgeoisie remains the best means of thwarting the plans for a split.

However much the reformist C.G.T., led by Jouhaux, Merrheim and Co., may betray the interests of the French working-class, the French Communists and the revolutionary elements of the French working-class must nevertheless before the

beginning of every mass-strike or any other revolutionary mass-action propose to the reformists that they support these actions of the workers and must systematically expose the reformists when they refuse to support the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat. In this way we will most easily win the non-party working-masses. Of course, this should under no circumstances cause the Communist Party to limit its independence, as for example, during the election campaigns in any way supporting the "Left Bloc", or the toleration of those vacillating Communists who still bewail the split from the Social Patriots.

11—In *England* the reformist Labour Party has refused admission to the Communist Party. Under the influence of the growth of the above-mentioned sentiments among the workers, the London Labour Councils have recently decided for the acceptance of the Communist Party of Great Britain in the Labour Party.

Of course, England is in this connection an exception, since as a result of unique conditions the Labour Party is in England a sort of general organization of the workers of the whole country. It is the duty of the English Communists to begin an energetic campaign for their entrance into the Labour Party. The recent treason of the trade-union leaders during the coal strike and the systematic attack of the capitalists upon the wage of the workers have brought about a profound fermentation among the masses of the English proletariat, now becoming more and more revolutionary. The English Communists should, at any price, make the greatest efforts to obtain contact with the working-masses by means of the slogan of the revolutionary united front against the capitalists.

12—In *Italy* the young Communist Party, which was most uncompromisingly opposed to the reformist Italian Socialist Party and the social-traitor Confederation of Labor, which recently completed their betrayal of the proletarian revolution, has nevertheless now begun to carry on its agitation under the slogan of the united front of the working-class against the capitalist offensive. The Executive of the Communist International thoroughly approves this agitation of the Italian Communists and only demands its strengthening in the same direction. The Executive of the Communist International is convinced that the Italian Communist Party, with sufficient far-sightedness, can show the entire International a fine example of courageous Marxism, which ruthlessly exposes at every step the halfway measures and treason of the reformists and centrists who have wrapped themselves in the cloak of Communism, and can *at the same time*, carry on a tireless, ever-widening campaign for the united front of the proletariat against the capitalists which will penetrate to the broadest masses of the workers.

In this connection the Party must of course do all in its power to draw the revolutionary Anarchist and Syndicalist elements into the common struggle.

13—In *Czecho-Slovakia*, where the Communist Party has the support of the majority of the political organized workers, the task of the Communists is in several ways analogous to those of the French Communists. Securing their independence and breaking the last organic bands with the Centrists, the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia must at the same time popularize the slogan of the united front of the workers against the bourgeoisie in their country and this finally expose before the less advanced workers the leaders of the Social Democrats and the Centrists, who are really agents of capitalism. At the same time the Communists of Czecho-Slovakia must intensify their work in the conquest of the trade-unions which are still in large degree in the hands of yellow leaders.

14—In *Sweden*, after the recent Parliamentary elections, a situation has arisen in which the small Communist fraction can play an important role. One of the most prominent leaders of the Second International, Mr. Branting, who at the same time is Premier of the Swedish bourgeoisie, is at the present in such a situation that in the formation of his Parliamentary majority the attitude of the small Communist fraction is of some importance. The Executive of the Communist International believes that under certain circumstances the Communist fraction of the Swedish Parliament should not refuse to support the Menshevik Branting ministry, as the German Communists have correctly done in several of the provincial governments of Germany (Thuringia, and Saxony). However, that does not at all mean that the Swedish Communists should in any way limit their independence or renounce the exposure of the nature of the Menshevik government. On the contrary, the more power the Menshevik possess, the more will they commit treason against the working-class and the greater the efforts the Communists must make to expose the Mensheviks before the great masses of the workers.

15—In *America* the uniting of all the left elements in the trade-union and political movement is beginning, which affords

the Communists the opportunity of penetrating into the great masses of the American proletariat, while assuming the central position in this left organization. Building Communist organizations wherever there are a few Communists, the American Communists must at the same time stand at the head of this movement for the uniting of all revolutionary elements and must now with especial energy proclaim the slogan of the united front of the working-class, for example, for the relief of the unemployed. The chief indictment of the Gompers' trade-unions should be the fact that they refuse to participate in the establishment of a united front of the workers against the capitalists for the relief of the unemployed.

16—In *Switzerland* our Party has been able to achieve several successes in the above mentioned manner, thanks to the agitation of the Communists for the united front they have been able to compel the trade-union bureaucracy to convoke an extraordinary congress which will take place in the near future, and in which our comrades will be able to expose the mendacity of reformism before all the workers of Switzerland and will be able to push the work of the revolutionary uniting of the proletariat still further.

17—In a number of other countries the question takes on an altogether different view as a result of entirely new local conditions. After this sketch of the general line of action the Executive of the Communist International is convinced that the various Communist parties will understand how to apply it in conformance with the conditions prevailing in each country.

18—The Executive of the Communist International considers as the main conditions which are alike and absolutely decisive for the Communist Parties of all countries, the absolute autonomy and complete independence of each Communist Party which makes an agreement with the parties of the Second and 2½ Internationals in the expression of its views and in the criticism of the opponents of Communism. While submitting to the principles of *action*, the Communists must unconditionally retain the right and the possibility of expressing their opinion on the policies of all organizations of the working-class without exception, not only before and after the action, but also when necessary *during the action* as well. The surrender of these conditions is under no circumstances permissible. In supporting the slogan of the greatest possible unity of all workers' organizations in every *practical action against the capitalist front*, the Communists can in no case renounce the exposition of their views which alone are the logical expression of the defense of the interests of the working-class as a whole.

19—The Executive of the Communist International considers it useful to remind all brother parties of the experiences of the Russian Bolsheviks—the only party at present which has been able to win a victory over the bourgeoisie and seize power. During the decade and a half which elapsed between the birth of Bolshevism and its victory over the bourgeoisie (1903—1917) Bolshevism did not cease to carry on a tireless fight against reformism, or what is the same thing, Menshevism. But at the same time the Russian Bolsheviks often came to an agreement with the Mensheviks in the course of this decade and a half. The formal separation from the Mensheviks took place in Spring 1905. But under the influence of the stormy labor movement the Bolsheviks at the end of 1905 had already formed a common front with the Mensheviks. The former split took place for a second time and finally in January 1912. From 1905 to 1912, split alternated with union and half union in 1906, 1907 and 1910. And these unions and half unions took place not only because of the changes of factional conflict, but also under the direct pressure of the great masses of workers who were awakening to active political life and actually demanded that they should be given the possibility of testing by their own experience whether the way of Menshevism really deviates from the path of the revolution. An especially strong desire for unity was to be observed among the Russian working-masses before the new revolutionary movement following the strikes on the Lena, just before the outbreak of the imperialist war. The leaders and diplomats of Russian Menshevism at that time attempted to utilize the desires of the workers for their ends about in the same way as the leaders of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam Internationals now are attempting to do. The Russian Bolsheviks did not reply to that desire of the workers for unity with a rejection of the united front. On the contrary, as a counterbalance to the diplomatic game of the Menshevik leaders, the Russian Bolsheviks proclaimed the slogan "Unity from Below", that is the unity of the working-masses in the actual struggle for the revolutionary demands of the workers against the capitalists. Practice has shown that this was the only correct answer. And as a result of these tactics, dependent on circumstances, and changing with time and place, a large number of the best Menshevik workers were won over to Communism.

20—In issuing the slogan of the united front of the proletariat and in concluding agreements between the various sections of the Communist International and the parties and unions of the Second and 2½ Internationals, the Communist International cannot naturally refuse to contract such agreements on an international scale as well. The Executive of the Communist International made a proposal to the Amsterdam International in connection with relief for the Russian famine-stricken. It repeated this proposal for common action in connection with the White Terror in Spain and Yugoslavia and the persecutions of the workers in those countries. The Executive of the Communist International now makes a new proposal to the Amsterdam, Second and also 2½ Internationals in connection with the first period of activity on the Washington Conference which has shown that the international working-class is menaced by a new imperialist butchery. Up to the present the leaders of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam Internationals have shown by their behavior that they drop their unity slogan when it comes to *practical action*. In all such cases it will be the duty of the Communist International as a whole and of its various sections in particular to point out to the masses of the workers the hypocrisy of the leaders of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam Internationals, who prefer unity with the bourgeoisie to unity with the revolutionary workers, who for example are a component part of the Washington imperialist conference by remaining in the International Labor Office of the League of Nations, instead of organizing the struggle against imperialist Washington. But a rejection of this or that practical proposal of the Communist International on the part of the leaders of the Second, 2½ and Amsterdam Internationals will not cause us to give up the tactics here sketched out, which are deeply rooted in the masses and which we must systematically and unswervingly develop. When a proposal for a common battle front is rejected by our opponents it is necessary that the masses learn of it and in this way learn who are the real destroyers of the united front of the working-class. When they agree with our proposals the action must gradually be made more thoroughgoing and intensified as much as possible. In both cases it is necessary that the attention of the working-masses should be attracted by the negotiations of the Communists with the other organizations, for it is necessary to interest the broad masses in all the swings back and forth of the struggle for the united front of the proletariat.

21—In drawing up the sketched-out plan, the Executive of the Communist International warns all brother parties of the dangers which can arise in this connection. Not all Communist parties are sufficiently developed and strengthened and not all the parties have completely broken with Centrist and semi-Centrist ideology. It is possible that cases of excesses may rise—tendencies which will actually mean the dissolution of the Communist Parties and groups in the formless united bloc. In order to carry out the sketched-out tactics successfully for the cause of Communism, it is necessary that the Communist Party itself, which must put these tactics into execution, should be firmly united and that its leadership should be marked by ideal clarity.

22—Among the groups within the Communist International itself which are with more or less justice counted as right and even semi-Centrist, there are no doubt tendencies of two sorts. One element has really not broken with the ideology and the measures of the Second International, has not freed itself from respect for its former organization and unconsciously or half-consciously seeks the way to an ideal understanding with the Second International and as a result with bourgeois society. Other elements which are fighting against formal radicalism, against the errors of the so-called "Left" and others, desire to give the tactics of the young Communist Party more flexibility, more capacity for manoeuvring in order to enable it to penetrate the more quickly in the masses. The quick development of the Communist parties has sometimes forced these two tendencies in the same camp, in a certain degree into the same grouping. The employment of the above indicated methods, the mission of which is the anchoring of Communist agitation in the united mass-action of the proletariat, most clearly exposes the really reformist tendencies within the Communist parties and by the correct employment of these tactics will extraordinarily assist in the revolutionary consolidation of the Communist parties, by the education of the impatient or sectarian elements through experience as well as by the cleansing of the Party of reformist ballast.

23—By the united front of the workers we understand the union of all workers who desire to fight against capitalism, in other words including the workers who still follow the *Anarchists and Syndicalists*. In other countries such workers can also be of assistance in the revolutionary struggle. The Communist International has from the first days of its existence maintained a friendly attitude to these proletarian elements which gradually

are overcoming their prejudices and coming over to Communism. The Communists must pay more attention to them than ever now, when the united front of the workers against the capitalists is becoming an actuality.

24—For the final decisions on future work in this field the Executive of the Communist International has decided to convoke a session of the Executive in the immediate future at which all parties are to send a double delegation.

25—The Executive of the Communist International will carefully follow each practical step in this field and requests all parties to report to it with all details every attempt and every success in the above direction.

POLITICS

The Political Outlook in England

by M. Phillips Price.

It is just three years ago that Lloyd George rushed England into the turmoil of a general election on the cry, "Hang the Kaiser and make Germany pay for the costs of the war." The moment was opportune for him. He could parade himself before the electors as the man, who had won the war and he knew that the psycho-neurosis of war was still gripping the minds of nine-tenths of the British public. The election ended in a complete victory for the Government Coalition of Liberal and Conservative parties and with the aid of this "democratic" majority Lloyd George was able to rule England, until he felt that the time was opportune for him to go to the country again.

Since that time England has enjoyed the fruits of the policy, which Lloyd George pursued on the strength of his majority, obtained at the elections of Dec. 1918. The South Wales coal trade is ruined, nearly two million unemployed walk the street, the French bourgeoisie dominate the continent of Europe and the German workers produce goods, underselling those made by British labour in all markets of the world. The British Empire has been torn with convulsions in Ireland, India and Egypt and a dangerous naval rivalry, which threatened to develop into a new war with America, had all ready begun. The outlook for the ruling classes of England and for the Lloyd George coalition, which represented it, looked extremely dark during the summer of 1921. That being the case it was of course impossible for Lloyd George to hold a general election and to appeal to the country on the results of his policy. For it is one of the principles of parliamentary government in England that a Prime Minister only appeals to the country, when he is popular and if he happens to have made himself unpopular during his term of office, then he must not appeal but hold on at all costs, until he has found some sensational diversion, which will suddenly gain for him popularity. And as long as he has a "sound" press at his disposal, ready to cry, "no election", as long as an election would mean defeat for the government and to cry, "election", as soon as it would mean victory, he has nothing to fear.

All during the summer Lloyd George has been busily seeking for a diversion, which would hypnotise the mind of the English "petty bourgeois", and secure for him another victory at the elections. There is no doubt that he worked very hard to secure a settlement in Ireland. All through the terror of the Anglo-Irish war last year Lloyd George was secretly trying to find a solution, which would retain Ireland in the British Empire and at the same time satisfy Sinn Fein's demand for independence. His former reputation as a radical-democrat and as the man, who spoke out in favour of the Boers at the time of the Boer war, had not been forgotten, so that it was not difficult for him to appear in the role of a peacemaker in Ireland. The present Treaty with Ireland, which will in all probability be ratified by the Irish parliament before many days, is directly his work. Thereby the British naval and military forces are secured in the possession of the Irish coasts in the event of future wars, while the Irish petty bourgeoisie are put on the same level as the Canadian and Australian farmers, as partners in the British Commonwealth.

In Washington, moreover, Lloyd George has secured a success. It is true that he has had to submit to the unpleasant operation of having the British lions' claws cut; for that is what happened with the abandonment of the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the acceptance of Mr. Hughes naval ratio. The old English song, "Britannia rules the waves" will have to be changed into "Uncle Sam and Britannia rule the waves". Nevertheless the Washington Conference so far has removed the danger of an Anglo-American war, which would have meant the end of the British Empire, has avoided the danger of Irish-American

cooperation at England's weakest spot and has given Lloyd George the chance to appear before the British public as the man, who avoided conflict with America and reduced the naval program.

Again on the continent of Europe Lloyd George is trying now to play the role of the "man who saved Europe from bankruptcy". In this he has the support not only of the small shopkeeper class and of the so-called "man in the street" but also of the big bourgeoisie and even to some extent of finance capital, whose economic power has been seriously threatened by the ruin of the German market and the military domination of France over the continent of Europe. His plan for the reconstruction of Europe by the aid of a huge international finance consortium is an attempt to save capitalism from the effects of post-war decay and at the same time to win the applause of pacifists, democrats and "Manchester-School Liberals". Will it succeed? That will be decided at Cannes. But even if it does not succeed on an international scale, it will and has to a large extent already succeeded on a national scale in England, by rallying round him again all those elements of the population, who were beginning to become very discontented with his government and with the bad trade and unemployment, which followed the Versailles and Spa treaties.

Also in regard to Russian policy Lloyd George is trying to mobilize those people in England, who realise that the exclusion of Russia from the European markets is disastrous for British industry. It is an open secret that Lloyd George has all along been an opponent of military intervention and the war against Soviet Russia and even at the time when he was making anti-Soviet speeches, he was working to stop the intervention policy and to secure the recognition of the *de facto* government of Russia. All these ideas are popular now in English middle class and intellectual circles and Lloyd George, whose political sense is probably the keenest of any politician in Europe, has not been slow to make himself the mouthpiece of these ideas.

If he succeeds in carrying thorough and realizing all these plans in Europe (he has already realized, as I have shown, his plans in Ireland and America) his position in England will be so strong, that it will be comparable to that of William Pitt at the time when England headed the European coalition against Napoleon. Then will be time for him to appeal to the electors at a general election and secure a new lease of political life. The position of the British bourgeoisie is undoubtedly stronger than it was a few months ago. It is no longer threatened with a great war with America and, while it has serious troubles in Egypt and India, the outcome of which it is hard to foresee, it has at home beaten down the labor organizations and secured large wage reductions and a lowering of the standard of living of the working population. This last fact of course will tell against Lloyd George at the new election, when it comes. For there can be no doubt that the Labour party will be able to secure a large number of new supporters, as a consequence of increased labor discontent. But it is extremely doubtful if the Labour Party can do more than increase its representation in parliament. The vast majority of the small middle class, the rentiers and the unconscious elements of labor will vote for the "man who made peace with Ireland, prevented conflict with America and saved Europe from bankruptcy". And many of them will not even have the political sense to do that but will vote for the man, who gives them the best glass of beer. Thus Lloyd George remains the dictator of England—the dictator however not with a mailed fist but with a velvet glove. It is meanwhile the task of the Labour and Communist parties of England to form a united front and make clear to the masses the shallowness and hypocrisy of the parliamentary regime in England.

January 4, 1922.

The Revolution in Egypt

by Arthur Rosenberg.

"It appears as if we have let an opportunity in Egypt slip by which will not easily come again"; the "Manchester Guardian" wrote warningly a few days ago. It is remarkable that England in spite of its victory in the world war today has less authority in its colonies than ever before. The situation in India is today more difficult than in the 50's of the century, at the time of the great Indian Mutiny. Never had there raged in Ireland a civil war of such bitterness as in 1921. Egypt has never so risen against the foreign invaders since the occupation of the country by English troops 40 years ago. These facts support the belief that in the last world war the question of defeat or victory had nowhere near the importance that

attached to it in previous conflicts. England, the "victorious" power, is faced by phenomena which usually appear only in defeated countries. In spite of its formal victory, English capitalism is deeply involved in the general crisis of world capital. The disaffection in the British colonies is nourished by the conviction that the old system of society is tottering and that at the present time it is possible to establish new economic and political forms of society by energetic action.

Up to the world war Egypt was formally a Turkish province, which however actually was under English control—occupied by British troops, exploited by British capital and ruled by British commissioners on the style of Lord Cromer. When England declared war on Turkey it abolished Egypt's formal allegiance to the Sultan in Constantinople. In Cairo there now sits an "independent" Sultan dependent on England's favor. However, the masses of the Egyptian people are protesting more and more decisively against this state of affairs. Until recently there existed two parties in Egypt. The Moderate Party was supported by the well-to-do native bourgeoisie and sought an understanding with Britain. Its leader was Adly Pasha. The Radical Party, opposed to this standpoint, was under the leadership of Zaghlul Pasha, a man with exceptional gifts as an agitator and organizer. This radical wing, which demands Egypt's independence and the expulsion of the foreign exploiters, has taken especial root among the students of the country. The celebrated Mohammedan University of Cairo has developed into a citadel of the Egyptian revolution. Whenever a movement commences, the students immediately go on strike. They do not, however, remain at home, but go into the streets of the cities and into the villages to preach the revolution. These thousands of young fanatical Mohammedan intellectuals are the shock troops of the movement, behind which the millions of exploited peasants, artisans and workers group themselves. This situation can be in some degree compared to that in Central Europe in 1848 or, even better, to the present situation in China, where the students and other young intellectuals also are the standard-bearers of the nationalist movement. These students, in China as well as in Egypt, are at first dominated only by national ideals. But the exceptional situation of their country brings it about that their nationalist struggle is directed against foreign capitalism, and in this connection they can expect no support from the half-hearted native bourgeoisie, but must depend on the great masses of the poorer population. Thus, the national struggle for independence in Egypt as well as in China adopts a social-revolutionary character. There are a few trade-union organizations in Egypt, but the political organization of the Egyptian proletariat is in its infancy.

During 1921, the British began to realize that they could not indefinitely rest their rule on the bayonet, and that some sort of agreement with the native population must be sought. A Commission was appointed to study the Egyptian question under the chairmanship of Lord Milner, who is considered by many as the cleverest representative of British world power. The Milner Commission recommended far-reaching concessions, above all the evacuation of the provocative British troops from the country. Only the Suez canal, an important link in the lines of communications of the British Empire, was to be protected by British troops. Lord Milner desired a compromise between British capital and the native Egyptian bourgeoisie. These two could easily come to an understanding on the economic field. Adly Pasha, the Egyptian Prime Minister, came to London last autumn to conclude an agreement in accordance with the spirit of the Milner Report. But Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Minister, spoiled everything through his obstinacy. He submitted a treaty draft to the Egyptian which meant nothing more or less than a perpetuation of present conditions, together with continual occupation of the entire country by British troops. Adly Pasha is usually a willing man, but the Egyptian bourgeoisie, in whose name he spoke, desired in one way or another to rise to the status of associates of the British Empire. They were no longer content to play the role of slaves. Adly Pasha refused to sign, left for home and resigned as Prime Minister. Thus the united national front was established in Egypt. The Adly Party united with that of Zaghlul for common action.

Britain's might is wielded in Egypt by Lord Allenby, a ruthless soldier and conqueror of Jerusalem in the war. He proceeded according to the recommended methods of reaction. Zaghlul and his most prominent adherents were arrested and deported to Ceylon. Native papers have been suppressed and political meetings forbidden. There followed a revolutionary uprising in the great cities of the country Cairo, Alexandria, Port Said and Suez. The students, officials and railwaymen went on strike. The people erected barricades and attacked the British troops, which resulted in many fatal casualties. The movement spread to the rural districts and the British resorted

to their accepted measures. The beating of political prisoners, which is secretly employed in Poland, Hungary, Germany and Spain, is allowed by law in Egypt, the realm of British democracy. Lord Allenby proclaimed that he would employ airplane bombs against assemblages of people. In Alexandria, British warships entered the harbour, armed ships were sent up the Nile and the bank deposits of Zaghlul Pasha, of his friends and of the National Egyptian Association were confiscated.

The British military despotism may again succeed in temporarily restoring order in Egypt. But British capital gains nothing thereby. The new infamies of the foreign rulers will only result in the more rapid revolutionizing of the country. In Ireland houses were set on fire and men executed by court-martial until British militarism did not know which way to turn. The cleverer representatives of the British bourgeoisie have already begun to realize this. It is not at all improbable that it will again attempt to separate the Adly Party from the revolutionaries and to come to a compromise with the Egyptian bourgeoisie. But Britain will now have to make much greater sacrifices than were necessary last autumn. Things in Egypt as well as in India and Ireland are following their inexorable path. All these national independence movements will sooner or later have to merge in the battle of the world revolution against dominating capital.

ECONOMICS

Economic Problems in Cannes

by *Spectator*.

Our prophecy, that the London Conference between Lloyd George and Briand would lead to no positive results, has been confirmed. The reparations question is still to be solved and is the main point taken up at Cannes. The beginning of the New Year involuntarily causes one to review the numerous conferences which have gone before and reminds one that two years ago, at the beginning of 1920, the same phrases were to be heard and the same problems were on the carpet before the League of Nations. The restoration of Europe has not made any progress and the English trade journals state that "as far as the British iron and steel industry is concerned, the past year must be considered one of the worst in the last fifty years" (Reichmann and Co., Glasgow, 30th December). The continually falling prices and the ever-increasing unemployment figures confirm this opinion and explain England's desire to emerge from this state of affairs in whatever way it can.

In addition to this the domestic situation must be held in mind the imminent general election. The London correspondent of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" hits the nail on the head when he says that Lloyd George's fear that the Labor Party might derive an undue advantage from the present degree of unemployment, causes him to seek a good election slogan in Cannes. Whether the Cannes Conference will have a better result than the previous conferences is another question.

What are the financial-economic problems which are before the Cannes Conference? Apparently the following plan for Germany's reparations payments has been adopted: the payment of 700,000,000 gold marks in 1922 and payments in goods for the rest required by the peace treaty and the Wiesbaden Agreement. Briand is supposed to have agreed to this plan and now the French industrialists are only waiting for their extra profits in order to agree as well.

At first it must be stated that the deliveries in goods are fundamentally no less ruinous to German industry than the payments in gold, which at bottom are also nothing but payments in goods. Germany has no gold. Therefore it must sell goods for foreign currency in order to deliver over this money as reparations payments. However, in this manner Germany is sharply competing with the other countries; England wants to eliminate that. Germany is to deliver directly goods which represents the same diminution of Germany's already weakened productive forces as the payments in gold. In addition, in order to be able to deliver manufactured products, Germany must buy raw material in the foreign market, for which it receives no repayment. As a result the mark will again sink. If Germany should be deprived of part of its labor-power, its productive capacity is diminished and the final result is the same.

As compensation for the fact that the German employers are to derive huge profits from the restoration of the devastated regions, the French industrialists are to participate in a consortium which is to assist in the restoration of Soviet Russia. Felix Deutsch the general director of the A.E.G. (General

Electric Company) has worked out the details of such a consortium. Its main points are that an international financial syndicate with representatives from the United States, England, France and Germany are to take over the Russian railways and harbors and in addition are to obtain a large number of various concessions. England and Germany are to deliver the goods and America to furnish the necessary capital. What role France is to play is not entirely clear. The French newspapers raise the same question. Apparently France is to receive the assurance that its capital previously lent to Russia is to be repaid.

The entire plan is well thought out. Only one question arises—what the attitude of Soviet Russia will be to such a consortium; whether it will submit to the yoke of international capital and deliver to it the economic arteries of the country.

This plan, however, has another flaw. It is built up on America's capital. America is to furnish the money so that Germany may profit by trade with Russia and deliver a portion of its profits to the Entente as reparations payment. But American capital fights shy of Europe. A bank expert, Dr. Felix Somary, writes in the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse" of the 24th of December, 1921, that America isolates itself from Europe because it has no confidence in European conditions. "Only an occurrence tending to create confidence," he writes, "such as the elimination of huge international expenditures for armaments or the downfall of Bolshevism in Russia, can open the way for a large loan for the countries in financial difficulties." As long as Bolshevism exists in Russia American capital will fight shy of Europe. Since, as Somary himself admits, such an event is not likely to occur in the near future, he arrives at a very pessimistic estimate of the situation. Whether the increasing crisis in America will cause American capital to take this chance in spite of everything cannot be definitely stated at the present moment. Under any circumstances it can be taken for granted that Deutsch' plan will not be realized in the immediate future and that in Cannes Europe will be as little rescued as in the previous conferences of the League of Nations.

The Bank Crisis in Italy.

by Umberto Terracini (Rome).

The reaction, established by the bourgeoisie in the belief that the growing power of the proletariat hindered the restoration of Italian industry, has ended by hastened the collapse of the financial organism of the Italian nation. In the closing days of 1921—this year so tragic for the Italian proletariat, suffering under the double scourge of the State and the White Guards—the Banca di Sconto, the largest credit institution in Italy, closed its doors and turned over its affairs to the Roman court.

The failure of the bank, which was brought about by the crash of the largest Italian industrial undertaking, "Ansaldo", has brought in its wake the failure of innumerable smaller concerns, so that the sphere of those affected grows from day to day. The proletariat, the final and inescapable victim of all the criminal and insane acts of the present system, has already been drawn into the vortex. Thousands of workers have been thrown out of work by the shutting down of the factories which were suddenly deprived of the support of the bank.

It can be said that with the crash of the Banca di Sconto the tragic cycle of Italian intervention in the world war has been closed for the Banca di Sconto can actually be called the bank of intervention.

Until 1914 Italy was ruled by the Banca Commerciale Italiana, founded principally by German capital and directed by Germans. Its activity in the economic field from the first developed parallel to the activity of the government on the international diplomatic field. The Triple Alliance had thrust Italy in the direction of a German orientation and the Banca Commerciale, which worked for the development of Italian industry and commerce, assisted in weakening England's and France's economic power. Thus, for example, the Banca Commerciale advocated the electrification of the Italian railways in order to deal a blow to the export of English coal.

The outbreak of the world war and the preparation for Italian intervention dealt the Banca Commerciale, which up to that time had indirectly controlled Italian politics, a severe blow; the Banca di Sconto was founded as a competitor.

The struggle between these two powerful financial institutions was fought out in the fight between two great competing metallurgical concerns, the "Ilva", supported by the Banca Commerciale and the "Ansaldo", subsidized by the Banca di Sconto.

The war-needs favored the duel between the two competitors, which immediately began to race with each other in the increase of capital and the building of new factories.

Thus in Italy, predominantly an agricultural country and poor in raw materials, an industry was artificially developed which with the end of the war and the cutting off of orders for metallurgical products woefully collapsed.

The traditional incapacity of Italian business men, who built castles in the air about the solution of the post-war crisis, prevented them from finding the only way of avoiding their ruin. Instead of demobilising the huge and now unnecessary works of the "Ilva" and "Ansaldo", they believed it necessary to enlarge them still further, imagining a growing demand of the domestic market. At the same time the two rival banks again took up the struggle through a cyclonic speculation on the stock exchange and the purchase of the shares of these industries controlled by the other banks. The clash was so great that both enterprises were ruined by it. The "Ilva" and the "Ansaldo", which had squandered their capital of hundreds of millions, collapsed, and now they are followed by the Banca di Sconto. The Banca Commerciale, the organ of the German financial world in Italy, has by a miracle remained standing; the Banca di Sconto, organ of military intervention, has failed.

Thus the world war has ended in Italy with a terrible collapse for the banks as well. Those who suffer the most by it are the petty and middle bourgeoisie, the thrifty and standing customers of the much-advertised banks. Previously they were the main supporters of Italian intervention and then served as the dam against the revolutionary proletariat.

This is a lesson for the middle-class, which fears the revolution because it fears that it will be compelled to surrender its hard-earned property; to-day its savings are being appropriated by the most bitter enemy of Communism—the bank plutocracy.

A few figures will give an idea of the extent of the failure. The capital of the Banca di Sconto was 375,000,000 lire; deposits, 3,000,000,000 lire; branches and subsidiary institutions, 165, of which one-third were in the United States of America.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Next Problems before the Communist International.

by Karl Radek.

I.

Shortly after the split of the German Independent Socialists at the Congress in Halle and after the forming of the United Communist Party of Germany, the latter sent an "Open Letter" to the Social Democrats, the Independent Socialists and the Trade Unions, proposing united action in the immediate actual interest of the German working-class. This step was received with great joy by the membership of the German Communist Party. But some of the leading comrades of the K.P.D. and of the International, however, were greatly surprised. Indeed, we had just propagated the breaking away from the Right Independents; we had just exposed them to the masses, as traitors and now we propose united action with the very same Scheidemanns and trade-union leaders who during the war had betrayed the proletariat to the bloody reeking capitalists! The demands which we put in our "Open Letter" were equally strange. Not a word was said of the dictatorship of the proletariat; even the actual demands were in no way exaggerated for agitation. On the contrary, they were unusually sober and modest. It was clearly to be seen that they were so formulated that no one could possibly have said that they were mere propaganda watchwords. The surprise of a number of leading comrades had its historical reasons, just as the approval of the Communist workers in Germany struck the right political chord.

This step was taken in January 1921 in view of the great economic struggles then approaching; and it seemed strange because here was a case where a certain situation called forth tactics which seemed to contradict the existing ones; at any rate they were new. On the other hand, however, it brought new hope to the Communist workers that these tactics would enable them to launch a new energetic campaign among their fellow-workers. They felt that the split at Halle was necessary because they were convinced that the Dittmanns, Crispiens and Hilderfings were camouflaging their unwillingness to enter the revolutionary struggle with revolutionary phrases. But at the same time they felt that this split created a wide gulf not only between them and their party comrades but also between them and the great working-masses. These working-masses see that capital is everywhere taking the offensive against the proletariat

and they therefore consider every split as a stab in the back and as a division of the working-class forces. And how were the Communists to overcome this estrangement? Were they to prove to the non-Communist workers the necessity for the struggle, for the dictatorship? But it was just because the non-Communist workers believed that further progress could be made with the former tactics, that they remained in the Social Democratic and Independent Socialist Parties? The only way to reach these non-Communist masses was to *join them in their fight for their immediate needs and to support them in their immediate demands* which they considered as indispensable. By assuming the duty of fighting for the masses in their daily struggles, the Communist Party would thus acquire a common ground for an understanding with the working-masses, and the opportunity of showing the proletariat, more clearly than ever, the absolute necessity of fighting for the dictatorship. If, with the present disorder of capital, the working-masses should start a fight for higher wages, which should anywhere approach the high prices, this practical struggle would not only show the clash of interests between the proletariat and bourgeois democracy, but it would at the same time prove the necessity for more far-reaching economic transition demands. The demand for the control of production is an example. If carried out, this struggle would either compel the Social Democratic and trade-union leaders to go further towards the left under the pressure of the masses, or to quit; it would not be a question of "Dictatorship or Democracy", which they always manage to confuse before the masses because the latter are not yet completely free from democratic illusions, but a question of working-hours and bread, that is, questions which the worker can more easily grasp.

The bitter struggle which the Social Democrats and trade-union leaders immediately started against the new Communist tactics showed how proper these tactics were. The fact that the German Communist Party retreated one step and, instead of treating the Social Democratic and trade-union bureaucracy as traitors, proposed a common fighting front, and the fact that, instead of directing the struggle towards its final goal, the German Communist Party proposed to fight in common with the others for the immediate demands of all workers, disregarding all party lines, did not by any means weaken the German Communist Party; on the contrary, these facts strengthened it.

The Social Democrats beat back the first onslaught. But by means of it the German Communist Party fortified and extended its positions within the trade-unions, and it was able to sail on under favorable wind. Even the mistakes it committed in the March action and the losses it suffered as a result, were made good by this very "Open Letter" method. And there is not the slightest doubt but that the fight for a united workers' front which it is now carrying on in view of the great German crisis, will make the German Communist Party a great power among the German proletariat. The violent counterattack carried on by the Social Democrats and the Independents with the aid of the entire capitalist press, and which they base upon the actual or imaginary errors committed by the Communist Party in the March action, proves beyond a doubt how perfectly well they know that with its new tactics the Communist Party wields a mighty weapon against them.

II.

The tactics for a united workers' front, like any other tactical move of a big party were not the result of doctrinaire calculations by individual men. This tactical move was not invented but found. After it was proposed by the headquarters of the KPD. at a session of representatives from all locals, it appeared that a number of provincial organizations of the party had already tried that method, as for example, the Communists of the Rhineland, Westphalia and Stuttgart. The move was thus based upon the *practical* needs of the German movement.

In a short while it became evident that this move corresponded to condition in other countries. The Communist Party of Switzerland applied the same tactics. Even our Italian comrades, though only recently having broken away from the Socialist Party and having shown the most bitter opposition to Serrati, proposed to the Italian Socialist Party collections in common for the relief of Soviet Russia. But if it is possible for them to unite fronts with the Socialist Party in aiding Russian proletariat, why should they not attempt to form an united front against the Fascisti bandits? Serrati and his clique are no more to be relied upon as regards Russia than in the question of fighting the Fascisti. In both cases the Communist Party gains if it succeeds in taking the Socialist Party's word and driving it into the struggle, as well as when in a practical question which is clearly understood by the masses, the Socialist Party unmask itself by showing that its words are different from its actions. And how are things in Sweden? The bourgeoisie is divided and can form no capitalist government in spite of the fact that in the

elections it received the majority of votes. The Social Democrats wanted to form a coalition government with the liberals, but the latter refused. The Social Democratic Party being the strongest party in the government had to take over the government, but it cannot remain in power if the Communists withdraw their support. The Swedish Communist Party only received one-seventh of the number of votes cast for the Social-Democrats. The great majority of organized workers are followers of Branting. Were the Swedish Communist Party to aid the bourgeoisie in overthrowing Branting, then the Swedish working-class would be spared the experience of the Branting government. Development and disillusionment would be slowed down. Indeed, the Social Democratic workers would blame the Communist Party for depriving them of the "better" conditions which the Social Democratic government might have brought them. But if the Communist Party supports the Branting government as long as the latter does not itself disappoint the workers by compromising with the bourgeoisie, then the influence of the Communist Party will grow.

In a number of countries the move for an united front was a necessary one. But if it is beneficial to the Communists on a national scale it is also admissible on an international scale. The Communist International and the Red Trade Union International proposed to the Amsterdam Trade Union International that the relief for Soviet Russia be organized in common. Have we lost anything by the refusal of the Amsterdamers? No! They have merely shown the worthlessness of their cry for proletarian solidarity. Shall we lose anything by proposing to them to unite against the *new dangers of war as revealed by the Washington Conference?* Let them reject! Then the workers in all countries will say: "The Amsterdamers are lackeys of international imperialism and of the munition industries. They shout 'No more war', but when it is a question of united proletarian demonstrations, they creep into their holes". And what if we propose to them to fight together *against the danger of the French imperialistic occupation of the Ruhr*, and against the danger of the complete enslavement of Germany, which would make the German Proletariat the reducer of the wages of the international proletariat? And what if we propose a united demonstration *for the recognition of Soviet Russia* and a loan for the economic reconstruction of Russia without which the economic crisis and with it unemployment will only increase in all countries? If they reject these proposals, the workers of all countries will see that the Amsterdam Trade Union International and the Internationals 2 and 2½ are rejecting their immediate demands and interests, that they only wish to perpetuate the division of the working-class, and that they voluntarily enter into coalitions with the bourgeoisie not because, as they said before, the divided working-class makes it impossible to exert an united pressure upon the bourgeoisie and to establish workers' governments in countries like Germany, England, Sweden instead of the capitalist governments, but because they themselves want this coalition. But should the Amsterdam Trade Union International and the Internationals 2 and 2½ accept our proposals, we shall then attempt with the aid of the working-masses to *drive them forward* step by step, and every half-hearted move will turn against them.

The new tactics offer such positive advantages and open such favorable vistas to International Communism and to the proletarian class-struggle, that they will become the common property of all the Communist parties. If this is so, then it must be due to certain *general changes having taken place in the international situation.* I say changes because it is self-evident that in the years 1918—1920 we fought with quite different methods. Then, we not only did not propose any general united action to the Social Democratic parties. (although we did so in isolated cases) but we did everything to affect a *split* within their ranks. Formerly we gave first place to *general principles* — the dictatorship, the Soviet government whereas now, without having in the least changed our general demands, we give precedence to concrete transition demands. What do these changes consist of? There is only one answer to this question if we wish to understand and apply the new tactics correctly.

III.

Comrade Trotzky entitled his speech on the international economic situation and the tasks of the Communist International, which he delivered before the Third Congress of the Communist International, "The New Stage". *What does, according to him, this new stage consist of?* It merely means that during the war and in the first post-war period, that is, in the demobilization period which lasted almost up to the conclusion of the Peace of Versailles, there was still the possibility of overthrowing the bourgeois capitalistic governments, in spite of the weakness of the Communist parties. The great mass of armed workers

streaming back from the war were full of desire to win better living conditions, and the capitalist government machine was so shaken that it might easily have collapsed at their onslaught, even if the working-class had not made the seizure of power their immediate goal. The bourgeoisie survived the demobilization crisis firstly because the Social Democrats and the trade-union bureaucrats everywhere rushed to its aid, and secondly because of the temporary post-war boom caused by the enormous demand for goods by the war-starved world, which lasted until the Summer of 1920. *After the demobilization crisis passed, a new and general onslaught by the working-class depended upon the further dissolution of the world economic system, upon the intensification of the political disputes which had not been settled by the Versailles Peace, and upon the dying out of the illusions created by the democratic revolution of 1918 and by the events of 1918-1920.* The new stage was manifested in the fact that from the middle of 1919 on we could no longer count upon an international explosion within a definite space of time, but rather upon a new and slow ripening process of the world revolution. We had adopted this view as early as in the fall of 1919, that is, from the time of the letter to the K.P.D. convention at Heidelberg in September 1919. The view that the world revolution would be a long process, could not at once be adopted by every Communist Party, because the world situation was overshadowed by the catastrophic situation in Central Europe, by the victorious armed struggle of Soviet Russia against the Allies and by the general situation. Occurrences like the Kapp Putsch in the Spring of 1920 and the victories of Soviet Russia over Poland, had a tendency to accelerate the process of development. Such occurrences are at present also possible, because the entire situation in Central Europe is analogous to a volcano, and because on the basis of the new economic policy, Soviet Russia will become a more powerful factor. Such occurrences would indeed accelerate the process of development, but they would not alter the general character of the present stage, which may be designated as follows: the victory of the proletariat on an international scale will follow only as a result of very long struggles carried on in most varying ways. This view was finally adopted by the Communist International and is expressed by the idea of "The New Stage".

A number of tactical and strategic deductions followed. The first deduction is that the immediate task before the Communist International is *not a general onslaught, but the organization of the army for the general onslaught, and drilling and manœuvring it*, which does not at all exclude the possibility that in individual countries general battles may take place overnight.

The first problem of the new stage was therefore to form parties which should consciously agitate and carry on Communist propaganda, intensify every local struggle of the proletariat, make it more general and transform it into a revolutionary struggle. This could be achieved partly by splitting off small Communist groups which in the process of the struggle would gain influence among the working-masses and partly by working within the Social Democratic parties which they would finally conquer or succeed in splitting. The Communist parties of the various countries were thus formed in either of these ways according to the situation in the particular country. First they were to assimilate the main Communist principles themselves and then to popularize them among the masses; the idea of civil war, for instance, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the Soviet government. What happened however, was that although as early as the middle of 1919, the necessity for starting concrete agitation on the basis of immediate and uncompromising transition demands became apparent, the Communist parties entered upon this task very timidly and unsystematically. Some of them considered this an unnecessary weakening of our agitation. Moreover, we must not forget that every intensification of the world-situation roused the hope of the young Communist elements for an early revolution and a quick victory. This hope gave rise to *putschist tendencies*; tendencies which sought to spare themselves the lengthy task of winning the masses, and attempted to win the final victory with a revolutionary minority.

The Second Congress of the Communist International accomplished the main task in the adaptation of the new tactics by the Communist parties for the new stage and for the problems which it raised, although its essentials were not as well understood as they are now. The Second Congress obligated the parties of the Communist International to lead the fight for the winning of the working masses on the basis of the mass-organization of the proletariat. It pledged them to begin with the immediate needs of the proletariat. It recommended to them to make use of all the local means that are still left

us by the capitalist democracy, (parliamentary action for example), and at the same time to fortify themselves by developing the illegal organizations. In the much abused 21 conditions it drew the line between the Communist Parties and those parties which pretended to be Communist but which in reality only sought to sabotage the work of Communism. The theses dealing with the functions of the party crowned the work of the Second Congress, which could be characterized as follows:

Formation of Communist parties for the preparatory work for the world revolution; drawing the line between these parties and the confused half-communistic, half-syndicalistic elements on the one hand, and the confused half-centrist parties on the other; and the setting of politically and organically well disciplined and sound parties to work among the great masses of the proletariat on the basis of the latter's daily demands.

The work of the Second Congress and its results in Germany, Italy and France—the splits in Halle, Tours and Livorno—formed the *pre-requisite for the next task*. Communist parties were created.

The Communist parties then had the task of starting the struggle for winning over the majority of the proletariat. It is self-evident that this struggle on their part cannot merely consist of parrot-like repetitions of the various watchwords like the dictatorship of the Proletariat or that of the Soviet system of government, but it is the duty of these parties to participate in every struggle of the proletariat, to explain to the proletariat its own experiences step by step and to attempt to extend its battle front more and more and to broaden the goal it is fighting for. It is in this way that the Communist policy takes root in the practical struggles of the proletariat for its immediate demands. From this it follows that these demands may often be identical with those of the other parties which seek the support of the proletariat, and which in the question of revolution are separated from us by an abyss.

The nature of the so-called reformist parties during the epoch of the social revolution consists not only of proposing reforms wherever the overthrow of capitalism becomes a real historical question; not only of their reformist utopianism, but in the fact that they themselves do not take their Utopia seriously and that they are in no way disposed or willing to fight even for reforms. The difference between the Communist parties and the reformist parties is therefore not only a difference in the final goal of the two, that is, not only in the question of "Reform or Revolution", but also in the fact that the leaders of the reformist parties are not at all willing to fight.

As far as the Social Democratic leaders are concerned, the outward approach towards these parties in the practical struggles for immediate demands, will in no way lead to an actual approach. But it is different with the organized workers of the Social Democratic party and the trade-unions. They are still suffering from reformist illusions and they are still afraid of the revolutionary struggle, but they are compelled to fight for an improvement of their conditions which are ever growing worse. And this struggle exceeds the limits of a struggle for reforms and leads to the collapse of capitalism; this struggle becomes one for power. The working masses which start out in this fight, blinded by reformist illusions, will in the process undergo a radical change. Of course, it is also possible that under the pressure of the radicalized masses the Social Democratic leaders may be compelled to go towards the left and that the sincerer elements among them will finally realize that reformism means the rejection of every struggle. The joint struggle of the Social Democratic and Communist parties for the immediate interests of the working-class may lead to splits within the Social Democratic parties, and may, under certain circumstances, even lead to their adopting Communist principles. It is also very possible that in the countries where the Social-Democratic parties have a deep foundation as mass-organizations, the Communist parties may be unable to win over the majority of the working-class before the coming to power of the Social Democrats. Only after their experiences with the Social Democratic governments, will the majority of the working-class be convinced of the necessity for adopting the Communist policy.

These questions came up with the developments in Germany after the Second Congress of the Communist International, and the party answered them with the struggle for a united front. This move raised a second question, namely, the question of slogans for local fights. It was clear that the local struggles broke out with local watchwords which set the fighting proletariat against the capitalist order. What were these watchwords therefore to be? Were they to be a program of reforms which we should seek to realize under the capitalistic system, or were they to form a fighting program which sought to smash the power of capitalism and increase the power of the working-

class? This question is easily answered. We Communists can only put up a *fighting program against capitalism*, and not a program of this reform. Our watchwords must of themselves reach out towards higher aims. In forming these watchwords we are not to be concerned with the question whether these harmonize with the interests of the capitalist class, but we are to consider whether they correspond to the interests of the proletariat and to the highest degree of its class-consciousness and willingness to fight. Objectively speaking, our watchwords are formed out of the crisis of world-capitalism. Even the most modest demands which would bring the working-class human living conditions endanger the present capitalist social order. The utopianism of the reformists consists in the very fact that most of their demands cannot be realized under the capitalist system which is doomed to death. The capitalist system can be restored only over the corpses of millions of workers. If the working-class wants to live, however, capitalism must die.

Thus the new questions put by the development of Communism on the basis of the new stage, reduce themselves to the question of the struggle for winning over the majority of the working-class not merely by the method of effecting further splits and divisions among the Social Democratic parties, but also by organizing a battle front in common with them; *not only by means of propaganda carried on for the final goal, but also by means of fighting for the immediate transition demands.*

But the development of the Communist parties does not proceed according to a previously thought-out scheme; so that these parties undertake new tasks as soon as the old ones are accomplished. The same party which through its experience had revealed the *new tactical problems* to the International, that is, the problem of a united proletarian front in the struggle for transition demands, committed a number of errors in March of this year. These errors revived some *old tactical questions*. The errors committed by the V.K.P.D. in the March action consisted firstly of the fact that although since the fall of 1919, that is, since the party convention at Heidelberg, this very party entertained the theoretical opinion that we were facing a new campaign in which the seizure of power was not an immediate aim, the same party led a partial struggle which was forced upon it, as if it were the final struggle. It resorted to *armed insurrection* where the situation called for a *general strike* at the most. This error had its historical reasons. The masses that left the U.S.P.D. wanted to test themselves as to whether they were Communistic. They rushed into action. While the members of the Spartacus League had been disillusioned in their fight with the K.A.P.D. (as if it were possible for a minority to seize power in Germany) the left mass of the U.S.P.D. workers had not yet forgotten the teachings of the old school. They could get rid of their putschist ideas only after they had made them part of their own experience. After the K.P.D. entered into the struggle as a slight minority, its extreme elements sought to avoid the inevitable defeat by starting a series of terroristic acts which only repulsed the masses from the party. In view of the situation and in view of the limited freedom of action of a minority, these mistakes were converted into a theory of the offensive which was based upon the general rising curve of the revolution and upon the idea of the minority as a determining factor which by setting an example, draws the majority into the struggle. Due to these errors the Third Congress was convoked sooner than was expected and was *assigned the task of cancelling the errors that had been made and of emphasizing to all the Communist parties that their immediate task lay in the struggle for the winning over of the majority of the working-class.* The Congress defined the conditions under which this struggle will proceed as follows:

"Taking into consideration the fact that in Western Europe and America the working masses are organized into trade-unions and political parties and that therefore spontaneous action can not be expected except in rare, isolated cases, it is the duty of the Communist Party to seek to extend its influence within the trade-unions and by increasing the pressure upon the other parties which depend upon the working masses for support, *to open the general struggle for the immediate interests and demands of the proletariat.* And in case the non-Communist parties are forced to join in this struggle, the task of the Communists will be to prepare the working masses beforehand for a possible betrayal on the part of the non-Communist parties at a later stage of the struggle, and to intensify the situation as much as possible in order to

be able in time to lead the struggle independently. (Compare with "Open Letter" of the V.K.P.D., "*Which may be the starting-point for similar actions*"). Should the pressure exerted by the Communist Party within the trade-unions and in the press not prove strong enough to draw the proletarian masses into the fight as one united front, then it will be the duty of the Communist party to attempt to lead a large part of the proletariat into the struggle independently."

The Congress also defined its position in the matter of transition demands which it acknowledged to be perfectly correct in principle. But since the attention of the Congress was particularly called to the errors and lessons of the March action, it could pass neither concrete international decisions upon international actions as based upon the tactics of the "Open Letter", nor could it treat the question of transition demands in detail. That is why these questions seemed to be new ones when they came up in the treatment of the tax question by the K.P.D. The question of a possible united action with the Amsterdam International and with the Internationals 2 and 2½ thus seemed to be a new one to some of our comrades. But in reality they are only concrete logical deductions from the theses of the Third Congress.

IV.

The new stage in which the Communist development finds itself now has been going on since 1919. The problems put to us by this stage of development have been solved step by step in the same form in which they were put to us, that is, the solutions, like the problems, depended upon concrete and very often upon contradictory and chaotic events. *These new problems are not only neither contradictory to the old ones nor to the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviets, but they point the only way in which we can possibly reach this goal, in the midst of the concrete situation which followed the demobilization crisis.* In many respects this way is different from the one we intended to follow, the latter being based upon the experiences of the Russian Revolution. The Russian revolution took place during the war which drove all conflicts to a point in the least possible time, and thus contracted the span between the bourgeois and the proletarian revolution to the period between March and November. Because of the weakness of the Russian bourgeoisie, reformism, which was deeply rooted only in the working masses of those countries with an old bourgeois-democratic development, also remained weak in Russia. And as soon as we were able to shatter the Russian bourgeoisie, we were also in a position to smash the Russian bourgeoisie, we were also in a position to smash Russian reformism or Menshevism. The way towards the European revolution is very much longer; so much the more so towards the world revolution. The victory over the bourgeoisie and with it, over reformist ideology and the reformist organizations, is so much the more difficult. The struggle therefore required methods that were not used in the Russian revolution. In principle this was recognized by us very early (see my pamphlet, printed in November 1919: "The Development of the German Revolution and the Problems of the Communist Party", or Lenin's pamphlet entitled: "The Infantile Diseases of Communism", published in the spring of 1920). But the new methods cannot have a practical theoretical basis because they arise out of the concrete situation in a particular country. Only then can they be objectively examined and generalized by the Communist International. The theoreticians of the International 2½ on the one hand and the confused left Communists on the other consider these *new methods as an opportunistic degeneration of the Communist International.* We shall not tamper with the illusions of the heroes of the International 2½. "He who has worries has his booze". We shall be only too glad if this estimate of the transformation of the Communist International will lead the Social Democratic and the trade-unions leaders to join us in the fight for the immediate aims of the proletariat and will make them resolve to fight. Experience will show that this intermediate stage of development will lead to the *next one*, that is to the struggle of the international proletariat for power, to the struggle which is becoming more and more necessary if the proletariat is not to be completely enslaved. *The present stage is the preparatory stage for the great struggle that is coming.*

RELIEF FOR RUSSIA

Inadequate Relief for Russia by the Cooperative International

by Karl Bittel.

On the 4th of December an International Conference for the relief of the Russian famine took place in Berlin. It was held under the auspices of the foreign section of the Relief Commission for the Famine Sufferers of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. Krestinski, the representative of the Russian Soviet Republic acted as chairman, and Victor Kopp brought in the main report. Almost all of the important organizations were represented by delegates: The Amsterdam International Trade Union Federation (Grassmann), the Vienna International Working Union of Socialist Parties (Friedrich Adler), the International Red Cross, Nansen's Relief Committee, the English Relief Committee—"Hands off Soviet Russia", the Quakers, the Clarté, and many others. *It is interesting to note that no delegates were sent to this important conference by the International Cooperative League of London nor by the Central League of German Consumers.* It is about time that these organizations make it clear whether they wish to carry on an energetic campaign for the Russian Relief or not. The millions of proletarian cooperative members consider the intensive cooperation of the consumers' leagues in the Russian relief as a matter of course act of international as well as proletarian solidarity. It must therefore be made clear to them whether the appeal of the Basle Cooperative Convention and the promises made by the National Cooperative Leagues were anything more than empty phrases. Do the cooperatives seriously intend to cooperate with all their energy in the general Russian relief work or not?

More than five months have now passed since the Communist fraction in the cooperative council of the Consumers' League of Greater Berlin brought in the urgent motion (on the 25th of July) to organize a relief action on a large scale throughout the entire cooperative movement. At that time a concrete program was at once proposed. First of all a *Cooperative Fund* for Soviet Russia was to be created out of collected moneys and supplies; secondly a *Cooperative Supply Warehouse* was to be organized.

At the International Cooperative Convention which took place in Basle in August, the German delegation brought in a motion by which the International Cooperative League obligated its member organizations to aid the Russian Relief to their utmost; this motion was passed unanimously. Even before this, the *Centrosojus of Moscow* came before the International Cooperative movement with Comrade Chintschuk's appeal in which it was pointed out that it was just these organizations which were best capable of furnishing aid not only at the present moment but that they were also capable of taking permanent measures. Comrade Chintschuk particularly demanded a *regulated cooperative exchange of goods with Soviet Russia* and aid in the economic reconstruction of the suffering regions by means of a *cooperative credit* and other cooperative measures. In another appeal to the "Consumers' Leagues of all countries", the cooperatives of Western Europe were urged to furnish aid without delay and to support the Russian cooperative organizations with all their energy.

But what has happened until today? According to the latest issue of the "International Cooperative Bulletin" (London), the net result of the cooperative collections is not quite satisfactory. The latest figures are as follows:

French Cooperative Leagues (Paris) 37,000 frs.,
British Cooperative Leagues (Manchester) £1,530,
Norwegian League (Christiania) 35,000 Crowns,
Belgian League (Brussels) 40,000 frs.,
Bulgaria 250,000 leva,
Dutch Cooperative League (Hague) £125,
Austrian Cooperative Purchasing Society (Vienna) 100,000 Crowns,
Sweden 66,000 Crowns,
Central League of German Consumers (Hamburg) 96,000 marks.

The three cooperative headquarters existing in Czecho-Slovakia, namely, the Czecho-Slovakian, the German and the National-Socialist Consumers' Leagues, have passed the most far reaching resolution:

"All the Consumers' Leagues are obligated to give 50 crowns to the Relief Committee for Soviet Russia, out of every

100,000 crowns taken in. For these moneys goods are to be bought and sent to Russia in carloads together with goods already collected. Grain, flour, clothing, linen and shoes are to be collected". No one would say that the result is a success which even partially corresponds to the capacity of the International Cooperative movement. On the contrary one rather gains the impression that there is a *sabotage of Russian relief* going on. This impression is warranted by the experience with the German Consumers' Leagues of which there 1300 in number. Not even 30 of these have as yet made any contribution. The Central League itself has not as yet contributed a pfennig! These facts should rouse the cooperative membership to a vehement protest.

A special commission was named by the *Centrosojus*, the Central League of the Russian cooperatives. This commission started its activities on the 5th of August with an initial capital of 15,000,000,000 paper rubles and 4,000,000 gold rubles. In a short while the Volga regions which were hit by the famine, had 1,300,000 puds of grain, 700,000 puds of potatoes and large quantities of other food supplies; outside of this 385,000 children and 125,000 adults were being fed.

It is the serious duty of the cooperative world to see what aid it can furnish outside of money. Our proposal of the 25th of July to organize a *regulated cooperative exchange of goods*, was taken up again and discussed in detail at the conference of the 4th of December. This discussion revealed the most flagrant carelessness and neglect of duty on the part of the cooperative movement, which had sent no expert delegates. For, among the projects which formed a concrete plan, there was also that of creating an *international cooperative exchange* on a large scale, to be independent of high finance. An *International Workers' Bank* and a *Workers' Loan* are to be organized in the interest of the proletarian organizations. An extensive credit system for gold and goods must be introduced! This effective plan can however be realized only through the cooperation of the international trade-union and cooperative movements.

The cooperatives alone cannot do this. At the Basle convention they admitted that they are not in a position to carry out their fourteen year-old project of organizing an *International Purchasing Society*. But with the creation of an *International Workers' Bank*, this old project can also be realized, because we may say that the bank is the prerequisite.

We shall not discuss here what are the functions of an *International Workers' Bank*. At present it is important that the cooperatives put all their knowledge and experience which they have gathered in the course of their existence at the disposal of the Russian relief and in the service of this important plan. This project reaches beyond the momentary problems and points to the possibility thus given to the trade-unions and cooperatives to help *not only Soviet Russia but the entire economic world on the road to Socialism.*

THE RED TRADE UNION INTERNATIONAL

Agenda

For the session of the Central Committee of the R. T. U. I. on the 25th of January, 1922.

- 1— Report of the Executive Bureau. (Comrade Lozovsky.)
- 2— Reports of the representatives of the various countries.
- 3— The united front of the proletariat in the fight against the offensive of Capital.
 - a— Practical forms and methods of struggle.
 - b— Relations to the Amsterdam International. (Comrades Brandler and Lozovsky.)
- 4— Relations to the Anarcho-Syndicalists. (Comrade Andrey-chine.)
- 5— The International Propaganda Committees. (Comrade Rubinstein.)
- 6— The situation in Germany. (A comrade delegated from Germany.)