Digitized by Google

# Index to Volume IV

January-June, 1923

### I—AUTHORS.

		pages
A. E. E. R.	A Journalist Tells the Truth	381-383
ARNOT, R. PAGE	The Labour Movement and the Un-	3.00
	employed	147-160
	The Labour Party's Approach to Power	329-339
BOGDANOV, A.	Proletarian Poetry-The Communist	
acamina is	Theory of Art—I	276-285
	Proletarian Poetry—II	357-362
BORDIGA, A.	The History of Fascism—I	93-99
erantesend to:	The History of Fascism—II	172-183
Browder, Earl	The I.W.W. and the Communists	100-104
Bucharin, N.	A Programme of Marxism	75-92
EARSMAN, W. P.	The Pacific in World Politics	235-243
E. B.	Unemployment in a Workers' State	24-30
E. M. H.	Peace by Order	61-64
GOUNDRY, B. D.	Whitleyism in the Civil Service	229-234
HOYER, PAUL	The German Arbeitsgemeinschaften	269-275
HUNTLY, L. V.	The Rupture of the Russian Trade	7.0
	Agreement	340-345
HUTT, G. A.	Egyptian Nationalism and the Class	
	Struggle	286-299
LAWRENCE, J. D.	Revolutionary Unionism in the Engineer-	200
2	ing Trades	244-248
LENIN, N.	The Materialist Conception of History	
	and Karl Marx	265-268
MURPHY, J. T.	Ireland and the International Working	
	Class	161-171
PRICE, M. PHILIPS	Bavaria and the German Fascisti	31-41
a natury at a stream to	The Coal War in Europe	137-146
RATHBONE, H. P.	The World Economic Situation	11-23
	The Dominion of Canada-I (concluded	
	in Vol. V, No. 1)	346-356
ROEBUCK, C. M.	The Daily Herald: A Workers' Daily?	201-218
ROTHSTEIN, A.	Russia in 1923	105-107
Roy, EVELYN	The Funeral Ceremony at Gaya	219-228
	The Metamorphosis of Mr. C. Das	363-376
R. P. A.	The Last Reserves of Mankind	60-61
- 7 - C - LEO C - 7 - C - LEO C - C - C - C - C - C - C - C - C - C		

#### The Labour Monthly

		pages
R. P. D.	More British Marxism	124-128
S. P. B.	Black Labour v. White	191-192
T. L.	The Fabian Discovery of Capitalism	253-255
	Mediation in Industrial Disputes	259-264
	The Labour Party Conference	323-328
VARGA, E.	Pacifism—Old and New	108-118
W. H. T.	The Law and the Profits	189-190
W. P.	What is Crime?	190-191
w.w.	Bourgeois Political Parties in China	42-52
	II—SUBJECTS	
Australia	Federal Court of Conciliation and Arb	i-
HOSTKALIA	tration	61-64
AUSTRIA	Growth of Fascism	249
Book Reviews	60-64; 124-128; 189-192; 253-255	
DUOIR TELEVISION	00-04, 124 120, 109 192, 253 255	381-383
BRITAIN	Daily Herald	201-218
Distriction	Fabian Discovery of Capitalism	253-255
	Labour Party	
	Labour Party Conference	329-339
	Mediation in Industrial Disputes	323-328
	More British Marxism	259-264
	Revolutionary Unionism in the Enginee	124-128
	ing Trades	The second second
	Russian Trade Agreement	244-248
	Socialism and Parliament	340-345
	Unemployment	3-10
	Whitleyism in the Civil Service	147-160
	Workmen's Compensation	229-234
BULGARIA	Communist Election Success	189-190
Dobonan	Election Terror	249-250
CANADA	Dominion of Canada	377
Catanan		346-356
CHINA	Workers' Party Congress	312-313
Cilina	Bourgeois Political Parties	42-52
CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	The Last Reserves of Mankind	60-61
CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	Anti-Sedition Measures	250
EGYPT	Communist Congress	185
FRANCE	Nationalism and the Class Struggle	286-299
7 MINUE	C. G. T.	185
	Defeat of Moselle Miners	313
	Revolutionary Committee of Action	on
	Against War	120-123

Generated on 2025-02-26 20:02 GMT / https://hdt.handle.met/2027/wiwg.30112061987296 Public Domain in the United States, Gaogle-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/acgess wseMpd-us-google

			pages				
	FRANCE	United Front	377				
	Frankfurt Conference						
	GERMANY	Arbeitsgemeinschaften	269-275				
		Bavaria and the German Fascisti	31-41				
		Coal War in Europe	137-146				
		Congress of Revolutionary Workers' Councils	57-59				
		Cuno Note	377-378				
		Essen Congress	120				
		Frankfurt Conference	300-311				
		Leipzig Communist Congress	188				
		Saxon Labour Government	313-315				
		Trade Union Collaboration	315-316				
	Ťesas a		363-376				
	India	Das, Mr. C.	219-228				
	************	Gaya Congress	137-146				
	International	Coal War in Europe					
		Fourth Congress of the Comintern	53-55				
		Third Congress of the Y.C.I.	55				
		Essen Left Wing Congress	120				
		Fusion of the Right Wing Internationals	119-120				
		Hague World Peace Congress (I.F.T.U.)	55-56				
		Hamburg Conference	119-120				
		International Federation of Trade Unions	56				
		International Situation 67-74; 131-136; Ireland and the International Working	195-200				
		Class	161-171				
		Pacific in World Politics	235-243				
		Red International of Labour Unions	57				
		Second International	119-120				
		Statistics of Trade Union Internationals	56-57				
		Third International	53-55				
		Vienna International Working Union of					
		Socialist Parties	119-120				
		World Economic Situation	11-23				
		Young Communist International	55				
	IRELAND	Ireland and the International Working	,,,				
	IRELAND	Class	300-311				
	Tonicas	Fascism 93-99; 172-183;					
	ITALY		379				
		Maximalist Congress	122				
	Table 6	Taxation of Wages					
	Jugo-Slavia	Election figures	315				
	24	Independent Labour Party	251-252 316				
	Norway	Left-Wing Movement					
		× 444 44 ~					



Generated on 2025-02-26 20:02 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987296 Public Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/aggess useapd-us-google





		pages
Notes of the Month	3-10; 67-74; 131-136; 195-200;	259-264;
X		323-328
Russia	Twelfth Communist Congress	379-380
	1923 Statistics	105-107
	Trade Agreement with Britain	340-345
	Unemployment in a Workers' State	24-30
SOUTH AFRICA	Unemployment	191-192
SWEDEN	Great Lock-Out	252
UNEMPLOYMENT	British Labour Movement	147-160
	Russia	24-30
	Black Labour v. White in South Africa	191-192
U.S.A.	Dual Unionism	318-320
	Farmer—Labour Party Negotiations	122-123
	I.W.W. and the Communists	100-104
	Pacific in World Politics	235-243
	Workers' Party Conventions	123
THE WORLD OF LABOUR	53-59; 119-123; 184-188; 249-252;	312-317;
		377-380



### THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 4

JANUARY, 1923

NUMBER 1

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

#### CONTENTS

Notes of the Mont	h	-	-	-	-	Pag	e 3
The New Labour Struggle—The T —The Chance f A Year's Review of Consequent Issue	est of Soc or Leade of Capital	cialism- rship—	—Second -Can it b	-hand P e Taker	olicy		
The World Econor			on R. P. R	АТНВ	ONE	,,	11
Unemployment in	a Wor	rkers	State	Ву Е	В.	,,	24
Bavaria and the German Fascisti By M. PHILIPS PRICE				"	31		
Bourgeois Politica	l Parti	es in		1 By W.	w.	,,	42
The World of Lab		- ermany	- 7.	-	÷	"	53
Book Reviews	-	_	-	-	-	,,	60
The Last Reserves Peace by Order	of Manki	nd			. А. И. Н.		

The Labour Publishing Company Ltd.
38 Great Ormond Street
London
W.C.

Generated on 2025-02-26 20:02 GMT / https://hdt.handle. Rublic Domain in the United States, Google-digitized /

Editorial Office:

162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE RD., S.W.1

Publishing Office :

38 GREAT ORMOND STREET, W.C. 1

¶ The Editor of The Labour Monthly invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, and can only return the same when stamps to cover postage are enclosed.

Subscription Rates:
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

Six months - 4/-

One year - 8/-

United States of America Subscription Representative:—Philip Novick, 192 Broadway, Room 15, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

Advertising Rates:

Ordinary position, per page, £5 5s. and pro rata.

The last issue completed Volume III. Bound Volumes July to December, 1922, can be supplied for 7s. 6d. post free, or these numbers can be bound and returned post free for 4s. 6d. if sent to The Labour Publishing Company.

Cases can be supplied for 3s. 6d. post free.

Title Page for Vol. III can be had on application if 11/2d, for postage is sent,

nerated on 2025-02-26 20:02 GMT / https://hdl.handle.met/2027/wiwg.30112061987290 blic Domain in the United States, Guogle-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/acgess.use#pd:w

### NOTES of the MONTH

The new Labour Party—The First Stage of Socialist Struggle—The

Test of Socialism—Second-hand Policy—The Chance
for Leadership—Can it be taken?—A Year's

Review of Capitalism—No Stabilisation—

The Consequent Issue

IGH hopes have accompanied the beginning of the new Labour group in Parliament. It is not only the accession of numbers that has given this new sense of hope and interest to all sections of the working-class movement after a long period of deadness. It is the composition of the group and the new elements within it that have given this hope. The Parliamentary Labour Party for the first time speaks as a reflection of the movement outside, and not as an effigy in a case apart and remote from it. Speeches have been made that are thoroughly unparliamentary in style and substance, with the result that for the first time the parliamentary news is being widely read. Insinuations have been made against honourable members of the capitalist class which would usually only be heard far from the polite atmosphere of the House. Amid general surprise at their simplicity new Members have brought in something of the actual sense of hatred and struggle into what should have been the It is in vain that their leader, with formal fencing of debate. his own celebrated lightness of touch and witty dexterity in the parliamentary fencing club, apologises for his raw recruits: these raw recruits, unfortunately for him, show an inclination not to accept his apologies. And this is the most significant innovation of all that they have accomplished. For the first time they have introduced politics in the Labour Party. For the first time they have raised the standard of Socialism in the Labour Party.

HE first stage of the Socialist struggle in this country now begins. The victory of MacDonald over Clynes was not a victory of the left over the right: on the contrary, it is likely to turn out in practice a victory for the extreme right: but it was a victory of Socialist and political elements over bureaucratic trade MacDonald's politics are likely to be more dangerous in the future than Clynes' trade unionism: because MacDonald represents a definite policy of the State capitalist organisation of industry and the action which coincides, as it has been already seen to coincide during the period of the Liberal Government in 1906-1914, with the aims of Big Business: whereas Clynes represents no policy at all other than docility. But the victory of MacDonald was not his own victory. Only a portion of his majority consisted of his own Liberal following. The victory was given him by the Socialist wing in the Labour Party. And it was given him because they had not yet a man of their own to put forward or sufficient strength to gain an independent success. What is the consequence of this? MacDonald has not a majority. He cannot count on the affection of the trade union officials. He has to look for his supposed majority to the Socialist group which is abhorrent to him. And he has all the time to remember that he is a nascent Prime Minister with the dignity of the Empire in his hands. In consequence he has to walk the tight rope gracefully with an air of light-hearted raillery. And behind his body can go on the conflict of groups. The fight over the leadership was the first real political fight in the Parliamentary Labour Party. The heavy step of official conservatism can no longer tread through every Labour utterance unchallenged. The play of politics begins in the Labour Party, and the first honours go to the Socialist group.

OCIALISM as a political force in the Labour Party is a new phenomenon. The significance of this cannot be too much emphasised in view of the common assumption that the Labour Party is Socialist. The Labour Party in point of fact is—so far—a long way from being Socialist. Socialism does not consist in swallowing a formula about the nationalisation of the means of production and exchange. The Labour Party performed this operation fifteen years ago, and it is still possible for one of its

Ŋ

25

it

le

115

10

ol

'n

0 >

of

n t

1 1

principal leaders and possible Prime Ministers to appear in court and swear that he is no Socialist. Socialism consists in a definite political outlook which colours a man's whole life and action. What is that outlook? It is one of open opposition to the capitalist class and its whole system, and identification with the working-class struggle for a free and equal society of workers. Opposition to capitalism: support of the workers' struggle-it is a simple test. There is no question of sectarian hairsplitting here. Every Socialist International, Second, Two and a-half, Third, or Fourth, subscribes to it. Every time the Labour Party or Independent Labour Party go abroad and mix with Socialists they have to subscribe to it. The I.L.P. not so long ago at Berne declared itself "steeped in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism." The Labour Party at the Berlin Conference of the Internationals proclaimed (through MacDonald as spokesman) its firm basing on the rock of the class war. It declared, "We accept the principle of a general conference with a limited objective, under the conditions and with the agenda proposed by the Vienna Union." The conditions laid down by the Vienna International were that "all proletarian parties will be admitted who stand on the ground of the class struggle, whose goal is to overthrow capitalism, and who recognise the necessity for common international action on the part of the proletariat for the attainment of this goal." But by this test not a single prominent leader of the Labour Party could pass as a Socialist at home.

WERY one in his every utterance, every speech and every manifesto proclaims the opposite. One and all proclaim their desire for "good relations" between Capital and Labour; their reverence for the "institutions and traditions" of the country; their regard for the "interests of the community"; their zealous upholding of the "national honour"; and their proud maintenance of "our Empire." They vote for reparations to show the "nation's united front"; they set up Committees to inquire into the "causes that impede maximum production . . . from the standpoint of the interests of the community"; they go off on expeditions to Georgia or India to report on "our" interests in the Middle East or "our civilising mission" in India. They sit on Government Commissions and Industrial Conferences "to improve the relations between

employers and employed." They deplore the "menace" of the unemployed "problem." They uphold and openly defend the class massacres and bombings and open executions by a General Smuts in the name of "parliamentary democracy"; and at the same time Vraise all Europe with clamour at the unfulfilled suggestion of punishment for the Churchill-inspired plotters against the workers' regime in Russia. They assume with pride the honours and decorations of the governing class; and cut out from their ranks old and tried workers of their own movement. Their first instinct on attack is to turn to the capitalist courts of justice for pecuniary satisfaction. Their most constant magnifiers and regular organs of publicity are the lower forms of the capitalist Press. When their master's voice called for war, they called for war; when it called for indemnities, they called for indemnities; when it called for more production, they called for more production; when it calls for reconstruction and international peace, they call for reconstruction and international peace. To talk of Socialism in this company has as much meaning as to talk of sedition at Buckingham Palace.

HE new Glasgow group are Socialists. That is the whole innovation. They hold a definite political position, and they regard the capitalist class as their enemies. That is all, but it is a great thing. For from that everything else can follow. In the conventional Press they are spoken of as extremists. This is, of course, ridiculous. They are very far from being extremists. On the contrary, it would be much easier to question their Socialism. David Kirkwood, so widely bruited as the fieriest spirit of all, pleaded on behalf of the unemployed as the men "who won the Great War." "Remember that the race which we represent—I mean you all now, I embrace you all—is the race which, when roused by the German menace, could face the greatest military machine the world ever saw, and smash it. Do you think that that same race is going to walk the streets of London unemployed?" We are sure that Kirkwood would have little wish to be judged in the Workers' International by such a sentence, or that in making the familiar appeal he had any thought to make the killing of German workers a boast, or a claim for consideration from the butcher class they served so faithfully, or a contrast with their present unemployed

condition, or anything but the counterpart of their present sufferings -the slaughter of yesterday and the unemployment of to-day, two episodes in a single story of subjection. But it would be beyond reason to ask for clear statement on such matters as this in the present stage of development of the movement of this country. There has never been a school of Socialism here, nor-despite all the Fabian tracts and copies of "Value, Price, and Profit"-any simple practical Socialist training. The time to criticise will be later. For the moment the great achievement is that there exists at last in the Labour Party, not one or two individuals, but a group of men who feel themselves to be the expression of the militant working class and in definite opposition to the capitalist class and its whole system, atmosphere, and traditions. That is a great achievement, and it holds out tremendous possibilities for the future, not merely in the Parliamentary Labour Party, but in the whole Labour Movement. The opportunity in the hands of this group is immense. If they use it to the full they can build up for the first time a definite Socialist leadership and following in the working-class movement of this country.

OW far will they succeed? It is a question which demands more factors than their own personalities to answer. The limitations of their Parliamentary rôle they themselves know as well as any. Their power, if it develop, will be outside. Inside, they are at the mercy of the Parliamentary group and its machine. Outside they can rally the workers behind them. If they stand firm on every issue they can be sure of the backing of the Party Conference against any attempt to gag or limit them. But the measure of their success will be the measure of their power to take up the leadership that is theirs for the asking, to voice, not merely Socialism in general, but the actual Socialist leadership which the movement is looking for in vain to-day. Can they formulate a clear alternative programme to the present drift of the official movement? Can they see a way through the present confusion? The question gives rise to another question. What are the possibilities of the position? What is the present line of development of the movement? Is Capitalism recovering for the moment? If it is, then that recovery will give another lease of life to the trimmers. But if

Digitized by Google

it is not, if the present sufferings are to continue or increase, then the Socialism which has already been thrown up by the conditions of after the war will grow and develop into the dominant force of the working-class movement.

YEAR ago, when we attempted to review the position in the light of the previous twelvemonths, we came to a provisional conclusion. On the one hand it was necessary to recognise the universal defeat and depression of the working class. On the other hand it was possible to take comfort in the failure of the victorious capitalists to settle their own affairs. The hour of their victory was the hour of their defeat. The first signs of this inner confusion of the capitalists was already visible at Washington and Cannes. The history of the past twelvemonths, with the failure of Genoa and the fall of Lloyd George, has supplemented this. It is now possible to give a more exact indication. The attempt of the capitalist world to solve its own inextricable confusion has failed. Recovery by the path of international reconstruction, of Genoa and Lloyd George, has met with disaster. The tangle of reparations, debts, and exchanges remains untackled. To-day the attempt at reconstruction is by a new path. And that path is at the expense of the working class. The capitalist offensive continues. After wages have been cut to starvation levels the attack has turned on hours. Already Stinnes makes the move for ten hours in Germany. The beginnings of the attack have already taken place here.

HAT is the meaning of this further development? It is an attempt at recovery by a new path. It is the third and most desperate attempt of capitalism to recover after the mortal crisis of the war. The first attempt was the simple-hearted attempt to start again with a boom and more production. The boom soon collapsed; the more production turned to over-production and unemployment. The second attempt was the serious and long-continued attempt to tackle the international position and reconstruct the shattered world economy. That attempt reached definite failure at Genoa and with the fall of Lloyd George. Now comes the third attempt, to raise up industry again for the moment,

not by any real remedy or restoration, but by the depression of the standards of the working class. It is a desperate attempt, and it is doomed to failure. For the situation has changed from a year ago. The first signs have now become visible of the recovery of the working class, particularly in Germany, but also in every country. And at the same time the failure of the capitalist class to solve their own problems, the abandonment of all attempts at international solutions and reconstruction, are the strongest confession of their weakness. What, then, will happen? They may win a temporary and unreal recovery by cheap production. But it will only recoil upon their own heads if the main problems of foreign policy and foreign markets remain untackled. By its inevitable increase of production it will only increase the intensity of competition and hasten the inevitable future war. And by its renewed blows upon the working class it will only stimulate their resistance and unity, and increase the intensity of the class war to the pitch of revolutionary readiness in the moment of the imperialist war.

HAT is the immediate consequent issue? The path of the recovery of capitalism is as futile now as it was futile in the days of repeating "more pro-Not in this way will the misery be lessened. Instead the way that is needed is the way of common resistance and the united front - the united front that was offered by the left wing a year ago and refused by the right wing, internationally and nationally. What has been the consequence of this refusal of the united front? To-day Fascism rules in Italy, Poincaré in France, Stinnes in Germany, Die-Hards and Conservatives in England, and a riot of anti-labour legislation rages in the United States. These are the consequences of refusal, but they are also our indication for the future. They show that the class struggle is growing stronger in the future, and not less. They show that the capitalist class is conscious of its weakness and is preparing for future struggles. The issue now is that we shall also be prepared, and no longer let our movement be shackled by those forces which are actively engaged at once in driving out the militant elements of the movement and in tying up the remainder with Ten Years' Truces and political alliances to the service of capitalist

Digitized by Google

reconstruction. The fight against these forces, which are still the ruling forces in the movement in this country, is the fight which the new Socialist group can take up, and by taking it up they can save the future of Socialism and the working-class movement in this country.



## THE WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATION

#### By H. P. RATHBONE

ORE than four years have passed since the first conflict between the forces of imperialism has ceased. In every newspaper to-day one may see one representative of capitalism or another anxiously discussing the possibility of a trade revival. If such a revival is coming are the forces of the workers prepared? Are we so ranged that we can take full advantage of it? Alternatively, if a further period of depression is at hand what are the forces making for resistance? What is our policy? Finally, supposing capitalists can manage to stabilise the present position, what is our next advance?

To decide then what are the tactics of the workers in the struggle against capitalism it is necessary to decide in what way the forces of capitalism will develop. Will capitalism manage to repair its efficiency and so bring about a revival, or will it slip further into the slough of depression, or finally can it succeed in stabilising its present insecurity?

The position to-day is that in every country except Russia the workers have been beaten by the forces of capitalism. Their wages have been cut, their hours have been lengthened, and the liberal reformism of the pre-war period has vanished in the thick mist of reaction. In England a tenth of the population is living on doles or starving. In Germany, in spite of a prolonged and ever more speculative capitalist boom, the workers are being crushed further into the mire by longer hours and lower real wages. In America, while capitalists have been making immense profits and securing them by bonus issues, the railroad workers are told by the Wages Board that "a living wage would wreck every railroad in the United States." In France the position of the workers grows every day more similar to the position of the German workers—they are becoming assimilated into the mid-European coolie plantation. In Italy the defeat of the workers is complete, and Fascism, the most reactionary form of capitalism, reigns supreme. In the colonies of



imperialist exploitation Irish workers are now confronted by their own capitalist government. India has not recovered from the debacle of Ghandism, and in every other colony capitalism has been able to exploit the workers even more ruthlessly than at home.

Yet the international world of capitalism is still facing the problems it has been endeavouring to solve for the last four years. Allied capitalism has yet to extract its war booty from the Central Powers and resolve all the other contradictions which it created by the Versailles Treaty: in its efforts to do this its unity has broken. American capitalism has not yet reconciled itself to a bankrupt European continent. The victory of the Allies, which was meant to secure peace for the victors in the Near East, has only produced further conflicts. Conference succeeds conference only to break up after "complete agreement," but nothing resolved. It would seem that chaos can only intervene. But is that the truth? To find the answer let us see what measures capitalism has taken to outlive until to-day the post-war chaotic conditions.

In the decade preceding the war capitalism in its modern form of imperialism was finally realised. Industrial companies were formed only to be absorbed by their rivals. These erstwhile rivals competed with other rivals, and finally amalgamated; international agreements were made; international consortiums were formed, thus producing an immense concentration of finance capital. Alongside of this concentration, and because of this concentration, capitalists instead of merely exporting their goods exported also their surplus capital. They competed to lend money to foreign governments. They competed for concessions to exploit newly discovered wealth and to start factories in countries where labour was "cheap." Fresh rivalries appeared and old rivalries were revived because of this effort to employ their capital to "economic advantage"-in other words to obtain greater profits from this capital than by keeping it locked up at home. These rivalries were manœuvred by cliques of politicians who also had their own personal interests to serve. The Agadir crisis, amongst many others, was temporarily resolved only to lead to fresh crises.

This development of capitalism sharpened the struggle of the workers. The concentration of capital led to a gradual rise in prices

and a consequent fall in real wages. This concentration, which contained the germ of the larger conflict, de-stabilised the position of capitalism, producing depression now in one, now in another, industry. This increased the number of unemployed, which was further increased by the rise in prices and the consequent lack of purchasing power. To defend their position the workers organised, they elected their own representatives to Parliament where previously they were represented by Liberal reformists, and in their demands for higher wages to meet the rising prices they were forced into strikes on a larger and larger scale.

The conflict between different groups of capitalists in their imperialist rivalry finally led to the world war. Each country was gradually thrown on its own resources. The lack of supplies enabled capitalists rapidly to force up prices. To meet the demand for raw material certain industries, such as iron, steel, and chemicals, were immensely increased in productive power. In that increase, and to take advantage of that increase, prices were further raised and profits also were immensely increased. The loss of imports coupled with the demands of the armed forces led to the absorption of the unemployed. The rise in prices and the consequent need for higher wages led to a renewed strengthening of the defensive forces of the workers.

Resolving the War Chaos

Finally by the end of the war every element in the forces of capitalism necessitated further inflation and a further rise in prices. Every country was burdened with huge war debts: every European country was short of certain supplies, thus threatening a rise in prices. All the victorious countries except America were faced with increased productive power in certain goods and decreased productive power in others. America alone had increased her total productive power. The Central Powers were faced with a decrease in the efficiency of production of iron, steel, and chemicals owing to the lack of necessary repair during the war, and their exchanges began to show signs of weakening.

Such was the situation at the end of the war. When the pegs were removed that held suspended the pre-war pound, the franc, and the lira, their values slid ever quicker down the precipice, leaving the dollar suspended menacingly on the heights of the gold

Digitized by Google

1

T

standard. The nationals of these currencies, England, France, and

Italy, found their exports to some countries threatened by America. They found their old hunting grounds stocked with American goods. In other countries they found that, owing to lower exchanges than their own, these countries could not purchase their goods. They were faced with unemployment. Likewise imports poured in from countries with better exchanges, and thus their home industries were faced with ruin. Nor was this all: for prices which had been checked during the war in their upward flow, now that control was removed could make further huge leaps upward. This only increased the number of workers unemployed. The consequence of this chaos in the exchanges and increasing prices only resulted in accentuating the rivalry. It was clear that artificial stability must be obtained if possible and that the supports to the capitalist edifice could only be strengthened piecemeal to prevent it from collapsing into chaos. So some countries prohibited entirely the import of certain articles until that particular industry could be rehabilitated and made able to compete on some "equitable" basis. In other cases huge tariffs were imposed frankly to subsidise the home product. Consciously or unconsciously the decline in the exchanges of the Central Powers, which was rapidly proceeding, was hastened by continual Allied threats, making it impossible for these countries to compete at all owing to their lack of power to purchase the necessary raw materials. Finally, throughout the Allied and neutral world huge schemes of reconstruction of industry were spread broadcast and popularised

Finally, throughout the Allied and neutral world huge schemes of reconstruction of industry were spread broadcast and popularised by the Press. In England electricity was to be the future power; it was going to revolutionise agriculture: the empty pasture was going to give place to intensified horticulture. In the colonies plans for huge harbours were made and a vast network of railways were to open up the undeveloped areas. America desired to compete for the largest mercantile marine. Italy created State industrial monopolies to manage and extend her ports, her shipping, and her shipbuilding. The world's undeveloped lands were to be planted with cotton and sown with wheat. Each neutral and victorious country, it appeared, would contribute to a general increase in world prosperity. Russia and the Central European Powers were alone excluded from these schemes.

Digitized by Google

Such was the dust that was thrown in the eyes of the workers in the way of industrial development. As to the conditions of the workers still more dust was necessary. The chaotic state of capitalism had produced its results: threatened unemployment and demands for wages to meet the ever-rising prices. The workers demanded nationalisation; they were promised it. More houses; schemes were elaborated. More education; bills were introduced. Workers' control; joint committees were set up. The pre-war capitalist indeed appeared to have been wiped off the map.

All these promises were accepted in good faith; meanwhile capitalism was recovering, was taking advantage of the shortage of supplies, was consolidating its position, and was intensifying the boom that followed in the wake of the war. Prices were forced up, huge combines were formed to insure short supplies and to secure the market that was created by this shortage of supplies. Concentration and high prices led to general over-capitalisation. Profits were made secure by the issue of bonus shares and by reconstructing old companies with inflated capital. But these features of the boom contained all the features of its quick collapse. Over-capitalisation led to high prices, which in turn led to dwindling markets. Shortage of supplies led to over-productivity, and both led to unemployment. Finally, the Central European markets were destroyed while the Russian market remained blockaded. The world was faced with a contradiction between production and consumption. This intensified the struggle between rival capitalist groups, and finally the boom showed signs of declining first in Japan, where the upward curve had been sharpest, finally spreading right throughout the world, until at the end of 1920 there were few who were not already looking for a new revival of trade.

That was the position at the beginning of 1921. Capitalism, by means of the artificial boom and speculation that it created in 1918-20, coupled with the promises of a reconstructed world, managed at once to survive the chaos which it had created by the war and to break and dissipate the revolutionary forces of the workers. From 1920 to the beginning of 1921 the boom which it had created collapsed, the revolutionary force of the workers had been dissipated, and it began its attack on Labour. By the end of 1921 the workers in the Allied and neutral countries had been

driven down almost to pre-war conditions and had lost practically all the gains they had obtained during the war and the post-war boom; the workers in Central Europe were still further beaten.

#### Survey of the Great Powers

But this was not enough: the forces of capitalism had done this, but they had still failed to solve their own problems. If we survey the position in industry in each of the largest countries we find that in England, for the third quarter of 1922, the export trade is still only 70 per cent. of the volume of 1913, whereas the imports are 85 per cent. of the 1913 volume. An accounting balance has been achieved in the last budget, but at the cost not only of deferring the redemption of the national debt, but even of increasing it. Wholesale and retail prices, though showing a fall in the earlier months of the year, have for the last two months been steadily on the increase. The production of coal for November was within 91 per cent. of the 1913 monthly average output; but this has been at the cost of reducing the workers' real wages to well below the 1913 level. Iron and steel production shows a slight increase, but the October output of pig iron, the highest this year, is still 56 per cent. of the 1913 output, and steel production 66 per cent. of 1913. Workers in American cotton are still working only four and a half days out of six in every week. Shipbuilding, though showing a slight revival during the last two months, in November had 36.3 per cent. of its workers unemployed. But the finance Securities are now 14 per cent. above of capital is booming. the figure for December, 1921. September bank deposits decreased by 9 per cent. since January, 1922, but since then again been on the increase. Capital issues are being eagerly over-subscribed; the Marconi Telegraph Co. last month, for instance, was offered £,13,000,000 for their issue of £1,500,000. Shipping freights, after declining throughout the year, have shown, during the last two months, an increase, and this in spite of the fact that there were still idle throughout the world on July 1, 8,200,000 tons or 44 per cent, of the total world tonnage.

In the *United States* we find that the indications of a revival which appear to exist in England have occurred earlier. Wholesale,

prices, which fell in 1921 to only 38 per cent. of 1913 prices, had risen to 78 per cent. in August. Imports have increased in the first eight months of 1922 by 10 per cent., and exports have increased by 28 per cent. Production of iron and steel, which boomed in the first six months of 1922, decreased during July and August owing to the strike enforced on the miners to defend their wages. Cotton piece goods production is now on the up grade, but cotton growers are already talking of reducing their acreage by 50 per cent. Bank deposits, capital issues, and the prices of industrial securities have largely increased. It would seem that trade had definitely turned the corner.

Japan was the first country to break the artificial boom, which, owing to her extraordinarily rapid development, was greater than in any other country. What has been her policy since then? How have her capitalists managed to save her from collapse? The answer to this question is simply and solely-by restriction of output. Other countries have restricted the output of their raw materials, such as raw cotton, as in the case of the United States and Egypt. The capitalists of all the Allied powers, as well as the United States, have restricted their output of iron and steel. Every other raw material throughout the Allied and neutral world has been more or less subject to this restriction, in some cases on an organised, in some on an unorganised scale. But Japanese capitalists have done this for their manufacturers on a much more complete and organised scale. Such products as iron, coal, copper, cotton fabrics, raw silk, flax, woollens, fertilisers, paper, and flour have all been restricted in output since 1920 by the organised trade associations of the capitalists. Thus, in May, 1921, the coal interests organised a restriction of 17.5 per cent. in the output of coal. In May, 1922, the principal weaving mills were only worked 69 per cent, of their normal output. The output of soda and bleaching powder was reduced to 59 per cent. in 1921, and to 60 per cent. in 1922 by organised restriction. Thus has Japan saved her industries from collapse. But at what a cost! By these means prices, ever since June, 1921, have been kept stable, or, if anything, increased; thus, the inflated capitalisation of Japanese industry which occurred during its short-lived post-war boom has been stabilised, but unemployment has increased. It was

B

estimated, for instance, that at the beginning of this year at least 90,000 miners were unemployed, or 20 per cent. of the total in the industry.

When we turn to France, however, the story is somewhat different. Here we have a country living on an ever-increasing budget deficit in the hope that some day a credit balance will be struck by means of reparations payments from Germany. The expected deficit on the budget for 1923 is estimated to be 35,000 millions of francs, compared with the estimate for 1922 of 31,000 millions and the estimate for 1921 of 3,197 millions. Meanwhile, wholesale prices have been increasing steadily until they were, in October, 1922, 239 per cent. above 1913 prices, having increased twenty-five points since January of that year. Likewise the exchange of France with England, which stood at 205 per cent. of par in January, 1922, had depreciated in November, 1922, to 240 per cent. of par. The total volume of trade, though it has increased in the first nine months of 1922 by five million tons since 1913, on a total of forty-eight millions for 1913, shows an increase in the adverse balance of imports over exports of over four million tons, or sper cent. This is mainly represented by increases in purchases of raw materials. It would appear, in spite of these signs of a revival, that the budget finances do not presage well for the future, while the reliance on reparations payments to pay off the ever-increasing debt and balance the budget has had its effect on the exchange an effect which is increasing as the amount of reparations expected becomes more and more exiguous.

If we examine the position in Central Europe we find in some countries, such as Austria, that the whole structure of capitalism is kept on its feet by a series of speculative operations, and when the frequent crises, which are the inevitable outcome of such operations, become too severe even for speculation to thrive in, the structure is propped up again by small loans so that speculation may continue. In Germany the enormous and artificial boom which has now continued for eighteen months is showing signs of changing from a type to some extent based on production to a type very similar to that of Austria. For there are indications that the collapse in the exchange, by preventing to an increasing extent the purchase of raw materials, is resulting in a decline in the surplus

of production available for export. The boom, the rise in prices, and the consequent inflation of industry has increasingly worsened the conditions of the workers. The decline in the volume of production per unit has resulted in the demand for longer hours, and the enormous rise in internal prices has meant that the struggle between the workers and the capitalists, owing to the fall in the real wages, becomes ever more intense and more defined. Owing, however, to the fact that the concentration of industry in Germany has led to the enormous surplus of finance capital in the hands of a few large industrial magnates like Hugo Stinnes and Otto Wolff, it is possible that this capital, by means of speculation in exchange, has been transferred abroad, and by being available for the purchase of raw materials will still postpone the collapse.

The result of this chaos of under-production on the part of England, the United States, and Japan, coupled with the loss of the markets of Central Europe, are producing similar conditions in the mainly exporting countries and colonies of South America, Africa, and Asia. They have surplus raw materials which they cannot export. In addition, they cannot obtain the supplies they need. So they have become, to an increasing extent, their own manufacturers. China has increased her cotton spindles from 1,422,832 spindles in 1920 to 2,066,582 spindles, according to the latest returns: India has increased her spindles from 6,689,680 in 1920 to 6,870,804 in February, 1922. Both in China and India there appears to be no short time, whereas in all the old cotton producing countries, including Japan, short time exists. But this process of industrialisation is slow: meantime their finances are in a rotten condition: budgets will not balance; exchanges are going further and further against them. They can only wait on the revival of the importing countries of the world.

#### The Economic Problems of Capitalism

In this survey of the countries of the world we have found that the chief problem facing capitalists in each country has been the discovery of how to prevent the chaos that threatened to intervene as a result of the break in the post-war boom. Prices, it will be remembered, were increased to an enormous extent, productivity was enlarged, and over-capitalisation resulted. It is estimated by

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Dr. Kitchin that, whereas the total world holdings of securities before the war was £20,000 millions, the present holdings have now approached the enormous figure of £60,000 millions, or an increase of 200 per cent, in less than ten years. When the demand fell away what could be done to stop the fall in prices and so prevent the collapse of the over-capitalised industry? The reply that was given to this question was restriction of output. In every country and to varying degrees of organisation and of success capitalism resorted to this method. The result is that to-day a certain stability if not a rise in world prices has been obtained. The prices of the three great exporting countries of the world at present-England, United States, and Japan—have been stabilised at a figure which for July of this year represented a mean average (unweighted) of 73 per cent. above 1913 figures. What does this mean? Does it not indicate in part the measure of over-capitalisation in these countries? It involves a further period of increase both in wholesale and retail prices. (The latter, it should be noted, have become stabilised almost in the same month that wholesale prices stopped falling, whereas when wholesale prices stopped rising retail prices continued to rise for several months thereafter. It seems that the middlemen were able and willing to wring the last pound of profit out of the rise, but though able refused to give consumers the last pound of saving out of the fall.)

But this rise in prices will occur in a world where there is an inherent contradiction between production and consumption. To make this clear let us take the production of steel. In England it has recently been stated by the president of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce that the productivity of steel furnaces is 50 per cent. above pre-war figures. The average monthly production of steel in 1913 was 855,000 tons. The present monthly productivity is therefore 1,282,500 tons, but the monthly production for October was only 565,200 tons, which is thus only 44 per cent. of the possible production. The United States tells the same story. Here was a country which acted as salesman to the Allies during the war, which increased her output of steel to satisfy the demands of the Allies. The highest average monthly output to which she reached was in 1917 when she produced 3,816,000 tons. Her highest monthly output in 1922, when steel production was said to be

booming again, was in May, when it reached the three-million figure or 79 per cent. of her average monthly production in 1917 (her productivity is all probability was vastly greater than this figure, though no statistics are available on this point). productivity of shipbuilding was also enormously increased after the war. In 1919 the monthly average tonnage launched in the U.S.A. and the British Dominions, the highest production year for these two countries, was 339,616 and 29,894 tons respectively. The monthly average in 1920, which was the year of the largest production for the United Kingdom, was 171,302 tons, making a possible total monthly production of 540,812 tons. In comparison the average monthly tonnage launched for the first nine months of 1922 in the United Kingdom, its Dominions, and the U.S.A. only reached a total of 157,449 tons, or a decrease, compared with the possible production, of 483,353 tons. In plain words, the shipbuilding production of the British Empire and the United States, the two potentially largest shipbuilding entities in the world, is now only 29 per cent. of its possible productivity. Nor is this all: for the shipbuilding industry has still to face the dead weight of the shipping tonnage which is still laid up unused throughout the world. It was estimated by the Department of Commerce of the U.S.A. that in July, 1922, roughly 8,200,000 tons of shipping were still laid up throughout the world, a reduction of only 400,000 tons since January. This means that 13 per cent. of the world shipping tonnage is idle. No wonder that 36 per cent. of the shipbuilding workers in Great Britain are still unemployed. No wonder that the workers employed are being forced to work for wages which are computed to be 61 per cent. below the pre-war level. Yet capitalism still maintains that trade has turned the corner, in the face of an under-productivity of 29 per cent. in shipbuilding and 44 per cent. in iron and steel !

But we have only taken the productivity in manufactures. There is also the productivity in raw materials. As we pointed out above, practically every raw material throughout the world is restricted in its potential output. Yet capital is still being exported to foreign countries, presumably for development of some sort. It is estimated that since the beginning of 1921 the U.S.A. has exported \$500,000,000. In the same period Great Britain has

Digitized by Google

exported £82,000,000. According to the apologists of capitalism this capital should now be being used to make productive the undeveloped portions of the earth. Yet capitalism seems to find that even the present production of the world is superfluous. Why then is this export of capital continuing except that finance capital can gain greater profit out of the mere export of it, not to mention the profit to be gained by manipulating the concessions resulting therefrom, than by keeping it deposited or even used for development at home. This, then, is the contradiction between production and consumption inherent in a capitalist system based on profit. And this is the reason why capitalism, though it may stabilise itself for a time by such devices as output restriction, cannot solve this problem.

The Political Problems of Capitalism

This problem, however, may be further accentuated in the near future by the possible solution of the international political problems that still remain to be faced by capitalism. Let us take only one instance. For four years such capitalist economists as J. M. Keynes have been endeavouring to persuade the Allies to redeem the mistake they made when they compelled Germany to sign the Treaty of Versailles. For four years these economists have succeeded in persuading the Allied capitalist Governments gradually to whittle down their original demands on Germany; for four years these economists have been showing that by ruining capitalist Central Europe the Allied capitalist Governments have nearly ruined themselves. Thus the slogan "Germany must pay to her very last dollar" has by gradual degrees been converted into the vague demand of Bonar Law: " Everything must be got from Germany that she can reasonably be asked to pay." The actual sums demanded by France, which were estimated by Dr. Klotz in the French Chamber in the autumn of 1919 at a total of £18,700 millions, have been whittled down until M. Poincaré at the Four Ministers' Conference last month in London announced that France would agree to accept £1,500 millions. Therefore if this problem ultimately solves itself by this process of elimination and in the near future a Germany be reconstructed by the loans to her which have already been proposed, the productive capacity of the world will thereby be increased. It would seem that before,

however, Germany's consuming power can have recovered, the productive power that she will add to the world's total will further increase the crises ahead of capitalism.

At the beginning of this article we put three alternatives of the future development of capitalism before us for solution in order that it may be possible to decide what should be the policy for the workers in the present and future struggle. These three alternatives were: Can Capitalism repair its efficiency and bring about a revival in trade, or will it slip further into the slough of depression, or thirdly will it manage to stabilise its position? From our survey it follows that the answer to these three alternatives is partly number one and partly number three, but with this important qualification. Capitalism has developed since 1913, has increased its productivity since that date, has further exploited the undeveloped areas of the world. Therefore it is in relation to this increased productive power and increased consuming power of the world that a trade revival must be measured, and not in relation to the producing and consuming power of the world in 1913. Accordingly the trade revival so anxiously awaited by capitalism must, to be a trade revival at all, be of such a kind that in terms of 1913 it would be considered a boom. From our survey of the present economic situation there is no sign of this. Nor is it this kind of revival which capitalism would appear to expect. The trade revival is simply one which will enable capitalism so to increase production as to prevent its complete collapse. In the strict sense of the word it is therefore merely a stabilisation of the present position. But owing to over-capitalisation and increased productivity of industry the stabilisation will be short; it will be followed by the inevitable artificial boom owing to the continued output restriction, the unabated concentration of capital, and the consequent rise in prices; the curve of the development of capitalism will become more jagged, the heights will be steeper, the depths more precipitous.

What is the end of this process? On the one hand progressive decay of industry, on the other hand a sharpening of the class cleavage. But actually these two portents contain within themselves their own remedy: and the solution of the second, the intensified class struggle, is also the solution of the first.

Digitized by Google

# UNEMPLOYMENT IN A WORKERS' STATE

By E. B.

VEN in Soviet Russia there is unemployment. The number of registered unemployed is now over 300,000, or about 5 per cent. of the total number of regular workers in industry and commerce. How does it happen that there is such a large volume of unemployment in a Workers' State?

As in England, so in Russia, unemployment is directly caused by factories closing down; but the reasons which have led to the closing down of factories are fundamentally different in the two countries. It is true that the unemployed worker himself does not care very much why he is unemployed: the fact that he cannot get work is the main point for him, whether he is in a workers' State or in a capitalist State. If he is interested in anything else, it is in the question of when he is likely to get work again.

But he can only find the answer to this question by examining the causes of the industrial depression and the factors which are making for recovery or the reverse. When these causes and factors are examined both in England and in Russia, the contrast in the outlook for the unemployed in the two countries is positively startling.

The causes of unemployment in the United Kingdom are familiar enough, and there is no need to do more than mention them here, in order to point the contrast with Russia. During the war years, and more especially after the war, the proportion of the nation's production taken by capital as profits, and by the State as taxation, increased substantially, leaving a smaller proportion to labour. In spite of the period of rising wages, therefore, labour's purchasing power was dwindling year by year, for wages (taking labour all round) never kept up with prices. There was, therefore, less home demand; and the possibility of foreign demand had been killed by exactly the same process in other countries. Of course the terms of the Peace Treaties were also most unfavourable to trade recovery; but they were only incidental.

The markets had been killed by the poverty of the workers, that is, by the increased proportion of the wealth produced which was taken by capital in every country during the war and after-war period. In Great Britain, this was concealed for a time by the "replacement boom," that is, the building up of stock lost (such as ships) or exhausted (such as textiles); but this boom could not do more than postpone the depression due to labour's loss of purchasing power. In many ways the boom actually aggravated the position.

Such was the fundamental cause of the unemployment which developed here and in other capitalist countries towards the end of 1920. What was the position in Russia?

There also the capitalist class and the capitalist State had exploited the workers to an increasing extent during the years 1914 to 1917. But with the Bolshevik revolution in November, 1917, this process came to an end. From that time forward the capitalist claim to a share in the wealth produced each year was disregarded; the whole product of labour passed to the workers and to their State organisation.

And yet, towards the end of 1921, unemployment began to appear, and it has since been slowly developing. As a matter of fact, this sudden appearance of unemployment in Russia is largely a mere change of organisation; ever since the early part of 1917 there had been large numbers of workers with no constant employment. In the earlier period of the revolution, these workers were kept on the factory books, although work was intermittent. The reason why the factories worked intermittently was simple enough. Owing to the occupation by the foreign invaders and counter-revolutionaries of the main fuel-producing areas, and to the constant struggle to defend the Soviet Republic, the factories could not get enough food, fuel, or raw materials to keep them going.

When the new economic policy was introduced in 1921, the available stocks of food, fuel, and raw materials were concentrated in the most efficient factories, and the others were definitely closed down, the workers hitherto attached to them becoming "unemployed."

Thus there has been no substantial change in the position; right through since 1917 there has been under-production owing

DIVILIZED by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN to the lack of food, fuel and raw materials, the difficulty of transport, and partly also the deficiencies in the new organisation of industry; but wherever production was possible, things were produced, and whatever things were produced were consumed. And here, in spite of the fact of unemployment, which exists both in Russia and in this country, lies the essential difference between the position in the two countries. Unemployment occurs in a workers' State when, owing to material conditions, production is not possible; it occurs in a capitalist State when production is perfectly possible, but does not "pay," that is, when the existing system does not allow consumption.

This contrast between the causes of unemployment in the two countries also holds good when we turn to the other factors in the position, which may cause industrial recovery or a continuance of the industrial depression in Russia and in the United Kingdom.

In the capitalist country each reduction of employment means a reduction in the purchasing power of labour, which in turn means less demand and more unemployment. Production is reduced because it does not pay.

In Russia, on the other hand, as actual experience has shown, the reduction of staffs attached to factories has actually increased production, because it simplifies the problems of food supply and transport to the factories which are kept working. The consequent increase of production, by providing more materials, makes production possible in other branches of industry, and thus leads to more employment.

It is particularly significant that, whereas in the capitalist State the growth of unemployment leads to all-round reductions in wages, in the workers' State the growth of unemployment has been accompanied by an all-round increase in wages. In the capitalist State these reductions in wages cause, of course, a further fall in demand and therefore more unemployment; in the workers' State the rise in wages stimulates demand and employment.

If again we compare the position of the key industries of mining and engineering in the two countries, we find that unemployment in these industries in the United Kingdom is extremely pronounced, while in Russia there is no unemployment in mining (on the contrary, there is a severe shortage of miners), and in engineering the only unemployment is due to temporary shortages of fuel and raw materials at the factories.

When we turn to the measures taken by the Government in each country to deal with the problem of unemployment, the contrast is even more glaring. As far as the actual relief of unemployed workers is concerned, it is true that unemployed pay is on a higher scale in England; but then such a comparison is not fair without allowing for the normal standard of living in the two countries—a standard due to the economic position of industry. The low relative standard in Russia existed before the revolution; and the fact that it has not been possible to raise it since the revolution is due to the devastating effects of the foreign invasions and civil wars.

But even taking things as they are, we find that in many points the unemployed worker is better off in Russia than here. His dependants, for example, are in many ways provided for, not because he is unemployed, but because the social system makes provision for the care of maternity, for infants, and for children. When there is a possibility of providing special work to absorb the unemployed, the local authorities encourage the formation of special "artels" or groups of workers who take on the job on lines somewhat similar to those of the guilds in England. There is no question of a contractor, whose profits absorb part of the available funds; the necessary tools and materials are provided by the local authority; and of course there is no question of the workers drawing anything less than normal rates of wages.

A considerable amount of special employment has been given along these lines in Russia, especially in Petrograd, Moscow, and other large towns, where full advantage of the need to provide work has been taken to carry out repairs to streets and houses, to improve sanitation, and generally to improve the material conditions of the population. Relatively to the amount of unemployment, far more has been done in Russia than in the United Kingdom to provide special work; and moreover the whole energies of the Russian Government have been steadily directed towards the development of normal production, the growth of which will provide permanent employment.

What has been done in the United Kingdom to develop production and thus provide permanent employment? There is first the series of Peace Treaties, whose clear aim is to develop British production by killing German competition—a policy which has already had to be reversed. Then there are the specially Imperialist attempts to provide markets by the appropriation of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the German colonies—attempts which by their costliness and creation of bad blood have simply increased the financial embarrassments and industrial depression at home. As a contrast, we find the Russian Government persistently widening the circle of its friendly relations with other countries, and slowly but successfully developing its foreign trade.

In purely internal matters, we find the British Government attempting to encourage production and employment in two clearly

defined ways.

The first is by reducing wages—decontrolling the mines and thus ending its wage guarantees; ending its agricultural commitments; scrapping the Trade Boards; and openly backing the employers' efforts to reduce wages on every possible occasion. In Russia, on the other hand, we find a legal minimum wage, adjusted month by month in accordance with price fluctuations and advancing with the growing economic stability of industry.

The second method tried by the British Government to encourage production is the provision of certain credits to industry at low rates of interest—a method which is in essence the same as the simultaneous reduction of the Bank of England's rate and of all interest rates. Let us consider what purpose this serves.

Production has dwindled in Great Britain because it does not pay. One part of the costs of production is the interest rate on borrowed money, with which many transactions are carried out. If the interest rate is reduced, production will be slightly cheaper. The reasoning is quite sound, so far as it goes. But the reduction in the cost of production is so slight that it makes practically no difference; and it has not added one penny to the purchasing power of labour which is the real key to the situation. No capitalist will produce goods which he will be unable to sell, however much the interest rates are reduced.

It would have been a different matter if the British Government had said: "The charges of interest and dividends on existing capital are crippling industry, and must be abolished." That was what the November revolution of 1917 actually carried out in Russia. But it is simply childish for the British Government to say, as in effect it has said in these financial measures: "The interest charges on existing capital—some £15,000,000,000—are sacrosanct; but of course it would not be good for production that the rate of interest on the petty sum of perhaps £50,000,000 required as new capital this year should be more than 3 per cent."

In Great Britain, of course, there has been no attempt to provide credits for the consumer, on the growth of whose purchasing power any permanent increase in employment must depend. In Russia, during the earlier period of the revolution, rations were distributed, and the question of the consumer's purchasing power did not arise. When, however, in order to make the organisation of production more efficient, payment was introduced, the purchasing power of the workers became important. It is very striking that in Russia, as soon as the consumers' purchasing power began to be outstripped by the increase in production, machinery was at once developed to provide credit for retail purchases, so that the growth of production should not be handicapped by a purchasing power always lagging behind it.

The nature of this retail credit machinery is of special interest, as its wide adoption is only possible in a workers' State. It was realised from the start that ordinary retail sales on credit would be out of the question, owing to the enormous volume of "booking" that would be necessary and the difficulty of ensuring eventual payment. But the existence of a wide network of co-operative stores, together with the government's control of credit, made a much simpler plan possible.

The first thing was the formation of special co-operative units at each important factory or office; many such units were already in existence.

Then the central co-operative society in the town or district gave, as a loan repayable with interest some months ahead, to each of these factory co-operative units a number of vouchers, with which goods could be bought at any branch store of the central co-operative society. These vouchers are distributed as required, again as loans, among the workers at the given factory, who then use them for purchases, repaying the loan out of subsequent wages. Thus at the retail stores the transaction involves no booking; the vouchers are equivalent to cash.

Meanwhile the central co-operative, which stands out of its money until the vouchers are paid for in cash some months later, receives a large credit, to enable it to do this, from the "higher" credit machinery—the State Bank or the Co-operative or Industrial Banks set up with Government help.

In this way the credit machinery in the workers' State is brought right to the individual workers, whereas in the capitalist State it never reaches the workers directly, and in times of severe industrial depression, due to reduced demands from the consumers, it is of no help whatever.

These contrasts between the unemployment situation in Great Britain and in Soviet Russia are not mere matters of chance, or of a "bad" government in this country and a "good" government in Russia. They go right down to the root of things. Failure to deal with unemployment in this country is not due merely to the follies of Lloyd George or Bonar Law; had they been a thousand times more able they could have done very little more. For, under the capitalist system, to provide employment means to provide employment that will increase capital's profits; no other employment—except on so small a scale that it makes no difference—can be provided. Thus it is that in this country even a labour government could do next to nothing; it could alleviate the suffering, but it could not cure the disease so long as it allowed the capitalist system to continue.

# BAVARIA AND THE GERMAN FASCISTI

#### By M. PHILIPS PRICE

HE end of the Hohenzollern monarchy in Germany meant something more than the fall of a dynasty. The event had important social-political aspects, for it meant nothing less than the removal of one of the pillars, which supported the fabric of the old German State, and that was the pillar of agrarian privilege. The ground had been prepared for this revolution as far back as last century, when some of the worst abuses of a semi-feudal society on the land were removed and the way paved for the investment of industrial capital in the agricultural industry. In November, 1918, Germany east of the Elbe had ceased to be a land in which the junker alone dominated the public services, and became a land where industrial capital and the junker owners of the latifundias were arrayed against an agricultural labouring population, which had won for the first time in history the right of combination in defence of its occupation. But the junkers, although they have lost their special privileges, still play an important rôle in German politics. They have an industrial policy of their own and, since they can no longer force that policy down the throat of other elements of the population without their consent, and since they cannot totally eradicate the Socialist instincts of the land-labouring population, they seek alliances with the middle-class elements of the industrial centres, whose capital is in the long run indispensable to them, if they are to keep up the productivity of their estates.

One symptom of the change that has come over the Prussian agrarian party to-day is the fact that it has changed its name from "Konservativ" to "Deutsch National." This shows that the junkers no longer expect to win popular sympathy by harking back to the slogans of the old days. They must have a constructive policy and a national policy in order to get support from the small cultivators and independent peasants in West Prussia and South Germany, and from the numerous elements of the intelligentsia and petit bourgeoisie of the industrial centres, without whom they cannot reckon,



now that the three-class electoral system is abolished, to secure a political representation in the Reichstag under the Weimar Constitution. And in order to win support from these elements it has been found necessary to have recourse to what Bebel in his day termed "the Socialism of the silly fools." Every village of small cultivators has its speculator, who in most districts is a Jew. Every impoverished family of the lower middle classes in the towns, whose sons are unemployed through the break-up of the old Prussian military system and are gaining precarious existences as political secretaries or as bank clerks, has in recent years been forced to call in the pawnbroker to value the family jewels and portraits. And the pawnbroker, too, is as often as not a Jew. What easier task is there than making the Jew responsible for all the evils of modern Germany? Here, then, are possible recruits for the party of agrarian reaction, which can no longer find a way to power by extolling the advantages of agrarian privilege, but can find it by appealing to religious prejudices of the middle ages and using these prejudices as a means to entice those into its camp who would otherwise be forced by poverty into the ranks of the Socialists and Communists. Thus has arisen in North Germany the so-called "Deutsch Völkisch" movement within the agrarian Nationalist Party. It has arisen through the attempt of the junkers to extricate themselves from the net of the industrial capitalists, which is closing down upon them, and has its point directed just as much against the capitalists of Hebrew origin as against the reformist and revolutionary Socialists of the Left. It is the instrument which the pure agrarian interests still possess (now that their Press is partly absorbed by the industrial capitalists) and which they use to strike their bargains with the middle-class parties in the Reichstag.

But when all is said and done, Prussia, with its great centres of industry containing a Socialist working class and a self-conscious middle class, with relatively few peasant proprietors and a large proletarianised land population working on the great estates, is not a very fertile ground for this "Socialism of the silly fools." Much more fertile ground has been found in Bavaria. Of all the Teutonic lands Bavaria was the furthest removed from the big highways of land and sea traffic during the industrial developments of the last fifty years. The industrial population is sparse and scattered, and

the peasants, freed by the influences of the French revolution from the junkers, became independent cultivators earlier than in Prussia. Shut in on their upland plateaus bordered by the Alps, the Thuringian and Bohemian forests, and the Jura, the Bavarian peasant remained the boorish, superstitious, good-natured, and politically backward element of Germany that he is to-day. Thus with a backward but landowning peasantry, with an absence of a politically effective industrial proletariat (except the far north, Frankenland), it only required introduction of an element which had been accustomed to rule to convert Bavaria into the Vendée of Germany. that element was soon to be found in the emigrant junkers and generals of the Hohenzollern army, who have settled in Bavaria in recent years, in order to make it the centre from which they could work for the re-establishment of the old regime in Prussia. Prussia, in fact, according to a popular saying in contemporary Germany, has migrated to Bavaria after the November revolution.

It is not generally realised that the Kapp Putsch of March, 1920, succeeded in its object—the overthrow of a republican Government based on a coalition with the Socialists-in one part of Germany, namely, in Bavaria. Ever since then an undisguised dictatorship of reaction has been in power in Munich. In Bavaria one can see on a miniature scale what would be likely to happen in the rest of Central Europe if the emigrants in Munich succeeded in accomplishing their plans. But the first thing that one can observe about the Bavarian reaction is that the various elements composing it have not by any means a common policy. That policy has been characterised by numerous vacillations, dependent upon whether Ludendorff, the leader of the Prussian emigrês, or Dr. Heim, the leader of the Catholic Bavarian Peasants' Party (Bayerische Volkspartei), get the upper hand in the councils of the Cabinet in Munich. In general it may be said that that policy has gone through two phases and is now in the middle of a third. During 1920 the peasants were in the ascendancy. The Bavarian "Volkspartei" commenced a plan of action whereby Bavaria should get back its old rights of fiscal autonomy, control its own passport and police regulations and foreign affairs, and generally undermine the strong centralist tendencies of the Weimar Constitution. In its separatist

C

zeal it was prepared to enter into relations with the diplomatic agents of the French Government and the representatives of the French General Staff, who were aiming at the re-creation of the Federation of the Rhine under French tutelage. Even the Prussian generals, including Ludendorff, began to coquet with these French agents, though their objects were not the same as Dr. Heim's. They wanted a separate Bavaria for their schemes of restoration in Prussia, although of course they would not disclose this to the French. But the French got wind of Ludendorff's intentions and made conditions for their recognition of an independent Bavaria under a restored Wittelsbach dynasty, which would have left the Bavarian Government a mere cipher of Paris, and so the whole plan fell to the ground. Thus ended the first phase in the history of the post-revolutionary Bavarian reaction.

In the winter of 1920-21 a certain State forest official, Escherisch, began to organise a military body, which was designed to combat by force all attempts at strikes and risings of the working classes and to rouse the national instincts of German middle-class youths. The revolutionary movement of the Italian workers which led to the occupation of the factories had just taken place, and the German industrial capitalists, who had not yet completed their big amalgamations, were becoming very nervous at these developments. The "Orgesch," as this strike-breaking organ of Escherisch was called, thus found abundant support from the finances of German heavy industry. The important feature about the "Orgesch" was that it did not confine its activities to Bavaria, but regarded itself as an All-German institution. Centred in Bavaria, it had by the new year 1921 spread its branches all over Germany. The plan, which the Prussian agrarians and militarists had hoped in 1920 to realise with the aid of Bavarian peasants' parties and with the connivance of the French, and which had been wrecked by the latter, they now attempted to achieve alone. The situation thus created was best characterised by the cartoon of the Munich caricaturist, Olaf Gulbransson, in the Berlin 8-Uhr Abend Blatt at this time. A Bavarian lion was seen stamping on the ground with its paws, its whole body taut with energy and conscious of its might. on its back and holding the reins in his hands sits a military figure resembling Hindenburg.

Here lay the cause of the difficulties which beset the Orgesch from the outset. The Entente Powers would gladly have seen the spectre of Communism laid by a German White Guard, but if that White Guard began to coquet with ideas of revanche and to aim at the re-establishment of a military regime, which might conflict with their own, at once there would be trouble. In the early part of the winter 1920-21 the Entente secured under the terms of the Versailles Treaty the dissolution of the Civil Guards (" Einwohnerwehr"), which had played such a part along with units of the old Hohenzollern army in suppressing the revolution in Prussia in 1919. The Orgesch, too, was threatened with the same fate, but by converting itself into a secret organisation it managed to save itself and to continue to keep its arms and depôts, to drill its members, carry on nationalist propaganda, organise strike-breakers, break up Socialist meetings, and raid the bureaus of the revolutionary Left. It was, in fact, the early phase of the German Fascist Movement. Yet it could not play quite such a rôle as the Italian Fascisti, for in Germany the now powerful industrial capitalists had control of the machinery of State, and had no intention of allowing their children, the White Guard organisations, to turn into independent prætorian forces with Bonapartist proclivities. Nevertheless the Stinnes party, which during this time was firmly entrenched in the executive but not in the legislative organs of the German Republic, used the Orgesch to terrorise the reformist Socialists and other "democrats," who fondly imagined that a parliamentary majority was a guarantee that the will of that majority would prevail. " It is not too much to say," says a secret report of the Munich bureau of the Orgesch, published in the Vorwaerts for September 11, 1920, "that the Government of the Reich is dependent on us. If it will stand up to the Entente and not dissolve the secret military organisations in Bavaria, all will be well. Only a Government which acts like this will remain in power."

The crisis in the Orgesch, which has symptomised the third and existing phase of the Bavarian reaction since 1918, has been brought about by two causes. Firstly, as indicated above, the Entente, and in particular the French Government, hung the threat of the Ruhr occupation over the heads of the Orgesch if it dared to aspire to any higher aim than strike-breaking and hunting

down Communists. This caused a split in the ranks: the more far-seeing leaders, like Escherisch himself, did not desire to try conclusions with an obviously more powerful French army, while a number of others, corresponding to the "Völkisch" elements in Prussia, were ready for any adventure. Secondly, the German heavy industry capitalists had by the winter of 1921-22 largely overcome the crisis immediately following the revolution. had carried through their great concentration and had got large blocks of their capital out of Germany and safely invested in neutral countries. The necessity for co-operation with industry and finance capital in the Entente countries, and particularly with the French ironmasters, was becoming an urgent problem for at least one of the German trusts, and consequently the existence of a potential prætorian guard in Germany which might take their nationalist and chauvinistic slogans rather too literally became a danger. For the Stinnes trust anti-French propaganda is only a means whereby better conditions may be obtained for that trust in any future amalgamation of coal, iron, and steel interests in Westphalia, Lorraine, and Northern France. But the nationalist agrarians, with their militarist and anti-Semitic hangers-on, have no understanding for the finesse of this diplomatic game. The anti-Semites in particular began to kick over the traces. These elements had got control over the so-called "Organisation Consul." That body, originating as the secret service of the notorious Erhardt Naval Brigade, which had dyed its escutcheon with the blood of many thousands of German workers during the struggles of 1919, had continued after the Kapp Putsch as the secret intelligence department of the Orgesch. And this Organisation Consul in the summer of 1921 commenced a regular campaign of terror and assassination. During the Polish rising in May, 1921, in Upper Silesia it and a brother organisation, the "Freikorps Oberland," distinguished themselves by organising pogroms of the Jews, who happen to be the best financial support of the German national propaganda in that country! The leaders of this movement began to preach the most extreme form of racial hero-worship. With them Jews are vermin, and even the Christian religion is tainted because of the racial origin of its founder. Their cult is semi-heathen, the old Teutonic gods and Wotan their symbols of greatness, the Teutonic

"Swastika" of Indian origin their sign of power. It is almost inconceivable that such views should be held in these days in a European land, but they are undoubtedly the inspirers of the murderers of Erzberger and Rathenau, as the trials of the accomplices at the Leipzig High Court showed. The ills of Germany are, to these impecunious sons of former Prussian officers, now gaining a precarious living, due to a universal Semitic capitalist conspiracy against a chaste Germania.

The crisis caused by the shot which brought down the head of the royal stag amongst Semitic capitalists, Walter Rathenau, shook the Orgesch to its foundations. The money from the heavy industries and from the economic organ of the Prussian junkers, the "Landbund," stopped at once, and the Nationalist Party in the Reichstag made haste to repudiate the Völkisch elements. Some of the more moderate of the Nationalists, like Dr. Düringer, joined the Stinnes party as a protest. The component groups of the Orgesch began to go their own way and divide into three independent groups. The Bavarian separatist groups, which under Dr. Heim and the peasant parties had given tentative support to the Orgesch after the breakdown of its French liaison in 1920, have now begun to act on their own again. At the congress of the "Bayerische Volkpartei" this autumn in Munich a new party programme was worked out, demanding for Bavaria an autonomy bordering on separation and the virtual abolition of the Other separatist groups have begun to Weimar Constitution. take the initiative in Bavaria of late. The Bavarian Royalist Party (Königspartei), led by Dr. Meyer-Koy and Graf Bothmer, have revived the plan for a restoration of an independent Bavarian monarchy under the Wittelsbach dynasty with the assistance of French finance. The group called the "Donau Federation" aims also at a separation of Bavaria from the rest of Germany and at a federal union with Hungary and Austria under the Habsburgs. The financial assistance for this plan comes from the Vatican and is directed not only against France but as much against the Quirinal. The representatives of this tendency in Munich are Cardinal Faulhaber and the Papal Nuncio Pacelli.

The second group arising out of the Orgesch is that centring round the so-called "National Socialists." To them have come

-02-26 20:09 GMT / https://hdt.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987290 the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/acsess.use#pd-us-go what remains of the Organisation Consul, the Organisation Kanzler, and the Freikorps Oberland. As extreme anti-Semites they have reconstituted themselves under this new name and are organising terrorist expeditions against Socialist industrial centres, attacks on Jewish shopkeepers, and the plundering of banks and post trains. In fact, even the Bavarian Government has been forced to issue warrants for arrest for highway robbery against some of the leaders of this group. They represent the extreme Right of the Fascist Movement in Germany—the romantic robber barons of the middle ages transplanted into the twentieth century, with the self-imposed task of saving the capitalist system. The German trusts have ceased to finance them any longer. Only Hugenburg, a former director of Krupps, is known to have given them money recently, for they would undoubtedly be useful in the event of a general strike.

There remains now to be considered the third group, and this can be regarded as the original kernel of the Orgesch, the men immediately round Escherisch himself, who still retain the old organisation after the others have split off. They retain also the connection with the heavy industry trusts, and are still amply supplied with funds from Stinnes, his friends, and industrial rivals. The latter do this because they see in the Orgesch still an extra-Parliamentary organisation which can force the Socialists into submission to their economic dictatorship, and which is not likely to get out of hand or set up as Bonapartists on their own. These are, in fact, the practical as opposed to the romantic Fascisti-the tame servants of industrial capital, who will break strikes or organise nationalist demonstrations whenever their masters, in delicate negotiations with the Entente heavy industry trusts and preparing the ground for future international amalgamations and pooling of profits, require a little assistance from "the people."

But if the rejuvenated Orgesch is to be the private military arm of the German trusts, it is necessary to find an intellectual arm. Stinnes, in his recent speech to the State Economic Council, has told all Germany that the eight-hours day must go, and that an extra two hours a day must be put on to produce for reparations account. His Stinnes-Lubersac agreement, as everyone knows,

gives him a 6 per cent. profit on the turnover of all reparations transactions. This ten-hour day must, therefore, be popularised at all cost, and the Social Democrats won over to the task of persuading the German proletariat of the necessity of this. In the event of their failing to persuade, then the Social Democrats must be induced to work the strike-breaking machinery ("Technische Nothilfe") created originally by their leader, Noske, and perfected now by the Orgesch. This, then, is the motive that stands behind the idea of the "Great Coalition from Stinnes to Scheidemann." Its realisation would be the last stone to be placed on the fabric of capitalist reconstruction in Central Europe. It would be the logical development of the particular form of practical, industrial Fascism which is developing in Germany to-day.

Up till recently it seemed as if the "Great Coalition," from the Stinnes party to the Social Democrats, with the extra-Parliamentary forces of the industrial Fascisti, the Orgesch, in the background, was going to be realised in Germany this winter. The ground had already been prepared by the union of the two wings of the Social Democrats, the outspoken revisionists and the Centrists, in the congress at Nuremberg in September. It was no accident that the meeting place was chosen at Nuremberg. The headquarters of the National Socialists and others of the romantic Fascisti type are at Munich. From here they dominate Bavaria south of the Danube. Through the secretary to the police prefect in Munich, Herr Glaser, one of their nominees, they control the secret service and apparatus of justice in this part of Germany. Woe to any person who crosses their path as the result of the Fechenbach trial showed, where ten years' penal servitude was given to German citizens who had dared to report in the Press the activities of their secret societies. But between the agrarian districts of South Bavaria and the industrial districts of Prussia, Socialist Thuringia, and Communist Middle Germany stands the industrial district of Nuremberg, in the pastoral highlands of Frankenland. The Frankish labouring population have always been staunch Protestants and upholders of the flag of reformist Socialism, and the heroes of the National Socialists would have to pass through this land in order to bring their filibustering expeditions to the North. That was what Otto Wels meant when he said, at the Unity Congress in Nuremberg:

Divilizan by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN "The fate of the German Republic is in the hands of the workers of Frankenland." The Unity Congress was a challenge to romantic Fascism, but it was also an offer of peace to industrial Fascism under the cover of the "Great Coalition," and with the watchword: "Defence of the Republic." For a week previously, the last Majority Socialist Congress at Augsburg had rejected a resolution to turn down, in principle, a coalition with the Stinnes' "People's Party." And the Majority Socialists were the dominant factor at the Nuremberg Congress. The policy of President Ebert and of Dr. Helphant (Parvus), whose influence in the councils of the German Social Democrats is still very great, and whose organ, Wiederaufbau, is untiring in its efforts to secure reconstruction with the aid of Stinnes, was in the ascendant.

But last month a crisis came. Directly after the Mussolini coup in Italy, the Bavarian National Socialists decided also to strike. The plan was to carry out a Putsch in Frankenland, and to use this as a base to operate against North Germany. But once again the German heavy industry capitalists blocked the way. threatened the National Socialists with the "Great Coalition," and the United Social Democrats with the dictatorship of the National Socialists, unless they agreed to the Great Coalition. Dr. Wirth was put up to give an ultimatum to the Social Democrats in this sense. Faced with this crisis, the Trade Union leaders, who are always more in touch with the masses than the leaders of the Social Democratic Party, forced the pace and secured the rejection of the "Great Coalition." So the Wirth Government fell. the meantime the South Bavarian Fascisti had missed their chance. As the Social Democratic Minister of the Interior for Prussia, Herr Severing, announced last week in the Diet: "We have now made preparations against any attempted armed expeditions from Bavaria into Prussia, not only by concentration of sufficient police forces, but also by the use of those methods of warfare which these people are used to." By this he referred to armed workmen's guards in Frankenland and Central Germany. The arrest of the notorious Captain Erhardt by police officials of the Reich, in the jaws of the lion at Munich, is also an indication that heavy industry and the Social Democrats were able, at the decisive moment, to scotch the plans of the National Socialists.

The Cuno Government is a coalition of the nominees of the two great German trusts—the Stinnes trust and the A.E.G., Krupps, Hamburg-Amerika Line Industrial Federation, with subsidiaries connecting the latter with Wall Street through the Harriman concern. It stands for a masked industrial dictatorship of heavy industry and finance, with its Fascist organ, the Orgesch, on the one hand and the "Great Coalition" with the Social Democrats on the other. It has the support of the former, which it finances. It is seeking to secure a coalition with the latter, without which it knows that it cannot put through the ten-hour day with the two extra hours for reparations account. It remains to be seen how the struggle within the ranks of the United Social Democratic Party will develop in the near future.

The coming of winter has seen romantic Bonapartist Fascism in the saddle in Italy. It has seen Germany one stage nearer to the extra-Parliamentary industrial dictatorship, which characterises the practical Fascism of northern, non-Latin lands. To complete it, the co-operation of reformist Social Democrat leaders who will confine themselves to parliamentary methods, while their capitalist colleagues will not, is required. In England the general election has brought finance capital in the form of the "Big Five" into power by constitutional means. But the problem of unemployment may force even the victors at the polls to seek assistance of the Labour Party to keep the underfed from taking action on the streets. Let the developments on the Continent be a warning to the Labour Party to refrain from any step which may lead down to the slippery slope, through parliamentary collaboration, to coalition with capitalist parties, and finally to direct responsibility for the industrial Fascism which big business interests of every capitalist country will be compelled to have recourse to sooner or later in order to save itself from decay.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

# Generated on 2025-02-26 20:09 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/viug.30112061987290 Public Domain in the United States, Geogle-digitized / http://www.hathirust.org/access-useMpd-

### BOURGEOIS POLITICAL PARTIES IN CHINA

By W. W.

THOROUGH understanding of the inner workings of that great and complicated process, the struggle of social forces in China, is impossible so long as the primitive idea exists that the Chinese struggle may be dismissed as a mere fight amongst generals. Unfortunately this superficial opinion of complicated Chinese conditions has already gained a footing; in reality, however, it is no more than a hasty, superficial conclusion drawn from facts which do not even exist. It cannot be denied that the names of generals are repeatedly found on the surface of political life. Civil war forces military groups into the arena, and people fail to see what are the forces at work behind these groups, far down in the depths of the Chinese masses.

China is daily becoming more involved in the sphere of international trade. The Chinese wall, which at one time cut off China from the whole world, has fallen, and China is no longer an isolated country unconcerned with world capitalism. The penetration of foreign capital into China, together with its effects, has done its work. Railroads, steamships, and entire factory settlements, with their smoking chimneys, prove the new trend of Chinese economic life, and their results cannot be ignored. It must be remembered that quite recently Chinese foreign trade has been doubled and has reached the enormous sum of £150,000,000. The network of railways connecting the various parts of the gigantic Chinese territory is continually expanding. However, it is not generally recognised that China does not form a uniform picture in its economic structure.

For most people China is a uniform whole and is treated accordingly: this conception is due to its remoteness. The reality presents quite a different picture, for China may roughly be divided into three different parts: the South, including the whole territory south of the river Yangtze; United China, generally termed North China, being the whole territory north of the river Yangtze as far as the great Chinese wall; and Manchuria. These

three parts of China have each peculiar economic conditions which determine the social tendencies of those political groups which are so closely allied to the several parts of China and the political demands and wishes apparent in the present struggle.

South China is now passing through the period of "primitive accumulation." It is a kingdom of the petty bourgeoisie, consisting almost entirely of native-born Chinese. Unlike North China, the South is less under the yoke of foreign capitalism. There exists a certain influence of finance capital, but even this performs merely a supplementary function. The coastal territory of South China is somewhat differently placed, for it is under the control of the British possession Hong Kong. Hong Kong, however, does not regulate industry, but merely trade, and this mainly by duties which are levied both on imports and exports.

Let us turn to the extreme end of China, viz., Manchuria. Here agriculture is making rapid strides and producing a big surplus for export trade. This tendency ensures a flow of ready money and thereby fosters the prosperity of the Manchurian farmers and traders. Simultaneously the development of peculiar types of finance capital is noticeable, which also speeds the development of Manchurian agriculture.

Then there is the case of United China, with its water system of the Yangtze river, a network of railways, and two important harbours, Shanghai and Tientsin—this is the kingdom of industrial China.

This scheme of the economic structure also corresponds with the growth of those social forces which are behind the present political struggle in China.

More than ten years have elapsed since the revolutionary war in China swept away the monarchy and hoisted the five-coloured flag over the newly founded Chinese republic. The mandarins, the Chinese bureaucratic clique of officialdom, still keep alive the Manchurian dynasty that existed for so many hundred years. They cling to power and for modern China they embody the most important section of those reactionary forces against which the present struggle is being waged.

The Chinese mandarins linked up their fate closely with that of world imperialism which surrounded the old Chinese empire

with exploiting treaties and contracts. In order to ensure compliance with these treaties the help of the mandarins was sought, so that the burden of the treaties should be shifted on to the Chinese people.

Military groups came into being during the first years of the revolution; these imitated the mandarins, joined forces with them, and formed the basis of those military groups, or cliques as they are styled in China. During recent years these cliques have grown so powerful as to give the impression that the military groups were the only active forces in China.

Both the mandarins and the militarists are reactionary forces; but these do not comprise the whole life of China. It cannot be doubted that the process of growth and development of class-consciousness on the part of the Chinese bourgeoisie is now in progress. In the different parts of China they are pushing their class interests and demands under different forms to the front.

The chambers of commerce and industry, the present mouthpieces of the Chinese bourgeoisie, are rallying around them the

support of the new generation.

The Chinese bourgeoisie does not confine its organising activity to itself, it undertakes also the organisation of the scattered forces of the petty bourgeoisie and of the artisans, a force strongly developed in China. Besides, between the Chinese bourgeoisie and the Chinese intelligentsia (by which is meant the so-called European-Chinese intelligentsia, which is steadily developing) by degrees a relation is becoming noticeable, which threatens to end in the transformation of the Chinese intelligentsia into a tool of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

Thus the two great and tangible powers now figuring in the political arena of China are the militarised mandarins and the Chinese bourgeoisie. And also quite recently the Chinese proletariat has appeared on the horizon. But this superficial review by no means covers the whole ground of the present facts. For just as the militarised mandarins of modern China are not uniform in structure, neither has the newly developed bourgeoisie attained its final form.

Actual conditions have produced strange combinations—and not isolated ones—of the absorption of militarists by the bour-

geoisie; for example, a military man who has amassed capital became shareholder in or even independent owner of a certain business undertaking.

General Tsao-Kun, the leader of the "Chihli," belongs to this type, just as General Chang-Tso-Lin and dozens of others.

It is quite clear that this combination is increasing the power of the Chinese bourgeoisie, giving it good cause to question the distribution of power and to stake a claim for its appropriate share thereof. In this matter the opposition of the military groups of the militarised mandarins becomes apparent; they will not relinquish their position without a struggle, a fact which gives rise to the intricate nature of the civil struggle in China.

In the Chinese political arena there still exist three important political groups, corresponding in detail with the economic plan already presented. South China has the so-called Government of Sun-Yat-Sen, Central China has in Peking the Peking Government under the control of the Chihli Party led by Generals Wu-Pei-Fu and Tsao-Kun. In Manchuria Chang-Tso-Lin reigns.

The bitter armed struggle of the past few months, although conducive to the increase in power of the Peking Government, caused no change in the political map of China, which for the present remains unaltered. How can this be accounted for? The reasons apparently are to be found in those social conditions which form the root cause of the general Chinese political position and the civil war.

The struggle between the south and the north has deep roots of an economic nature. The victory of the north signifies for the southern, chiefly the petty bourgeoisie, the penetration of inland capital into the south, which would bring about the ruin of southern commercial bourgeoisie. It is this fact that strengthens the southern independence, the tendency to provincialism and autonomy. This, too, is the reason why Sun-Yat-Sen—the supporter of the petty bourgeoisie—demands in his programme the nationalisation of finance capital and independence of foreign capital; for finance capital, let it be home or imported, is alike the enemy of the southern trader and factory owner.

Sun-Yat-Sen and the Ho-Min-Dan Party are popular in the south. Careful observation indicates that this popularity is not so

Divilization Google

much due to the fact that Sun-Yat-Sen wants to reform the whole of China, but that he defends the independence of the south in the struggle against the north.

Manchuria, where the Fin-Chang (Mukden) Party operates under the leadership of Chang-Tso-Lin, is on the one hand the home of the last Manchurian dynasty—a fact which has had its influence on Chang-Tso-Lin-and on the other it constitutes the arena for the opposing influences of the Imperialists, where the chief part is played by Japan, which compels Chang-Tso-Lin to dance to the tune it calls. It is no longer a secret that Chang-Tso-Lin became strong by the support of Japan. Japan calculated that in this way it would not only gain control over Manchuria, which was necessary as a compensation for Korea, but also over Peking, the seat of the official Chinese Government, such control being of great importance to Japan. It has already been noted that Chang-Tso-Lin is an important shareholder in several Manchurian financial concerns, and was therefore organically connected with the Manchurian bourgeoisie. Consequently, although half-beaten, Chang-Tso-Lin is necessary, both to Japan and the Manchurian bourgeoisie, and in return he was able to maintain his positions in Manchuria.

During last April north and south had a common enemy, Wu-Pei-Fu, who prevailed in Central China and had established himself in the valley of the river Yangtze. He held the majority of Chinese arsenals in his hands. Under the ensign of the "Fight for the National Revival of China" he became a serious competitor of both Chang-Tso-Lin and Sun-Yat-Sen. The result was, on the one hand, Sun-Yat-Sen's expedition against the north, and on the other the military operations opened by Chang-Tso-Lin against Wu-Pei-Fu. In Central China Chang-Tso-Lin was stigmatised as a traitor of the Chinese people and a hireling of Japan. circumstance was made use of by Wu-Pei-Fu and facilitated his victory over his enemy. Sun-Yat-Sen's expedition to the north was too weak; Chang-Tso-Lin's defeat in the north was viewed with sympathy in the south, and all Sun-Yat-Sen's calculations miscarried. Wu-Pei-Fu kept the upper hand, and by means of his victory was able to be in control over the Peking Government. He restored the old Parliament and the power of the former President, Li-Yun-Chun.

Divilized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN Wu-Pei-Fu's victory was obviously to the advantage of that section of Chinese bourgeoisie which we have described above as the industrial bourgeoisie of Central China. It is quite clear that the restoration of the parliamentary system throws open the political arena, which had previously been occupied by the representatives of the militarised mandarin class, to the Chinese bourgeoisie. The latter in its struggle for power is naturally aware that it needs a pliable weapon, and no doubt looks on and values Wu-Pei-Fu in this light. This last encounter of armed forces is all the more important in that it set free the hands of the Chinese bourgeoisie and raised the hopes of Chinese public opinion.

The scene of conflict in China will now be Parliament, as it was formerly the battlefield. In other words, the Chinese civil war is by no means at an end. The troops are merely resting. Wu-Pei-Fu and Chang-Tso-Lin return to their headquarters, one to Lao-Yan, the other to Mukden, to reorganise their armies, form new corps, and prepare for renewed fighting. In the meantime the struggle is prosecuted by peaceful means in Parliament, and even more outside. The calling of Parliament is by no means an ideal solution. Under present conditions this Parliament is far from being, even in the slightest degree, an acceptable representation of the country.

China must deal with the following questions: (1) the conclusion of the work for establishing a constitution for the Chinese republic; (2) the unification of the country and the formation of a Central Government; (3) the abolition of the "Tu-chuns" and the reduction of the army.

In order to understand future discussions of these questions in Parliament we must examine the political groups at present in existence in China.

In the ordinary sense of the word there are no political parties in China. The so-called parties are really groups of persons connected by personal interests and not by questions of principle. The only party with a definite programme, even though not strictly adhered to, is the Ho-Min-Dan Party, with the old revolutionary, Sun-Yat-Sen, at its head. Before the 1911 revolution it was known as the Tin-Men-Wei, or Federation of Nationalists. This body was the leader of the 1911 revolution, but subsequently fell to pieces partly owing to the reprisals of the dictator Yuan-Shi-

Kai, partly owing to internal disintegration, the leaders fled the country, and within the party itself serious differences of opinion were manifest. Somewhat later Sun-Yat-Sen formed a new party out of the remnants of the Ho-Min-Dan Party, calling it the Chinese Revolutionary Party, which adopted three basic principles: (1) the racial principle, (2) democracy, (3) socialism (somewhat on the lines of Henry George's Single Tax), and accepted the authority of the executive head of the party. It formed a comparatively small group, as several old members left the party. After the restoration of the Shantung province in 1920, however, the influence of this party gradually increased; it was reorganised in 1921, and resumed the old name, Ho-Min-Dan, without altering the party programme.

The composition of the party is extremely varied. Widely different types belong to it quite independent of their class. Ex-officials and generals, bourgeois emigrants, soldiers, and workers, and particularly Chinese who have been educated abroad. This party is very like the Russian Social Revolutionaries, although the agrarian question with them is not so predominant an influence as with the latter.

The so-called "racial principle" or nationalism is conceived by the supporters of the party as an endeavour to restore China by the efforts of the Chinese themselves. But it is also taken to cover the idea of colonising and assimilating Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan, Tibet, and Manchuria. The party's idea of Socialism is the nationalisation of large-scale industry. It is Sun-Yat-Sen's conception of Socialism as State capitalism. Owing to its varied composition the party is unable to play the part which might otherwise be expected of its large membership in China (the paper figures are about 100,000). The kernel of the party consists of petty bourgeoisie, which gives it its character. As a matter of fact, membership of the party entails no obligation, although Sun-Yat-Sen himself lays great stress on the question of submission to the executive head of the party. From the point of view of organisation, it is not a party in the Western sense; it holds no congresses, no conferences. The Central Office, elected two years ago, carries on the work of the party on its own responsibility, so that its leadership applies not so much to the party as a whole as to a given group of persons.

The Ho-Min-Dan Party may thus be characterised as a party of the petty bourgeoisie which aims at liberating China from the domination of foreign capital. It is at present the means by which the Sun-Yat-Sen Government of the south has been able to retain its power.

More recently there have been serious differences of opinion within the Ho-Min-Dan Party, especially between the Sun-Yat-Sen and another leader, Chen-Tsun-Min, who has several supporters. These differences became evident already two years ago, and arose mainly because Sun-Yat-Sen insisted on the immediate election of a President regardless of the "law" and the Constitution, while Chen-Tsun-Min maintained that "a council of administrators of the Canton Government could be formed." Sun wanted centralisation of China. Chen wanted decentralisation.

Sun wanted to overthrow the Northern Government with armed force; but Chen was of opinion that the north should be split up and that the power of the Peking Government would be weakened by the union of autonomous provinces. Sun advocated the dictatorship of the Ho-Min-Dan Party, whilst Chen is a supporter of the coalition idea. As recent events showed, their differences of opinion within that party led to an armed struggle between Sun-Yat-Sen's and Chen-Tsun-Min's supporters, thereby causing a big deterioration in the party strength. Still, this party, which possesses many talented people and a certain degree of organising experience, will play an important rôle in the history of Chinese life, especially in the political struggle threatened in the newly formed Parliament.

After the revolution another party, called the Progressives, was formed alongside of the Ho-Min-Dan, but differing from it in its conception of the centralisation question. In its original form this party did not exist for long, and dissolved quickly. In its place two groups were formed—or, as they are termed, "cliques": "Nyan-Gin" and "Tsao-Tun." Neither of which has a written programme; they are composed of practical business people, members of big industry and bourgeois financiers. Lan-Chi-Cha is the leader of the Nyan-Gin group; he was a reformer under the rule of the Manchurian empresses, and prior to the revolution a supporter of the constitutional monarchy and an opponent of the republic. Under Yuan-Chi-Kai he occupied the position of a

D

Minister of Justice, from which he retired when Yuan-Chi-Kai tried to have himself proclaimed emperor. At a later date he took part in the struggle against the south, thereby losing his political prestige and barring his return to any governmental position. In 1919, during the students' movement, both he and his group concentrated in trying to influence the young generation, for which purpose they attempted for a time to herald Socialism. Yet the young Chinese remained hostile to this group.

The Tsao-Tun group was divided into an old and a new group, with Lan-Chi-In and Tsao-Chu-Lin as leaders of the old group. This group is closely connected with the Chinese financial and industrial circles. The new group is composed in reality of commercial people belonging to the "Bank of Communication." Wu-Pei-Fu's victory has almost brought about the ruin of this group, so closely connected with Chang-Tso-Lin. The former prime

minister, Lan-Chi-In, fled to Japan.

Recently yet another group was formed in the upper classes of China which is connected with the progressive groups. This new group consists of professors, chiefly of Peking University, and its directors are Tse-Yuan-Pei and a professor named Chush-Shi. They issued a manifesto and a programme entitled "Our Political Views," which is an interesting example of the formulation of the political demands of Chinese liberalism. The manifesto was addressed to the "Best People" without reference to their opinions. That is to say, the document was intended to provide a programme which could unite democrats, syndicalists, and anarchists. document is extremely characteristic of the individualist Chinese outlook, showing an inclination towards various anarchist forces. The authors of the manifesto, in their attempt to find a main political platform, declare: "We must unitedly demand good government for China as a minimum." The maximum demands of the group are classified under two heads: (1) all State organs must fully serve the interests of the community; (2) the freedom of the individual and his development must be fully secured. They embody their political wishes in three demands laid before the Government: (1) the Government must be constitutional; (2) it must be responsible, and its work must be public both in the financial concerns of the State and in the investigation of

matters which may allow of State action; (3) the Government must have "a plan of action." This latter plan of action is defined in the form of definite demands which the new progressive party will put forward under given political conditions. On the question of the unification of China they demand that a peace conference of the north and south should be held. They recommend as practical measures for guaranteeing unity of the north and south: (1) the calling of the Parliament dissolved in the sixth year of the revolution; (2) final confirmation of the constitution; (3) final reduction of armaments; (4) the reorganisation and centralisation of the machinery of Government, and a number of other demands which almost entirely formed the basis of the work of Wu-Pei-Fu.

It may be of interest to point out that Tse-Yuan-Pei is an important figure and has repeatedly taken part in the Government as Minister of Education. This time he was also a candidate for the position of President; it is clear that there was little chance of his succeeding to the latter post. Undoubtedly, however, the demands raised are in accordance with the views of the Chinese progressive bourgeoisie, and at the present time seem to be being carried into effect. In any case the new political group contains the germs of a new organisation which could play an important part in the life of China, not so much perhaps from the practical view as from the ideological side.

These are the most important groups in the political life of China. The question as to whether they are based on the broad masses of the population must be answered in the negative. With the exception of the Ho-Min-Dan Party all the groups are only connected with a narrow upper-class section. They are either of the governing class or of the Chinese intelligentsia in the service of the governing class. Except in the south, where the peasants form the majority of the population, they have not been drawn into the political struggle. They are ignorant, full of prejudice, and from the economic point of view their life is deplorable. The paid soldiery are only involved in the civil war as tools.

Young China—a mass of high school and other students all sporadically take part in the popular movement—at present forms a very small proportion of the Chinese millions. But

this small proportion is largely penetrated by Socialist ideas, and forms the radical groups.

As a whole it may be stated that the wide masses of the Chinese people are at present outside political life. The political parties described above have only gained a slight hold on the masses, and therein lies their essential weakness.

## The World of Labour

	Account to the Control of the Contro			PAGE
International:	Communist Congress		4.4	53
	Young Communist International	14.4		55
	Hague Peace Congress			55
	Trade Union Statistics	4.1	2.0	56
GERMANY:	Congress of Workers' Councils			57

#### INTERNATIONAL

#### Communist Congress

T Petrograd on November 5 the Fourth Congress of the Communist International was opened by Zinoviev; the further sessions were held at Moscow and continued until December 5. The invitations sent out for this Congress were more restricted than those to the previous congresses. There were 392 delegates present representing sixty-three national parties, of these 342 possessed full voting powers, forty-four in a consultative capacity, and four guests. The whole international position was reviewed, and the effect of the policy adopted at the last world congress closely examined in respect of each country.

The congress unanimously approved the tactics of the executive and voted the following resolution to sanction the report submitted by the executive:—

#### RESOLUTION ON THE EXECUTIVE

The fourth World Congress unreservedly sanctions the political work accomplished by the Communist International Executive, who during fifteen months faithfully carried out the decisions of the third world congress and adapted them, where necessary, to the political exigencies of the moment.

The fourth Congress of the Communist International especially approves the tactics of the united front, such as were formulated by the Executive in December, 1921, and the other documents drawn up by the Executive on this subject.

The fourth Congress of the Communist International agrees with the opinion of the Executive in respect of the crisis in the French Communist Party, the events which have taken place in the Italian Labour Movement, as well as in the Norwegian and Czecho-Slovakian Communist Parties. Purely practical questions of detail concerning these parties will be dealt with by the special Commissions, whose decisions are still being studied by the Congress.

In reference to happenings in certain parties, the fourth Congress recalls and confirms the fact that during the interval between two international congresses the Communist International Executive is the highest authority of the entire Communist Movement, and that the decisions arrived at by the Executive



nerated on 2025-02-26.20.14 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061 htts Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust. are binding on the members of the Third International. It therefore follows that it is a breach of discipline to attack decisions of the Executive under the pretext of appealing to the next congress. Should the Communist International permit such practices it would thereby paralyse its activities and abolish all regularity and unity.

As for the doubts expressed on the question of the application of Article 9 of the statutes of the Communist International, the fourth Congress declares that it is Article 9 which confers on the Executive the incontestable right to exclude from the Communist International, and in the same way from national sections, persons or groups of persons who take up a hostile attitude towards Communism.

As a matter of course the Executive is obliged to have recourse to Article 9, if the national party does not exercise the necessary energy and vigilance by means of its intermediaries to the party against non-Communist elements.

The fourth Congress of the Communist International reaffirms the twenty-one conditions, drawn up by the second Congress of the Communist International, and charges the new Executive to be most vigilant in enforcing them. In the future the Communist International ought to be more than ever an international proletarian organisation which combats all opportunism; in short an organisation based most rigidly on the principle of democratic centralisation.

Trotsky in the course of his speech referred to the new economic policy in Russia, and stated that the Russian State enterprises employ more than 1,000,000 workers. In reference to the International, he maintained that it was made up of right and left elements, and although he considered the right element a grave danger, he denounced indifference as the worst danger of all.

Amongst the delegates present the negro race was also represented, for the Communist International, unlike the Second, includes both white and coloured races; it was suggested that at a future date an all-black conference should be held at Moscow so as to discuss the position of the 150,000,000 negroes—52,000,000 of whom live in America and edit 450 papers—and realise the united front.

The attitude of the Communist International to the trade unions and the action of Communists was summed up by Losovsky, who declared that the International was against expulsions as well as the voluntary resignation of Communists from the unions.

In view of the fact that a cursory review of the programme of the International would be of no value, and the impossibility of making a detailed one at the congress, it was unanimously decided, at Zinoviev's suggestion, to delegate the Executive to deal with it on the following lines:—

(1) That the Executive should study and publish all the projects contained in the programme;

(2) That every national body be required to submit their definite proposals to the executive three months before the convention of the fifth Congress;

(3) That the same national sections justify definitely and decisively the necessity of the struggle for temporary demands, at the same time making necessary reservations according to existing conditions;

(4) That the Congress energetically refuses to term opportunist temporary demands based on theory;

(5) That the general programme should include historic fundamental examples of temporary demands made by certain national sections. Amongst the most important national questions discussed was the crisis in the French Communist Party, which had been only temporarily decided at the Paris conference of November 15 (see Labour Monthly, December, 1922), subject to ratification and further proposals by the Communist International. The Fourth Congress decided that the French Communist Party should convene a national council, possessing the powers of a congress, during the month of January, at which a new executive committee should be elected and composed on the following basis:—

CENTRISTS: ten principal delegates and three deputy ones. THE LEFT: nine principal deputies and two deputies.
RENAULT GROUP: four principal delegates and one deputy.
THE RENAUD JEAN GROUP: one principal delegate.

THE YOUNG COMMUNIST GROUP: one principal delegate (with voting power)
The political bureau to be composed of three delegates each from the centre and left
sections, and one from the Renault group.

Froissard and Souvarine were appointed to represent the French Communist Party on the International Executive during the coming three months. The decisions in respect of the French Press were that Cachin should remain as editor of L'Humanité with Dunois, on an equal footing, as general secretary; one editorial secretary to be chosen from the centre and another from the left. Comrades who have resigned should return to their positions. The editing of the Bulletin Communiste is to be entrusted to a comrade belonging to the left section of the party. The congress adopted these proposals with two dissentients.

The Young Communist International

The Third Congress of the Young Communist International met in Moscow on December 4, 1922. The organisation has greatly increased in strength during its three years' existence, and possesses members in almost every country in Europe. The present total membership is 800,000 divided into fifty sections.

The agenda discussed by the congress included: (1) Report of the Fourth Congress of the Communist International; (2) The results of carrying out the decisions of the Second Congress; (3) The economic position and struggle of young workers; (4) The next steps in the fight against militarism and the white terror; (5) The young socialist organisations and the united front of young workers; (6) The question of workers' sports.

#### World Peace Congress

A peace congress, summoned by the International Federation of Trade Unions, met at the Hague, December 10-15. The following organisations received invitations to be present at the congress:—

The National Trade Union Centres (twenty-two in number) affiliated with the International Federation of Trade Unions, together with their constituent trade unions; twenty-nine of the International Trade Secretariats; nine of the National Trade Union Centres not affiliated with the International Federation of Trade Unions, together with their constituent trade unions; the Second (London) International and affiliated organisations; the International Working

ed on 2025-02-26 20114 GMT / https://hdt.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987290 Jonain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathirust.org/access-useMpd Union of Socialist Parties (Vienna) and affiliated organisations; the International Co-operative Alliance and affiliated organisations; the Young Workers' International (Berlin) and affiliated organisations; the International Working Union of Socialist Young Workers' Organisations (Vienna) and affiliated organisations; the International Federation of Working Women; twenty-two of the International Pacifist and kindred organisations together with their affiliated organisations; nineteen of the Teachers' organisations of various countries.

The congress was well attended, and representatives from twenty countries were present. The following resolution was passed unanimously on the opening day of the congress:—

This conference demands a new peace, based on new international agreements, and its members resolve to work unremittingly by every means in their power to bring about the convening of a World Congress through the instrumentality of the League of Nations in order to achieve a new peace.

Though both the Third International and the Red International of Labour Unions were not invited, Russia was represented on behalf of the Russian Trade Unions. Losovsky as spokesman declared that Russia was ready to join in any definite scheme. The peace resolutions were such that the Russian delegates outlined a separate one, calling for a Committee of Action against War. But the Congress rejected the Russian proposition and voted in favour of resolutions advocating prevention of war by an international general strike, education in peace ideals, disarmament, and the transformation of the League of Nations into an effective instrument for peace.

#### Statistics of Trade Union Internationals

International Federation of Trade Unions

The most recent statistics published by the International Federation of Trades Unions of Amsterdam show a total membership of 21,991,615, organised in twenty-four countries and being 69 per cent. of the total number of organised workers in the countries under review. The membership is as follows:—

OHOWS.					Mark A			A Company of the Company
Argentine				74,958	Hungary		150	152,577
Austria		1.1		1,079,777	Italy	des		1,200,000
			100	698,384	Jugo-Slavia	4.4		50,000
Belgium			- 77	14,803	Latvia	Carlo	100	22,607
Bulgaria	• •			164,383	Luxembourg			20,966
Canada					Norway			95,927
Czecho-Slo	vaki		18.8	827,761				
Denmark			100	242,545	Peru	1.1	2.5	25,000
France				756,243	Poland			365,190
	•			0	South Africa			50,000
Germany			**					240,113
Great Brit	ain	4.40	2.41	6,559,033	Spain			
Greece				170,000	Sweden			313,208
				223,718	Switzerland			225,822
Holland	V .	**		223,/10	Cittoniana		- 1	0.00

In comparison with the statistics published in July, 1921, these show a decline, the total affiliations at that date being 23,907,059; besides the same applies here as in the case of the R.I.L.U. in respect of Italian figures which have been recently reported in L'Humanité as being not more than about 800,000.

#### Red International of Labour Unions

The Central European Bureau, on the occasion of the Second Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions, published complete statistics from each country of the strength of R.I.L.U. in each union and in the country as a whole. These show there are thirty-two countries in which the R.I.L.U. has supporters, the members are mainly groups in opposition to the central organisation and not the affiliations of central organisations, except in the case of Bulgaria, Egypt, Dutch Indies, Uruguay, Chile, where either the chief trade union centre or the majority of same adheres to the R.I.L.U. The statistics which give a total of 12,274,000 are:—

٠	madered Hr	men. P.	,	cour.	2 12/2/200					
	Argentine				30,000	Esthonia				16,000
	Australia	-0	eq.	600	60,000	Finland	231			48,000
	Austria				90,000	France				300,000
	1.27		•		90,000	Germany		120		1,250,000
	Belgium	••	**	16.5	r	Holland	1.3			20,000
	Canada	**		1.5	30,000	India				7
	Chile				90,000	Italy	-5.5.		44	350,000
	China				150,000	Japan				7,500
					(metal	Luxembo	ire			2,000
					workers	Mexico				25,000
					who are	Norway				100,000
					negotia-	Poland	100			200,000
					ting with	Rumania	133			2,500
					the	Russia	Si in		4.	7,914,000
					R.I.L.U.)	Spain				200,000
	Bulgaria			53	34,000	Sweden				75,000
	Czecho-S	lovakia	21		367,000	Switzerla	- 4	***	199	50,000
	Dutch In				27,000		na			15,000
		idica				Turkey				3,7
	Egypt			• • •	100,000	Uruguay	100,5	C A	400	422,000
	England				300,000	United S	tates o	Amei	ICa	420,000

In the case of Russia the statistics issued at the last Trade Union Congress show that on the voluntary basis the membership of the central commission has been reduced to 5,100,000; the figures given for Italy cannot be regarded as absolutely reliable because the whole labour movement is in a state of chaos under the Mussolini regime and statistics are constantly changing.

#### GERMANY

#### Congress of Workers' Councils

HE first Congress of the Revolutionary Workers' Councils was held in Berlin, on November 23. Prior to the congress there was much controversy on the advisability of holding the congress under existing circumstances. The General Federation of Trades Unions (A.D.G.B.) refused to be associated with it, and was loud in its condemnation of what it termed the Communist Congress. The A.D.G.B. helped in this way to spread the idea that the delegates and conveners of the congress consisted entirely of Communists. That such was not the case a few detailed figures will suffice to show; though the idea of the congress and majority of the delegates belonged to the German

100

k

23

20

2

B ... B

Communist Party (K.P.D.). For instance, of the 371 delegates from Saxony, 237 were members of the Communist Party, thirty-seven of the United Socialist Party, and seven Independent Socialists; the representatives from Rhineland, Westphalia, consisted of 211 Communists, eighty-two United Socialists, forty-two Independents, and fifty-nine non-party; those from Thuringia included twenty-two United Socialists, fifteen Independents, and fifty-nine non-party workers. All the funds necessary to organise the congress were collected from the workers, and the congress received the support of the rank and file if not of the officials, and was attended by nearly a thousand delegates from all parts of the country. Since nothing tangible was being done to alleviate the misery of the

workers, the idea of formulating a plan of campaign and urging it on the Government by means of the Workers' Councils was mooted, and in this way the congress of November 23 came about. It was since it was proposed that the enormous fall in the exchange and the change in Government took place.

Chief among the demands of the delegates were the establishment of a workers' government; measures to ensure daily necessaries to the labouring masses; the annulment of the Versailles Treaty and restoration of Europe and prevention of bankruptcy and economic chaos by (a) seizure of values; (b) increase of production by retention of the eight-hour day and the introduction of compulsory work for all those fit to work between the ages of eighteen and fifty-eight years. The congress was unanimous on all the resolutions on these points, as also on that defining the attitude towards the trade unions here reproduced for greater lucidity :-

#### RESOLUTION ON TRADE UNION POSITION

In answer to a communication from the A.D.G.B. and Afa Union Workers' Councils.

The Congress regrets to record that a completely unnatural relationship exists between the Trade Unions and the Workers' Councils. Trade Unions and Workers' Councils, organisations similar in nature, should support one another in every possible way, especially in the present struggle against the employers, against hunger and want, and in the defence of the eight-hour day.

Instead the public is granted the spectacle of certain Trade Union leaders opposing

the Workers' Councils Movement with an energy worthy of a better cause.

The Congress therefore considers it a duty to put and elucidate the question: "Why is this?" before the German workers who must bear the consequences of this unnatural state of affairs.

The spokesmen of the Workers' Councils demanded from the very beginning that the Trade Unions should take over the leadership of the movement and convene a Workers' Councils Congress. So persistent were the Works Councillors in their desire to link up all the forces of the Labour Movement that they repeatedly approached the A.D.G.B. Executive, although rebuff seemed certain from the attitude of the Trade Union leaders.

The Trade Union leaders repeatedly rejected the proffered hand. Even when the leaders of the most important Trade Union in Germany requested the summoning of a Workers' Council Congress, the large majority of the Trade Union leaders persisted in their earlier decision and all the evil consequences entailed for the workers.

Based on these incontrovertible facts, this Congress declares that it is entirely the

Digitized by Google

on 2025:02-26 20:14 GMT / https://hdl.handle.

fault of the Trade Union loaders that the Congress was summoned without the co-

operation of the Trade Unions.

The German workers could not possibly be satisfied with a mere protest against the cowardly inactivity of the A.D.G.B. in view of the events connected with the eight Bielfeld points; the five demands of the Stuttgart metalworkers; the open letter of the Communist Party; the ten A.D.G.B. demands to alleviate unemployment; and their ten demands on the taxation question. On the contrary they owed it to themselves and their class to try to fulfil on their own the duty which the A.D.G.B. Executive had so criminally neglected to perform; to carry out this duty despite all difficulties, threats of employers and numerous Trade Union officials, and the enormous financial sacrifice entailed.

The Congress is glad to be able to confirm the fact that the Workers' Councils Movement proved strong enough to set aside all obstacles which threatened the holding

of the Congress. . . .

Just as the employers threatened those who took part in the Congress with proceedings, there were many Trade Union officials who threatened they would bring about the expulsion of those who participated in the Congress and thus disrupt the Trade

Unions. . . .

7

Generated on 2025-02-26 20:14 GMT Public Domain in the United Stales, This Congress calls on all unorganised workers to join the Unions, for only when all workers are prepared to make sacrifices will they be in a position to conquer the employers' organisations. . . . It is therefore the duty of every honest worker by all possible means to strengthen the unions, so that everything now in the Trade Unions helpful to the bourgeoisie will be wiped out and the Trade Unions thus transformed into what their very existence demands: Organisations of the workers' class struggle.



#### BOOK REVIEWS

In

12

1 10 10

四一四四

in it

4

#### THE LAST RESERVES OF MANKIND

The Citizen of the World. By Oliver Goldsmith.

The Problem of China. By Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin, price 7s. 6d. First Congress of Toilers of the Far East. January, 1922. Published by the Communist International, Petrograd.

HERE are always certain difficulties in making a comparison between "two poets in two different ages born," and perhaps the difficulty is increased when the characters and nurtures are so radically different as those of Mr. Russell and Oliver Goldsmith. Nevertheless the similarity of their treatment of the problem of China is sufficiently noticeable as to warrant comparison. To Oliver Goldsmith the idea of treating the Chinaman and what he understood to be the Chinese outlook on life as a foil to the feverish behaviour of contemporary society, was irresistible. It delighted his contemporaries, as Mr. Russell's articles delighted The Times. For all the more ridiculous features of Western civilisation a contrast, real or fancied, could be found in the calm and serenity of the Yellow Land. Reflections upon the nature of society, the nature of men, their motives and impulses, came readily from the pen. By the literary circles of the eighteenth century the Citizen of the World was ranked along with the Vicar of Wakefield.

In one thing Mr. Russell has the advantage over Dr. Goldsmith: he has been to China. But it is only fair to say that he makes no undue use of this advantage. Apart from a few anecdotes and personal reminiscences, he introduces no more facts than he might have gleaned, living in Chelsea, from a perusal of the books of Mr. Putnam Weale, Professor Dewey, and other authorities and journalists. Indeed in one sense the necessity of using these authorities (a necessity imposed on Mr. Russell by this highly sociological century) detracts from the main purpose of the book. It is true that Mr. Russell may have thought his purpose to be a statement of the recent history of China and its present problems. But his true purpose comes out in those passages which reveal the balm to his wounded ideals and disillusioned spirit that Chinese habits and manners had the power to give. Though the apparent effect is an added querulousness with the West, yet one feels that China was the healer of his soul.

To some it will seem a pity that Mr. Russell should merely have contributed another book to the Renascence of the Eighteenth Century, as built up by the Cambridge school. So much about China could have been told us by a trained Socialist investigator. Still, even that is of less importance than the views of the Chinese people themselves.

Fortunately, though we have still to seek for a fully satisfactory treatise on Chinese society, the actual plans and programmes of the live elements in China are revealed to us by the report of the Congress held in Moscow last February. There were assembled the victims of the Washington Conference, the peoples

on 2025-02-26 20:14 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/202 main in the United States, Google-digitized / http:// of Korea oppressed by Japanese imperialism, the peoples of Mongolia, raided and ravaged by White Guard Russians and by the Japan-aided Tu-chuns of the northern provinces, the Syndicalist Unions and working-class parties of Japan, and finally a round dozen of parties, Nationalist and Socialist, that are springing up in the exploited lands of China. These people had been excluded from the thieves' kitchen of Washington. Here they were able to voice their claims and prepare their plans in common for resistance to the common enemy—Imperialism. In twelve sessions they discussed their plans, dealing first with the international situation and the results of the Washington Conference, and then with the differences that might arise between the nationalist bodies and the Socialist and Communist Parties. On these differences an understanding was reached; in the particular case of Mongolia a declaration was elicited from the Ho-Min-Dan Party (Chinese revolutionary nationalists) that they renounced any aim of re-annexing liberated Mongolia.

The results of the Washington Conference are summed up in a resolution, too long to quote, in which the world situation and its effect on all imperialists and the toilers of each of the Far Eastern countries is briefly defined. The last

definition is memorable. It runs:-

The vast masses of workers and peasants of the Far East make up "the last reserves of mankind." Their revolutionary awaking will be a mortal blow to the entire world rule of oppression and exploitation.

The veteran socialist Katayama opened the congress, while there participated in the discussions a motley list of speakers, including a woman member of the Chinese Parliament, representatives of the Chinese railwaymen's union, the nationalist Press of China, and the Labour Press of Japan, the Christian organisations of Korea, and even the trade unions of the Dutch Indies. The history of the Korean passive resistance rebellion of 1919 and its bloody sequel was related—a movement of independence scarcely even heard of in this country—and the recent annals and problems of the Mongolians and Japanese workers are plainly and simply told in speech after speech. It is something like a Beatific Vision to read this report, to see these exploited peoples of the Far East preparing to get rid of exploitation, and to realise that it will not be a long time until the imperialist robbers are put to flight.

R.P.A.

#### PEACE BY ORDER

A New Province for Law and Order. By Henry Bournes Higgins. Constable.

N this book Mr. Justice Higgins, who from 1907 until 1921 was President of the Australian Federal Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, describes for the benefit of the inquisitive foreigner the working of industrial arbitration in Australia. It has virtue, for it sets out the principles which have guided the court, and the statement of those principles may help to dispel illusions. Apart from this, however, the book is a pathetic document.

"The object of the court," we are told, "is to preserve industrial peace, ... to protect the people as consumers." The President's only comment on

the action of "loyalists" who in 1917 took the places of striking waterside workers is that "the ships were being loaded and unloaded, and that was enough." "The court has no duty, it has no right, to favour or to condemn any theories of social reconstruction. . . . It leaves every employer free to carry on his own system so long as he does not . . . endanger industrial peace." Industry must be humanised, but for the reason that "one cannot conceive of industrial peace unless the employee has secured to him wages sufficient for the essentials of human existence."

tŋ

3

-

EN .

THE STATE OF

1

100

7

it

四四四四四

But the book goes further, and tries to estimate the results of arbitration; here it ceases even to be edifying or illuminating. It tells of the number of disputes which have been settled without a stoppage, and enumerates a number of temporary gains which the court has authorised for the workers; otherwise, however, it does not attempt to explain the part which arbitration has played in Australian life, in the development of the Australian working class. Mr. Higgins writes as an expert, fascinated and blinded by a welter of detail, interested in "problems" for their own sake, and as a lawyer, concerned not with the conflict of class interests but with the logical implications of a statute. He treats the court simply as a piece of mechanism to be adjusted dexterously to deal with the difficulties which threaten "industrial peace"; he seeks to have an answer ready for any particular case of conscience upon which men are prepared to dispute. This book was published at a time when the condition of the Australian worker is on all counts worse than it has been for twenty-five years, and when the arbitration system is in hot water all round; but Mr. Higgins calls only for the redrafting of the Act which set up the court. In spite of its portentous catalogue of decisions the book does not make it possible to appreciate the effects of compulsory arbitration on the working class in Australia. To do that we need at least to give a thought to the conditions under which the arbitration system has developed and to consider the manipulation of trade unions by the court.

Arbitration began with the whole backing of the trade unions. After the collapse of the great strikes of the early 'nineties the unions in their revulsion from direct action put their hopes in legislation. Allied with strong middleclass sections who were vaguely convinced that Australia had a future of its own, they aspired to build up within Australia a self-sufficient middle-class paradise where the troubles of the Old World would not be reproduced. Australia, guarded by an invisible Long Wall of tariffs and Immigration Acts, was not to be "a drift Sargasso where the West in halcyon calm rebuilds her fatal nest," but a land where democratic principles and reason would prevail, and in which class antagonisms would be obliterated. Arbitration appeared to promise security to all classes. The steady increase in general prosperity during the early years of this century encouraged Labour to hug the illusion that Australia was to develop on lines of its own. The demand for labour was keen; the workers' bargaining power, apparently ruined in the 'nineties, had been more than restored. Arbitration, which registered a series of wage advances corresponding to price increases, received the credit for the maintenance and improvement of the workers' conditions. By the time the Federal Court was

established (1904) the Labour Movement everywhere was pledged to support compulsory arbitration.

The gratuitous glory which the court derived from the improvement in the workers' bargaining power was reinforced by the personality of the President. Uncannily "fair-minded," Mr. Justice Higgins went to immense trouble to "see both sides," and to play his legalist game with scrupulous accuracy. Unquestionably, in the three or four years preceding the war, there was no one more popular with the workers and the small middle class. Both he and his court were supported especially keenly by Labour politicians, who could appear as reassuring apostles of industrial peace, and by trade union leaders, who found that arbitration encouraged large membership. Certainly arbitration in Australia had as good a run for its money as was conceivable.

With the collapse of trade in the last two years, however, the hollowness of the "benefits" of arbitration is revealed. The court is now unable, as the present President admits, to secure even the "sacrosanct" basic wage. It is used to prevent unions from striking, and, as in the case of the engineers and the timber workers last September, to impose longer hours. It was a fairweather system. Now, when the economic conditions of the last twenty years have disappeared, the issue between Capital and Labour is becoming clear. When both sides are resolute, the impotence of a formal, supposedly classless, piece of machinery is disclosed. Employers turn to the lockout, dignified under the name of "quiet trade," and, impatient even of the Arbitration Court, demand instead piece-meal machinery created to deal at random with a particular dispute. Unions resist the employers' demand to scrap the whole system but, following the lead of the miners and seamen, tend to scorn the court and to revert to direct action. Further, it is now clear that the defects of the Act, of which the late President complained, were not an accident, but the natural and necessary result of the unwillingness of legislators to put the needs of employers at the mercy even of an Arbitration Court. The book is an anachronism and a piece of mysticism, blind to the facts of present-day industrial

Not only is compulsory arbitration proved now to be impotent to help, the progress of Labour to a private millennium; its effect on the organisation of the workers has been simply disastrous. Unionism has been encouraged, in the sense that recruiting was made easier, and the result was "pence-card unionists," who now are deserting. The court, as is shown in this book, frankly used all its influence to break the principles of militant unionism. It refused to arbitrate while members were on strike. Registration at the court was conditional on continued "good behaviour." Rules and the internal government of unions were modified at the order of the President. As was seen by the Australian Workers' Union in 1915, members could be admitted or excluded at his discretion. It was left to the President to settle the status of rival unions. Heavy money penalties were imposed for direct action. Different wage rates were fixed at different centres, in spite of the existence of a "union rate." Preference to unionists was refused the shearers and the seamen in 1911, and the builders' labourers in 1913. The sympathetic strike was given especial attention. Crafts were given awards "which should be regarded as a special

privilege entailing special o bligations"; in 1917, for instance, the enginedrivers were treated well on condition that "in a strike of miners they would lower and raise the officials and any men remaining at work." Heavy bonds were required from unions to prevent their members presuming to place "their duty to other unions higher than their duty to the public, to their human kind." Under arbitration unionism has been emasculated; the court has almost succeeded in turning it into a mere convenience of capitalist social order, in destroying ideas of class, and in making Labour mutely content with a subordinate status. "This court has repeatedly expressed the value which it attaches to unionism, and with no uncertain voice, but this court cannot help unionism in a struggle against the public interest. It is hard to see what more could be done by the court, a court created by and for the public of Australia . . ."

E. M. H.

TH

W

#### THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

**VOLUME 4** 

FEBRUARY, 1923

NUMBER 2

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

#### CONTENTS

Notes of the Month	-	-	10	-	Page	67	
THE INTERNAT	IONAL	SITU	TION				
The End of Reconstruction America's Hand—The H —Britain's Next Policy— Workers Unprepared—T Mock Campaigns—The	Iand Sl -French 'he Ind	own—B Bankrup ecency of	ritish Isola otcy or W	ation ar—			
A Programme of Mars	xism				22	75	
		By N.	Висна	RIN			
The History of Fascism—I.						93	
		By A	. Bord	IGA			
The I.W.W. and the Communists						100	
	$\mathcal{B}y$	EARL	Brow	DER			
Russia in 1923					,,	105	
	$\mathcal{I}$	By A.	Roths	TEIN			
Pacifism—Old and New						108	
		By	E. VA	RGA			
The World of Labour International—France—It	aly—U	Inited St	ates	-	"	119	
Book Reviews -	1.2	-	-	-	,,	124	
More British Marxism			R.	P. D.			

The Labour Publishing Company Ltd.
38 Great Ormond Street
London
W.C.

#### The Labour Monthly

Editorial Office:

162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE RD., S.W.1

Publishing Office:

38 GREAT ORMOND STREET, W.C. 1

¶ The Editor of The Labour Monthly invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, and can only return the same when stamps to cover postage are enclosed.

Subscription Rates : [PAID IN ADVANCE]

Six months - 4/-

One year - 8/-

United States of America Subscription Representative:—Philip Novick, 192 Broadway, Room 15, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

Advertising Rates :

Ordinary position, per page, £5 5s. and pro rata.

Volume III, (July to December, 1922), can be supplied for 7s. 6d. post free, or these numbers can be bound and returned post free for 4s. 6d. if sent to The Labour Publishing Company.

Cases can be supplied for 3s. 6d. post free.

Title Page for Vol. III can be had on application if  $1\frac{1}{2}d$ . for postage is sent.

#### NOTES of the MONTH

The End of Reconstruction—A British Policy Pricked—America's Hand

—The Hand Shown—British Isolation—Britain's Next

Policy—French Bankruptcy or War—Workers

Unprepared—The Indecency of the Hague—

Mock Campaigns—The Way Clear

HE air is clearing. The oppressive stagnation, the long-drawn deadlock of the world after the war is reaching its end. The conflicts of capitalism to-day, so long concealed under hypocritical forms, are breaking out in open violence and preparations for war. A new period is beginning, and it is not the period of peaceful reconstruction looked for by the economists. The forces that govern our age are becoming plain to all. The issues of the working-class struggle are growing sharper. The opportunities of veiling those issues behind sham sentiments are becoming more difficult. At the present moment no one can survey the world situation as it is without perceiving the utter remoteness of the common formulæ of recovery and reconstruction, and the deeply revolutionary character of the age in which we live.

HE last few weeks have seen a testing of the forces of the world situation; and the answer has been a revelation that marks a stage in the progress to new conflicts. Events have been so rapid that there is still a widespread unconsciousness of the complete reversal that has taken place. When French forces are on the Ruhr it is difficult to realise that barely a month ago Poincaré and Clemenceau were definitely declaring their opposition to the occupation of the Ruhr in the face of the angry demands of French nationalism. When the British Government is meekly signing the terms of its financial bondage to American capitalism, at the same time as it is seeing the European debts to itself ignored and the hopes of European trade revival destroyed, it is difficult to remember that barely a month ago British capitalism was hoping



by a skilful stroke and the exploitation of American indecision to bring about a liquidation of the whole situation in terms of European restoration and triumph for itself. From this far-reaching reversal of the whole situation, with its immeasurable consequences for all Europe, two great facts emerge. The first is that Britain, whose economic position has made her for the moment the upholder of the interests of European reconstruction, has been defeated. The second is that the force behind that defeat has been the United States.

MERICA has once again been the supreme power for Europe which has held every country dangling in hopes, and in the end left all to go to crash. Six weeks ago the hopes of an American loan and intervention dominated the situation. In the hopes of that financial relief French nationalism moderated its tune, and Clemenceau, as he left New York, declared against military measures on the Ruhr, while Poincaré on the same basis met a hostile vote of the Chamber and accepted the support of the Radicals in the hope of that miraculous intervention. finance built castles in the air of European restoration and a cancelling out of debts. The British Premier had already described the pathetic dilemma of the British position. If on the one hand we pay the United States, he had declared, while on the other we remit German reparations and Allied debts, then victorious Britain "would be the only nation in the world that would in truth be paying any substantial indemnity at the close of the war." It was on December 13 that the British Premier made this statement. On December 14, J. P. Morgan, British financial agent in America, visited the Secretary of State Hughes. On the 15th Poincare faced the hostile vote of the Chamber. At the same time rumours were spread of an American loan of one and a-half million dollars ready to hand, and an impending economic conference to be summoned by America. The coincidence of the summoning of the American London Ambassador to Washington with the visit of the British Chancellor of the Exchequer was made the subject of speculation. British diplomacy began to build magnificent schemes.

UT those schemers were destined to a rude awakening. Once again at the last moment the American hand was The dreams of a saviour vanished. French militarism was left free to work its will. British policy found itself isolated and helpless. The Paris Conference revealed the discomfiture of the British. Just as at Washington a year ago the French unrestricted submarine and aeroplane building programme was let through by America after expressions of pained regret, so now with the occupation of the Ruhr. According to The Matin, Mr. Hughes, the American Secretary of State, recently discussed the occupation of the Ruhr with M. Jusserand, the French Ambassador to Washington. Mr. Hughes "expressed some doubts" as to the value of the occupation from a material point of view, but added: "In any case, it is your right." Once again British hopes were dashed to the ground: American policy under the guise of spoken disapproval gave practical support to the French. America found that she would only be a "sympathetic spectator"; "when the French plan has been tried and its results demonstrated "she might consider intervening.

HAT was the practical effect of this? On the one hand the negotiations for funding the British debt went inexorably forward, there was no respite there. conference at Washington opened with professions of good-will; the British Chancellor of the Exchequer was stated to have made a profound impression by the frankness of his business-like state-Then the Conference got down to work. And almost immediately there came news of a deadlock, of a suspension of the conference, of Mr. Baldwin's return to England to consult with the Cabinet. The American Debt Commissioners were inflexible: they demanded the acceptance of terms that would mean the eventual payment of £200,000,000 more than the British felt they could offer. This is one factor in the changes of the last few weeks-changes that have left Britain isolated. And on the other hand reparations and the Allied debt for Britain vanished out of sight, not as a price of economic restoration, but alongside of a smashing blow to the hopes of economic restoration. The situation feared by

Divilized by Google

Mr. Bonar Law became realised. Amidst the general consensus of the rest of the world the burdens became shifted on to Britain.

HE result was immediate. Britain was thrown into the arms of Germany. The co-operation between Britain and Germany became complete. The British representative on the Reparations Committee became virtually Germany's spokesman. The German Government implored the British troops not to desert them. The Times published a review of Nitti by Keynes. British opinion looked admiringly to Stinnes and the industrial magnates concocting of economic resistance on the Ruhr, an admiration betrayed a lurking fear lest Stinnes and his associates might not come to an agreement with the French. British industry looked to the possibility of a revival of the coal trade in consequence of the removal of the Ruhr for the time being from the economic sphere of Europe. As for France, the British Government consoled itself with hopes of an impending bankruptcy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer declared to the American public (according to the New York Herald) that "the franc may go the way of the mark" and "there is danger of revolution in France as well as in Germany." The British representatives at Paris were reported to be convinced that France was aiming, not at reparations, but "a new war . . . as a diversion that may postpone the inevitable hour when it shall be seen that French national finance is bankrupt-that word is used here."

N this way British policy adapted itself to the new situation. But it was at the cost of a tremendous change. The hopes of economic restoration and reconstruction were submerged. The new calculations were in terms of hostile alliances and impending conflicts. For the one factor on which most hopes were placed was also the most threatening—the question of French bankruptcy. With each successive phase it has become increasingly clear that the driving force in French policy is the French financial position, alike in the moments of truculence and in the moments of concession, in the moments of rabid anti-Germanism and of

Divilizando Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

sudden co-operation with Germany. The French Budget Commission has reported that in a few years' time the whole available French revenue will barely be adequate for the interest on the growing debt, and there will be nothing left for public services. At the same time the feverish expenditure on military preparations continues in full force—an army of 700,000; conscription of the African colonies to produce a further army of 800,000; strategic railways in Africa to facilitate the transport of these troops to Europe; intensive submarine building; and an air force of 128 squadrons of nine planes (against the British thirty-two of twelve). the militarists in the countries that neighbour France are also working hard. The superiority of the French in aircraft is used as an argument, in Britain as in other countries, for a more rapid development of the air forces—forces which only hypocrisy can pretend are useful in defence. Major-General Brancker, the Director of Civil Aviation, spoke bluntly on this point on January 16. He said that France was outbuilding us, that her planes were admittedly meant for war, and that therefore she could only be building for war with Britain. The British Cabinet, remembering taxes, unemployment, and the American debt, cannot go beyond the addition of two Territorial Air Force brigaded to the brigade defending London. But the conjunction of these two conditions, of growing financial collapse and growing military expenditure, is too arresting for the meaning not to be plain to anyone. There can here be no question of time and long calculations. If the goal is not war very much sooner than is yet generally recognised, it is only because events may supervene of no less magnitude than war.

HIS is the situation with which the international workingclass movement is confronted. In the face of this situation the preoccupation of the various sections with rosy pictures of what can be achieved in "our Parliament" or "our Diet" is even more irrelevant and pathetic than in the days that led to 1914. The growing clearness and insistence of the class struggle in its simplest sense and in its fullest international force becomes more and more definite; and it becomes more and more difficult for the most conventional, hesitating, and reactionary leadership to ignore it without becoming openly involved in opposition to the working class. The easy confusions and alluring alternatives are being driven out of existence. The most reactionary of leaders are being compelled to make a show of taking up the issues of the class struggle. They go to the Hague under the presidency of Mr. J. H. Thomas to pledge themselves to the international general strike against war. They go to Trafalgar Square to arouse the masses on the issue of unemployment alongside of the unemployed leaders. The ludicrousness of both these situations, and the inevitable inconsistency with their actual policy and actions, exposes their real position in the sharpest light. The falsity of the position is such that, if only sufficient of the working class are awake to it, it cannot long continue.

'HAT happened at the Hague Peace Congress? The official leaders of the Labour Movements of every country met to mobilise the forces of the international working class against war. They met to proclaim the international general strike against war. Did they mean anything serious by this? Their own comments make clear their point of view. "In one sense," declared Mr. Henderson, "the cause of peace will already have been lost if it ever becomes necessary to put the resolution into effect." "Our business," wrote Mr. MacDonald after the adoption of the resolution, " is not to make grand declarations that if a war came we should not fight (my comment on that is 'Wait and see')." But even more than their comments, their actions reveal the facts. For, as it happened, the conference was able to afford a simple test. The Russian trade unions' representatives wished to treat the question seriously and prepared a careful concrete programme of actual steps necessary in order to organise international working-class action against war-forms of propaganda to be undertaken, method of organising resistance, establishment of organisations in the armies and navies to cause revolt at the critical moment, establishment of international working-class communications, &c., &c. This was a cold breath of reality against the hot-air resolutions of the posturers. To have to discuss it

and provide an alternative programme would have been inconvenient. The chairman, Mr. J. H. Thomas, accordingly refused to put the resolution of the Russian Trade Unions to the conference. Instead, resolutions were passed in favour of education in peace ideals for the rising generation, disarmament, the League of Nations, and—the international general strike against war, passed on the proposition of the British Trades Union Congress. The British Trades Union Congress, which had just at its last meeting refused its central body any power whatever, not merely of common action, but even of common financial assistance, now comes forward as the sponsor of a resolution for international common action under the direction of the Executive of the International Federation of Trade Unions. It would be difficult for open indecency to go further.

HE same situation is revealed at home. Under stress of the situation the Labour Party is compelled to develop from the path of purely parliamentary agitation for legislative measures to endeavouring to take up the leadership of the movement of the masses on class issues such as unemployment and the rent strike. But once again the character of their campaign is rendered unreal by the actual facts of their policy of class co-operation. While they can organise unemployment demonstrations all over the country, the only demand they can put forward is to summon Parliament. The solitary voice of one leader, Smillie, declares for a definite policy—the one-day or two-day general strike to secure the demands of the unemployed. His proposal is not even published in the official Labour organ. So in Parliament the Labour benches may raise their indignation and protest. They feel (whatever they may be told by Sidney Webb and Lord Haldane) the class character of the contest: the very opposing benches an expression of class opposition; the ranks opposite them an embodiment of the interests of the exploiters. But their official policy, the policy of their leader, is a policy of class co-operation, and all their raging is without meaning. Their leader is embarrassed by it, but his policy is not hindered. On the very night of the famous "scene" MacDonald takes part in the next debate to appeal for "peace in the coal industry" and the necessity for employers

Divilized by Google

and employed pulling together in "the general interests of the community" (this section of his speech was omitted in the report in the official Labour organ—the policy of class co-operation cannot be too openly displayed before the masses, who have to be fed on make-believe campaigns).

HAT does this amount to? It means that the present leadership of the Movement is being compelled by the nature of the working-class situation to embark on campaigns which by reason of its non-working-class policy it is unable to carry through. It is being compelled to take up the issues of unemployment or war against war: and at the same time it dare not face what is involved in making the advocacy real. The straddle of one foot in the mass movement and one foot in class co-operation becomes more and more strained and difficult, and results in more and more ludicrous postures. They may mount the rostrum with the unemployed leaders in order to place themselves at the head of the agitation: but when once their panacea of summoning Parliament has failed they have nothing left to offer. If in this situation they succeed in remaining at the head of the movement, the disgrace is with all the rest of us. We should welcome the present position. For the moment, it is true, it is full of disastrous possibilities for the working class. Against real and impending dangers we have nothing but a sham structure of such palpable dishonesty as to be almost honest in it. But the same situation which exposes the rottenness of what we have points the way to what we need. The shams cannot long stand the fierce testing imposed on them by the revolutionary realities of the world situation. At every successive turn of the situation the inadequacy of the old forces is more manifestly revealed. We who believe that we can see the clear way of the working-class movement can go forward.

# A PROGRAMME OF MARXISM

### By N. BUCHARIN

(It is many years now since there has been any attempt to make a full statement of the world outlook of Marxism. The last classic attempt was the Erfurt Programme of 1891. On that programme was built up the Second International and the social democracy of before the war. Since then the whole conditions of the world have changed. The situation of world crisis and revolutionary struggle which the old Marxist programme only foretold is now part of our actual experience. The following first attempt to make an adequate statement of modern Marxism, prepared as a draft programme for the Communist International by N. Bucharin, will arouse widespread interest.)

#### I. CAPITALIST SLAVERY

General Characteristics of Capitalism as a System of Exploitation.

At the present time almost the whole globe is under the rule of capitalism.

This rule is based upon private property and the production of commodities for the market.

A small group of persons is in possession of the monopoly of the means of producing these goods, and of the means of distributing them; this group is the capitalist class. This monopoly assures to this class an undivided economic domination over millions of proletarians, who possess no means of production, and who are forced to sell their labour power.

The economic domination of the bourgeoisie is secured by its political rule and by its state organisation, which gives it a monopoly over all arms and means of applying physical force.

The rule of the bourgeoisie is also secured culturally, for it possesses the monopoly of education, this being in the hands of the capitalists.

Original from

Wage Labour and the Conditions of Exploitation

The working class, which forms a constantly growing majority of the population, thus serves as a living source of profit to the bourgeoisie exploiting its labour.

The working class, economically oppressed, subjected politically

and culturally, is the slave of capital.

Contradictions in the Development of the Capitalist System

The hunt for profits forced the bourgeoisie to develop its productive powers continuously and increasingly, and to extend the sphere of operations of capitalist production. But the fundamental defects of the capitalist system revealed themselves at the same time with ever growing distinctness; these defects inevitably lead to the complete breakdown of the capitalist system.

The rule of private property imparts an anarchic character to production, and leads to blind production regulated by no conscious power. This is shown on the one hand in the severe conflicts between various competing concerns and groups of concerns, causing an enormous waste of energy; on the other hand the unregulated production causes periodically recurring crises, accompanied by destruction of productive forces and mass unemployment among the proletariat.

To the anarchy of production must be added the class conflicts. Capitalist society, built up on the exploitation of an overwhelming majority of the population by an inconsiderable minority, is torn in two, and its whole history is one of conflicts between the classes.

The struggle of the capitalist system for world domination leads to a special form of competition among the capitalist states, finally expressed in wars which are equally inevitable accompani-

ments of capitalism, as are crises and unemployment.

The extension of capitalist production, involving the development of productive forces, is accompanied by the decay of precapitalist economic forms in the competitive struggles, by the decay of a part of the peasantry, by the disappearance of handicrafts, by the economic defeat of small and medium capital, and by the open plundering and merciless exploitation of the colonial countries. This process leads on the one hand to an accumulation of capital, to its concentration (centralisation) in the hands of a few multimillionaires, and is, on the other hand, accompanied by a tremendous

increase in the numbers of the proletariat, which, having passed through the severe school of the capitalist system, becomes the deadly enemy of the bourgeoisie and its system of society.

The process of the centralisation of capital, and of the extension of the capitalist system, constantly reproduces the fundamental defects of capitalism on an ever-increasing scale. The competition among small capitalists ceases, only to be replaced by one among big capitalists; where competition among big capitalists comes to a standstill, it widens its radius and becomes a competition between the gigantic associations of the millionaires and their states; the crises change from those of local and national character to crises extending over a number of countries, and finally to world crises; the local wars are replaced by alliances and world wars; the class war develops from isolated actions of single groups of workers, first to a national struggle, and then to an international struggle of the world proletariat against the world bourgeoisie.

The inevitable sharpening of the class antagonisms is accompanied by a simultaneous consolidation of the antagonistic class forces. On the one side the capitalist bourgeoisie forms its associations, secures its state power, and organises its armed forces; on the other side the working class, brought into one camp and united by the mechanism of capitalist production itself, creates its own powerful organisations, which are sooner or later transformed into weapons of the proletariat in the war against the bourgeoisie and its main support—state power.

The natural course of capitalist evolution thus inevitably sharpens the contradictions of the capitalist system, and finally renders the existence of the system itself impossible. The living force which overthrows the capitalist system is the proletariat, which revolts against its bondage, annihilates the regime of capital, and organises the systematic economics of Socialism, the premises of which are created by capitalism itself.

These premises of the new form of society which has to replace capitalism are: the concentration of the means of production, a powerful capitalist technique, the science created by capitalist evolution, and the workers' organisations, which will be able to furnish the first organisers of the new order of society.

The last decades of the rule of capital are characterised by special features of evolution, rendering the internal contradictions intensely acute, and leading to the unheard of war crisis of 1914 and the years following.

Capitalism became world capitalism, a form of economics which subordinated all other forms on the whole surface of the

globe.

The numerous private undertakings competing with one another and destroying each other in this competition, have been replaced by mighty associations of industrial magnates (syndicates and trusts), consolidated by the banks. This new form of capital, in which banking capital amalgamates with industrial capital, in which the possessions of the large landowners also become a part of the general organisation through the agency of the banks, where there are cliques of enormously rich financial oligarchies almost possessing the character of hereditary dynasties, bears a sharply accentuated monopolist character. The free competition which has taken the place of the feudal monopolist economics now changes into a monopoly of finance capital.

This organisation of capital, essentially monopolist in nature, and frequently causing separate groups of the bourgeoisie of different branches of industry to unite, also gives rise to substantial changes in the type of competitive struggle. Instead of competing by means of low prices, there is a growing tendency to use force openly: boycotts and other forms of pressure within the country itself; high protective duties, tariff wars, the employment of armed force backed by state power—in international relations. This increasing acuteness of competition is in international economic relations largely due to two facts: first to the general division of the colonies among the greatest capitalist states; secondly, to the extraordinary increase in the export of capital, accompanied by the increased endeavour to occupy fully the territories to which the exported capital flows.

Under such conditions state power and its armed forces assume a special significance for the bourgeoisie. The policy of finance capital is directed to rapacious activity of the utmost intensity (Imperialism), requiring enormous reinforcements for armies, air

Divilizando Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN fleets, and every description of means of annihilation. The gigantic development of militarism becomes one of the causes of international competition, increasing the acuteness of the competitive struggle and leading to disastrous wars.

The process of the centralisation of capital on a world scale has thus led to the creation of mighty state capitalist trusts, great powers of finance capital, which have become the central points of the capitalist pressure extending throughout the world, of the capitalist predatory raids, and of the exploitation and enslavement of enormous numbers of proletarian, semi-proletarian, and peasant elements. The weaker bourgeois states exist in direct or indirect dependence on these mighty powers and live at their mercy. A direct object for enslavement and exploitation is finally formed by the colonies, which number hundreds of millions of working and exploited inhabitants.

There are two main forces organising against the mighty organised forces of finance capital: on one side the workers of the capitalist states, on the other the oppressed peoples of the colonies. This basic revolutionary tendency is, however, temporarily paralysed by the corruption of a considerable section of the European and American proletariat by the imperialist bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie of the most powerful imperialist states, which have reaped enormous profits by plundering colonies and semicolonies, have raised the wages of continental workers out of the booty of their plunder, thereby interesting these workers in allegiance to the imperialist "Fatherland" and in its plunderings. This systematic bribery has taken special effect among the labour aristocracy and among the leading bureaucratic elements of the working class, social democrats, and trade unions, which have been perfect tools in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The keen competition among the most powerful of the great powers for the possession of the colonies led to the world war of 1914. This war shook the foundations of capitalist economics to such an extent, rendered the position of the working class so much worse, destroyed so many imperialistic illusions among the proletariat, that it brought on a new historic phase in the disintegration of capitalist production.

The Results of the War and the Beginning of the Decay of Capitalism

The war of 1914—1918 brought about a destruction of productive forces never before experienced in history; it led to the immediate annihilation of gigantic means of production and of the best living working forces of humanity; it caused an unheard of waste of energy as a result of productive power being used for unproductive purposes. The attempt made by the national state capitalist trusts to compensate for this wastage by the perfection of the forms of organisation (the subjection of private capitalist enterprises to the state, the so-called State Capitalism) only served to render the struggle between the separate states the more acute.

ih

23

西 强

The total disorganisation of the world's traffic thus brought about the chaos in the division of labour hitherto obtaining throughout the world, the collapse of the reciprocal and regulated modes of settlement, the disturbed rates of exchange, and the unheard of state debts, all these factors intensify the ruin of capitalist world economics.

The imperialistic economic systems undergo essential changes, for the colonial and semi-colonial countries take advantage of the slackening of the imperialist grip to gain for themselves greater economic independence. This circumstance undermines the sources of the affluence of the mother countries, and intensifies the general crisis.

All the above stated fundamental facts of the war and postwar periods are expressed in the sinking of the total income of

society.

The sinking of the collective income of society leads in the first place to an acuter struggle in the re-division of the income, not only in the competitive struggles of the various groups of the financial oligarchies, and in the struggles of the colonies with the mother countries, but in the class war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, in which the intermediate groups show the tendency to join the proletariat in those cases where they have particularly suffered during the war.

The post-war position of capitalism can in general be characterised as being absolutely unstable in every sphere of its existence: economic, political, social, and even on the ideological and cultural fields; for in the background of the general crisis there appear

DIVILIZED by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN obvious signs of the decomposition of the bourgeoisie, the return to religion, to mysticism, to occultism, and so forth, plainly showing the coming fall of bourgeois civilisation.

The Breach in the Imperialist Front and the Epoch of Social Revolution

The growing intensification of the class war, which became apparent during the war itself, led to a breach being made through the imperialist front at its most sensitive spot—Russia.

The November revolution of the Russian proletariat, which was able to overthrow the bourgeois regime thanks to specially favourable fighting conditions, started a new era of international revolution, and became the first link in the chain.

The proletarian uprisings which followed the Russian revolution, and which ended in the defeat of the proletariat after a brief victory (Finland, Hungary, Bavaria), or which remained standing halfway, due to the treachery of the Social-Democrats, who were actively engaged against revolutionary Communism (Austria, Germany), formed stages of the general development of international revolution—stages in which the bourgeois illusions are being punctured and the forces of Communist revolution are being mobilised and consolidated.

It is just for the above reasons that the mere fact of the existence of Soviet Russia is of such significance as an organising centre of the proletarian world movement. By the mere fact of its existence Soviet Russia drives a wedge into the capitalist system, for it comprises one-sixth of the globe, and its structure is in principle opposed to the capitalist regime. Besides this, it represents the most powerful vanguard of the proletarian movement, for here the working class has all the means and auxiliaries of state power at its disposal.

In the course of development of international revolution, the Social Democracy and the trade unions under its leadership became an extraordinarily powerful counter-revolutionary force. Not only did these abandon the interests of the workers during the war, in that they supported their "own" imperialist governments, but they also supported the rapacious treaties of peace (Brest-Litovsk, Versailles); they stood by the side of the generals (Noske), as an active force, when proletarian uprisings were being drowned in

B

rated on 2025-02-26 20:19 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987296 .lc Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access-useMpd·u blood; they led an armed resistance against the first proletarian republic (Russia); they treacherously betrayed a proletariat almost in possession of power (Hungary); they became members of the rapacious League of Nations (Thomas); they openly took sides with the employers against the colonial slaves (the English "Labour" Party). International Social Democracy thus forms the last reserve and strongest support of bourgeois society.

The abandonment of imperialist illusions within the working class has freed the proletariat from the influence of the Social Democracy, and forms the soil for the development of the Communist Parties, which are uniting in the course of the struggle to form a mighty revolutionary association of revolutionary workers: The Communist International. From out of the chaos and the misery, out of the falling debris of shattered capitalism, out of the mad and monstrous new wars in which the bourgeoisie may destroy the last remnants of its own culture—out of all this the Communist International will lead humanity on a new path and only those who do not follow this path will fall victims to death and decay.

## II. THE EMANCIPATION OF THE WORKERS AND THE COMMUNIST ORDER

The final aim pursued by the Communist International is the substitution of the capitalist order by the Communist order of society. The Communist order of society, prepared by the whole course of evolution, is the sole means of escape for humanity, for it alone is able to remove the fundamental defects of the capitalist system leading to inevitable and unavoidable ruin.

By means of abolishing the private ownership of the means of production, and the passing of these means into common property, the Communist society replaces the unregulated force of competition and the blind course of production by a rational organisation and an appropriate plan. The abolition of anarchy in production and of competition implies the simultaneous disappearance of war. The colossal waste of productive energy, and the spasmodic development of society will here be substituted by a systematic utilisation of all sources of help, and by a harmonious, painless, economic evolution.

The Communist order of society also does away with the division of society into classes, that is, besides exterminating anarchy in production it exterminates social anarchy. The opposing classes are replaced by members of one great equal working community. The gigantic unproductive expenditure caused by human beings combating one another in a society composed of classes, now disappears, and the energy thus released is employed in the struggle with nature, and for the progress and development of the power and dominance of mankind.

The abolition of private property does away with the exploitation of one human being by other human beings. The work done is no longer done for others. Every difference between poverty and wealth disappears. At the same time the organs of class rule vanish also, above all—state power. State power, which is the embodiment of class rule, vanishes in proportion to the vanishing of the classes. All standards of compulsion die off gradually in proportion.

The abolition of classes will be accompanied by the abolition of all monopoly of education. All education, including the very highest, becomes general. Such a state of affairs in the first place renders a dominance of any group of persons over another group impossible, and in the second place, offers a wide field of selection and sifting of talent and genius in every branch of culture.

Here there are no barriers of a social nature placed in the way of productive forces. In the Communist society there is no private property, no patent rights, profit making for personal benefit, artificially maintained ignorance among the masses, or gigantic unproductive expenditures.

The uniting of technique and science, the scientific organisation of production, statistic-social book-keeping, the utilisation of every economic possibility (correct apportionment of districts, concentration, the best possible utilisation of natural forces) secure the greatest possible productivity of labour and set human energy free for the mighty task of developing science.

The development of productive forces enables the general well-being of the collective mass of humanity in the new society to be improved, enabling a degree of culture to be attained hitherto unexampled in history. The new culture of a humanity united for the first time, and having now abolished all limits set by intermediate state forms, will be founded on clear and transparent reciprocal relations among human beings. It will thus bury all mysticism, religion, and superstition for all time, and give a mighty forward impetus to the development of all-conquering human mind.

## III. THE FALL OF THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE FIGHT FOR COMMUNISM

General Characteristics of the Transition Period

Between the capitalist and Communist systems there lies a long period of proletarian struggle, of its victories and defeats, a period of continuous decay of capitalist relations, of national wars, of colonial uprisings, of armed and "peaceful" warfare of capitalist states against the socialist states coming into being,—a period which comprises temporary agreements between social-economic systems contradictory to one another, and life and death struggles between such systems. Finally, the complete victory of the proletariat and the firm establishment of the power which it has gained through so much suffering and privation, will be followed by an epoch of accelerated development. The multiplicity of the conditions of the revolutionary process, the variety of types of the new relations being formed,—this will be the main feature of the tedious transition period of development. Not until this epoch has fulfilled its historical task will society begin to become a Communist society.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat as the Unavoidable Premise of the Struggle for Communism

An unavoidable premise for the transition from capitalism to Communism,—the starting point without which the further evolution of mankind is entirely impossible, is thus the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois state and the seizure of power by the working class, which has to set itself the first and most important task of suppressing the enemy and firmly establishing the new regime. Dictatorship of the proletariat—that is the most elementary premise for social evolution.

The seizure of power by the proletariat is nothing else than the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus by the fighting organs of the proletarian class struggle, and the organisation of a new proletarian class power by these organs.

The form of proletarian state power generally best adapted to its purpose is that of the type of the soviet state. This has been demonstrated by the experiences of the Russian and Hungarian revolution, which greatly widened the experience gained by the Paris Commune of 1871. It is precisely this type, arising immediately out of the broadest world movement, which assures the greatest activity of the masses, and consequently the best prospects of ultimate victory.

The soviet type of state is flatly opposed to bourgeois democracy, which is invariably a veiled form of bourgeois dictatorship. The mass organisations of the workers, which are at best merely tolerated under bourgeois dictatorship, form in the proletarian democracy the main supports and organs of the proletarian state everywhere.

The soviet state differs from bourgeois democracy in that it openly reveals its class character, and openly sets itself the task of suppressing the exploiters in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population.

While the bourgeois democracy does not touch the monopoly of the capitalist class with respect to the means of production, and to all material values of decisive importance, and thus reduces the formal rights of the workers to mere fiction, the soviet state first creates the premises for these rights by actually securing the liberty of the workers' press by rendering the functions of the workers' organisations possible, &c.

For the first time in history the proletarian democracy realises the equality of all citizens without difference of sex, race, religion, and nationality,—an equality which has never been realised in a capitalist state.

The proletarian democracy and its organs which realise the broadest democracy amongst the workers are in incomparably closer relations with the masses and enable them to take part in the administrative process. The right to elect new delegates, the right to recall them, the combination of executive and legislative power, the arrangement of electoral districts not according to territorial, but according to economic principles (according to factories, undertakings, &c.)—all this draws an abrupt line between

the bourgeois parliamentary republic and the soviet dictatorship of the proletariat.

The proletariat, as leader and vanguard of all other workers, and above all of the masses of the peasantry, secures its leading role by legal privileges, which are unavoidable in the first stages of development. These privileges must gradually die out in proportion to the progress of the education received by the rest of the working masses, and later by the rest of the citizens of the state on the basis of the new relations.

An essential part of the seizure of power by the working class is formed by the destruction of the bourgeois monopoly of arms, and by the concentration of arms in the hands of the proletariat. During the course of the struggle the main object in view must be the disarmament of the bourgeoisie and the arming of the proletariat.

The further organisation of the armed forces, based on strict revolutionary discipline, must be carried out on precisely the same fundamental class principle; it must correspond to the structure of the proletarian dictatorship, and to the principles assuring leadership to the industrial proletariat.

Expropriation of the Expropriators and Abolition of the Bourgeois Monopoly of the Means of Production

The victorious proletariat utilises the power which it has seized, first to break the resistance of the enemy and to guard the continued rule of the working class against the attacks of the bourgeoisie, and secondly, it utilises this concentrated power for the expropriation of the expropriators, that is for the revolutionary transformation of the economic, and consequently of all other social relations. As a rule this expropriation will assume the form of confiscation, that is, by the expropriation of the means of production without compensation, and the delivery of these means into the hands of the proletarian state.

In this regard the Communist International proposes the following fundamental measures:—

(1) The expropriation of the large industrial undertakings, of the means of transport and traffic (telegraph, telephone), electric works, &c.



- (2) The proletarian nationalisation of large landed estates, which are to be given over to the administration of the organs of the proletarian dictatorship; one part of the landed estates, especially that part being worked by the peasantry under lease, to be handed over to the peasantry. The extent of the ground area to be delivered up to the peasantry is determined by economic expediency, and by the necessity of neutralising the peasantry, that is, by the social-political importance of the peasantry.
- (3) Proletarian neutralisation of the banks. Delivery of all gold reserves, securities, &c., into the hands of the the proletarian state. Security of the interests of small depositors, centralisation of the banks, subordination of all large banking concerns to the central state bank of the republic.
- (4) Nationalisation and municipalisation (communalisation) of wholesale trade.
- (5) Annulment (cancellation) of state debts.
- (6) Monopoly of foreign trade.
- (7) Monopolisation of the most important printing establishments and newspapers.
- (8) In the execution of these measures, the following principles are to be observed:—

Nationalisation should as a rule not be extended to small and medium properties. The first reason for this is that the proletariat which has seized power has not the required number of organising forces at its disposal, especially during the first days of the dictatorship, to enable it not only to destroy the old order, but to bring about a union of the small and medium units of production. The second reason is that the proletariat should not provoke the intermediate groups against it. The victorious proletariat must find the right course of action to be adopted towards those spheres of production which can be subjected to centralised and systematic management, and those which would only

be cumbersome ballast. The latter must be left to

private initiative.

The transition from Capitalism to Socialism cannot be carried out at one stroke. For this reason externally capitalistic forms and methods of administration and organisation, as individual stimulation to work, piece work, bonus systems, calculation in money, capitalist forms of accounting and book-keeping, &c., are thus not only permissible during the preliminary period, but unavoidably necessary. The proletariat must devote particularly careful attention and the utmost precaution with regard to reciprocal relations between town and country, and set up no barriers to the individualistic working motives of the peasantry.

The Proletarian Dictatorship and the Classes

The struggle for the expropriation of the expropriators requires a most thorough study of all elements of this struggle. The big bourgeoisie and the rich landowner, as well as that part of the officers' and army staff subject to them, are the most consistent enemies of the working class, and a bitter struggle against them is absolutely inevitable. As a rule it is only possible to utilise the organised powers of these circles after the dictatorship has been established and all conspiracies of exploitation and uprisings have been determinedly suppressed.

The question of the technical brain workers plays a most important role for the proletarian revolution. Every counter-revolutionary action originating in the ranks of the technical brain workers must be rigorously suppressed, but at the same time the proletariat must take into consideration the absolute need for these skilled workers and carefully avoid any action which could injure them economically, especially those groups which have already suffered through the war.

With regard to the peasantry, the Communist Party is confronted with the task of winning over a great part of the peasantry for the party. The victorious proletariat must differentiate strictly between the various groupings within the peasantry itself, estimate their specific importance, and aid the landless, semi-proletarian

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN elements of the peasantry by every possible means, give them a part of the large landowners' ground, ease their struggles against usurious capital, &c. The proletariat must neutralise the intermediate elements by leaving their land and their possessions untouched, and by combating every attack made by the rich peasantry in combination with the rich landowners. In this struggle the proletariat should lean upon the organisations of the poorer population of the country, which are under the leadership of the country proletariat in all countries where the system of agricultural wage labour is developed.

The petty bourgeoisie of the cities, which always stood between extreme reaction and sympathy for the proletariat, is also to be neutralised as far as possible. Their neutrality is assured if their property is not touched, if they are allowed liberty of economic intercourse, aided in their struggles against usurious forms of

credit, &c.

In order to fulfil all these tasks the most varying organisations of the proletariat (co-operatives, trade unions, and other associations, finally the party as well) must be actual organs of the proletarian power. It is only when these organisations lend unlimited support to the proletarian power, only when the class will is perfectly united, and when the party has the leadership, that the proletariat can successfully carry out its part as organiser of the whole of society in the most critical period of human history.

Abolition of the Bourgeois Monopoly of Education

The proletariat, when abolishing the monopoly of the capitalist class over the means of production, must simultaneously do away with the monopoly of education possessed by the bourgeoisie, that is, it must take over all schools, including those for higher education.

One of the most important tasks of the proletariat is to train skilled technicians from the ranks of the working class, not only in the sphere of production (engineers, mechanics, organisers, book-keepers, &c.), but for scientific and military work, &c. This is the only way possible of enabling fresh groups of qualified workers to be continually added to the proletarian power, so that this may in reality become a power leading the development of society.

To this task must be added the further task of raising the general cultural level of the proletarian masses, the task of their political enlightenment, the raising of the level of their knowledge and technical qualifications, their practical introduction into social work, and further, the combating of vestiges of bourgeois and petty bourgeois prejudices, &c.

Under the heading of combating bourgeois prejudices and superstitions, the first place is taken by the fight against religion, a fight which must be carried on with all requisite tact and all caution, especially among those sections of workers in whose daily life religion has hitherto been deeply rooted.

#### The Removal of Imperialist Pressure and the Organisation of Voluntary State Associations of the Proletariat

The main support of the gigantic imperialist state were and are the artificially created relations between the colonies and halfcolonies, and imperialist mother countries. The colonial and national questions thus play an exceedingly important role, not only from the viewpoint of the decay of capitalist relations, but also from the viewpoint of capitalist structure.

In this regard the programme of the Communist International makes the following demands in complete opposition to the policy of the bourgeoisie and of social democracy:—

(1) The right of self-determination of the peoples, under which is also to be understood the right of complete separation from the state. This principle is binding as a requirement to be demanded of the bourgeois state, where it serves as a weapon against imperialism, and is equally binding under the regime of proletarian dictatorship, where it serves as a means of overcoming the national distrust nurtured through centuries of bourgeois government.

(2) The liberation of the colonies, and the support of all colonial movements against imperialism. In the case of a proletarian state embracing former colonies, the latter are accorded the right of separation.

(3) Unions of Soviet Republics, at first in the form of federations.

Digitized by Google

In view of the fact that the power cannot be seized by the proletariat simultaneously in all, or even in the most important countries, and that single proletarian states come into being—compromises on the field of foreign diplomacy by the proletarian states (commercial connections abroad, loans, policy of concessions, participation in general conferences, and other forms of agreements) including military agreements) are possible, permissible, and at times even obligatory.

This policy, dictated in each case by the necessity of attaining some purpose, has, however, nothing in common with pacifism as a principle. On the contrary, the Communist International recognises in the fullest degree the right of the proletarian republics

to intervene in the interests of the oppressed and exploited.

The question of defending a native country can no longer be put in so general a form as at the beginning of the war, before a proletarian state was established. In the first place the proletariat of all countries must aid the defence of this proletarian state, and even aid in its extension as the extension of the base of international revolution.

The question of the attitude to be adopted towards war is further complicated by the perfect admissibility in principle of the formation of blocs between proletarian states and many bourgeois states against other bourgeois states, in accordance with the particular war in question. The question must be solved with regard to concrete expediency of purpose, and the strategy of the general struggle is to be worked out by the Communist International.

## IV. THE ROAD TO THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

A successful fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat assumes the existence of a Communist Party which is firmly united, determined to fight, disciplined and centralised. The first step on the way to the dictatorship of the proletariat is the firm consolidation of the Communist Parties. These parties must play the leading role in every sphere of the proletarian mass struggle, must utilise every opportunity of gaining influence over the broad masses of the workers and of extending this influence to the working masses of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie of the towns.

The most important problem towards winning over the masses is to win over the trade unions, and to free these from the ideological and organisational influence of the social democracy. Unless the majority in the trade unions is won over, the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship is unthinkable. In precisely the same manner, special attention is to be devoted to the working youth and women, for the attitude adopted by these during the first phase of the dictatorship will largely determine the course of events.

The process of uniting the masses under the Communist flag must be developed in all actual questions of daily life. Above all the fight against imperialism and militarism, the fight against the

danger of fresh imperialist wars, &c.

Other questions coming under this heading are those connected with the struggle against the economic results of the war and postwar crisis. (Fight against increased prices, against unemployment, against longer working hours, against higher taxation, &c.)

The support of Soviet Russia, as a means towards strengthening it and towards mobilising the masses about this anti-capitalist centre point, constitutes the most powerful organising instrument

in the hands of the international working class.

For the co-ordination of actions, and for the purposeful leadership of the same, the international proletariat requires an international class discipline, which must above all be strictly adhered to in the ranks of the Communist Parties. This international Communist discipline must be expressed by the subordination of all partial and local interests of the movement to its general and permanent interests, and by the unqualified execution of all resolutions passed by the leading organs of the Communist International.

# THE HISTORY OF FASCISM—I

### By A BORDIGA

HE origin of the Fascist movement may be traced back to the years 1914-1915, to the period which preceded the intervention of Italy in the world war, when the foundation for this movement was laid down by the groups which supported intervention. From a political point of view, these groups were made up of several tendencies. There was a group of the Right, led by Salandra and the big industrialists, who were interested in the war and who had even supported the war against the Entente before the decision to fight on the side of the Entente. On the other hand, there are also the tendencies of the left wing of the bourgeoisie, the Italian radicals, i.e., the democrats of the Left, the republicans who had been by tradition in favour of liberating Trieste and Trento. Finally, the interventionist movement included also certain elements of the proletarian movement: revolutionary syndicalists and anarchists. From a point of view of personalities, it is worth mentioning that the movement was joined by the leader of the left wing of the Socialist Party, Mussolini-the manager of

It may be stated approximately that the Centre groups did not participate in the formation of the Fascist movement, but returned to their traditional bourgeois political parties. The only groups which remained were those of the extreme Right and those of the extreme Left, *i.e.*, the ex-anarchists, the exsyndicalists and former revolutionary syndicalists.

These political groups which in May, 1915, scored a big victory in forcing Italy into the war, against the will of the majority of the country and even of parliament, lost their influence when the war was brought to a close. Already during the war one could foresee the inevitable waning of the influence of the interventionists.

They had represented the war as a very easy enterprise, and when the war became prolonged they lost their popularity. Indeed, one might doubt whether they were ever popular. In the period that followed immediately after the war, we saw the influence of these groups reduced to a minimum.

370

zeti Ke

100

10

To

and the

Ti

110

26

26

1

is

I

From the end of 1918 to the first half of 1920, the period of demobilisation and slump, this political tendency was completely defeated owing to discontent caused by the consequences of the war.

Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of political organisation we may connect the origin of the movement which seemed so insignificant at first with the formidable movement which we see to-day.

The "fasci di combattimento" did not disband. Mussolini remained the leader of the Fascist movement, and their paper, Il Popolo d'Italia continued to be published.

At the elections in Milan in October, 1919, the Fascisti were completely defeated, in spite of having their daily newspaper and their political chief. They obtained a ridiculously low number of votes; nevertheless, they continued their activities.

The proletarian revolutionary and socialist movement, which was considerably strengthened by the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses after the war, did not make full use of the favourable situation, for reasons I need not go into now.

The revolutionary tendencies lacked the backing of a revolutionary organisation and of a party that would lend them permanence and stability, and thus the favourable psychological and objective circumstances were not utilised. I do not assert—as Comrade Zinoviev accused me of saying—that the Socialist Party could bring about the revolution in Italy, but at least it ought to have been capable of solidly organising the revolutionary forces of the working masses. It proved unequal to the task.

We have seen how the anti-war socialist tendency has lost the

popularity which it enjoyed in Italy.

To the extent that the socialist movement failed to take advantage of the situation and the crisis in social life in Italy, the opposite movement—Fascism—began to grow.

Fascism benefited above all by the crisis which ensued in the economic situation and which made its influence felt in the

labour organisations.

Thus the Fascist movement at a most trying period found support in the D'Annunzio expedition to Fiume. The Fiume

expedition in a sense gave to Fascism its moral support, and even the backing of its organisation and its armed forces, although the D'Annunzio movement and the Fascist movement were not the same thing.

We have spoken of the attitude of the proletarian socialist movement; the International has repeatedly criticised its mistakes. The consequence of these mistakes was a complete change in the state of mind of the bourgeoisie and the other classes. The proletariat became disorganised and demoralised. In view of the failure to win the victory that was within its grasp, the state of mind of the working class changed considerably. One might say that in 1919 and in the first half of 1920 the Italian bourgeoisie to a certain extent became resigned to the idea of having to see the triumph of the revolution. The middle class and the petty bourgeoisie were ready to play a passive part, not in the wake of the big bourgeoisie, but in the wake of the proletariat which was to march on to victory.

This state of mind has undergone a complete change. Instead of submitting to a victory of the proletariat, we see on the contrary how the bourgeoisie is organised for defence.

The middle class became discontented when it saw that the Socialist Party was unable to organise in such a manner as to gain the upper hand; and losing confidence in the proletarian movement, it turned to the opposite side.

It was then that the capitalist offensive of the bourgeoisie started. This offensive was to a certain extent the result of capable exploitation of the state of mind of the middle class. Fascism, by reason of its heterogeneous character, offered a solution of the problem, and for this reason it was chosen to lead this offensive of the bourgeoisie and of capitalism.

Our Communist Party, from the moment of its inception, consistently criticised the situation and pointed out the necessity of united defence against the bourgeois offensive. It advocated a united proletarian plan of defence against this offensive.

To get a full view of the capitalist offensive, we must examine the situation in its various aspects in the industrial as well as in the agrarian field.

In the industrial field the capitalist offensive in the first place

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN exploited the direct effects of the economic crisis. The economic crisis caused the shutting down of a number of factories, and the employers had the opportunity of discharging the more extreme elements of the organised workers. The industrial crisis furnished the employers with a good pretext for cutting down wages and withdrawing the disciplinary and moral concessions which they had been forced to make to the factory workers.

1

TON.

D.

At the beginning of this crisis we saw in Italy the formation of a General Confederation of Industry, an association of the employing class which took the lead in this fight against the workers and submitted every individual employer to their discipline. In the large cities it is impossible to start the fight against the working class by the immediate use of violence. The workers of the cities are generally organised in groups: they can easily gather in a large mass and put up a serious resistance. The employers therefore started by provoking the proletariat into actions that were bound to end unfavourably for them, because the economic struggle in the industrial field was bound to transport the activity of the movement from the trade unions to the revolutionary domain, where it would need to be under the dictates of a political party which was really communist. But the Socialist Party was nothing of the sort.

At the decisive moment of the situation the Socialist Party proved incapable of giving a revolutionary lead to the action of the Italian proletariat. The period of the great success of the Italian labour organisation in the fight for the amelioration of the workers' conditions gave place to the new period in which the strikes became defensive strikes on the part of the working class, and defeats became the order of the day.

At the same time, the revolutionary movement of the agrarian classes, the agricultural labourers and other peasant elements which are not completely proletarian, compelled the ruling classes to seek a way of combating the influence acquired by the Red organisations in the rural districts.

In a great part of Italy, for instance in the most important agricultural districts of the Po Valley, a state of affairs prevailed which closely resembled a local dictatorship of the proletariat or of the groups of agricultural labourers. The communes, captured by

the Socialist Party at the close of 1920, carried on a policy of imposing local taxes on the agrarian bourgeoisie and the middle class. The trade unions flourished. Very important co-operative organisations and numerous sections of the Socialist Party grew up. Even in those rural districts where the working-class movement was in the hands of men who were reformists, it took a definitely revolutionary trend. The employers were even forced to deposit sums of money to guarantee the carrying out of the agreements imposed by the trade unions.

A situation was reached where the agricultural bourgeoisie could no longer live on their estates and had to seek refuge in the cities.

Certain errors were committed by the Italian socialists, especially on the question of occupying the vacated lands and with regard to the small farmers, who after the war began to buy up land in order to become big proprietors.

The reformist organisations compelled these small farmers to remain somewhat the slaves of the movement of the agricultural labourers, and in this situation the Fascist movement managed to find important support.

In the domain of agriculture there was no crisis of such dimensions as to enable the landed proprietors to wage a successful counter-offensive on the basis of the simple economic struggles of the labourers. It was here that the Fascisti began to introduce their methods of physical violence, of armed brutal force, finding support in the rural proprietor class and exploiting the discontent created among the agricultural middle classes by the blunders of the Socialist Party and the reformists. Fascism benefited also by the general situation, which daily increased the discontent among all these groups of petty bourgeoisie and petty merchants, of petty proprietors, of returned soldiers, and of ex-officers disappointed in their lot after the glories of war.

All these elements were exploited and organised, and this was the beginning of this movement of destruction of the Red organisations in the rural districts of Italy.

The method employed by Fascism is rather peculiar. Having got together all the demobilised elements which could find no place for themselves in post-war society, it made full use of their

G

30

200

2

TY

1

780

U, h

No.

H

357

2

1

7

1

F

A 19.

1

4

on 2025-92-26 20:24 GMT / https://hdi.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112001987290 Nain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.haihitrust.org/access.use#pd·us-goog military experience. Fascism began to form its military organisations, not in the big industrial cities, but in those which may be considered as the capitals of Italian agricultural regions, like Bologna and Florence. The Fascists possessed arms, means of transportation, assured immunity from the law, and they took advantage of these favourable conditions while they were still less numerous than their revolutionary adversaries.

The mode of action is somewhat as follows. They invade a little country place, they destroy the headquarters of the proletarian organisations, they force the municipal council to resign at the point of the bayonet, they assault or murder those who oppose them or, at best, force them to quit the district. The local workers were powerless to resist such a concentration of armed forces backed by the police. The local Fascist groups which could not previously fight by themselves against the proletarian forces have now become the masters of the situation, because the local workers and peasants have been terrorised and were afraid of taking any action for fear that the Fascist expedition might return with even greater forces at their command.

Fascism thus proceeded to the conquest of a dominant position in Italian politics by a sort of territorial campaign, which might

be traced on a map.

The Fascist campaign started out from Bologna, where in September—October, 1920, a socialist administration was the occasion for a great mobilisation of the Red forces.

Several incidents took place: the meeting of the municipal council was broken up by provocation from without. Shots were fired at the benches occupied by the bourgeois minority, probably by some agents-provocateurs.

That was the first grand attack made by the Fascisti.

From now on militant reaction overran the country, putting the torch to proletarian clubs and maltreating their leaders. In their dastardly work the Fascisti enjoyed the full backing of the police and the authorities. The terror started at Bologna on the historic date of November 21, 1920, when the Municipal Council of Bologna was prevented by violence from assuming its powers.

From Bologna Fascism moved along a route which we cannot outline here in detail, but we may say that it went in two chief

geographical directions, on the one hand towards the industrial triangle of the north-west, viz., Milan, Turin, and Genoa, and on the other hand towards Toscana and the centre of Italy, in order to encircle and lay siege to the capital. It was clear from the outset that the south of Italy could not give birth to a Fascist movement any more than to a great socialist movement.

Fascism is so little the movement of the backward section of the bourgeoisie that it could not make its first appearance in southern Italy, but rather in those districts where the proletarian movement was more developed and the class struggle was more in evidence.

Having just described the prime elements of Fascism, how are we to interpret the Fascist movement? Is it purely an agrarian movement? That we would not say, although the movement originated in the rural districts. Fascism could not be considered as the independent movement of a single group of the bourgeoisie, as the organisation of the agrarian interests in opposition to the industrial capitalists. Besides, Fascism has formed its political as well as military organisation in the large cities, even in those provinces where it had to confine its violent actions to the rural districts.

We have seen it in the Italian Parliament, where the Fascisti formed a parliamentary faction after having precipitated the parliamentary elections of 1921, which did not prevent the formation of an agrarian party independently of the Fascisti.

During recent events we have seen that the industrial employers have supported the Fascisti. A deciding factor in the new situation was furnished by a recent declaration of the General Confederation of Industry in favour of entrusting to Mussolini the formation of a new Cabinet.

But a more striking phenomenon in this respect is the appearance of Fascist Syndicalism.

(To be continued)

DIVILIZED by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

# THE I.W.W. AND THE COMMUNISTS

### By EARL R. BROWDER

2 000

17

a sh

die

.tom

100

2 mi

211

No

217

Mar

16

1

100

P

14

J.

20

(The information contained in the following article, of which advance proof-sheets have been sent to us by the courtesy of the "Labour Herald" of Chicago, is sufficiently serious to justify publication in this country.)

NCE holding the position of foremost exponents of revolutionary unionism, the Industrial Workers of the World have to-day the doubtful honour of being the only labour organisation that expels Communists for their political opinions. And now the recent convention of the "wobblies," by approving of the past administration's activities and the expulsion of Brown, Hardy, Novak, Newman, and others, has carried that organisation into company with the most reactionary bureaucrats of the world's labour movement. In the American labour movement, it is the I.W.W. alone which has made it a crime against the union to advocate affiliation to the Red International of Labour Unions.

The I.W.W. has often protested against the expulsion of rebels from the trade unions, and made great arguments thereon. But few records of violent suppression of minority opinion in labour unions are more complete than that of the "wobs" against "The Temporary Committee for Working Class Unity," formed to propagate affiliation to the R.I.L.U. after the I.W.W. had denounced that organisation. The details, published in the Unity Bulletin, issue No. 3, leave nothing to the imagination. The story of the kidnapping of Bartell, in Detroit, by Raddock, secretary of I.U. 440, and a gang of fellow workers, and the robbery of his papers and \$213 in money, still stands unrefuted and unrebuked. The assaults upon the persons of Joe Carroll, Lorence Borzik, Walter Bates, and Mike Novak are there recorded as typical of many others; the attack upon the members of the Unity Committee went to the length of a raid upon the home of Newman,

100

the seizure of his desk, typewriter, money, and other personal property. Any one who said a good word for the R.I.L.U. was called a Communist and treated as an outlaw.

These methods are worse than those used even by Gompers, the arch-reactionary. In the capacity of president of the A.F. of L. this bureaucrat recently excluded a union of office workers in New York because it was officered by rebels and Communists. But when the Locomotive Engineers' Journal reported this as an exclusion of radicals, Gompers took pains to get in the record his denial that the action had any political significance. He placed the entire case upon the ground of the immediate functioning of the union, without any consideration of the radical views of those excluded. In the whole American labour movement it is only in the I.W.W. that "Communism" is sufficient ground for expulsion.

Not content with leading the fight upon the Red International, the I.W.W. blazed the trail later followed by Abe Cahan in the Forward, Jewish Socialist daily, by attacking the work of the Friends of Soviet Russia. Without the slightest evidence, they published statements that famine relief money was being diverted to other uses. But they went further than any other group has cared to follow; they physically interfered with famine relief collections, an act without parallel in this country, and only equalled in Europe by the most reactionary governments. On Christmas evening, 1921, an entertainment was held by the Jugo-Slav members of I.U. 440 to assist the famine sufferers in Soviet Russia. This gathering was invaded by Bowerman, secretary of the I.W.W. Union, with a bodyguard, who demanded that the receipts of the entertainment be turned over to him. Not caring to make a fight, the Jugo-Slav members allowed him to get away with it. They saved some of the money for the famine stricken workers of Russia, however, by presenting bills for the services of the performers, which was later turned over to the famine fund. But the General Headquarters officials took away \$57.12 intended for Soviet Russia's sufferers.

The confiscation of the membership card of H. S. Calvert, but very recently, demonstrates that this spirit continues unabated. Calvert is an I.W.W. of some years' standing, who went to Russia in 1921, and was one of those instrumental in launching the Kuzbas industrial colony project. For a year he has been working in America on that project, which has the approval of the Soviet Government of Russia. As a further demonstration of their disapproval of anything even remotely connected with the Red International, via Russia, the officials of the I.W.W. took advantage of Calvert's presence at a union meeting, where cards must be presented, to confiscate his. They did not take the trouble to prefer charges, or to hold any proceedings whatever.

It has seemed to many observers that the I.W.W. was definitely setting out on the road of the anarcho-syndicalist organisations of Europe. But their recent convention has shown that there is nothing so positive even as this left in the organisation. What seemed like vigorous action in that direction was only fear of the new ideas brought into the movement by the Red International. The I.W.W.

U

10

is not going anywhere. It is just drifting and decaying.

For over twenty days from November 11 to December 5 the Fourteenth Convention sat in session to do the business of not more than 15,000 members. And in all that time there was hardly one clear and definite action taken. Following up their doctrine of "democracy," one side of which is their constitutional provision that officers can serve but one term, the forty delegates each spoke on every question that came before them. The nature of this "important" business is illustrated by the debates of seven days upon the officers' reports, of three days on the question of remitting debts of a few hundred dollars owed to the organisation by the retiring officers, and others of the same calibre.

When the appeals of the expelled Communists came before the convention, however, they were quickly disposed of. Mike Novak, one of those appealing, was present and requested the floor to defend himself. He was refused, and the convention even excluded him from the hall while they considered his case. He was then told that his appeal had been referred back to the Industrial Union to which he had belonged. But the official organ of the I.W.W., Industrial Solidarity, later stated that the expulsion had been upheld. In no other labour organisation in America would it be possible to witness expulsions being confirmed without even allowing the victim to be heard in his own defence.

....

Following Gompers Internationally

In the question of international affiliation, the I.W.W. followed the examples set by Mr. Harding and Mr. Gompers. That is, it adopted a policy of isolation, prefaced according to the Harding-Gompers manner with protestations of desire for international amity and accord. The only line which means anything definite in the international resolution adopted by the convention is that which reads: "Resolved, that we do not send any delegate to any International at the present time." The leading element in the organisation is favourable to Rudolph Rocker's "International," but is afraid that affiliation would cause another loss of dues-paying membership.

Typical of the general drift of the I.W.W. (and the outstanding characteristic of the organisation to-day is the complete lack of any kind of leadership—it has merely drifted into the currents of counter-revolution) is the case of John Sandgren, a notorious anti-Russian propagandist. Everyone thought that he had been thoroughly discredited, and so he had. His name is now carefully kept in the background, but actually he is the theoretician and "intellectual" of the I.W.W. to-day. Whenever it is necessary to produce a document of a theoretical nature, John Sandgren is the man called upon. He it was who wrote the recent reply of the I.W.W. to Losovsky's appeal to the rank and file of that body. Sandgren has come back, but the fact is not generally known or acknowledged.

#### Dual Unionism the Issue

The explanation of this entire course of events, the expulsion of the Communists, the attacks on Russia, the refusal to affiliate with the Red International, &c., is a simple one. The I.W.W. has gotten into its present deplorable position by its reaction of fear of the new tactics of the world revolutionary movement, of the slogan of "back to the mass unions." Based from the beginning upon the conception of dual unionism, the tactic of splitting the old unions as the beginning of building new ones, it could not understand or assimilate the R.I.L.U. tactic of solidarity, of industrial unionism through amalgamation, and the unity of all the revolutionary forces of a given country upon a common plan of action. For too long I.W.W. militants had made their organisation

the all-in-all, refusing to recognise the existence of anything outside of it as worthy of a moment's consideration. The year of 1921-22 found them incapable of changing to meet the new epoch now opening up. As a consequence they are now definitely outside the stream of Labour's revolutionary movement.

Many alleged theoretical differences are trotted out as the reasons for opposing the R.I.L.U., but the only effective reason is to be found in the issue of dual unionism. These chronic dualists cannot bring themselves to unite with the mass unions, which they would have to do in the Red International. To prevent such a thing they bring forth the most elaborate sophistries. But if the Red International would accept their dual unionism, the I.W.W., in all likelihood, would quickly dissipate all their other objections.

M

1

H

When one recalls the splendid revolutionary fervour formerly animating the I.W.W., typified by such men as Ralph Chaplin and Harrison George, which made that body of men objects of admiration even on the part of those who disagreed most strenuously with their dual unionism, the present nondescript organisation which bears the name made famous by former heroes appears as a tragic example of degeneracy. The reactionary poison has got in its work. Many militants who have hoped against hope for the past few years that the organisation would redeem itself are now turning their faces toward the future. The dead past must bury its dead, which includes the former revolutionary spirit of the Industrial Workers of the World.

# RUSSIA IN 1923

By ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

OVIET Russia is facing the coming year with confidence. In the economic sphere the ground is daily becoming firmer under her feet. Take industrial production, which for a modern State is the crucial point. During the "industrial year" (September to September) just ended, she turned out close on one million more tons of coal than in 1920-21, and more than in any year since 1918. She produced half a million tons more of oil, and reached the 50 per cent. level as compared with pre-war figures. Her furnaces produced 170,000 tons of pig iron, 136 per cent. of 1921 figures; 322,000 tons of martensite, 175 per cent. of the previous year's output; and 254,000 tons of steel, 179 per cent. of 1921. All these are the highest figures reached since 1918. The same applies to the output of locomotives (141 per cent. of 1921 figures); iron ores (129 per cent.); cotton yarn (227 per cent.), woollen yarn (158 per cent.), and linen yarn (1,820 per cent.); rubber manufactures (800 per cent.), and so on.

In large measure this improvement is traceable to more efficient and exacting measures in the factories; but these again were rendered possible by a definite improvement in agriculture. The new economic policy in this sphere, which leaves the peasant free to sell his grain at the best possible price once he has paid his taxes, has provided a vast stimulus which would have shown itself last year but for the famine. It has produced an extension of the area sown this year, and, under improved weather conditions, a consequent improvement of the crops. Russia has now an internal reserve of nine million tons of corn until the next harvest, and though most of it must be devoted to fighting the effects of the famine, for that very purpose possibly half a million or a million tons will be

This revival in production must have, and is already having, a marked effect upon her financial position. While, on the one hand, a series of drastic measures of economy and taxes upon industry—such as no State but Soviet Russia dare attempt—have combined progressively to increase the proportion of her revenue accountable by taxation from one-sixtieth of the total in January to one-tenth in July; at the same time her foreign trade relations have already provided a small trade balance (twenty million gold roubles),

available for export abroad.

plan

which is being poured like a rejuvenating stream into the arteries of the industrial organism, drained of its resources by seven long years of war and revolution. Arcos Ltd., the commercial agent of the Russian Government in Great Britain, had a total turnover between August, 1920, and December, 1921, of £11,850,000. During the nine months between January and September, 1922, it had a further turnover of £10,500,000. The foreign trade monopoly held by the Government determines that the ultimate decision as to Russia's economic needs shall rest with the State, while at the same time it is elastic enough to allow complete freedom to industrial trusts and private undertakings to make their necessary purchases and sales abroad, under the general supervision of the Russian commercial representatives.

It has been alleged that this economic improvement has been secured at the cost of abandoning all that was won by the revolution. In reality all that has happened has been the emancipation of industry, agriculture, commerce, and finance from the fetters imposed by civil war and invasion, and a return to the comparative freedom enjoyed by private enterprise in 1918. But the principal natural sources of wealth, the main industries, foreign commerce and shipping, remain in the hands of the State: and a judicious use of the apparatus of the State Bank will before long be the deciding factor in keeping the price of food and other necessities at a reasonable level, thanks to the reserve created by the State grain tax (240 million poods).

The real wages of the workers (i.e., as compared with the cost of living)—and in this Soviet Russia stands alone—show an unbroken monthly increase from last spring onwards, until now they stand at an average of 80 per cent. of the pre-war level. Large credits are being given to the co-operative societies, and to their branches in factories and workshops, in order to lower the prices of primary necessities and increase the purchasing power of the workers. Housing is still a municipal concern, being handed over to private groups only when they can show the possibility of putting and keeping the house in proper repair; and it is noteworthy that the assumption of such functions by organised groups of workers is the rule, not the exception. The more vital provisions of the Labour Code still remain in force, and their constant application is

enforced daily by the Labour Inspectors, acting under the control of the People's Commissary for Labour, who is himself chosen by the All-Russian Trade Union Congress. Education is still more accessible to the workers than to any other section of the community (thus bearing direct proportion to numerical strength), thanks both to the Government free places and to the widespread system of trade union scholarships.

With the consciousness of this healthy progress at her back, Soviet Russia faces the new year in foreign policy with even greater confidence than at the beginning of 1922. Her programme is a simple one and straightforward. She wants peaceful and neighbourly relations with all the world. At the Genoa Conference last spring she raised the question of disarmament, foreseeing the bloody possibilities of strife in the Near East. Her overtures being rejected, she raised the question again in December, at the Moscow Conference with the Border States, albeit in a narrower form.

In the Near East she desires to see a free and economically independent Turkey resume the enlightened guardianship of the Straits, which would then once more become a boon to commerce and permit the complete demilitarisation of the Black Sea. In the West, Soviet Russia asks for an opportunity to do business on equal terms. In countries with which she has had a trade agreement for some time she expects that common sense will soon have driven home the necessity for full diplomatic recognition. In other countries, and first and foremost the United States, she hopes that the spectacle of devastated Europe will soon convince all sane men that she cannot be ignored if reconstruction is ever to begin.

But she is firmly determined on one thing—that she will remain, not only in politics but also in economics, a free and sovereign State, fulfilling her function in the world of States as an independent unit. Under no circumstances will she consent to accept unfair and impossible burdens, which can only have the result of reducing her to the status of a colony, though her chains should be gilded by the League of Nations. She became a free labouring community in November, 1917, and intends to remain so. It rests with the Western nations to say whether she shall labour in co-operation with and for the benefit of all, or remain a stranger both to the wealth of the West and to its miseries.

# PACIFISM—OLD AND NEW

#### By E. VARGA

ACIFIST ideology has recently undergone a change. Once again it seems as though the fate of the world is to be dependent on the pacifist idea. The Washington Conference awakened a new interest in Pacifism; the refusal of the United States to participate in the Genoa Conference on the pretext of the impossibility of European reconstruction as long as European states maintained such big armies has also tended to make the question more actual. After the great disillusion, due to the failure of Wilsonism, the Socialist Internationals hastened to endow Pacifism with a new meaning. Capitalist papers, like the Manchester Guardian which pursues a clear-cut pacifist policy, have done likewise. Hence the importance of examining to what extent this new Pacifism is taken seriously, and in how far it is likely to become a political reality, or, on the contrary, give rise to new conflicts amongst the forces of imperialism.

In its present form the pacifist movement is exceedingly complicated, though it is undergoing rapid changes, and it is no easy matter to discover the class feelings at the bottom of the various pacifist ideologies. We need first to examine the development of Pacifism before, during, and after the war. Later we shall attempt to differentiate between bourgeois Pacifism and the proletarian peace movement, in spite of the difficulty in drawing the line between the bourgeois movement and the opportunist tendency of the workers' movement with its Pacifism in the tow of the bourgeoisie.

#### Pacifism Before the War

Bourgeois pre-war Pacifism had two main tendencies: the ethical and idealistic and the economic.

Idealistic-ethical Pacifism has been nothing but an ideological movement. Its principal preachers, Lammasch, Förster, Fried, Forel, &c., are ideologists unrepresentative of any class, and are wholly incomprehensible in their attitude to the problem of war.

108

They assume war to be the result of the lack of the ethical development of humanity. Their anti-war campaign is conducted on behalf of a general moral; in principle they are anti-violence, no matter what the source. Socially, they are counter-revolutionaries, since they also repudiate the use of force for the liberation of the oppressed classes.

Förster, who is an example of this tendency, writes in his book, "World Policy and World Conscience," as follows:—

Those who believe that external warfare justifies civil war, prove with what speed imperialism at home flourishes on that which they desire to destroy.

It is quite comprehensible that Förster repudiates communist methods of which he writes naively:—

The Russian Communists must not treat every question from the point of view of class interest on the principle that this interest is one with the human interest. No. They must act, in a most definite way, with justice and humanity—towards the present directors and organisers of production.

They should not allow all intellectuals and the whole ruling class to be in opposition to them, nor by the severity of their dogmas, which are regardless alike of customs and traditions, thus split society completely into two hostile camps.

The works of all the other pacifists of this calibre are in a similar vein. The Hague Peace Conference and the establishment of the International Court of Justice have been the sum total of the success of ethical-ideological Pacifism: the world war has shown only too clearly the inefficacy of this movement.

A more positive school of pacifism holds the opinion that war is a bad business for every country, even those which are victorious. Norman Angell is a characteristic representative of this type, whose work "The Great Illusion" is well known. He bases his argument on the dependence of states, which is of such a kind that, bound by the ties of foreign commerce, credit, and exchange, the fall of any one state results in considerable economic injury to the victor country. Without having recourse to any philosophic reasoning, he argues that war should be avoided, because it is a deplorable business even for the victors. It is no mere chance that England is the land of origin of this kind of pacifism, being a country most dependent on foreign economic conditions.

The basic error in the reasoning of Norman Angell—apart from the fact that he neglects to consider the reasons for the history and the part played by the warlike spirit—the basic error is in his assumption that the question of war or peace may be considered in its relation to the welfare of a country as a whole. In reality the problem of war or peace does not evoke the interest of the whole country, but merely that of small groups of big business men, armament manufacturers, officers, and such like. And in spite of the enormous damage inflicted by the world war, it has not yet been proved that these groups did a bad business—on the contrary.

Yet this type of Pacifism deserves a certain attention, because the victorious countries, in their struggle against war, adopt this view of Norman Angell.

Proletarian Pacifism

Before the war, and especially during the war, two kinds of proletarian Pacifism were distinguishable. Let us term the first passive counter-revolutionary; the second active counterrevolutionary.

Pacifism, passively counter-revolutionary, is generally confused with opportunism. The outstanding characteristic of opportunism is its belief in the evolution of capitalistic society towards Socialism without the necessity of any struggle, without any bourgeois war, and in truth at a period so remote that it is of no interest to the present.

These opportunists passively await the future in their mistaken interpretation of the Marxian dogma, which puts political over-throw and reconstruction after the overthrow of economic conditions, without understanding or desiring to understand that this goal can only be reached by means of the incessant class-struggle and armed action against the bourgeoisie. Since opportunism believes that capitalism cannot be abolished by force, it has no conception of the revolutionary possibilities which war opens up: it is pacifist in principle. And that is logical. In the eyes of those who accept the capitalist exploitation of the workers, all wars, as far as the workers are concerned, are nothing but the reflection of prejudice.

The various pacifist resolutions adopted by the Second International illustrate this point of view very clearly. Some of these resolutions tend to bring out the active revolutionary current in proletarian Pacifism. In this manner the Stuttgart resolution of 1907 expresses itself:—

In case of an outbreak of war, it is the duty of Socialists to intervene to secure its termination at the earliest possible moment, and with all their energies to use the economic and political crises caused by the war to rouse the masses of the people, and thereby hasten the fall of the capitalist domination.

Governments ought not to forget that the Franco-German war resulted in the Commune, and the Russo-Japanese war stirred up

the revolutionary forces of the Russian people.

Workers consider it treason to fire on one another for the benefit of the capitalist class and the aggrandisement of dynasties.

The "active revolutionary" tendency of the proletariat is based on Marx and Engels. For them wars are not brought about by lack of human development as the pacifist theologians aver, but are the fatal result of a certain given situation between classes. Lenin reasoned in like manner when he wrote on November 1, 1914:—

War is neither a mere chance, nor a punishment as the teachers of Christianity, patriotism, humanity and peace, and the opportunists pretend. It is an inevitable part of capitalism, a capitalist fate as surely determined as peace.

Wars, in the opinion of Marxian revolutionaries, are important factors in the development of society. Marx remained quite a stranger to passive pacifism, but in several instances he intervened in favour of war. For example, in 1849, after the victorious revolution, he wrote on the duty of the German workers to wage war on Tsarist Russia. In 1910, Kautsky spoke of the probability of the proletarian revolution during war or at its close.

It is obvious that these two conceptions of proletarian Pacifism clash; the one is opportunist, the other revolutionary. It is not surprising that the first type, despite its most violent protests, in words, against war, collapsed on the outbreak of war and became identical with that of the bourgeoisie.

War-Time Pacifism

There were two distinct types of bourgeois Pacifism during the war. The first, ideologic, based its campaign on pre-war

Digitized by Google

principles with the watchwords: "A speedy peace" and "A peace of reconciliation." It met with no more success than in its prewar efforts.

A new point of view emanated from the Entente countries, and particularly from Anglo-Saxon countries. It was that of the "war to end war." Germany might be defeated; but once victory was assured a League of Nations should be created, which would prevent all future wars. Peace without annexations, the last war, the League of Nations, right of self-determination for all nations may be confused with the Wilsonian watchwords, for the famous fourteen points were based on these principles. Wilsonism was propagated by Wilson, by a small ideological circle and the leaders of social patriotism who were in need of a way to become reconciled with the masses whom they had fooled for years and years with their talk of Pacifism. Wilsonism provided obstinate Anglo-Saxon opponents of war with a means of taking up a position against Germany, and forced them to take an active part, in spirit, in the war.

The attitude of the champions of pre-war proletarian pacifists is well known. All the spokesmen of the Second International who for dozens of years had declared their hatred of war, passed into the bourgeois camp with flying banners. Plekhanov, Hyndman, Hervé, Kautsky, &c. This disgraceful failure of the International, and this treachery, was justified in different ways. Kautsky's theory was that the workers of every country are bound to defend their own country.

On October 2, 1914, Kautsky wrote in the Neue Zeit :-

Everyone has the right and the duty to defend his own country; it is real internationalism to recognise this to be the right of all Socialists of every country, even those who are at war with my country.

But the opportunists, who did not give such brutal approval to the murder of the working class in the service of the bourgeoisie, did not find the means of utilising in a revolutionary way the given situation. Max Adler wrote in his pamphlet "Principles or Romanticism" as follows:—

The foreign policy of Marxism can only be a pacifist one, though not pacifist in the bourgeois sense of a movement for peace, nor according to the Socialist idea of peace such as has obtained hitherto; it must be emphasised here that the internationalism of the Social Democrats will be, and inevitably must be, a piece of Utopianism, if the principle of peace is not made the essential principle of home and foreign policy . . . . Socialism after the war will be organised international pacifism, or it will not be realised.

On this point Zinoviev aptly remarked that such ideas are not those of a Marxian programme, but of petty bourgeois opportunism. The gulf between International Pacifism and International Chauvinism is easy to bridge.

The explanation of the keen war service of those who were so filled with hatred of all war lies in the fact that their interpretation of the proletarian class struggle was absolutely wrong. People who are of opinion that an armed struggle is unnecessary to emancipate the workers, and believe in peaceful evolution by improving the lot of the workers under capitalism must necessarily conclude that the workers' interests and those of the bourgeoisie are inseparable. This outlook is clearly expressed by the most important representatives of Chauvinism, Lensch and others.

What is the position of the bourgeoisie in war-time? Colonies are lost, as well as the possibility of exporting on a large scale, which leads to unemployment, wage-reduction, and a lowering of the standard of living for the industrial proletariat of the country. In this way some explanation is possible of the apparent contradictory attitude of the Social Democrats, both before and during the war. Anti-war in pre-war days, because war adds to the ills of the proletariat, they are social-patriots during the war because a deterioration in the position of the bourgeoisie would signify a similar condition for the proletariat. Such an outlook is purely the logical development of their separation from the real struggle for the abolition of capitalism, and is not a contradiction.

The active revolutionary pacifists adopted quite a different attitude and principles during the war. Particularly was this so of the little group around Lenin, which was the very soul of the Third International. From the beginning this group decided to transform this imperialist war into a war against the bourgeoisie for the overthrow of capitalism. Its programme seems to me well sketched in Lenin's words which declare:—

The present war is a popular war. That does not mean that one should be swallowed up in the popular current of Chauvinism, but that in time of war class antagonisms exist and are shown up more

H



readily. Refusal to obey, military strikes, are utter stupidities, the tearful and plaintive dream of an unarmed struggle against the armed bourgeoisie. It is still the duty of socialists in war-time to carry on propaganda for the class struggle. Have done with those ramblings and senseless dreams of "Peace at any price!" We want to raise the standard of the war against the bourgeoisie.

On this programme the strategy and tactics of the Russian Communist Party have been built to lead the proletarian revolution on to victory.

#### Post-War Pacifism

The war has entrenched moral and ideological Pacifism in all the ignorant circles of the intellectuals, the petty bourgeoisie, and even in certain proletarian circles. On the other hand, Pacifism, or rather Wilsonism, has suffered much from the peace negotiations.

Keynes, in his book "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," has described in a most interesting way the attitude of the principal signatories of the Peace Treaty. He pictures how Lloyd George and Clemenceau led Wilson step by step away from the path of Wilsonism and forced him to take that of the brutal peace. Needless to say, this historic event was not due to the different personalities of Wilson, Clemenceau, and Lloyd George. The real truth is that Wilsonism was devoid of any class ideology, whilst Clemenceau and Lloyd George really represented the interests of the capitalist class of their own countries. All the beautiful Wilsonian phrases subsided, and his pet idea, the League of Nations, was no more than a house of cards to which nobody paid any serious attention. This constituted the death-blow of pacifist ideology.

On the other hand the second type of bourgeois Pacifism became stronger. Norman Angell's theory has been fully verified during the years that have elapsed since the war. It is apparent that in the present state of capitalism a victorious war is a misfortune for a country, and that it is impossible in present conditions for the conquered to restore war damages or even for the victorious countries to allow themselves to accept payment of their due, should the conquered be prepared to pay, for fear of bringing about a crash in the capitalist economic system. Norman Angell predicted all these consequences: the decay of international credit, the chaotic condition of exchanges, unemployment, the

cessation of international trade, and all these things have come to pass. And it has been proved that for the mass of the inhabitants of a victorious country war is in reality bad business.

The enormous amount of unemployment in the victorious countries, the business crises, and the crushing taxation constitute a powerful economic foundation and explain why certain capitalist circles are sincerely pacifist. This is especially the case in England, where commerce has suffered most from the economic world upheaval. The Manchester Guardian, under the direction of Keynes, carries on a most active pacifist propaganda. The two million unemployed and the increase in taxation by 30 to 40 per cent. have shown the British what a bad business the war has been for them. In the case of the other victorious countries, a similar state of things exists amongst the bourgeoisie, unless nationalism has been so developed by war that they are blinded to the fact at the moment.

The Russian Revolution and the revolutionary attempts in Hungary and Germany, &c., have given rise to a third type of bourgeois Pacifism, which we shall call "Bourgeois Class-Pacifism." Bourgeois politicians see much more clearly than the opportunists of the working-class movement that defeat in war, and all war in general, gives the proletariat the best chance of securing arms which are indispensable to the overthrow of capitalism.

This type of bourgeois Pacifism has gained more and more ground since the victory of the Russian Revolution. The great change which has taken place in the balance of power between the classes is characterised by the following fact: whereas before the war the ruling class drew from the ranks of the proletariat the forces destined to keep the proletariat in its place (police, soldiers, &c.) it is now forced to organise class-troops for this purpose.

All the defence organisations of recent origin in the various European countries (the "Orgesch" in Germany, the "Awakened" in Hungary, the Fascisti in Italy, &c.) prove that the ruling class has been obliged to arm itself against the proletariat. From which fact it becomes clear that a new war, involving as it would arming the proletariat (this proletariat which must be armed for the struggle which it has to endure), would be an extremely dangerous

enterprise for the ruling class. Hence, in addition to their unhappy economic experience, the fear of arming the proletariat adds a powerful incentive to bourgeois Pacifism.

It was to be expected that the opportunists of the workers' movement should put themselves entirely at the service of this bourgeois Pacifism. An article which Hilferding published in the Freiheit is particularly typical; he speaks of the possibility that exists for imperialist countries to arrange their affairs amongst themselves by means of a peaceful compromise. The Washington Conference was the chief reason for this conclusion. But let us read the passage of this article, which clearly shows how Helferding and the Centrists paddle in opportunist waters:—

Nothing is more senseless than to fail to recognise that behind the new methods of world policy the most powerful political and economic forces are at work. The communist interpretation, daily based on the hope of a new war and the wish to let loose the world revolution, is as perverse as it is senseless. It is senseless because it forgets the terrible void of this young epoch. Perverse, because of the abominable thought that the victory of Socialism, that is to say, the victory of true humanity and culture, can only be secured by means of the terrible barbarism and cruelty of another war! If one really expects the victory of Socialism from a renewal of suffering and not from increased knowledge, then one can only close one's eyes anxiously before the period which is coming.

N

1 1

Here we see counter-revolutionary Pacifism of a pre-war type. There is to be no armed struggle at a moment when the proletariat is armed or the ruling classes weakened, but an "increase in knowledge," that is the way to secure the victory of the proletariat—at a very remote period, it is true.

The Perspective of the New Pacifism

The most important question is, what is the strength of this new post-war Pacifism?

The reduction of armaments, prescribed by the Washington Conference, is generally considered—though incorrectly in my opinion—to be a result of this movement. The reduction in warships has a double interpretation. In the first place, it has been openly recognised that should the United States decide to compete in the race for battleships with the British and the Japanese, they would win the race because of their superior economic position. On this account they were in a position to

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN force other maritime powers to reduce their armaments—and that by means of the threat of another war. In the second place, the war has proved that armour-plated warships no longer play the effective rôle in warfare formerly attributed to them. A year prior to the Washington Conference the British Press carried on a controversy on the advisability of building dreadnoughts, or of concentrating the limited resources of the country on building submarines and light battleships. The reduction of armaments decided by the Washington Conference is hence only a logical result of the experience gained in the last world war.

The rôle played by France at this conference throws still more light on this subject. France rejected the proposal of reducing the number of submarines, in spite of Balfour's declaration that the only interpretation of this policy was that France contemplated an attack on Great Britain. In the same way France persisted in her refusal to reduce land armaments.

Thus it is evident that the results of the Washington Conference have not exactly the same reasons as Hilferding and the pacifist opportunists ascribe to them. Neither should it be forgotten that the Washington Conference gave rise to a number of war threats on the part of the United States against Great Britain (on the question of oil in Mesopotamia, submarine cables in the Pacific, &c.), besides provoking during the conference a courteous exchange of war threats between the French and British representatives.

Still we must make the deduction that war experiences have strengthened bourgeois Pacifism; but not so much ideological Pacifism as class-economic Pacifism. The fear of a proletarian revolution will make the capitalist powers think before rushing lightly into a new war, before re-arming the proletariat.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the world economic crisis implies the necessity of a new war. No new market is available for the products of the machinery of production created by the war in the United States, England, and Japan. The possibilities of capitalist expansion are reduced at present. The United States is trying to monopolise the South American market; China, that great market, appears to be developing its own capitalism and meets the invasion of foreign capital, or rather colonisation,

with the beginnings of military organisation and a call for independence. The reconstruction of Germany, East Europe, and Russia is held up for reasons of policy. France and Great Britain fear a renewal of strength in Germany, not only politically, but because of commercial competition in the world market. Capitalists regard Russia as dangerous ground, because there the proletariat is in power. The world market has become too limited for the three great victorious powers, U.S.A., Great Britain, and Japan. Hitherto, a similar international situation has caused an armed struggle between imperialist powers to conquer the world market.

Two tendencies present themselves: one to avoid war both from fear of economic consequences and the possibility of a proletarian revolution, and the other a desire to fight for possession of the world market. It would be frivolous to say beforehand which of these tendencies will win the day. The teachings of history, however, are there to tell us that the days of warfare have not yet passed.

# The World of Labour

						PACE
INTERNATIONAL:	The Fusion of the Right Wing					119
-31 -02-01.00 (7.00)	Essen Conference of the Left again	st the V	Var			120
FRANCE	Revolutionary Committee of Action	agains	t the V	Var	44	120
ITALY:	Taxation of Wages				14.25	122
United States:	Farmer-Labour Party Negotiations	100		4.5		122
	Workers' Party Convention		do			123

#### INTERNATIONAL

The Fusion of the Right Wing

Representatives of the Second International and of the International Working Union of Socialist Parties' (Vienna) Executives, met in Cologne, on January 5, in accordance with an agreement arrived at during The Hague Peace Congress of December, 1922, when a Committee of Action was formed. The Cologne meeting, in a long manifesto, declared that International Socialism must mobilise its forces and re-establish itself internationally to meet the capitalist offensive and world-wide reaction. In so doing, the manifesto, while announcing its desire for unity, condemns the parties and groups who "take the name of communists" and makes them responsible for the breakdown of the effort to attain unity made at Berlin, in May, 1922. Therefore, the manifesto continues, the possibility of convoking a congress together with the Moscow Executive has vanished for a long time to come.

The meeting agreed to call a World Socialist Congress to re-establish the Socialist International on May 21, at Hamburg, to include all socialist parties who are in agreement with the following:—

(1) The emancipation of the workers by abolishing the capitalist system of production to be the ultimate aim, and the class struggle the means of attaining that object:

(2) The unity of the Trade Union Movement within the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam to be essential to the success of the class struggle;

(3) The resolution of the Hague World Peace Congress in 1922 on the question of the "Mission of the workers in the struggle for peace" to be the basis of all action against the danger of war; the necessity of being perfectly clear as to the attitude of the workers during war;

(4) The International is not merely a peace-time instrument but an essential weapon during war;

(5) On the final formation of a Socialist International to adhere to that and no other political international association outside this body.

Representatives are to be sent from all bodies on the basis of one delegate for every 5,000, and not more than fifty from any country.

119

37 10

211

The

100

ix

150

D.

10

120

M

M

12

日.日.豆

ħ

1

W. W.

F. 67

The meeting discussed the Paris Conference on Reparations at some length, and Comrade Wels spoke on behalf of the German workers. In the conviction that the reparations position would still be unsolved when the Unity Congress meets in Hamburg, he made the following proposition which the Conference approved:—

(1) The question "Reparations and Occupation" to receive special attention at

the Hamburg Congress;

(2) A special international commission to prepare a report giving details of actual conditions in the occupied territories taken in connection with the Reparations question;

(3) The international Socialist Press to be requested now to give special attention to this question, and Socialists in Parliament to give details of the position when

a suitable opportunity arises.

Essen Conference of the Left Wing against the War

On January 6-7, a congress of left wing Trade Unionists and Communists met at Essen to discuss the situation arising out of the breakdown of the Paris Conference on Reparations, and the threatened occupation of the Ruhr. Representatives were present from: Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and the Netherlands. The Conference drew up a manifesto addressed to the workers both of the Entente and conquered countries, in which it was urged that the workers were being rushed into a new war for capitalist aims; that the whole burden of reparations and sanctions was being shelved on to the workers by the capitalists, who at the same time cut down wages and agitated for a longer working day, and that the bourgeoisie should be forced to take the whole burden of the Versailles Treaty on themselves. In the words of the manifesto:—

Down with the robber Versailles Peace! War on all imperialist wars! Down with the reparations and sanctions of the Capitalist Governments! Workers, unite, so as to be able to make the capitalists—the real war lords—shoulder the burdens of the war and the expense of economic reconstruction.

The occupation of the Ruhr implies a new war, even then when the Germans make no armed resistance. It will accentuate the differences between the

different States and enflame national passions anew.

A European committee of action was formed of those most closely concerned in the coming struggle, and a general strike is being organised should it prove necessary. Already the French Government has made wholesale arrests of French Communists and left wing Trade Unionists in connection with the Congress.

FRANCE

Revolutionary Committee of Action against the War

Recent events have re-awakened the energy of the militant workingclass movement in France after a long period of confusion and weakness. The Communist Party, strengthened by the decisions of the Fourth Congress of the International which led to the withdrawal of its compromising elements, put up a strong and unhesitating stand against the militarism of their Government in the Ruhr, and drew upon its leaders the full force of Government persecution. And the United Confederation of Labour, throwing aside the old economic sectionalism of no politics, has joined with the Communist Party in the formation of a Revolutionary Committee of Action to combat

The stiffening of the Communist Party by the Fourth Congress of the International took the shape of a demand that members should resign the membership of freemason organisations and of the "League of the Rights of Man" (an association which did patriotic propaganda during the war). These demands, though apparently of a simple character, were effective in their intention of freeing the party from elements which had come over with the old Socialist Party, but really belonged to the bourgeois political world. series of resignations followed, including Frossard, the secretary. Similar steps were taken with Humanité to relieve it from its pre-communist elements. Cachin, Vaillant-Couturier, and others of the better-known leaders stood by the party and have since received varying terms of imprisonment. The Government persecution has not touched Frossard or any of the right-wing socialists, Longuet, Renaudel, &c. In conformity with the recommendations of the Fourth Congress a Committee of Action of the party together with the Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire has been formed, move was a result of the abolition of Article 11 of the Statutes of the Red International of Labour Unions which involved co-operation between it and the Communist International; in lieu of this statute committees of action, composed of trade unionists and communists, are to be formed. French Committee of Action met simultaneously with the Reparations Conference in Paris, and is carrying on an active anti-war propaganda.

The Congress of the Seine Trade Union Federation, held December 24-25, was of especial importance due to the final decision of the C.G.T.U. to ratify its affiliation to the Red International of Labour Unions in accordance with the C.G.T.U. resolution at the St. Etienne Congress. The question of affiliation was the chief subject under debate, and the vote showed a two-thirds majority in favour of it. The Bakers' Union opposed the discussion of international affiliation, urging that it was not the business of the departmental unions, but of the National Congress. The Seine Federation, it may be recalled, was the ringleader in the opposition to the C.G.T. in 1920, and took a prominent part in the split. Before the C.G.T.U. was established it was composed of 203 unions; but these have now fallen to 146, with 80,000 subscribing members.

The resolution on the international orientation received 94 votes from 78 unions, against 37 votes of 26 unions, and was as follows:—

The Congress of the Departmental Union of the Seine Trade Unions, in complete accord with the decisions of the National Congress at St. Etienne, confirms those decisions. It specially approves of the decisions in respect of trade union control and factory committees, propaganda, tactics, and action, as well as relations with external groups which adopt the platform of the class struggle.

It will prepare, in conjunction with the C.G.T.U., by intensive propaganda, the establishment of factory councils, including all the workers in any one enterprise, so as to exercise workers' control, both as to working conditions and production.

The congress, in accordance with the decisions of the last national congress, invites all the trade unions affiliated to the Seine Federation to apply these

decisions and to carry on a vigorous workers' offensive for a general increase in wages, the maintenance of the eight-hour law, and against the taxation of wages. In the international field, the congress approves of the attitude of the C.G.T.U. delegation at the Second Congress of the R.I.L.U., and congratulates the C.G.T.U. on its affiliation to the R.I.L.U., at the same time requesting all the unions belonging to the Seine Department to carry out the decisions taken.

14

1

W I

100

RO

10

No.

NO

B

#### ITALY

Taxation of Wages

N order to cope with the financial chaos in Italy, the Mussolini government introduced a system of wage taxation, calculated to bring in sixty million lire annually. The tax applies to State employees and also municipal and provincial employees. For those workers in permanent employment the scale is 10.32 per cent. for State employees, municipal, &c., 12.40 per cent. for workers on inferior railways, trams, or inland waterways. Non-permanent workers are to pay 4 per cent. on their basic wage and 10.32 or 12.40 per cent. on all supplementary allowances.

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Farmer-Labour Party Negotiations

CONFERENCE for progressive political action was held at Cleveland, on December 11, 1922, one of a series since the first conference held in Chicago in February, 1922, to debate the question of the formation of a third political party on the lines of the British Labour Party. Representatives of railroad unions, farmers' organisations, trade union leaders, and the Socialist Party were present; but the Workers' Party, which has been active in working for a Labour Party, was refused representation on the grounds that "The principles of their organisation were not in conformity with the declaration of the conference. . . . " The Socialist Party entered a mild protest against their exclusion on the grounds that the party was "un-American"; but agreed that the party should be excluded because of its "disruptive tactics," and its policy of "rejecting the principles of democracy in favour of dictatorship."

The Farmer-Labour group moved that a Labour Party be formed in these "That the conference for progressive political action hereby declares for independent political action by the agricultural and industrial workers through a party of their own." The resolution was discussed at length and finally lost by 64 votes to 52.

The programme adopted by the conference was :-

(1) Repeal of the Esch-Cummins railroad law, operation of the railroads for the benefit of the people, and public control of water power in the interests of the people.

(2) Direct election of the President and Vice-President by the people, and extension

of direct primary laws in all States.

(3) Action by Congress to end the practice of courts to declare legislation unconstitutional.

(4) Enactment of the Norris-Sinclair consumers' and producers' financing corporation bill, designed to increase prices that farmers receive and reduce prices that consumers pay for farm products, and the creation of an independent system of food production credits.

(5) Increased tax rates on large incomes and inheritance and payment of a soldier

bonus by restoring the tax on excess profits.

(6) Legislation providing minimum essential standards of employment for women; equality for women and men while improving existing political, social, and industrial standards, and State action to insure maximum benefit of Federal maternity and infancy acts.

Workers' Party Convention

The second convention of the Workers' Party was held in New York, December 24, 1922. The report presented showed that the party had greatly grown in power since its foundation in December, 1921, and been very active in carrying on both political and industrial campaigns. The chief campaigns have comprised an agitation for a Labour Party and the programme on the industrial field, urging the militant workers to remain within the old unions and work on the lines laid down by the Trade Union Educational League. The party strength was estimated to be 20,000, built up chiefly by the foreign language federations of which there are now sixteen in the party; an appeal was made for more activity in building up the English-speaking membership.

The following statement on the International was presented to the con-

vention and voted unanimously :-

The Workers' Party accepts the principle that the class struggle for the emancipation of the working class is an international struggle. The workers of Russia have been obliged to fight against the whole capitalist world in order to maintain their Soviet Government and to win the opportunity of building their system of production on a communist basis. In this struggle they have had the support of the enlightened workers of every country.

The future struggles against capitalism will take the same character. In order to win the final victory in the struggle against world capitalism the working

class of the world must be united under one leadership.

The leadership of the international struggle which inspires hope in the hearts of the workers of the world and arouses fear in the capitalists of every country

is the leadership of the Communist International.

The Workers' Party declares its sympathy with the principles of the Communist International and enters the struggle against American capitalism, the most powerful of the national groups, under the inspiration of the leadership of the Communist International.

It rallies to the call: Workers of the World, Unite! The Workers' Party sent fraternal delegates to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International; but this convention took place before the delegates returned to report.

DIVILLED by Google

### BOOK REVIEWS

mete

MORE BRITISH MARXISM

An Outline of Modern Imperialism By Thomas Ashcroft and others. Plebs Text Book No. 2. Plebs League. 2s. 6d.

Imperialism: The Final Stage of Capitalism. By N. Lenin. Translated by André Tridon. Progress Printing Co., Boston, Mass.

HE above two books show very clearly the difference between Marxism and the British-American substitute for Marxism.

Lenin's book is not yet available in English. The above "version" is only a mangled fragment which it is a crime to have issued under Lenin's name. (This fact itself, incidentally, is an illustration of the barbaric character of British-American Marxism, which issues even the classics of its science in a doctored and mutilated form without being conscious of its vandalism—not only in the case of unknown and unnamed publishers such as the above, but also in the case of the Kerr publications. The nature of the omissions is even more significant, but to these we shall come later.)

Even in its present mutilated form, however, the preface to Lenin's book reveals in a flash the whole difference between revolutionary Marxism and Plebs hobbies of the economic interpretation of politics.

"It is painful," writes Lenin, "in these days of freedom to read over certain passages of this book in which the thought of the censorship prevented me from making certain definite statements or from enlarging upon certain important points. When I wished to say what imperialism stood for on the eve of the Socialist revolution, when I wished to say that social-patriotism, that is lip-service to Socialism coupled with patriotic deeds, was a complete betrayal of Socialism, a desertion to the bourgeois camp, and that this schism in the Labour Movement stood in certain relations to certain concrete conditions of imperialism—I had to confine myself to allusions and suggestions, or to refer the reader to a reprint of the 'illegal' articles I wrote between 1914 and 1917."

To Lenin, writing under a censorship, it is painful and shameful to be compelled to slur over what the Plebs authors, writing under no censorship (save, perhaps, the fear of ill-will of trade union officials), never think of including.

The absolute difference here revealed is a revelation of two worlds.

To Lenin imperialism is a living, concrete thing; it is not simply the expansion of finance-capital and the partitioning of territories; it is the development of oligarchy, the spread of social decay, the corruption of the Labour movements, the growth of opportunism, the division of the world working class, the betrayal of socialism—and also the eve of the socialist revolution.

To the Plebs the study of imperialism is an assiduous collection of information about capitalist expansion and exposures of capitalist diplomacy, together with a few conventional references to the exploitation of the working class and the necessity for replacing capitalism.

124

So Lenin's treatment shows the living interest of an active thinkerfighter in the class struggle. His chapters run:-

#### MODERN CAPITALISM

- (1) Concentration of Industry and Monopoly.
- (2) The New Rôle played by the Banks.
- (3) Finance-Capital and Oligarchy.
- (4) The Export of Capital. (5) Division of the World under the Capitalist Groups.
- (6) Division of the World under the Great Powers.
- (7) Imperialism as a Special Stage of Capitalism. (8) Parasitism and Stagnation of Capitalism.
- (9) Criticism of Imperialism.
- (10) Historical rôle of Imperialism.

Contrast with this the banal and unrelated newscutting treatment of the Plebs chapters:-

- (1) The Economics of Imperialism.
- (2) British Expansion, 1882-1914.
- (3) German Expansion, 1885-1914.
- (4) French Expansion, 1881-1914. (5) Russian Expansion.
- (6) Italian Expansion.

i

- (7) Europe on the Eve of War, 1914.
- (8) Imperialism in War Time.
- (9) Imperialism in the Peace Treaties.
- (10) Japanese Expansion, 1871-1921.
- (11) American Expansion, 1898-1921.
- (12) Imperialism and the Worker. Appendix.—The Theory of Imperialism.

What are the lessons that the Plebs has to teach? For this we must turn to the chapter on "Imperialism and the Worker," neatly docketed away from the rest of the book. Here the Plebs finds that "three lessons of especial moment stand out from a study of imperialism." They are (1) "The Interdependence of Economics and Politics" (a typical Plebs phrase, Marxistically ludicrous, but no doubt a rare and refreshing reward of arduous study for the working class); (2) "Internationalism" ("The workers must learn that an injury to one is an injury to all "); (3) "Working Class Independence" ("Let us rally to our own standard. Let us inscribe upon it the watchwords, 'Solidarity,' 'Self-Reliance.' In that sign-and in that sign alone-we shall conquer"). So ends the third lesson of the Plebs gospel.

These are the portentous results of scientific Marxism applied to the main character of modern capitalist society. The Plebs had really better merge itself in the Labour Magazine.

What is the explanation of this pathetic and abject failure? It is not an accident; it is instinct in the whole of Plebs teaching and thinking, with its barren "science" and abstract class-consciousness, leading only to Labour Party vagueness.

arile.

mer :

lk

10

m.

100

11 00

1247

15 10

200

TIME

the

We We

110

M . N

ie

The explanation is to be found in the very character of the "Marxism" taught by the Plebs—the British-American substitute for Marxism as taught in such works as Ablett's "Outlines of Economics" or Boudin's "Theoretical System of Karl Marx."

In these systems the essence of Marx is left out. The economics (Marx never wrote about "Economics") is taken in unreal abstraction, and the history and politics is slurred over or omitted. The value for the class struggle becomes nil. Promising young men are sent to the Labour College for two years and come back budding snobs and trade union officials.

So extreme is the pitch this reaches that the American translator of Lenin's "Imperialism" actually only takes Chapters 1 to 6 of the ten chapters given above, and entirely omits the remaining four chapters, which contain the whole outcome. No doubt he felt that the first six chapters contained the "economic exposition," and that the rest was simply Lenin's ramblings, containing party politics and similar matters of no concern to Marxism.

To examine the opportunism of the British Labour Movement as a reflection of imperialism would no doubt appear to be a partisan occupation beneath the impartial theoretical dignity of the Plebs conception of Marxism. But it might come as a surprise to the Plebs-taught students of Marxism to learn that Marx wrote:—

"The English protelariat is becoming in practice more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of nations appears to be aiming at establishing in the end a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat alongside of the bourgeoisie. For a nation which is engaged in exploiting the whole world, all the conditions are ready for this."

#### Or that Engels wrote:-

"You ask what the English workers think of the colonial policy? The same as they think of any politics: there is no workers' party here, but only conservative and liberal radicals: the workers are eating out of England's world-market and colonial monopoly."

And

"The English trade unions let themselves be led by men who are bought by the bourgeoisie, or at any rate are counted in their ranks."

All this vulgar language of Marx and Engels is far from the refined and scientific atmosphere of the Plebs text-book, which introduces its "Marxian" study of imperial and world problems with a blessing from a member of the General Council.

The distinction may now be quite shortly and simply put.

Marxism interprets history and politics in terms of the class struggle.

The British-American substitute for Marxism interprets history and politics in terms of economics (an occupation favoured by many bourgeois historians). The conventional insertion of a stock phrase or two about the working class at the beginning and the end—"at the base of the whole structure lies the exploitation of the masses," p. 9; "we cannot solve the problem of

imperialism while capitalism lasts," p. 135—makes no difference to the complete absence of the class struggle from the actual study.

The most glaring example of this may be taken from the account of the outbreak of war. A whole chapter is devoted to "Europe on the Eve of War, 1914." In the nine pages of that chapter the collapse of capitalist diplomacy is carefully narrated. The collapse of the International is never mentioned. Is it not clear that any account whatever of "Europe on the Eve of War, 1914," from the point of view of the class struggle, though it were only three lines in place of three hundred, would mention the collapse of the International? And if that is clear, then is it not clear that any defence whatever that may be put forward for the reasons in this case only serves as an admission of the central issue, that this study is not written from the point of view of the class struggle—and therefore is not an accurate historical study?

In point of fact there are two whole pages on the "psychological aspect."

"We must not omit another aspect of the eve of war—the general outlook of the peoples, which makes them fit material for the great struggle." The passage goes on to speak of the "deception of the masses." And all the time it never touches on the main instruments of the deception of the masses, the main agents which made the people fit materials for the great struggle—the social patriotic Labour leaders, whose treachery was the real collapse of 1914. To do so might have made these pages useful for the practical understanding of the workers, instead of filling them with inflated psychological bombast about "race egoism." But, then, this might have given offence; and there is nothing in this book to disturb the equanimity of the most offensive and treacherous member of the General Council.

Not that the Plebs authors are wanting in moral censure when they feel occasion arises. The terms of the Treaty of Versailles, they tell us in another of their bold passages, "grossly violated both the proposed war aims of the Allies and also the terms of the armistice." Here they are on safe ground; here the Labour Party and the U.D.C. have already spoken; and here a British Marxist may safely follow. The violation of armistice-pledges by capitalist diplomatists is a serious matter for the workers. But the violation of certain other pledges in 1914 by the workers' own leaders is of no concern.

This clinging to the skirts of the U.D.C. is the final and logical conclusion of the picture of these Marxists, who set out on their journey without understanding that Marxism is politics or nothing. For it is not the case that there can be a kind of vacuum of no politics, as they hope and imagine; if they exclude the revolutionary politics of Marxism they inevitably come at the mercy of liberal politics. Their economics wither into an arid dogma; their actual thinking and politics becomes philistine and bourgeois. An actual examination of the authorities quoted in this "Marxian" work is instructive evidence of the real influences which have moulded it. The score is as

follows (political writers only; historical authorities, such as Holland Rose, have been omitted):-

Brailsford				17	quotation	s
Newbold		ala.		6	,,,	(all from his I.L.P. period)
J. A. Hobson	24	440	20	4	,,	
E. D. Morel			10	3	,,,	
BrigGeneral	Thon	nson		3	>>	
Boudin				2	99	
L. S. Woolf		49.6	30	2	"	
Marx, Engels						
Trotsky, Bud	harin,	Hilfer	ding,			
Rosa Luxemb	ourg,	Varga	4.6	0	>>	
			11	1	to a very to	to the

It is really superfluous to add anything to this list

The only reason for spending a review of such length on a book of this character is because the Plebs teaching is still widely looked to in this country as representative of Marxism, and only when we have completely exploded that myth can we lay the foundations of the real revolutionary movement in R. P. D. this country.

#### PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

The People's Year Book, 1923. Co-operative Wholesale Society. 38. The Worker and the State. By F. Tillyard. Routledge. 10s. 6d.

Public Finance. By H. Dalton. Routledge. 5s.

The Outline of History: Definitive Edition. By H. G. Wells. Cassell's. 21s.

Der Neue Kurs in Russland. By Dr. Hahn and A. v. Lilienfeld-Toal. Gustav Fischer,

Wir Klagen an! By Clara Zetkin. Carl Hoym, Hamburg.

Der Kampf der Kohlarbeiter in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika. By T. Loaf. Carl Hoym, Hamburg.

Gandhi and the Anglican Bishops. Ganesh and Co., Madras.

The Awakening of Asian Womenhood. By T. L. Vaswani. Ganesh and Co.

A Voice from Prison. By C. S. Ranga Iyer. Ganesh and Co.

The Bankruptcy of the American Labour Movement. By Wm. Z. Foster. Trade Union

Educational League, Chicago. Documentary History of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 1920-1922. The American Labour Year Book, 1921-2. Volume IV Rand School of Social Service.

\$2.00

## THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 4

MARCH, 1923

NUMBER 3

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

#### CONTENTS

Notes of the Month	- Page	131
THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION		
Collapse—A Few Weeks Back—A Petition in Bankruptc —The Shams Go Down Together—Lausanne the En of Liberal Pacifism—The British-French Conflict— Miniature Boom and Coming Slump—War Prospec	d	
The Coal War in Europe		137
By M. PHILIPS PRIC		-37
The Labour Movement and the Unemploye		147
By R. Page Arno	T	
Ireland and the International Working Class By J. T. Murph		161
The History of Fascism—II.  By A. Bordig.		172
The World of Labour	L	184
International—Czecho-Slovakia—France—Germany	"	
Book Reviews	_ ,,	189
The Law and the Profits W. H.		
What is Crime? W. P.		
Black Labour v. White S. P. B.		

The Labour Publishing Company, Ltd. 38 Great Ormond Street London W.C.

Tree Difference Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Editorial Office :

162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE RD., S.W.1

Publishing Office:

38 GREAT ORMOND STREET, W.C. 1

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, and can only return the same when stamps to cover postage are enclosed.

Subscription Rates:
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

Six months - 4/-

One year - 8/-

United States of America Subscription Representative:—Philip Novick, 192 Broadway, Room 15, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

#### Advertising Rates :

Ordinary position, per page, £5 5s. and pro rata.

Volume III (July to December, 1922) can be supplied for 7s. 6d. post free, or these numbers can be bound and returned post free for 4s. 6d. if sent to The Labour Publishing Company.

Cases can be supplied for 3s. 6d. post free.

Title Page for Vol. III can be had on application if  $1\frac{1}{2}d$ , for postage is sent.

Senerated on 2025-02-26-29-29 GMT / https://hdu.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112001987290 Public Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access.

Digitized by Google

## NOTES of the MONTH

Collapse—A Few Weeks Back—A Petition in Bankruptcy—The Shams

Go Down Together—Lausanne the End of Liberal Pacifism—

The British-French Conflict—Miniature Boom and

Coming Slump—War Prospects

In the hour of need the working-class unity of the West is lacking. This is the first and foremost fact of the present situation. Four years after the war it is possible for French troops to overrun the heart of industrial Germany with the connivance of the British Government, while the workers of the countries concerned look on helpless. This is the exact amount that has been achieved by the Wilsonian pacifism of the Second International and the paper solidarity of the International Federation of Trade Unions. The collapse of the International of the West European Labour Movements was so certainly predictable that it is too commonly taken for granted. It occasions no more surprise than the parallel collapse of the League of Nations. Yet the circumstances are such as to make it worthy of note.

Thas occurred with dramatic suddenness after the empty parade of the Hague Conference. Only a few weeks back, and the whole assembled Labour and Socialist organisations of Europe, under the presidency of Mr. J. H. Thomas and in union with the liberal pacifist sections of the bourgeoisie (but excluding the communists) had vowed themselves to the international general strike against war. They had refused consideration of the Russian proposal of a practical programme. They had scorned the Russian warning that the Ruhr would put them to the test. The secretary of the Trade Union International boasted in public in Berlin that the occupation of the Ruhr would see twenty-five million trade unionists in action. When the test came, the hollowness was



exposed. The twenty-five millions of the Amsterdam Trade Union International were revealed to be a paper army. The first instinct of the Social Democrats of Germany and the Independent Labour Party of this country was to clamour for the retention of the British Empire's forces on the Rhine, thus revealing the extent of their belief in the working-class International. The fight against French militarism in France was undertaken, not by the Socialists, but by the Communists, who had never been invited to the Hague Conference, and who alone bore the brunt of the French Government's persecution. The Second International, the Vienna International, and the Amsterdam International joined in a manifesto to the German workers calling on them to exert pressure on their capitalists to pay reparations.

IKE a company promoter who recognises that his last cards have been played, and that nothing remains but to go into voluntary liquidation, the secretary of the bogus Trade Union International at Amsterdam decided to make a clean breast of it in the hope of thereby regaining credit. He confessed the organisation and policy that he represents to be as powerless as in 1914. But this confession is worthless unless it is accompanied by a recognition of the mistake that has been made and a determination to alter it. The attempt by a confession of failure to gain another lease of power shows a complete inability to understand what is happening. The important point is not that his organisation and policy is as powerless as in 1914; it is that its continuance or reconstruction along the present lines will be as useless as in 1919. It is necessary to recognise, however bitter, that the Russian warning was correct, and that it is useless to pass general resolutions without making practical preparations to carry them out. United working-class action against war is a revolutionary thing, or it is hypocrisy: and if it is sincerely intended, it is necessary to face up seriously to all the requirements of revolutionary organisation. This is the issue which the Labour Party leaders who profess theoretical adherence to the principle of united working-class action against war will now have to face.

HE collapse of the International of the Western European Labour Movements coincides with the collapse of the League of Nations. These two organisations have been so closely intertwined that their common outcome combines to form a single picture. Their simultaneous collapse serves to reveal and symbolise the character of the new period on which we are entering. The clash of forces has now reached a point at which the shams and polite fictions of the peace can no longer find any room. Those shams received their most obvious and concrete embodiment in the League of Nations and the loyal and anti-revolutionary "Internationals" associated with it. During the years of ferment and movement after the war those organisations were pushed upon the attention with an untiring publicity. That these institutions, whose publicity was plentifully financed by the wealthy and absorbed by the gullible during these last few years, should now pass out of the picture is a significant item. They were born together, and in their death they were not divided. The events of the Ruhr and Lausanne represent more than the immediate issues with which they They represent the final conclusion of reare concerned. constructions and liberal pacifism.

IBERAL pacifism-or the veiling of imperialism under gallant phrases of freedom and crusading justice-reached its death at Lausanne. Belgium and the war was its vision of glory; Wilson and Versailles was its zenith. The aftermath of Versailles made the taste prove bitter. Washington sought to revive the tradition, but already the reflection was fainter and less confident. Genoa made a supreme effort to conjure up the old spells—and failed. With the events leading up to Lausanne the last authentic note was heard in Lloyd George's rallying cry to fight for "the freedom of the Straits." The cry won no response. Lausanne took place in a relentless public atmosphere of bargaining and oil. "I loathe the question of Mosul," declared Lord Curzon on his return to the sympathetic atmosphere of the Peers, "especially its associations with oil." Lord Curzon had reason to complain. The rôle of the "English gentleman" is finishing—and all history

Digitized by Google

breathes a sigh of relief. The grandiloquent periphrases are ignored. Short sordid words like "oil" have to be pronounced by noble lips that loathe them. In the last fierce lap of imperialist rivalry and conflict politics become open in their indecency. Coal in the Ruhr, oil at Mosul, become the open objects of the fight. When ugly things are called by ugly names, the world can at last become beautiful.

HAT war has not already developed from the situation of the British and French Governments at present is due to British inability rather than lack of will. Britain has to suffer the whims and wills of France alike in the Ruhr and at Lausanne, thwarting her policy and preventing her moving, because France is ready to fight and Britain is not. Britain is not in a position to face war at present. The British Prime Minister had occasion recently to refer to the problem created by the existing war weariness and the probable necessity of war. The panic call to the colonies sent out by Lloyd George had evoked only a cold response. The magic of the " freedom of the Straits " failed to work. And at the same time, by an unfortunate coincidence, just when the crisis to the Ruhr and Lausanne brought the moment of need, America became urgent over the settlement of her debt, and the British Government, after vain attempts to improve the terms, found itself compelled to accept a further heavy burden for an immense Thus everything in British conditions since last period ahead. autumn pointed to caution even at the expense of the appearance of pusillanimity-in other words, to Bonar Law in place of Lloyd George. In France, on the other hand, desperate conditions breed valour, as in Britain discretion—in other words, Poincaré in place of Briand. With certain bankruptcy ahead, the French bourgeoisie was ready to gamble on vast military expenditure and adventures in the hope of somehow coming out on top. So France was free to act, and to play the enfant terrible without fear of consequences in the Ruhr and at Lausanne. The British rulers could only look on with apprehensive helplessness at the French, and hope that they would get enough rope to hang themselves.

N consequence, the policy of the British bourgeoisie was to make the best of it and leave it at that, in spite of the demands of a powerful section for immediate action on the side of Germany. They could only comfort themselves with the thought that France was engaged in a preposterous adventure and must soon be bankrupt. Meanwhile the temporary boom resulting from the stoppage of the Ruhr afforded a welcome stimulus to British industry. In all the mining districts and iron and steel centres orders poured in. "The French occupation of the Ruhr," runs a typical report from Sunderland, "has increased the demand for pig iron: there is every indication that many more blast furnaces on the Tees-side will be blown again, though of course the miniature boom may be only temporary." But this boom in its nature cannot be a mark of returning health, but of increasing disease. It is based, not on the recovery, but on the desperation of Germany. The orders may pour in, but can they be paid for? And if not, the boom can only be the prelude to a slump far more devastating than any preceding. Finally, if France should succeed after all in organising the Ruhr, and reaching an agreement with the German industrialists, then the great coal and iron combination of Central Europe against Britain will have been accomplished, and it will be impossible for Britain to remain quiet. Already the apprehension of this, and the consequent preludes of action, appear in the utterances of British Press and statesmen.

Britain and France is declared in any case. In the one alternative France fails and goes bankrupt, and British supremacy in Europe is established. In that case the conflict between Britain, the one remaining power in Europe, and America is immediately hastened. It is in fact likely that, if there is any danger of such an issue, America will intervene beforehand with some form of international loan and rehabilitate France. In the other alternative, France is successful, and Britain is compelled to face the choice of final capitulation and industrial decline or war with France. In any case the issue before the working-class movement is one of definite action or wordy impotence. To invoke in these conditions the

Divilized by Google

formula of the League of Nations, as was done in the Labour Manifesto at the opening of Parliament, is simply abdication. The old general opposition to war or agitation over unemployment become meaningless and impossible. Either the challenge when it comes must be taken up, or the complete inability to act must be confessed. When real events happen, politics must be made real or they cease to exist.

Digitized by Google

# THE COAL WAR IN EUROPE

#### By M. PHILIPS PRICE

Pacifists and humanitarians tell us that the Versailles Treaty, as the embodiment of the spirit of greed and envy, is responsible for chaos in Europe and is a breeding ground for new wars. To judge from their line of argument one might think that had it not been for the accident that President Wilson was outwitted in Paris in the summer of 1919, the ills of Europe might have been on the way to being cured by now. But the mere fact that each successive Entente Premier, whether he is inclined to be reasonable in nature, like M. Briand, or whether he is a firebrand, like M. Poincaré; and each British Premier, whether he be Coalition Liberal or Tory, follows a certain line of policy in regard to the Versailles Treaty, would indicate that the policies of England and France over the problem of Central Europe are not due to the whims of misguided statesmen but are due to far-reaching economic causes, dictating political tendencies.

At the same time, as regards France at least, it is not quite true to say that there has been no change in her policy towards the Central European problem in the last year. There has been a change, but it is not due to the replacing of "reasonable" M. Briand by "unreasonable" M. Poincaré. The change is of a deep-seated economic nature, connected with internal developments in France. The Versailles Treaty was, in effect, a compromise between two classes of economic interests in France—the inflationists and the The latter saw the yawning gap in the national deflationists. Budget and held that in the interests of the investors in War Loans and public funds, i.e., of the holders of passive capital, that Budget must be balanced. The seventy-five milliard gold francs, which M. Klotz estimated in September, 1919, as the French claim on Germany for allowances, pensions, and widows, was a demand for cash payment from Germany to prevent the continuance of inflation of the French currency, the fall of the value of the franc, and of the investors' holdings. On the other hand, the inflationists in France

The

(at the period when the Treaty was framed they were weak) had no objection to seeing the franc fall, so long as French industries could expand and with the aid of low currencies dominate the Continent. Steering a somewhat middle course between the small investors, who spoke through M. Klotz, and the heavy industries came the big French banks. Interested as floaters of War Loans in the policy of deflation, they also had one foot in the heavy industries, which in France, unlike in England and Germany, they largely influenced even during times of inflation. Hence when the seventy-five milliard gold francs of German reparations were not forthcoming, it was not difficult for the great French banks to cut their losses on depreciated currencies and war investments, and to back the Comité des Forges in its bid for the control of the coal and iron resources of Europe. Hence the demand for sanctions became louder and louder, beginning with the occupation of three Rhine harbours on the right bank in February, 1921, followed by the talk of "productive guarantees" when the question of a moratorium was raised in the autumn of 1922. The Dariac report at last showed what the French heavy industries were aiming at. The French annexation of Lorraine, control of the Saar, and occupation of the left bank of the Rhine for fifteen years was foreshadowed already during the war and embodied in the Franco-German secret agreement of February, 1917. But that could not satisfy the French heavy industries. In order to secure a dominating position, they had to get control of the Ruhr coke, with which alone the Lorraine ore could be smelted. As Germany's incapacity to fill the gaps in the French Budget became clear, the excuse which the French industries wanted was provided. In his secret report to the French Government M. Dariac, after describing the coal and iron industries on both banks of the Rhine, concludes: "This is a question which must be for us beyond all discussion. These are the guarantees, which we must on no account relinquish."

The demand for the economic union of the areas in which the Ruhr and Saar coal, the Lorraine and Longwy-Briey ores are situated, has not been confined to France. As far back as May, 1915, when the German heavy industries were beginning to make their voices more and more heard in the councils of the junker Government of Germany, a document was written by the confidential

Ir.

ď

n,

1

.....

parliamentary agent of the National Liberals, Herr Stresemann, on behalf of the Zentralverband Deutscher Industrieller and Bund der Deutschen Industriellen, containing the following passages: "In addition to the acquisition by us of the iron region of Briey, the coal departments of the Pas de Calais ought also to be included. The acquisition of these territories makes it essential that the population of these regions should not be allowed to exercise political influence on German policy, and therefore the mining and other properties here should be taken over and the owners compensated by the French Government. . . . Our monthly production of steel is now one million tons. But this does not fully cover our requirements and an increase is desirable. The basis for this increase is the minette in Lorraine united with that of North France. But if we were to give back the fortress of Longwy with the numerous smelting furnaces in that region to the French, then we should have to carry on the next war with the enemy guns threatening the greater part of our Luxemburg steel plants." And so we see that the Dariac and the Stresemann reports, although separated by seven years from one another, speak one and the same language. They say: union of coke and iron ore. But as the events since 1914 have shown this is only possible in one of three ways. Either the Ruhr coke subordinates Lorraine and Longwy-Briey iron ore to its will (the Stresemann solution), or the Lorraine and Longwy-Briey ore subordinates the Ruhr coke (Dariac and Comité des Forges solution), or, thirdly, the ore and the coke unable to dominate each other agree to unite on a basis of equality.

The Versailles Treaty enabled the French heavy industries, if not to dominate the iron and coal of the whole of the above-named regions, at least to go a good way on the road to so doing. In spite of the devastated areas the French coal production, which in 1913 was 40,800,000 tons, was in 1922 with the Lorraine and Saar coal 32,000,000 tons. In addition to this comes 20,000,000 tons of German coal and equivalent of coke deliveries under the Spa agreement, making the Comité des Houillères, which controls the coal distribution of France, the biggest coal merchant in Europe. The fall of the mark in Germany does not worry the Comité des Houillères, which uses the German coal, produced at sweated wages, to pay subsidies to the French coalowners and to keep the home

mi

price of coal in France down. Also the amount of iron ore at the disposal of the French Comité des Forges is bigger than that at the disposal of any other European State. The pig-iron production in France in 1922 was 5,100,000 tons, the iron ore production in 1920 and 1921 13,800,000 and 14,100,000 tons against 12,700,000 and 3,400,000 tons in England, while France's steel exports have risen from 400,000 tons in 1913 to 1,300,000 tons in 1922. Against this the German Verein der Deutschen Eisenhütten has lost 75 per cent. of its iron ore sources, and the Kohlensyndikat has, in addition to the loss of 10 per cent. in that part of Upper Silesia ceded to Poland, and 15 per cent. lost in Lorraine and the Saar, to give up another 10 per cent. of its coal production under the Spa Nevertheless, this great increase in the industrial strength of the Comité des Forges and of the Comité des Houillères over against its German counterparts has not brought about the complete domination of the former over the coal and iron resources of Western and Central Europe. The Saar coal acquired by the French under the treaty has proved itself entirely unfit for coking, being of too soft and gaseous a nature. English coke is too dear, The Lorraine and Longwy blast and cost of transport great. furnaces therefore have been to a large extent dependent upon the Ruhr, which is the only large area where there are numerous coal seams containing the requisite percentage of carbon, gas, and ash to make good coke. And the German Kohlensyndikat has not been slow to use its control over this valuable coke source to its own advantage. It has obstructed every attempt of the Comité des Houillères to alter the Spa programme and to secure that instead of 1,720,000 tons of coal monthly France shall receive 1,775,000 tons, of which 620,000 tons shall be coke and 100,000 tons fine coal for coking. The amount demanded is practically the same, but the Comité des Forges asks that instead of sending non-coking coal to glut the French markets, an increased portion shall be converted into coke and delivered. This is what the Comité des Forges secured on paper through the Reparations Commission last August, and one of the pretexts for the present coal war is in the fact that the Kohlensyndikat has not carried out these deliveries.

But these pin-pricks of the Kohlensyndikat are all part of the game, which is to lead up to negotiations for the creation of a

Franco-German coal, iron, and steel combine for controlling the production of the Ruhr, Lorraine, Saar, Longwy-Briey, and Luxemburg. They are lovers' quarrels, which, as the present coal war shows, are often the most bitter on the eve of the announcement of the betrothal. For it is just as much a necessity for the Verein der Deutschen Eisenhütten to have a good supply of cheap Lorraine minette, bought on a falling franc, thereby saving buying at gold value Swedish and Spanish ores, as it is for the Lorraine and Longwy furnaces to have Ruhr coke. Therefore some interchange of shares in each other's undertaking, coupled with purchase and sale agreements, is becoming a vital necessity for both. But will the trusts which make up the Comité des Forges and the Kohlensyndikat be content with a 50 per cent, participation in each other's concerns, or will the former demand 60 per cent. as the price of victory enforced by the bayonets of the French army, and the latter 60 per cent, on the ground that they alone have the technique and engineers to make the combine a success? That is the issue which is being decided on the Ruhr to-day.

In this connection it is interesting to see what has already been done by the German heavy industry trusts by way of co-operation and co-partnership agreements with non-German trusts. As I have pointed out in former articles since the defeat of the German revolution, two enormously powerful industrial trusts have arisen in Germany which dominate the political life of the country—the Rhine-Elbe Union (Stinnes) and the A.E.G.-Krupp-Otto Wolff Federation. Both of them have spread out their tentacles and have their connections in the City of London and Wall Street on the one hand, and in the Rue de Madrid (Paris) on the other. connections with English banks and undertakings enable them to get credit in gold for raw material purchases and also profits from participation in British exploiting enterprises in colonial parts of the earth. Also these enabled them to fall back on English coal for the finishing metal industries in their trusts, in the event of a breach with the Comité des Forges. On the other hand, both the Stinnes and the anti-Stinnes trusts have French connections, but in neither case, where subsidiary companies have been formed to exploit a certain enterprise, has the participation been equal. The French have in nearly all cases secured a controlling influence. Nevertheless

Digitized by Google

the principle of co-operation and division of profits between French and German capitalists has in the last two years been accepted and become a fact.

The Stinnes trust is less internationally connected than its rival, but nevertheless its connections are not unimportant. Its iron and smelting properties in Luxemburg were bought out at the end of the war in cash, so that it has now no share in the Société des Terre Rouges, which has taken them over. But in Czecho-Slovakia it has formed a subsidiary company with participation of Schneider-Creusot (an important member of the Comité des Forges) to control the metal trade, in Austria it is in partnership with Italian capital (Castiglioni) in the Alpino-Montana mines, and in Hungary with British City banks in the Anglo-Hungarian bank. Another French connection is between one of its members, Siemens-Halske and Siemens-Schuckert, and the Syndicat des Constructeurs en Ciment Armé.

The A.E.G.-Krupp-Otto Wolff Federation have the following international connections. Through the Phœnix A.G. and thereby the Hamburg-America Line, it comes in contact with the Harriman concern in America; through the Anglo-German banking house Kleinwert (London) with the Russo-Asiatic Consolidated in the City and with Vickers. The exact share percentage held by the German trust in these English concerns is not yet known. Then through two of its members, the Haniel group and the Phœnix A.G., it has a minority participation in the French Société Metallurgique de Knutange, exploiting its former properties in Lorraine through the Röchling bank, a minority participation in the Société Lorraine Minière et Metallurgique and the Acières de Longwy, formed to take over its properties after the war in Lorraine and North France, through Felten Guilleaume a minority participation in the Société de Terre Rouge, and the "Arbed" behind which stands de Wendel, Schneider-Creusot, and the Belgian Bank de Brusselles. In all these participations, except the one through Röchling, the German trust is in a minority of 40 per cent. Röchling, however, has succeeded in acquiring 60 per cent., thus controlling a joint Franco-German enterprise in Lorraine under the shadow of French bayonets. This perhaps is the first swallow announcing the summer.

It is not possible at the present time to say that one or other of the two German trusts tends more towards industrial alliance with the French heavy industries and the other more to London City and Wall Street. A year ago it was possible to see a pro-French tendency in one and a pro-English one in the other. This may have been because a bitter struggle was being fought between them in Germany. But last autumn Stinnes, who until then had poor international connections and little German bank capital behind him, fearing the coming of a stable currency under Anglo-American banking pressure, made haste to acquire one-third of the shares in the Berliner Handelsgesellschaft, the bank of the A.E.G. then, although the competition between the two trusts continues as before, there is more than one point now where they overlap and even co-operate for limited ends. Before both of them now lies the question, whether they are to develop their French connections, aim at the coal, iron, and steel combine with the Comité des Houillères and the Comité des Forges, pass through a period of crisis while the mark is being tuned up to the level of the French franc, as has already happened in the Saar and will happen in the Ruhr if the French army stays there, but in exchange for this get the unity of the mineral resources of the western part of the European continent. That this solution has much attraction for Herr Stinnes no one can doubt after his utterances during this last year. Thus at a meeting of the Westphalian industrialists last June he said that the German heavy industries must concentrate on coke production for export, and that the rest of Germany would have to look elsewhere for its supplies. Also he said: "We must at all costs have a definite settlement of reparations, even if it means the occupation of the Ruhr by the French." Again, on December 6, the Zeit, organ of the heavy industry Volkspartei and closely connected with Stresemann, referring to the unification of German coking with French smelting interests, said that this solution must be aimed at, even if it means that the German concerns hand over ready cash to the French concerns in compensation.

That the French trusts have shown from time to time a readiness to come to an understanding is undoubted. Thus, when the question of the division of Upper Silesia after the plebiscite had to be decided, it is a fact, though not generally known, that members of

the Comité des Forges proposed that if the German interests owning coal mines and smelting plants in Upper Silesia would agree to a French participation of 20 per cent. in these German undertakings, the French Government would leave the whole Silesian industrial area within the German political system. This was refused by the German Government under pressure from the directors of the mining and smelting interests in the Ruhr, mainly from the Stinnes trust. Even now in the Polish part of Upper Silesia the French have not taken more than 20 per cent. of the shares in the great Hohenlohe concern and the management is left in German hands. Again, shortly before January, 1923, negotiations were going on in Paris and Berlin, through confidential agents of the two German trusts and the Comité des Forges, for the creation of the Franco-German Combine. But the Germans laid down conditions unacceptable for the French. Trusting to the fall of the mark, which enables them to keep the gold value of wages at an everdecreasing ratio to selling prices of industrial products, and knowing that the French heavy industries are suffering from difficulties in placing their products in countries with a currency more depreciated than theirs, they stubbornly refused to consider a combine in which they did not have the controlling interests, or at least a 50 per cent. participation. The reply to this has been the military occupation of the Ruhr and the new economic "sanctions" of the French, which will lead logically to the introduction of a higher currency than the mark in the Rhineland and Ruhr. This is an attempt to make it impossible for the Ruhr industries to keep their markets in the rest of Germany by raising Ruhr coal prices to the level of the prices in France. The same measures have led in the Saar already to coal being quoted there at 836 marks a ton, while on the right bank of the Rhine it was quoted at 300 marks. If the German trusts accept this position they lose their home markets. But they would increase their investments in French industrial concerns and they would probably be ready to agree, if they got at least a fifty per cent. participation in the French trusts. That they have a good idea of the value of the properties which are at stake, is seen from the Stock Exchange reports of the Bergwerks Zeitung for January 30, the organ of the Westphalian heavy industries, which says: "The developments in the Ruhr have called the attention of the world to 2

2

E,

the fact that colossal and valuable properties exist here. Both home and foreign investors are tumbling over each other for shares in them. This is the cause of the great rise in the value of Westphalian industrials at a time when the enemy is in the land."

The other chance before the German trusts is to extend their liaisons with English and American banks and businesses. would beamuch more painful operation and would probably mean the shutting down of the greater part of the German industries, because large credits for coal and raw material in high valuta lands could only be obtained by stabilising the mark and bringing it in some fixed relation to the sterling and dollar. The unemployment which would follow from this is appalling to contemplate. But the German trusts would not lose, for they would increase their holdings in valuable industrial securities and other investments in England and America. On the other hand this method would reduce Germany to a vast pawnbroker's shop, in which English and American banks would buy up the national property at knockout prices and the German trusts would get their commissions and a share in the subsequent profits. It would mean a conversion of huge blocks of active capital into passive capital. The former holders of German industrial shares would now hold the scrip of currency loans and mortgages on the public works of Germany. The dead weight of interest-bearing paper would press down as an intolerable burden upon the German population, who would be unemployed to an even greater extent than in England to-day. Some such solution is clearly what the Executive Council of the British Associated Chambers of Commerce had in mind when it issued its memorandum recently on the reparation problems. It proposes the seizure of Germany's maritime customs, to be administered by the Allies in the service of a loan (it could only be a British or American loan) of one milliard sterling for currency stabilisation and reparation payment. And is one not to assume that this is the course recommended as a solution of the reparations problem by the Joint Council of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, in its recent manifesto published immediately after the French occupation of the Ruhr? No actual mention is made of a loan, but after a preamble condemning a policy which "cripples Germany's purchasing power and destroys

×

her credit" it goes on to demand amongst other things the making of "a formal proposal for the reference of the whole reparation problem (including the present action of the French Government) to the League of Nations." In other words, it would call in that same body, which may be more truly styled the political organ of the Pierpont Morgan, Rothschild, and various international Jewish banking houses from the Frankfurt ghetto. These will lend to any bankrupt State in Europe credit on terms. We know the terms in Austria—the dismissal of thousands of State employees without provision for their future, the seizure of important public revenues, and the relinquishing of the control over the State finances by the Austrian Parliament in favour of a foreign financial commission. This is the alternative for Germany to the Franco-German coal and iron combine. In place of sweated wages and ever-falling currencies the German workers will be paying tribute to the international money-lords in unemployment. From the inflationist frying-pan they will have jumped, with the applause of British Labour leaders, into the deflationist fire.

I cannot think that those who framed the manifesto of the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party are aware of the true nature of the remedies they propose and of the people whom they look upon as saviours of society. But it is satisfactory to see that the I.L.P. has, no doubt under the pressure of the militants from Scotland, demanded the complete scrapping of the Versailles Treaty and of the whole policy of reparations. It is necessary to add, however, that the only way for the producers of wealth in Europe to escape from slavery under a Franco-German coal and iron combine on the one hand, and being sold up like old iron to the international Shylocks of finance masquerading under the name of the League of Nations on the other, is to combine to down the heavy industry trusts and make the great mineral resources in the basin of the Rhine and Moselle European public property to be worked in the interests of all.

Digitized by Google

# THE LABOUR MOVE-MENT AND THE UNEMPLOYED

#### By R. PAGE ARNOT

OR two and a-half years now a large proportion of the workers of this country have been unemployed. Throughout the whole of these thirty months nearly two million wage-earners have been living in great poverty, bordering on starvation: some of them have been like this for three years. Their condition has now come to be taken as a matter of course. Nobody thinks twice about them. They have become, as it were, a permanent feature of our civilisation.

Yet, if one pauses to reflect for even a moment, then the fact that one out of every nine wage-earners is unable to earn a wage, that these millions (counting their families) have been starving slowly since the autumn of 1920, suddenly acquires a deep significance. It is seen at once not as a permanent feature, explicable in lecture rooms, of a continuing capitalist civilisation, but as a sign that this civilisation is waning to its end.

But obviously men do not see it in this way. Nor, though remarkable, is this by any means hard to explain. The historic parallel is not difficult to find. It is clear to us that when the Roman Empire had begun to crumble to pieces, no one, or at any rate no body of men seem to have been capable of understanding exactly what was taking place. Politicians and civil servants, capitalists and trade unionists, shopkeepers and merchants—they all went about their business as usual, accepting every fresh calamity (after a little squealing) as a matter of course, and doing nothing in the vain hope that sooner or later they would get back to normal times.

In all our surroundings, in all the news of foreign events, there is only one thing which is of any real importance, that is the existence

in this country of nearly two million men and women who have no work to do and have not had work for two and a-half years.

Confronted with what is euphemistically called "the slump," the Government of Great Britain found itself completely incapable of providing any measure by which to surmount the difficulty. Its immediate efforts were centred on balancing the Budget because, for the first time within memory, there was a danger that the national accounts of the United Kingdom might show a deficit. Apart from this the attitude of the Government was no different from the mob of financiers and capitalists who kept repeating during the last months of 1920 (as they were to keep on repeating during the whole of 1921 and 1922) that there was bound, very shortly, to be a revival of trade. Save for this parrot cry no power of foresight was shown anywhere. What of the unemployed? As for them they, like the other workers, would have to "grin and bear it." The Government was not particularly concerned as to what might happen to the workers provided that their "wages came down to an economic level." In pursuance of this they hurled the miners and the agricultural workers into the abyss by withdrawing control of the coalfields at the orders of the coalowners, and by flinging overboard the Corn Production Act in order to balance the Budget. Thereafter the Geddes Axe was forged and sharpened to fall upon the working-class standards of education, housing, health provisions, and so on. To the Government the unemployed were simply pawns in the game: they did not starve them because starved men are difficult to manage, and may also become unemployable. They kept them on a dole, and by frequent shifting of Insurance Acts displayed both their own complete lack of any settled outlook on the future, and at the same time contrived always to make the lot of the unemployed a little worse. Administratively too, the same policy was carried out. Sir Alfred Mond was set to grind the faces of the poor. Every other means by which the unemployed could be prevented from becoming a nuisance on the one hand, and on the other hand driven to seek sustenance even at the cost of cutting wages, was systematically employed. At the end of two and a-half years the Government

DIVILIZED by Google

#### The Labour Movement and the Unemployed 149

policy as regards the bringing of wages to an economic level has been completely successful. Yet their success has done nothing to solve the problem confronting them; they have defeated the Labour Movement, they have defeated the unemployed, but they cannot defeat unemployment. The measure of their fundamental helplessness is that they are still repeating like witch doctors the magic words "There is every sign of a trade revival."

But if the leaders of capitalism have been no better than witch doctors, the leaders of Labour have been like the ignorant believers in their witchcraft. The working class has been defeated, not because of the force of capital's attack so much as from the fact that there was no power of resistance shown, no attempt made to organise that resistance. The most remarkable thing is that this unemployment was treated as a "question" and a "problem" instead of being itself a call to action of the whole of the workers against the capitalists. Actually, instead of this call to action of the whole of the workers, the men who were unemployed were abandoned, thrown back upon themselves. They were left to organise themselves-for themselves. There began the separate organisation of the unemployed—an incredible thing. To organise the unemployed was to reject the possible and obvious, and instead to attempt the impossible. Nevertheless this impossible thing was attempted, and the fundamentally unsound idea of organising an evil was put into operation. Once begun, the separateness of the organisation was allowed to develop. No contact was kept between the organised workers and the men who were unemployed. The unions did nothing; the Trades' Councils did nothing; the Labour Party did nothing; the Independent Labour Party did nothing. It was only a few individual communists who, in their leading of the unemployed tried to make the men out of work feel that they were part of the working class in its struggle against capitalism, and that they must therefore act, not as organised blacklegs, but against blacklegging, against rate-cutting and acceptance of sweated conditions. The National Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement formed agitational committees, but as these were not created or backed by the whole of the workers they became centres of agitation with a limited objective and for the special use of the unemployed. Therefore, from its

very nature, the separate organisation of the unemployed could not prosper.

It is true that there was a period just at the end of 1920 when it was beginning to dawn on some minds that unemployment was something that demanded not an outlook or an attitude, but action, concerted, prepared for, and carried through with skill and determination. At the Conference of December 29, 1920, called to deal with Ireland, there was passed, at the request of the Counci of Action, a resolution which, amid some questionable declarations, demanded maintenance, fixed a rate, and finally in threatening tones stated that

Both the unemployed and the employed workers are not prepared to remain the victims of the pernicious economic system which exposes them and their families to hardship and demoralisation as a consequence of unemployment.

Here in this hastily passed resolution there was a chance. Here, building on this, it was possible to form up the ranks and, as far as could be, control the situation as it developed. What actually happened? The next month, January, unemployment had bounded up by 308,000, and the Cabinet had appointed a Committee to deal with the matter. Quite rightly the Joint Meeting of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive Committee of the the Labour Party refused to serve on this Committee, but their positive proposal was of very little use. Their bold counter-stroke was themselves to set up a committee of their own. Their words were:—

This joint meeting of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the National Executive of the Labour Party unanimously rejects the Government's invitation to appoint representatives to a Committee of Inquiry upon Unemployment; and decides to appoint its own committee to formulate practical schemes for securing immediate relief for those now unemployed, and definite proposals for dealing with the whole problem as one of national urgency: such schemes and proposals to be submitted for consideration and endorsement to a special Joint National Conference of the Trade Union Movement and the Labour Party on January 27, 1921.

Nevertheless, something might have come out of it if there had been either grasp or foresight shown, but all that that Con-

#### The Labour Movement and the Unemployed 151

n in

10.72

200

I

to to

no:

M.

世

ference of January 27 did was to adopt the report of its own Committee—consisting almost entirely of excellent proposals which Mr. Sidney Webb had been putting forward pretty regularly from 1897 onwards—and then adjourn for a month. The Conference had cost nearly £5,000. When the adjourned Conference met it was only to pass one of the most feeble resolutions ever recorded. It found the Government's policy "lamentably inadequate," it "emphatically reiterated" its previous demands, in addition it put forward certain proposals of a positive nature: these require to be quoted:—

The Conference concurs with the proposal of the Parliamentary Labour Party that every possible step should be taken to press this question on the attention of the House of Commons, and to insist that the Government take immediate action for the benefit of the unemployed.

The Conference further invites the Executive Committee of every trade union to secure the affiliation of all its branches to the local Labour Parties and bring all its members actively into political work, in order to take the earliest possible steps to promote a Labour candidate for every constituency in which this has not yet been done.

The Conference further declares that every opportunity should be taken to use the by-elections as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the Government by defeating every Coalition candidate.

In conclusion, the Conference calls upon every wage-earning elector in East Woolwich, Dudley, Penistone, and Kirkcaldy Boroughs to mark his or her sense of the callous refusal of the Government to deal adequately with unemployment by voting for the Labour candidates.

A hostile critic might affect to praise these proposals on the ground that they admitted the bankruptcy of the Labour Party and so were at least honest. Certainly the last clause seems to suggest that the wage-earning electors should be guided, not by any hope in what the Labour Party might do, but simply by hatred of the vices of the Government.

It is worth while to pause for a moment on the circumstances of this Conference, which was so typical of many conferences, and in dwelling upon it we may come upon one of the root evils of the movement. Action after December had been postponed until the January Conference. At that January Conference in the thousand

The

k

zi,

Semerated on 2025-02-26 20:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.39112061987298 Public Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathifrust.org/access-usoWpd-us word resolution that was passed there occurred the following operative clause:—

"This Conference shall stand adjourned until Wednesday, February 23, to enable the Executives of the Trade Unions to take the opinion of their members in order to decide on any further steps that may be necessary to secure the adoption of its recommendations."

This operative clause could have been interpreted as meaning that the delay of a month in waiting for the January Conference was to be excused on the grounds that the unions, having conferred together, would under this clause return ready for instant mobilisation of all their members, all their money, and all their other forces.

When the February Conference met a month later it was discovered that a number of unions had not troubled to make these vital preparations. How large was that number? Were there ten unions so remiss? Were there as many as twenty? Or, since the total number affiliated either to the Trades Union Congress or the Labour Party is over 200, might there be as many as twenty-five who had completely lost their sense of fellowship and the duties that fellowship brings? The answer to this question is almost unbelievable. It is that out of all the trade unions the Labour Party Report shows only one union which fully carried out the instructions in this clause solemnly passed at a special conference costing thousands of pounds contributed by the workers for the purpose of saving the workers from the evils of unemployment. And the remarkable thing is that though the one union which took the ballot of its members as to whether they would agree to a one day strike against the Government is a union whose members are generally reckoned amongst the most moderate and backward of the working class (in a political sense), the result of the ballot was 32,368 against 4,369 in favour of a general strike. If this was so with one union—and a union of this kind what would it have been with the others? The truth is that the workers were profoundly stirred in the beginning of 1921 when they realised that the hunger and want they had known in 1908, that they or their parents before them had known in the 'nineties and the 'eighties, and their grandfathers before them in the hungry

## The Labour Movement and the Unemployed 153

m

163

180

25

b

TO.

N.

5

et

ø

ø

'forties, was again about to be their lot and the lot of their children. They were resolved to get rid of it if they could. Had they been led in January, 1921, they would have marched and marched willingly. Therefore, it is not the attitude of the workers themselves that must be blamed, but that of their officials and leaders, whose reluctance to stand boldly at the head of the workers and fight the capitalists amounted to the grossest social treachery. (Four months later at Brighton one leader was quoted as having said: "We will do nothing to embarrass the Government.") Why, even the most right-wing Kaiser-true social democrat would have seen that merely as a matter of political tactics the spreading of a great agitation amongst the workers, bringing every sort of pressure to bear upon the Government, would have strengthened parliamentary opposition and weakened the Government correspondingly. But even from the point of view of parliamentary gain they were unable to realise what a weapon was in their hands. Perhaps some of them did realise it, but decided it was better "not to embarrass the Government." How great a weapon was cast away, and to what revolutionary policy it could be attached, was shown a few months later when the least little bit of that revolutionary policy, the small desperate effort of Poplar, aroused an almost unparalleled enthusiasm amongst the masses. Poplar was only a little outpost; in Poplar they were doing no more than relieving the misery they were too late to prevent; but the working class of Poplar, on behalf of that little, and against the capitalist Government, threw themselves into the struggle with an energy and spirit which only the repeated adjurations of the Poplar Councillors themselves prevented from developing into mass action on a larger scale. Thus, in those two vital months of January and February, Labour missed the revolutionary issue.

Why was there this failure? The answer is because the leaders looked at everything through bourgeois spectacles: Keynes had been their economist, not Marx. They too, like the rest of the capitalist world, have muttered their charms, and wrung their hands helplessly, awaiting a revival of trade. It is true that they have never hesitated to stigmatise unemployment as part of the present system, and irremediable as long as the present system lasts. This view has been hugged as if it was the extreme demonstra-

tion of a Socialist outlook; as if whatever steps they took, or failed to take, they would still be sound revolutionaries at heart. But the utterance of this truism is not limited to Labour leaders. Even the King's speech on the occasion of the opening of the 1921 session contained the remark, " This terrible unemployment which we are seeing to-day cannot be solved by legislation." While Mr. Bonar Law has said his say to the same effect a couple of months ago. The fact that unemployment is part of the system is not an argument for fatalism, is not a reason for refusing to embarrass the Government ("We and the Government are in the same boat after all"). It is a reason for using it as a weapon to wring every possible concession out of the capitalists by agitation and arousing the masses, and then, when the masses have been aroused, and when everything possible under the system has been extorted from the capitalists, for overthrowing that system as a whole.

So far we have dealt with the effect of the failure of 1920-1921 on the unemployed, but that was not the only effect. When failures come, they come not as single spies, but in battalions; and now the Labour Movement is sapped and ruined almost beyond repair. Those who did not stand by the unemployed in January were not likely to fight for the miners in April, and as the decay of courage and solidarity proceeded, a year later they were bound to let down the engineers. 1922 simply continued the story of disintegration and failure. The membership of the unions has dropped right away down, their funds have run out, their resources have gone. Between September, 1921, and September, 1922, membership affiliated to the Trades Union Congress had fallen, without any intervening disaffiliation of a union, from 6,417,910 to 5,128,648. The strongly organised and highly-skilled metal workers dropped down like a plummet. A year ago the A.E.U. had 425,714 members, to-day it has only 333,123, a fall of 21 per cent. Nor is this unrepresentative. In actual fact there are many unions where the proportionate drop has been still greater. There are unions which have not published—and, perhaps, dare not publish—their membership figures. Not only have funds been depleted, but union after union has been compelled to suspend payment of this or that benefit. In the cotton industry, in the engineering industry, in

## The Labour Movement and the Unemployed 155

various crafts running throughout all the industries, benefits have been suspended. Wages have been steadily dropping. Agreement after agreement has been concluded with as little publicity as possible, and the wages of the workers thus let down to a degree which would have been thought impossible three years ago. More and more wages questions are being "referred for local settlement"-a dreadful phrase which conceals the collapse of the standardised wage scales built up within the last ten years. But worst of all, the failure that began in the winter of 1920 has so eaten its way into the heart of trade unionism that the workers are ceasing to believe in the value of organisation. They are becoming cynical. Those whom trade unionism has failed are beginning to repeat that phrase of despair, " each for himself": what good, they say, has trade unionism been to us. There we have the picture : on the one hand the working class losing its faith in trade unionism; on the other the incredible spectacle of trade union officials' minds moving in the narrow circle of wondering whether the next week's contributions will be able to pay their salaries.

For every single thing that has gone wrong—and nearly everything except parliamentary representation has gone wrong—this failure to deal with unemployment is principally responsible. Whatever the trade unions or their officials do, this dogs their footsteps. Marching by their side goes Holbein's Death: whatever the Labour Movement is doing, there too is the grinning skeleton with his whip.

But, it may be said, what of these parliamentary successes; is not Parliament a means by which to rescue the Labour Movement? Will not the parliamentary fight restore the drooping spirits and hearten the masses? The answer to that question is another. Will Parliament restore the miner's wage or give back to the engineer's family the sticks that were sold up in the lock-out? Parliamentary agitation, combined with a real agitation and mass action outside, can do much. Parliament alone can do nothing. To this we return later.

By the autumn of last year the enthusiasm of the workers' movement was almost completely dead, while the separate organisation

The L

niers.

and I

mbles

k N

big

mi

1

Men

N

b

NO.

2025-02-26 20:32 GWT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987290 in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access-useMpd-us-google of the unemployed which had flared up like a flash in the pan in the summer of the previous year had also almost completely died away. The ordinary British public had settled down into a blissful forgetfulness of unemployment. In the suburban railway carriages they had forgotten the existence of the unemployed. They were shortly to be reminded of it. Some curious dramatic instinct was at work. Who first made the suggestion is not known; but presently, and as if spontaneously, the idea of a march of the unemployed upon London began to be talked of. The National Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement took in hand its organisation, and throughout the latter part of September and October bodies of unemployed men, like the hunger marchers of 1909, were converging on London. For a time the Press boycotted it or gave it very little mention. Something, however, in it had the quality that arouses widespread attention. Its original purpose had been that these hunger marchers should meet Lloyd George, then the chief ruler of Britain. It appeared to be something like one of the pilgrimages of the Middle Ages. It was not merely a dramatic, it was a romantic move. The romance was heightened when the prosaic Mr. Bonar Law, unable as his predecessor would have been to rise to the occasion and large-heartedly promise them nothing, stonily refused to see them at all. Meantime the new Parliament had been returned while these men were tramping down along the The new Socialist members were eager to win English roads. their spurs and, themselves responsive to popular excitement, pressed vehemently for Bonar Law to see the marchers. The final touch of romance was added by Scotland Yard, whose confidential Press organs proclaimed the existence of a Red plot, a Moscowengineered attempt at insurrection, and its own brave intention to spoil the rascals' game, while with a courteous insistence they besought the general public to keep away from the Whitehall area where skulls were going to be cracked. A drama, however, cannot last for more than a certain limited time. By the middle of December when it had become clear that Bonar Law was not likely to yield, that the marchers were not likely to storm the West End, and the police were not likely to be given the opportunity of saving society, the interest of the public began to flag, and with the subsiding of public interest there subsided also the lively and concentrated

#### The Labour Movement and the Unemployed 157

interest that had been displayed by the members of Parliament and leaders of the unions. The advertising of unemployment had served to stir up the Cabinet to announce a reconsideration of the problem: it had made the middle classes once more aware of the unemployed under the name of Hunger Marchers, and it had stimulated the General Council into receiving a deputation from the National Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement and to a series of joint demonstrations. But Bonar Law had not been seen in the flesh. The nominal object of their march had been unfulfilled and there was much disappointment in the ranks. Advertising unemployment has its limits.

Nevertheless, in spite of the failure of the march to gain its ostensible object, in spite of the limited uses of advertisement, the Hunger March is not without objective value. That value is found in the simple fact that throughout the English towns men were marching hither and thither, meeting with sometimes a friendly, sometimes a hostile reception, passing through country-sides where the workers came to look at them as at some strange and wondrous procession. All this has meant that by word of mouth, by actual sight and touch, the workers of these towns and villages through which the marchers passed have seen unemployment as a spectacle, have looked upon these men marching like slaves in the triumphal procession of capitalism. Without word spoken, without any tale told of the miseries endured, these marchers have made many people realise capitalism as a process, made them see their own lives and their subjection to the system. This has had an organising value. Once men see things, they have set out to abolish them ; and this march, if it has achieved nothing else, has meant that the masses have begun to organise themselves. This is its main value. And this must not be overlooked.

Nevertheless, this value will be lost unless the organisation thus begun is carried through and followed by action. Unfortunately nothing has happened. Something worse than that, a sham thing has begun to happen. The whole issue of the hunger march is going to be confined to the relations between the General Council and the National Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement. Already discussions of policy within that Movement have contracted to this, that the main issue for these two millions

The

slowly starving is put forward as "Affiliation to the Trades Union Congress." Actually after two years the net result of the disorganisation of the working-class bodies is the question of affiliation or non-affiliation to the T.U.C., that is whether the N.U.W.C.M. is to be treated as a trade union, its officials as trade union officials, and its speakers recognised Labour speakers, standing on the joint platform. There is simply no sign of any policy having evolved from the alliance of the General Council and the N.U.W.C.M. Neither from the one side nor the other has there come anything more constructive than proposals for joint demonstrations.

This is the most serious thing at the present moment. It means that, unless a policy is evolved, we shall simply have a reproduction of the failure of two years ago. Only this time the failure will involve the new unemployed organisation in the general discredit; and the broken men who in the failure of trade unionism had themselves reared up an organisation will be finally persuaded that all their efforts are in vain, that all officials are like Walt Whitman's elected persons, and that organisation and solidarity of any kind is not merely sentimental but useless. This, then, is the position in the spring of 1923, that after two and a-half years there is no unemployed policy in the whole Labour Movement. On the other hand there is no hope to be found by looking abroad and expecting a revival of trade, or in looking to the Government and imagining that anything will come from its mingled impotence and insolence. At the moment, it is true, it seems that at last there is some little warrant for the parrot cry of Trade Revival, repeated in ever shriller tones for the last thirty months. It is just possible that for a temporary period the difficulties of the French bourgeoisie in the Ruhr may enable England temporarily to capture the Mediterranean and European market, such as it is. The production of steel may come up, and coal and manufactured goods may increase, but it will not last. There is still no sign whatever of permanent revival and the end of temporary revival with its falling back into a slump will be worse than the beginning. There is no hope then of avoiding the burden of framing a policy by waiting hopefully on the course of events.

The position of the Government is not weak but stronger than ever. The unemployed strategists have reached the end of their THE PART OF THE PARTY OF THE PA

. . . . . . .

le.net/2027/uiug.30112061987290 / http://www.hetbitrust.org/access

An the United States, Google-digitized

tether; driven by the lowness of the State dole they were able for a time to exploit the resources of local government. "Go to the Guardians" was good tactics, but it has yielded the inevitable result that the Guardians are either bankrupt or have been replaced by hard-faced men whose business it is to guard the rates. The cry "Go to the Guardians" is a good lead, but it was not a long suit. The long suit was held by the Government which could afford to disregard the outcry from the more excitable members of the middle class, which could shut its eyes to many acts of partial violence on the part of the unemployed, such as mobbing the guardians, because it was bound to win in the end. The Fabian policy of Giolitti in Italy towards the metal workers was followed in England by the British Government towards the unemployed, The motto was "Let the Labour Guardians force up the rates, the rising rates will force out the Guardians"; and wherever the Labour policy had not been carried right through as it was in Poplar Borough, the calculations of the bourgeoisie were successful. Now in 1923 the bankruptcy of local government together with the gap system leave very few chances for the unemployed. There is no longer much to be gained by "tactics": the unemployed leaders, too, cannot escape the burden of working out a policy for the whole of the workers.

The time when there were alternatives is now past. There is now no choice left. Everything else has failed or will fail or by partial success will only deceive the more. The only action which has not yet been tried is the action of the workers themselves. The workers themselves-that does not mean the customary "great campaigns" and "nation-wide agitations" of the past, campaigns and agitations which never got outside the newspaper offices in which they were conceived: nor does it mean the somewhat potvaliant resolutions of executives and conferences, assemblies of chiefs without an army. To rouse the masses, to set these elemental forces in motion, needs nothing but the will to do it and the energy to carry out what has been willed. The actual steps are clear. Definite demands must be put forward in such a way that it becomes unmistakably clear to everyone exactly and precisely what the working-class movement stands for. maintenance must cease to be an orator's catchword. The worker

must be the first charge on the Budget-the vote must be for maintenance and against the Army and Navy. Demands once formulated must be enforced by every means in the power of the workers, leading up to the General Strike. The General Strike is reached, not by a bombastic summons from these chiefs without an army, but by every party and union presenting a united front and carrying on a continuous campaign in Parliament, in the municipalities, in the workshops, at the Labour Exchanges, on the streets, and from door to door, increasing steadily in intensity and all concentrated on one issue. When that stage has been reached it does not much matter whether the General Strike is victorious or defeated. For, if defeated, it is the defeat of a class and the defeat of a class is but a phase of victory. Real defeat is the disintegration of a class, the loss of its solidarity, the selfishness of sections, the cowardice of leaders, the corruption of an organised movement.

DIVILIZED by Google

# IRELAND AND THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS

By J. T. MURPHY

NEW stage has been reached in the struggle for Irish independence. Fourteen months after the Sein Fein forces were split by the treaty with Great Britain, after months of bitter civil war that have thrown into sharp relief the alignment of the political forces of Ireland, there arises a popular demand for peace. It is a moment when popular sentiment tends to obliterate from the public gaze those deep moving currents which sooner or later force themselves to the top. Decisions are being taken now which are all important. Upon them will depend the recurrence of confusion or the clearing of the path to victory.

The working-class movement of Britain deems itself a looker-on more or less unconcerned as to what these decisions may be. Its leaders have allied themselves to Mr. Bonar Law, the leader of British imperialism, through Mr. R. MacDonald, who has called for the blessing of the Almighty on the Free State. How entirely the fate of the British working class is bound up with the fate of Ireland, and other of the subject nations of the empire, seems to be little dreamed of or considered, either by the leaders or the workers themselves. Nevertheless, the decisions now being taken are fateful, and no time could be more opportune than the present to take the measure of our experience and of the tasks to be accomplished in relation to the Irish struggle for independence.

It has been the lot of the majority of those who have participated in or supported this struggle to gather their inspiration from an intense spirit of nationalism. Even the best of the revolutionary leaders of the Irish workers, who hated the ruling class with unsurpassable bitterness, and declared that Ireland could never be free until she had a workers' republic, saw their problem mainly as an Irish problem and not as an international problem of the

working class of the world.

Probably James Connolly was nearer to grasping the latter point of view than any other leader Ireland has produced. He, at least, made clear the part of the Irish working class in the struggle for national freedom, pointed to the workers' republic as the goal, and fought and died to give the national impulse an orientation in that direction.

Time and again the question has been raised as to why Connolly, the international socialist, led the workers of Dublin into the forefront of the Irish revolt of 1916. Some thought he had become thereby a nationalist of the deepest dye, and others that his burning hatred of the ruling class had flamed up into despair and enthralled him in a passionate desire to "wreck the great guilty temple" and find rest. But Connolly was too cool and calculating for that. He led the revolt for definite purposes, not the least of which was to demonstrate that an international socialist could and must participate in the struggles of peoples held down by imperialism.

Whether he clearly perceived all the implications of his actions we do not know. One thing is certain; his action in leading the working-class forces of Dublin to the forefront of the national struggle stamped on the pages of history, for all to see, the part which the working class of Ireland must play if ever the goal of a

workers' republic is to be attained.

This one outstanding lesson of the revolt passed by almost forgotten or unobserved by friend and foe alike. Discussion centred around the apparent contradiction between Connolly's international socialism and his association with the nationalist movement. Described as the first revolutionary socialist martyr of Ireland, his work appeared to be complete in paving the way to the saturation of the nationalist movement with socialist aspirations and ideas. That his martyrdom has done this none will deny. But this limited conception of the service he rendered only reveals the theoretical immaturity of socialism at the time, an immaturity which is still evident to-day.

It is thought by some who have an intense class hatred that international socialism ought not to worry itself about struggles for national independence. "What does it matter," they ask, "even if Ireland gets a republic? Free State or republic, the workers will still be at the bottom." By some this is used to intensify their class

#### Ireland and the International Working Class 163

E

į,

a:

Ŷ

į

7

-101

propaganda, by others to avoid responsibility and struggle. But in almost all cases the national struggle is viewed out of relation to the struggle of the workers against world imperialism. The cry for self-determination of small nations is generally declared as an absolute right, except by British Labour, which inscribes on its banner an additional qualification: "—outside the British Empire." Revolutionary "extremists" and moderate labourists alike have been bound to a narrow nationalist theoretical equipment, which has warped their actions and misdirected their energies. Labour in England has been and is as imperialistic as its masters, whilst the revolutionary movement is only slowly emerging from a narrow sectarianism almost equally baneful. Until these confused and inadequate conceptions are cleared from the minds of the workers, the path to liberation can only remain tortuous and full of the tragedy of misunderstanding.

The contradictions inherent in any one of the theories indicated above are made so vividly clear by the actualities of to-day, that one feels compelled to bow one's head in shame on realising that responsible leaders of Labour hang on to these outworn theories and make them the basis of their actions. Let us examine them briefly, one by one. The cry of "Self-determination of small nationalities" was made a slogan of the war and taken up by the Labour movement. That it was a distinct appeal to nationalist idealism none can deny. That it was meant in practice to be qualified by an unwritten proviso is equally clear from experience. This proviso reads "on condition that it does not interfere with the operations of the imperialist policy of the Great Powers." How it could be otherwise passes comprehension; imperialism signifies that capitalism has shattered the limitations of nationalism and is driving the dominant Powers towards the conquest of the whole world. To attempt to revert to a national economy is to intensify the problems of capitalism rather than to solve them. It is for this reason that imperialism keeps its colonies in thrall and subjects the "free small nations" to its domination.

There is not a socialist who can deny that the material conditions of the world are ripe for a world economy. It is because the imperialists realise this, too, that they all strive for world power; but because of their narrow foundations, rooted in the nationalism

of an epoch that cannot return, and in an economy which bids them expand as a condition of existence, they cannot create that which the life of the world demands. Self-determination of any nation can therefore never be a reality of any nation within capitalism.

As an absolute demand and conception it is doomed to a similar fate in relation to the working class. Because imperialism cannot solve the world-problem and create a single world-economy, the task falls upon the international working class, as the one social force capable of eliminating the class divisions in society and dealing with the world-economy free from the private vested interests which choke the pathway to a solution under capitalism. It is a task which involves the fate of humanity, and the workers cannot escape it. If therefore the central task is a world-task, national independence as an absolute right falls to the ground, whether viewed from an imperialist point of view or from a working-class point of view.

This conclusion does not justify the claims of the internationalists who decry the nationalist struggle of subject nations. It neither justifies the British Labour movement in limiting the demand for national independence to self-government within the Empire, nor does it give grounds for ignoring the struggle for national independence as a factor in the war for the conquest of capitalism. The struggle for national independence is more than a pious aspiration on the part of the peoples subject to an imperial power. To the working masses of these countries it is a passionate appeal to be free from the shackles of an internal and external enemy, which weighs even more heavily upon them than upon the workers of the imperialist countries. Nay, more; who can deny that even the workers of these countries, of Britain more than any country in the world, have had the rough edges of their every-day struggle softened at the expense of the workers of the colonial countries? Fighting their master class means to the latter not only fighting their masters' State, but also the super-State power of the imperialists. Is it necessary to refer to imperialist interventions in Russia and in Hungary in order to question whether British imperialism would not intervene if the workers of Ireland took the reins of power from the hands of the Free State to-day?

It is this fundamental difference between the relations of imperialism and the international working class towards the

#### Ireland and the International Working Class 165

subject nationalities that makes their war for national independence one with the war to defeat imperialism. Imperialism holds the subject nations for exploitation and retains a subordinate national exploiting class dominating the workers. The working class goes to the roots of the struggle and harnesses the workers of all lands to push over the imperialists and the national exploiters, as a means towards solving the problems of economic life and the cultural requirements of the masses of all lands.

The internationalists of the "pure" class war will agree, but fail to see the dialectic process whereby the end is achieved. They classify the imperialists with the national exploiters. That both are exploiters is true. But that their interests always coincide is untrue, or there would be no reason for national revolts of a bourgeois character. From time to time they contradict each other and fight. When thieves fall out there is a chance for the workers to advance. If they do not, the shackles are fastened tighter by the subsequent agreement among the exploiters, who are certainly not out to end their own system. If the workers are to advance, what other course lies open to them except the struggle against the imperialist power—a struggle which opens the path to victory over their own bourgeoisie.

It is only in this way that the problem of class domination in the nation can be solved. If we face it as a national issue only, and make no effort to take the leadership out of bourgeois hands—suppose by some stretch of the imagination that the imperialists could be defeated. What would we have done but laid the foundations for the development of a new capitalist imperialism? The only alternatives to an active striving for leadership in the national struggles are an adaptation to capitalism and the demands of imperialism, the arm-chair philosophy of a looker-on, or agitation for ultimate issues without a single contribution to the forces that are driving towards the goal.

The central problem of the working-class movement of the world, we repeat, is the defeat of imperialism; and upon this victory depends the liberation of the subject peoples of the earth. These national problems find no solution through a nationalistic approach to the problem. Ireland's problem is not simply an Irish problem or an English problem. It is more. It is a problem of the inter-

Divilized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN national working-class movement, and until the working class of this country and Ireland face it as such, we shall wallow in a mass of confusion, be the victims of the clap-trap of the capitalist Press, and be held up to derision throughout the world.

No phase of British history is so appalling to contemplate on the basis of the considerations we have put forward as the later period of the struggle for Irish independence. The long years of struggle against English domination found no echoing thrill in the hearts of the British workers and their leaders. They saw it only as a nuisance when it broke forth into open struggle, and either ignored it entirely at other times, or viewed it at the best through the spectacles of British Liberalism. British Labour protested against "atrocities," but never against the domination of British imperialism in Ireland, even at the worst moments of intervention. Nor did their protests amount to anything more than paper protests and resolutions. Munitions, troops, equipment went as usual. Not once did British Labour hold up a single waggon of munitions or prevent the transport of a single soldier, whilst the common imperialist enemy delivered blow on blow. When Mr. Lloyd George held the weapon of greater war at the heads of the Irish leaders, Labour made a united front with the imperialist Government against the revolting Irish nationalists. It only required the hypocritical benediction on the resulting Free State Government and the moral castigation of the Irish republicans to complete the ignominy of it all. It is time indeed for a transvaluation of our values and a fresh acquaintance with the fundamental issues that are at stake.

Throughout the seven hundred years of Britain's political domination over Ireland not a century has passed without an uprising and a forcible effort to throw off the invader. Time and again the Irish have been crushed, only to see succeeding generations renew the efforts of their fathers. Within the period of struggle the elements which waged the fight have undergone a transformation true to the capitalist era they were entering. From a fight to revert back to a social system of preceding generations, back to the clan and the commune, it became a fight in which the forces were divided into the social classes of capitalism. The capitalist class of Ireland proved no different to the capitalist of any other country, and used the sufferings of the workers and peasants as the means

#### Ireland and the International Working Class 167

to liberate themselves from the inconvenience of external domination. Always they drew from the poorer strata of the population to fight their battles, but there were few who were themselves prepared to bear the brunt of these fights for freedom. The masses went into revolt. The exploiters reaped the goods.

Throughout the whole period of their rule the British Government has never been uncertain as to what it wanted or as to which path to pursue. The policy of divide and conquer has never been more efficiently applied. From the days when it brought thousands of Protestant workers into Northern Ireland, fanned the flames of religious hatred and created an Ulster problem, to the days of recent history when it left a hole in the boundary clauses of the recent treaty and prepared the way for re-invasion through Ulster, its policy has been a masterly application of the principle of division and a guarantee against a united Ireland.

When the British ruling classes fettered Irish industry for generations, prevented the growth of an Irish merchant fleet, and placed Irish commerce at a disadvantage, they created situations which rallied the industrial workers to their employers. But in settlement they always settled with the employers and left the workers to make the best of it. When they created a land hunger, and compelled the transformation of rich cultivatible soil to pasture land for cattle rearing, and depopulated the country, they passed their Land Acts to ease the problems of the large farmers, and left the poor agrarian population in starvation. A short-sighted policy for an industrialised country to pursue with an agrarian neighbour, but never an uncertain one.

The ground for revolt has thus always been fertile, whilst the means of division rooted in the class divisions of the Irish nation were ever open to pave the way to Irish defeat. No one saw this more clearly than James Connolly, and no one did more to clarify the minds of the masses on this issue. Each succeeding revolt, rooted deep in the sufferings of the workers of town and country, had produced a further stride towards a socialist programme. But Connolly went much further by his act of 1916. He placed the working class of Ireland at the head of the nationalist movement, which rose mainly amid the agrarian elements of the nation. Had his successors realised the significance of Connolly's action and



measured up its implications, the history of the last few years in Ireland and England would have had to be written differently. If ever there was an historical illumination of the rôle of the industrial workers in the Irish struggle, it was certainly in this bold leadership of the citizen army at the head of the national struggle. It is the high-water mark in the history of the working class of Ireland, a portent of what has yet to be fulfilled more definitely and thoroughly, ere the Irish workers' republic can become a reality.

What then shall we say of the succeeding days between 1916 and 1923? Although it has been repeated until it has become axiomatic in the ranks of Irish Labour that " The progress of the fight towards national liberty of any subject nation must perforce keep pace with the progress of the struggle for liberty of the most subject class in the nation" can we say that these succeeding years have shown an appreciation either of this teaching or of the act of Connolly? Let the successor of Connolly speak for himself as leading custodian of the policy of Labour, and when reading remember the remarkable rally to Sein Fein, the split on the signing of the treaty, and the subsequent civil war. " Now by our own act we of the Labour Movement have kept out of the political arena all through. Right up to the General Election we were content to leave the control of affairs in the hands of the party and the movement that the country trusted implicitly. We did that. We submerged ourselves. We declined to use the situation for party purposes. We joined with the rest of the country and gave our support to the party that had set out to get national freedom. We did everything that we possibly could to strengthen their hands and to assist them in the task they were engaged in." (Voice of Labour, September 23, 1922.)

Here is no struggle for leadership, but "We submerged ourselves." Here is no recognition of the working class of Ireland as the custodian of Irish freedom, but the relegation of Ireland's fate into the hands of the bourgeoisie of Ireland, who had no intention of submerging themselves. And yet in the same speech he declares "I had the suspicion that Ireland would not be different from other countries and that the Labour movement of Ireland would have to put up the same fight as in other countries." Yet "We submerged ourselves." The only possible justification there

Generated on 2025-02-26 20:35 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.38112061987296 Public Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/ascss-

### Ireland and the International Working Class 169

could ever be for the Irish workers to participate in the struggle was to use the differences between the bourgeois elements of Ireland and the British imperialists as a means to defeat both and to make Ireland theirs. Until then they are Irishmen without a

country, fodder for class exploitation.

The relegation of the Irish workers to this subordinate rôle means the perpetuation of their slavery indefinitely. In a country which is preponderatingly agricultural the proletariat cannot relegate the hegemony to the farmer class, except at the price of its own failure to emerge from its existing conditions. class is never historically the pioneer of socialisation, which is the only possible means of working-class emancipation. Without the socialisation of land there can never be a real solution to the problem of the poor peasantry and agricultural labourers, or a general introduction of up-to-date methods of agriculture. These things can only come through the advancement of industry and its application to agriculture. But the conditions for socialisation are already ripe in industry, and the proletariat are compelled to take it up as an issue or pass into social decay. To take its proper rôle in Ireland as the leader in social progress it must perforce face the issue of the struggle against imperialism. In doing so Irish Labour will be placing itself in direct line with the interests of the working class of the world, and will have a basis for appeals for aid that is sounder and stronger than the political abstraction called selfdetermination.

The failure of Irish Labour to play its historic rôle during these years has driven it into the hands of its enemies. Objectively the interests of the workers are against the Free State Government. Every effort they make to improve the lot of the worker brings them up against the forces of the State. Nevertheless the policy of submergence is continued to the extent of denouncing the forces which have taken up the fight that they themselves have failed to prosecute, until it would seem that there is neither an appreciation of the rôle they ought to play or of the forces operating in their favour. First they appeared neutral in the struggle between the republicans and the Free State, and then allied themselves to the Free State. Right thoroughly we understand what would have happened had there come into being a republican bourgeois



Irela

and

Government. The workers would still have been subject, but only because of the policy that has been pursued by Labour. That is why the hour of negotiation proved to be the hour of the great betrayal of the working class. Not because it was wrong to arrive at a compromise with British imperialism. Had the workers of Ireland been at the helm in the then existing international circumstances they also would have had to compromise. It is as true to-day as in the days of Mitchell that Ireland will never be free whilst the British Empire endures. But the failure of the working class of Ireland to take the lead left the capitalist class of Ireland free to make the compromise which left the workers where they were before—slaves still to be liberated. The new triple alliance on the pages of history looks well thus: Irish Labour, Irish Free State, British imperialism—versus the interests of the workers and the republican army.

If there was any doubt about the rôle of the Free State then Lord Birkenhead, who helped to make it, can make things clear. Speaking in the House of Lords in March, 1922, he said:—

Does the noble lord really imagine that if someone had presented Queen Elizabeth with this alternative . . . If they said to her . . . "Would you rather send Lord Essex and British troops to put down the turbulent population of the south of Ireland, or would you rather deal with a man who is prepared, with Irish troops, to do it for you, who is prepared to acknowledge allegiance to yourself and who will relieve you of further anxiety and responsibility in the matter . . ." that she would have hesitated? That is the line of political development which I observe with great pleasure, and it is being followed at this particular moment.

However much we may criticise the republican forces, the fact remains that the direction of their activity is correct. It is directed against imperialism, and commands the support of the workers of Ireland and of the International so long as it keeps that direction. The failure of Irish Labour to take the lead in this republican struggle will place Labour in exactly the same position as to-day if the republicans are victorious and carry through a bourgeois programme. And the refusal to fight in any case seals the fate of Irish Labour as a body of workers who made a virtue of slavery.

Thus Ireland's tragic hours reveal again and again how deeply its liberation tasks are entwined with the fundamental task of the

#### Ireland and the International Working Class 171

1

T

international working class. Upon the men and women without property in Ireland devolves the task: to create a workers' party out of her rich supplies of revolutionary workers and fighters, a party that will lead the workers and peasants of Ireland towards the workers' republic through revolutionary struggle. This does not mean that it is the task of the Irish workers to rise arms in hand and seize power to-day or to-morrow. But it means that the whole character and direction of their activities must be towards that end.

The obligations upon the working class of Britain are equally clear. Its interests are diametrically opposed to British imperialism and so is the issue of Irish freedom from British domination. Freedom for Ireland should be stamped upon the banner of every party claiming to pursue the interests of the workers. The Irish question is an English question, but just as the Irish working class are faced with the task of assuming the lead in the task of liberation for Ireland, so it is the working class of Britain who are primarily interested in their fate. The struggle of the Irish nation is a contribution to the war against the imperialists who hold the British workers in thrall. The fate of Ireland and the fate of the British working class are tied together with the bonds of life and death. Neither can emerge from slavery whilst imperialism endures. The cry of "Freedom for Ireland," and for other subject peoples, thus proves to be not the echo of Liberal imperialism, but a rallying slogan of the international working class, drawing the victims of world imperialism into common struggle against the common enemy.

Digitized by Google

# THE HISTORY OF FASCISM—II

#### By A. BORDIGA

HE Fascisti have taken advantage of the fact, which we have already mentioned, that the socialists never had an agrarian policy, and that the interests of certain elements of the countryside which are not purely proletarian are in opposition to those of the socialists.

Fascism is an armed movement which employs all methods of the most brutal violence. It also knows how to employ the most callous methods of demagogy. The Fascisti endeavoured to form class organisations among the peasants and even among the agricultural labourers. In a certain sense they even opposed the landlords; we have examples of the syndicalist struggle, led by Fascisti, which resembled greatly the old methods of Red organisation.

We cannot consider this Fascist syndicalism, which works through the use of force and terror, as an anti-capitalist struggle, but neither can we, on the other hand, draw the conclusion that Fascism, in an immediate sense, is a movement of the agricultural employers. The fact is that Fascism is a great united movement of the dominant class, which is capable of using for its final aims any and all means, including the local interests of certain groups of employers, agricultural and industrial.

The proletariat has not properly understood the necessity of forming a united single organisation for the common struggle by sacrificing the immediate interests of small groups. It has not yet succeeded in solving this problem. The ruling class created an organisation which could defend its power; this organisation was completely in its hands, and it followed the plan of the capitalist anti-proletarian offensive.

Fascism participates in trade unionism. Why? In order to take part in the class struggle? Never! The Fascisti took part in the trade union movement saying all economic interests have the right to organise; one can form associations of workers, peasants,

business men, capitalists, landowners, &c. But all organisations should, in their activities, be subordinate to the national interest, national production, national prestige, &c.

This is nothing but a class truce, and not a class struggle. All interests are directed towards a certain national unity. This national unity is nothing more than the counter-revolutionary conservation of the bourgeois State and its institutions. In the make-up of Fascism I believe that we can count three principal factors: the State, the capitalist class, and the middle class. The State is the principal constituent of Fascism.

The news of the successive Government crises in Italy have led one to believe that the Italian capitalist class possessed a State apparatus which was so unstable that it could be made to fall at one blow.

This is not at all the case. Just at the period when its State apparatus was consolidated, the Italian bourgeoisie formed the Fascist organisation.

In the period immediately following the war the Italian State underwent a crisis. Demobilisation was the obvious reason for this crisis. Numbers of those who had taken part in the war were suddenly thrown into the labour market, and at this critical period the State machine, which had previously been organised to its highest pitch to resist the foreign enemy, now had suddenly to transform itself into the defensive machinery guarding capitalist interests against internal revolution. This is a formidable task for the bourgeoisie. They could not solve this problem of the struggle against the proletariat in a military or technical manner; it had to be done by political means.

Therefore we saw the Radical Governments of the post-war period; that of Nitti, that of Giolitti.

It was just the policy of these two politicians which rendered the subsequent victory of Fascism inevitable. They started by making concessions to the working class in the period when the State mechanism had to be consolidated. Fascism came afterwards. The Fascist criticism of these Governments, which they accuse of cowardice in the face of the revolutionaries, is merely demagogic rhetoric.

Digitized by Google

As a matter of fact, the Fascist victory has been possible precisely because of the first Cabinets of the post-war period.

Nitti and Giolitti made certain concessions to the working class. They acceded to certain demands of the Socialist Party: demobilisation, a democratic regime, and amnesty for deserters. They made these concessions in order to gain time to re-establish their State on a solid basis. It was Nitti who organised the "Royal Guard," an organisation not purely of the police type, but of the new type, the militarist. One of the great errors of the reformist socialists was that they did not consider important the question, which they could have presented on constitutional grounds, of the formation by the State of an auxiliary army. This point was not grasped by the socialists, who regarded Nitti as a man with whom they could very well collaborate in a Left Government. This is one more proof of the fundamental incapacity of the Socialist Party to understand the development of Italian politics.

Giolitti completed the labours of Nitti. It was Bonomi, Minister of War in the Giolitti Cabinet, who fostered the beginning of Fascism; he placed at the disposal of this young movement demobilised officers who, although re-entered into civil life, were still in receipt of a large portion of their army salaries.

He placed at the disposal of the Fascisti the State machine in as large a measure as possible. He gave them every possible facility

for organising their fighting forces.

The Government realised that it would be an error to engage in a real struggle in the period when the armed proletariat occupied the factories and the agricultural proletariat showed signs of being about to seize the Crown lands.

This Government, which had done the preliminary organisation work of that reactionary force with which they desired one day to destroy the proletarian movement, was aided in its strategy by the treacherous leaders of the General Federation of Labour, who were then members of the Socialist Party. By conceding the law of Workers' Control, which has never been applied or even voted, the Government was able to re-establish the stability of the bourgeois State.

The proletariat was seizing the workshops and the landed estates. The Socialist Party once more failed to bring about united

action of the industrial proletariat and peasants. And it is precisely this inability to secure united action which enabled the master class to achieve counter-revolutionary unity and so defeat the industrial workers on the one hand and the agricultural workers on the other.

1

6

10

1

10

T

Ė

1

C

1:

¢.

ė

After the Nitti, Giolitti, and Bonomi Governments, we had the Facta Cabinet. This type of government was intended to cover up the complete liberty of action of Fascism in its expansion over the whole country. During the strike in August, 1922, several conflicts took place between the workers and the Fascisti, who were openly aided by the Government. One can quote the example of Bari. During a whole week of fighting, the Fascisti, in full force, were unable to defeat the Bari workers, who had retired into the working-class quarters of the old city and defended themselves by armed force. The Fascisti were forced to retreat leaving several of their number on the field. But what did the Facta Government do? During the night they surrounded the old town with thousands of soldiers and hundreds of carabineers of the Royal Guard. In the harbour a torpedo boat trained its guns on the workers. Armoured cars and guns were brought up. The workers were taken by surprise during their sleep, the proletarian leaders were arrested, Labour headquarters were occupied. This was the same throughout the country. Wherever Fascism had been beaten back by the workers the power of the State intervened; workers who resisted were shot down; workers who were guilty of nothing but self-defence were arrested and sentenced; while the magistrates systematically acquitted the Fascisti, who were generally known to have committed innumerable crimes.

Thus the State was the main factor in the development of Fascism.

The second factor was the co-operation, as I have already said, of the great capitalists of industry, finance, and commerce, and also of the large landed proprietors, who had an obvious interest in the formation of a combative organisation which would support their attack upon the workers.

But a third factor has also had a very important influence on the formation of the forces of Fascism.

In order to form an illegal reactionary organisation outside of the State, one is compelled to recruit other elements than those belonging merely to the highest circles of the dominant class. They gained the help of these elements by appealing to those sections of the middle class of which we have spoken, and, in order to draw them into their ranks, endeavoured to express their interests. One must confess that Fascism has well understood how to do this, and has succeeded well in so doing. They gained the assistance of elements belonging to strata only just above the proletariat, and even among those suffering from the effects of the war—all those petty bourgeois, semi-bourgeois, tradesmen, and, above all, those intellectual elements of the bourgeois youth which, in adhering to Fascism, discovered in this struggle against the proletariat a new energy and the exultation of patriotism and Italian imperialism. They brought to Fascism a considerable contribution in supplying it with those human elements necessary for its militaristic organisation.

These are the three factors which have permitted our adversaries to confront us with a movement whose ferocity and brutality we may denounce, whose solidarity we must recognise. We have also to recognise the political intelligence of its leaders. The Socialist Party never understood the importance of this growing antagonistic movement. The Avanti never understood that the bourgeoisie was preparing, while profiting by the criminal errors of the working-class leaders. They did not wish to denounce Mussolini, fearing that by so doing they would be giving him

publicity.

Fascism, of course, is not a new political doctrine. It has managed to build up a strong political and military organisation, a considerable Press conducted with a good deal of journalistic ability. But there is no semblance of a programme; and now that they have arrived at the control of the State they find themselves confronted by concrete problems and are forced to apply themselves to the organisation of political economy. Now that they have to pass from negative to positive activities, despite the strength of their organisation, they commence to show their weakness.

We have examined the historical and social factors influencing the birth of the Fascist Movement. We shall now discuss the Fascist ideology and the programme by which this movement

has drawn to it the various adherents following it.

Mà

bù

jæ

125

ρż

10

11

lá

B

12

15

也

Ė

đ

In reality Fascism has added nothing new to the ideology and traditional programme of the bourgeois politics. Its superiority and originality consist only in its organisation, its discipline, and its leadership. Behind this formidable political and militarist apparatus, there looms a problem which it cannot solve, namely, the economic crises which will continually renew the reasons for revolution. It is impossible for Fascism to reorganise the bourgeois economic machine. They do not know how to find the way out from the economic anarchy of the capitalist system. They endeavour to carry on another fight, which is the struggle against political anarchy, the anarchy of the organisation of the master class in political parties. The stratification of the Italian master class has always thrown up certain political groups, which did not bat ? themselves on soundly organised parties, and which have been continually engaged in struggles among themselves. This was above all the political reflex of the private and local interests, competition between professional politicians in the field of parliamentary backstairs intrigue. The bourgeois counter-revolutionary offensive has dictated to the bourgeois class the necessity of achieving unity of action in the social struggle and the parliamentary field. Fascism is the realisation of this. Placing itself above all the traditional bourgeois parties, it is gradually sapping their membership, replacing them in their functions and—thanks to the mistakes of the proletarian movement—is including in its political crusade the human elements of the middle class. But it cannot construct an ideology, nor a concrete programme of social reforms, going beyond those of the traditional bourgeois policies, which have been bankrupted a thousand times.

Fascist doctrine is anti-socialist and also anti-democratic. So far as anti-socialism is concerned, it is obvious that Fascism is the movement of all anti-proletarian forces, and that it must therefore declare itself against all socialistic or semi-socialistic tendencies, without being able to present any new justification of the system of private ownership, unless it be the well-used one of the alleged failure of communism in Russia. But their criticism of the democratic regime—that it has not been able to combat revolutionary and anti-national tendencies—and that therefore it should be replaced by the Fascist State, is nothing more than a senseless phrase.

M



Fascism is not a tendency of the Right wing bourgeoisie, which, basing itself upon the aristocrats, the clergy, and the high civil and military functionaries, is to replace the democracy of a constitutional monarchy by a monarchic despotism. In reality Fascism conducts its counter-revolutionary struggle by means of an alliance of all bourgeois elements, and for this reason it is not absolutely necessary for it to destroy democratic institutions. From the Marxian point of view, this fact need by no means be considered paradoxical, as we know well that the democratic system is nothing more than a scaffolding of false guarantees, erected in order to hide the domination of the ruling class over the proletariat.

When the Fascisti turn from their alleged criticism of liberal democracy to proclaim to us their positive conception, inspired by patriotic exultation and a conception of the historical mission of their country, they base it upon an historical myth which has no basis in fact, if one considers the gravity of the economic crisis which exists in this Italy, falsely called "the victorious." In their methods of influencing the mob we see nothing more than an imitation of the classical attitude of bourgeois democracy: the conception that all interests must be subordinated to that of national supremacy, which is nothing more than the collaboration of classes, and is a means of protecting bourgeois institutions against the revolutionary attacks of the proletariat.

The new feature which Fascism has revealed is the organisation of the bourgeois Governmental machine. Recent Italian parliamentary development almost made us believe that we were in the presence of such a crisis in the evolution of the bourgeois State machine that one more blow would have shattered it. In reality we were only faced by a critical period of change in bourgeois Governmental matters, due to the importance of the old political groupings and of the traditional Italian politicians.

Fascism has constructed the organ capable of conducting the counter-revolutionary struggle, even during a disturbed period

of transition, if placed at the head of the State.

But when the Fascisti wish to place, side by side with their negative anti-proletarian campaign, a positive programme and concrete proposals for the reorganisation of the economic life of the country and the administration of the State, they were only able to repeat the banal platitudes of traditional democracy and even of social democracy. They have furnished us with no trace of an original and co-ordinated programme.

For example, they have always said that the Fascist programme advocates a reduction of the State bureaucracy, starting from above, with a reduction in the number of ministers, and extending into all the branches of the administration. Now it is true that Mussolini has withdrawn the special train usually allotted to the Premier, but on the other hand he has augmented the number of Cabinet Ministers and of Assistant Secretaries of the State, in order to give jobs to his legionaries.

Fascism, after having temporarily adopted republicanism, finally rallied to the strictest monarchist loyalism; and after having loudly and constantly cried out against parliamentary corruption, it has now completely accepted conventional parliamentary procedure.

They departed so far from the tendencies of pure reaction that they even made use of syndicalism. In their congress at Rome in 1921, where they made almost ridiculous attempts at formulating their doctrines, they endeavoured to explain Fascist syndicalism theoretically as being the supremacy of the movement of the more intellectual categories among the workers. But even this theory has been denied by their practice, which bases their trade union organisation upon the use of physical violence and the "closed shop" sanctioned by the employers, with the object of breaking up the revolutionary trade unions. Fascism has not been able to extend its power in those organisations where there is the least amount of that technical specialisation of labour which facilitates the control of the job. Their methods have had some success among agricultural workers and certain sections of the less skilled city workers, such as for example the dock workers, without having attained success in the more advanced and intelligent sections of the proletariat. It has not even given a new impulse to the organisation of office workers There is no substantial theory of Fascist and metal workers. syndicalism. The Fascist programme is a confused mixture of ideas and of bourgeois and petty bourgeois demands; and the systematic use of violence against the proletariat does not prevent them from making use of the opportunist methods of social democracy.

encrated on 2025-02-26 20:40 GMT / https://hdt.handle.net/2027/uiug.38112061987290 Jblic Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access use#pd-us-google One proof of this is contained in the attitude of the Italian reformists, whose policy, during a certain time, appeared to be dominated by an anti-Fascist principle and by the illusion of forming a Bourgeois-Proletarian Coalition Government against the Fascisti, but who at present have rallied to the support of triumphant Fascism. This combination is not paradoxical; it has been produced by a series of events, and there were many early incidents which made it easy to foresee this alliance. One may mention, for instance, the d'Annunzio Movement, which on the one side is related to Fascism, and on the other endeavours to attract to itself working-class organisations on the basis of the programme of the Vienna International, which claims to have a Labour or even socialist basis.

I have still to deal with the recent events in Italy.

On October 24, a National Fascist Council was held in Naples. Everyone knows at present that this event, which was advertised in the entire bourgeois Press, was only a manœuvre to divert the general attention from the "Coup d'Etat." At a given moment the parliamentarians were told: "Cut short your debates, there are more important things to do, every man to his post!" This was the beginning of the Fascist mobilisation. It was October 26, and everything was still quiet in the capital.

Facta had announced his determination not to resign before at least another meeting of the Chamber, in order not to offend against the traditional procedure. However, in spite of this declaration, he

handed in his resignation to the King.

Salandra was summoned to form a new Cabinet. In order to countenance Fascism he was expected to refuse to do this.

At this time it was quite possible that the Fascist armies might have behaved like brigands and might have pillaged and destroyed everything in the towns as well as in the rural districts, even against the will of their chiefs, if satisfaction was not given them by

calling Mussolini to power.

Then there came a period when public opinion was rather perturbed. The Facta Government decided to proclaim martial law. Martial law was proclaimed, and a collision between the forces of the State and the Fascist forces was expected to take place. For a whole day public opinion awaited developments. Our comrades were very sceptical about such a possibility.

1

dE

kh

Ė

1 pi

100

唿

ele

(d)

Vc.

Ŕ

ď.

2

Q.

ĠĽ

The King refused to sign the proclamation of martial law, which was tantamount to accepting the conditions of the Fascisti who wrote in the Populo d'Italia: "In order to obtain a legal solution it is only necessary to ask Mussolini to form a new Cabinet. If this is not done, we shall march on Rome." A few hours after the declaration of martial law was revoked it was known that Mussolini was on the way to Rome. The military defences were already prepared, advance forces were concentrated, and the town was surrounded with barbed-wire entanglements. However, an agreement was arrived at, and on October 31 the Fascisti entered Rome triumphantly and peacefully.

Mussolini formed the new Cabinet, whose composition you know. The Fascist Party, which had only thirty-four seats in Parliament, had an absolute majority in this Government.

Mussolini reserved for himself the position of President of the Council and the portfolios of the Ministry of the Interior and of Foreign Affairs.

The other important portfolios were divided among the members of the Fascist Party.

However, as the severance from the traditional parties was not complete, the Cabinet comprised also two representatives of the social democracy, viz., Left bourgeois elements, and also liberals of the Right and one adherent of Giolitti. During the war we had General Diaz and Admiral Thaon de Revel at the Admiralty, both of them representatives of the monarchy.

The Populist Party, which carried great weight in the Chamber, was very clever in its compromise with Mussolini. Under the pretext that the official organs of the party could not meet in Rome, it deputed to a semi-official assembly of some of the party's parliamentarians the responsibility to accept Mussolini's offers.

Some concessions were at least obtained from the latter, and the Press of the Populist Party was able to announce that the new Government would not make many changes in the electoral system and in parliamentary representation.

The compromise was extended to the Social Democrats. Mussolini did not accept a representative of the reformist General Federation of Labour, principally because the Right elements in the Cabinet were opposed to it. But Mussolini thinks that he must eventually have a representative of this organisation in his "great National Coalition," now that he has become independent of all revolutionary political parties.

We can see in those events a compromise between the traditional political cliques and various sections of the ruling class, landed proprietors, financial and industrial capitalists, who are rallying to the new State regime, which has been established by the Fascisti, and assured of the support of the petty bourgeoisie.

What has been the effect of these events upon the proletariat? The latter has been recently in such a position that it has not been able to play such an important part in the struggle but has been compelled to remain almost passive.

The only example of the struggle against the power of the State and the Fascisti was the battle at Cremona, in which there were six killed. The workers fought in Rome. The revolutionary working-class forces hurled themselves against the Fascisti; many were wounded. The following day the Royal Guard invaded the working-class quarters and deprived them of all means of defence, permitting the Fascisti to follow and to shoot down the workers in cold blood. This is a most striking episode of this struggle.

The General Federation of Labour disarmed the Communist Party by proposing a general strike, and begging the proletariat not to follow the dangerous path indicated by the revolutionary group. At a moment when our Press was prevented from appearing they even published the news that the Communist Party was on the point of dissolving.

The most striking incident concerning our party in Rome was the invasion by the Fascisti of the editorial offices of the Comunista. On October 31, while the city was occupied by 100,000 Fascisti, the printing plant was entered by a band of Fascisti just when the paper was to come out. With the exception of Comrade Togliatti, our editor in chief, all the staff were able to evade the Fascisti by emergency exits. Comrade Togliatti was in his office when the Fascisti entered. He boldly declared that he was the chief editor of the Comunista. He was stood up against the wall to be shot, and our comrade was only able to escape because the Fascisti, who were informed that the other editors were escaping over the roofs, started in pursuit.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN h'z

deli

AE

151

ME

nd iz

25 12

107

业

DE

II.

de

to!

01

TES.

加

But this example is quite isolated. The organisation of our party is in good condition. The publication of the *Comunista* is suspended—but not because the printers refuse to publish it. We have published it illegally at another printing plant. The difficulties in publishing it were not of a technical nature, but economic.

They seized the building of the Ordine Nuovo in Turin and confiscated the arms which had been kept on the premises for its defence. But we are publishing the paper elsewhere.

In Trieste the police also took possession of the printing plant of our paper, but we are still publishing it illegally. The possibilities of legal work still exist for our party and our situation is not very tragic. But it is hard to foresee future developments.

I have not exaggerated the conditions under which our party has been fighting. This is not the time to be sentimental.

The Italian Communist Party has committed certain errors which we are entitled to criticise; but I believe that the attitude of our comrades at present is proof that we have really worked towards the organisation of a revolutionary party of the proletariat which will form the base of working-class revolution in Italy.

Although one may consider certain steps which they have taken as being incorrect, the Italian communists are well entitled to feel that they have done nothing with which to reproach themselves before the revolutionary movement of the workers of the whole world.

(The Editor of the LABOUR MONTHLY regrets that owing to pressure on our space it has been impossible to include the article on "The Daily Herald" advertised as appearing in this issue.)

# The World of Labour

International:	New Trade Union Asso Right-Wing Socialists A					PAGE 184 184
CZECHO-SLOVAKIA:	Communist Congress				 	185
FRANCE:	Right-Wing Congresses	Reject	United	Front	 	186
GPDMANY .	Communist Congress	4 7 4 5 5 5				.00

#### INTERNATIONAL

#### New Trade Union Association

HE outcome of the Congress of Revolutionary Syndicalists, held in Berlin, December 25 to January 3, was the formation of another trade union international, the International Association of Workers, or the First International, with its centre in Berlin. It was formed as a "bond of continuity between the glorious past and the ominous present full of menace to the life, autonomy, and independence of trade unionism." All unions affiliated to the Red International of Labour Unions were said to have been invited, but only anarcho-syndicalist representatives from the following countries attended: Argentine, Chile, Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, Germany (two organisations), Holland, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the Hindu Syndicalist Committee, the Russian Minority, and the French Comité de Defense Syndicaliste (a section within the C.G.T.U.).

The French C.D.S. affiliated to the new international in protest against the C.G.T.U. having ratified its affiliation to the Red International of Labour Unions, in accordance with the St. Etienne decision. The C.D.S. adhesion to the International Association does not imply a further split in the C.G.T.U. The C.D.S. hopes to occupy a position within that federation similar to that which the Comité Syndicaliste Revolutionnaire occupied within the C.G.T. It may, however, be recalled that the C.S.R. did not adhere to any

international until it became the C.G.T.U.

## Right-Wing Socialists against Action

The committees of the International Federation of Trade Unions, the Second International, and the International Working Union of Socialist Parties (Vienna) met at Amsterdam, January 26 and 27, to consider the situation created by the occupation of the Ruhr. The conference condemned the militarist action of France, and warned the workers against the lying methods being used to deceive the workers, just as during the world war.

184

It recommended a peace policy based on the general interests of the workers of the world, to attain which the following methods were approved:—

- (1) The vigorous propaganda of the peace policy by publicity in the the Press, meetings, and demonstrations.
- (2) The organisation of constant exchange of exact information on the situation in the various countries, to maintain and strengthen the bonds of confidence existing between the proletariat in different countries.
- (3) Pressure to be brought to bear by all Parliaments on their respective Governments to bring about an appeal to the League of Nations, to which Germany should be admitted as a preliminary, with the same rights as the other Powers. Workers to be made aware of the growing danger of war, and to be called upon to use all their strength to repulse the open or secret acts of both militarism and imperialism, and thereby work for the establishment of a durable peace.

This is as far as the executives believed they were capable of going, in spite of the unanimous resolution a few weeks previously at the Hague Peace Congress, declaring in favour of a general strike in order to stop the outbreak of any further wars.

#### CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

#### Communist Congress

N February 2 the first national congress of the Communist Party was held at Prague. According to the report presented, the number of paying members was 132,000, but should in no sense be regarded as accurate, since conditions in the country prevented a regular census of the party from being taken. The membership is said to be rapidly increasing; at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International the figure given was 170,000.

Manifestoes were unanimously passed sympathising with the French and German workers in their common struggle against both French and

German capitalists in its latest phase in the Ruhr.

Kolarov, who addressed the congress on behalf of the Communist International, was deported from Czecho-Slovakia for having assisted at the congress.

The question of opposition within the party, which was discussed at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, has been solved.

#### FRANCE

## Right-Wing Congresses Reject United Front

THE Congress of the General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.) met in Paris, January 30, and gave occasion for the renewal of the question of a joint conference between the two trade union sections. This has been the uppermost question in French trade union life since the Lille

Congress in June, 1921, when the Left Wing section, since formed into the Confédération Gênérale du Travail Unitaire, made itself felt by force of numbers. Since the definite split in December, 1921, the C.G.T.U., which professes to have the major part of the workers organised within its ranks, has repeatedly suggested the possibility of unity. The C.G.T.U. urged the necessity of unity during the crises through which the French workers are and have been passing, caused by the intensive capitalist offensive. A fresh appeal was sent to the recent C.G.T. Congress. In this the C.G.T.U. pointed out the necessity of unity in the face of the new warlike activities of France. Such unity, the appeal declared, is only possible of attainment by calling a joint congress of all trade unions, without exception, for which it drew up the following programme as possible basis:—

(1) The trade unions affiliated to both C.G.T.s on December 31, 1922, to be invited to the congress.

(2) The agenda to be exclusively confined to the programme of action and the question of national and international orientation.

(3) The votes to be based on the average number of stamps received by each trade union between January 1 and Decmeber 31, 1922.

(4) A mixed commission of control to be charged with the verification of the real strength of the two bodies, and to report to the organisation commission of the congress, the commission of control to consist of an equal number of delegates from both organisations in the unions, the departmental unions, the federations, and the C.G.T.

(5) This commission to examine the position of the trade unions affiliated to the C.G.T. at the time when the Lille Congress took place, which have since become autonomous and express a wish to participate in the joint C.G.T. congress.

(6) Any irregularity or inexplicable discrepancy in the books to disqualify both from participation in discussion or voting.

(7) The programmes of orientation and trade union activity to be determined by the congress majority.

(8) The Executive Committee and Confederal Bureau resulting from the congress to be in agreement with the programmes approved by the majority.

(9) The minorities to bow before the majority, but to retain the right to independent views, criticism, and opposition within the ranks of the C.G.T.

(10) In future, no exclusion to be pronounced either against a trade unionist or trade union on the plea of trade union discipline. Trade union discipline can only apply in cases of regular decisions for action.

Only one organisation out of the thirteen represented at the congress voted in favour of unity. In a long reply, the C.G.T. Congress pointed out to the C.G.T.U. its disbelief in any possibility of unity, whilst protesting its earnest desire for unity. A big obstacle, it averred, was the affiliation of the C.G.T.U. to the Red International of Labour Unions. Unity, the C.G.T. Congress declared, was only possible within the C.G.T., which represents the French workers. Therefore, before any congress be convoked, unity should be attained within the various unions. Hence,

The congress can only favour the reconstitution of all the unions.

The unions thus reconstituted could take any initiative they liked, including the convocation of a confederal congress to complete the preliminary unity realised by the rank and file.

The C.G.T. Congress was attended by about 700 delegates, and, besides the all-important question of unity, discussed and passed resolutions on practically every phase of trade union organisation. The insidious attacks on the eight-hour day were deplored, but the obvious reply of united forces was rendered impossible by the majority vote against the C.G.T.U. appeal for unity. Edo Fimmen, who represented the International Federation of Trade Unions, confessed that the workers of the world were "asleep," and therefore the general strike resolution taken at The Hague Congress in December could not be carried out.

Much controversy was caused by the proposal to raise the affiliation fee in order to defray the expenses of running the C.G.T. daily organ, Le Peuple. The opponents pointed out that no other country had a trade union daily, and that it should become a weekly. Despite such protests, the affiliation fees were increased.

No reliable statistics regarding the strength of the C.G.T. were given, but the general estimate is that the strength is less than 200,000.

#### Lille Congress

At Lille, on February 3, the French Socialist Party held its second congress since the majority of the French Socialist Party became the Communist Party in 1920, after the Tours Congress. The congress was attended by many delegates from other countries, including Hilferding from Germany. This was the first occasion a German attended the congress since the war.

The congress, which met at the most difficult period for the French proletariat, came to no more far-reaching decision than that the League of Nations should intervene in the present international political crisis. The proposition of the Communist Party that both sections should unite in the common struggle was rejected. The attitude of both parties is more evident in the exact invitation and the reply here reproduced:—

#### COMMUNIST MESSAGE TO LILLE CONGRESS

The Communist Party suggests to the Lille Congress that delegates from both parties meet in a joint congress. This reunion to make plans for the convocation of a conference of all proletarian organisations, with a view to uniting to make an efficacious stand against the occupation of the Ruhr, against Governmental repression, and the danger of a new imperialist war.

In view of Compère-Morel's intervention in the Chamber on January 18 in favour of a general strike, the Communist Party anticipates a favourable reply from the Lille Congress to the present proposal.

The Communist Party is ready to examine any counter proposition made

on the part of the Socialist Party.

The Communist Party has only the desire to serve the interests of the workers in the imminent dangers now threatening, and makes no preliminary condition as to the joint action of the proletarian organisations.

Louis Sellier, Tommasi.

The Lille Congress rejected this offer of unity, and at the suggestion of

The congress of the Socialist Party has examined the telegram renewing the proposal of a united front, this time "against the occupation of the Ruhr, against Governmental repression, and the danger of a new imperialist war."

The congress is in agreement with the reply sent to the first offer signed by Frossard, and recalls the reply to your memory. Our party asked you to define exactly the method you purposed to employ in the united front, and demanded guarantees of good faith. Your reply, causing the rupture of the pourparlers, declared your reluctance to "submit to a new examination a question which your congresses, both national and international, had discussed."

. . . You now suggest common action against the occupation of the Ruhr and the dangers of an imperialist war. Nevertheless, you know that your action in these matters is inspired by principles opposed to ours.

You have not taken up a position in respect of reparations, European reconstruction, nor as to the method of solving the Ruhr difficulties which would allow of agreement in united action.

We want a solution conducive to peace. The Communist International, to which you belong and which solely obeys the dictates of Moscow, pursues tactics which risk creating new causes of European warfare. . . .

The congress, therefore, discards your offer.

It hopes that you will consider it useless to send us proposals of a similar nature in future as long as the conditions of good faith and loyalty, necessary to all joint action suggested by us, have not been fulfilled.

The congress failed to seize this opportunity to unite the workers into one body on this issue, so important to all French workers; no unity in other matters was asked. Yet many of these delegates have been willing to make a united front with capitalists, of whom they may truly say their "action is inspired by principles opposed to ours."

#### GERMANY

#### Communist Congress

HE Leipzig Congress of the German Communist Party began on January 28. It was well attended, and discussion gave proof of the determination of the party to sift each problem. The position in the Ruhr naturally took precedence in discussion, and the final decision of the congress was an appeal to the workers to carry on active opposition to the foreign invader, but not in the leading strings of the German bourgeoisie, but as an independent force. The resolution on the tactics for the united front was passed by 118 votes to 59; the main plan included approaching the workers in the Social Democratic Party and uniting with them in the struggle to bring about a workers' government.

Much discussion took place as to methods, but the majority of the party showed that no rash action would be countenanced, and thus silenced the

opposition section, still noticeable within the party.

# BOOK REVIEWS

#### THE LAW AND THE PROFITS

Workmen's Compensation in Great Britain. By Joseph L. Cohen. The Post Publishing Co.

THE object of this book (as stated in the publisher's note) is to set forth, in as simple a form as possible, a statement of the existing laws, some account of their working, and of the problems to which they give rise. The book is stated to be written by a recognised authority on this subject, and to be the only comprehensive study of this branch of social insurance. The publisher's note states that the book should be of service to trade union officials, the student of law, and others. It can only be said that many of Mr. Cohen's statements, when compared with the facts or even (in some cases) with each other, make it important that his recognition as an authority, if it exists, should be at once withdrawn. A careful examination of the legal part of the book demonstrates that it is full of contradictions, omissions, and errors which, if perpetrated by a claims agent of an insurance company, would necessitate his seeking other employment for his talent. The legal aspect of the subject is technical and would be wearisome to most readers, but a few instances must be given. Compare the two following statements as to the powers of the County Court Registrar with regard to agreements between an employer and workman:-

"If, however, the Registrar has reason to think that the amount fixed for compensation is inadequate and that any undue influence has been used, he may ask the Judge to arbitrate, and he may alter the amount according as he thinks fit" (pp. 109-10).

"Where the injustice to the workman is glaring, the Registrar will refuse to record the agreement, but the Court has no power to increase the compensation unless the insurance company can be persuaded to do so" (p. 133).

The reader may take his choice of these two statements, but is advised to rely on neither; the powers of the Registrar are technical, and only relate to certain classes of cases which raise technical distinctions too complicated to set out here, but they are nowhere set out in this book.

The statements of the law under the Employers' Liability Act have two serious and fundamental omissions. The statement (on p. 114) that the failure to make a claim under the Workmen's Compensation Act within six months cannot be excused if the employer's position is prejudiced is simply incorrect. The provisions of the War Additions Acts are stated differently on pp. 84, 111, and 118, and two of the statements are incorrect. There is nothing said about special rights of minors to an increase after twelve months, nor about the requirements of the Act as to notice or claim

in cases of industrial disease; nothing even about what constitutes "total" incapacity—the subject of most of the disputes under the Act. The foregoing are a few examples of the numerous mistakes and omissions which occur in the legal part of the book.

I realise the difficulty of writing a simple book on the legal aspect of this subject; it is wellnigh impossible, but it is inexcusable that a book so full of misstatements of the law as Mr. Cohen's should be published. We suggest that he should take pains to find out the very technical character of the law

or leave the subject to be dealt with by someone better qualified.

Apart from the legal aspect of the book, it contains statistics which can be obtained from government and other publications by any industrious person. The difficulty is that these are not well arranged, and are interspersed with theories and comments. The statistics are, however, interesting in some particulars. For instance, it is not sufficiently known that in 1920 the employers paid to insurance companies about £9,000,000, out of which the injured workmen received under £3,000,000—the balance being intercepted.

It is not quite clear whether or not Mr. Cohen offers this book as his final philosophical contribution to the solution of the problem of industrial accidents; if so, we should have expected something more from a "recognised authority." He is quite kindly disposed towards the workman, but fundamentally he has nothing to say. Schemes of "safety first," joint committees, hospitals, and what not are apparently attractive to him, but to anyone who sees this business from the inside it is the old, old story. In practice, when it is cheaper to be careless of life and limb, care is at a discount, and the interests of organised capital are preferred to those of the injured workman.

The benevolent can talk of helping the workpeople; the keen business men of safety first; Mr. Cohen can write a book of mixed theory, fact, and fiction; but the worker who is injured will continue to be treated either as a fraud or a semi-pauper so long as compensation is merely part of capitalist machinery.

W. H. T.

#### WHAT IS CRIME?

Crime: Its Cause and Treatment. By Clarence Darrow. Cloth. 292 pp. 10s. 6d. net. Harrap.

LARENCE DARROW, the prominent American lawyer, is well known in the international Labour Movement because of the splendid part he played in defending socialists and industrial unionists who were criminally persecuted by their 100 per cent. democratic Government. These people were marched, tried, and imprisoned because they spoke and wrote against the propertied system. They were criminals according to the legal and moral standards of propertied society. What then is a crime? It is, according to our author, "an act forbidden by the law of the land." And what is the law,

and who defines it? "All laws are naturally and inevitably evolved by the strongest force in a community, and in the last analysis made for the protection of the dominant class." This means, if it means anything, that law has not been evolved to protect society; it is rather an important weapon developed through the class struggle and relentlessly used to protect that class which dominates the State. Darrow, at this point, cuts right through a great deal of humbug prevalent in the Labour Movement regarding the democratic and communal function of law. Within propertied society the law's most important task is to protect the right of possession; that is why, as our author admits, "by far the largest class of crimes may be called crimes against property."

Darrow is not very clear in his handling of the relation of crime to economic conditions. He seems to imagine that this means that poverty is the cause of crime. It is a pity he has not studied that famous Marxian work on Criminality and Economic Conditions, by Professor W. A. Bouger (published by the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology). There he would have found it clearly stated: "He who writes upon the connection between crime and economic conditions must analyse the whole present economic system, and not stop with one of the consequences of that system, the poverty in which the proletarians find themselves."

Crime: Its Cause and Treatment is an eloquent plea on behalf of those who, as a result of complex factors, get within the clutch of the law. It does not claim to be a specialist study of the subject, and that is why Bouger's work still remains the greatest book on crime.

W.P.

#### BLACK LABOUR v. WHITE

Unemployment in South Africa. By Morris Kentridge. I.S.L. Press, Johannesburg. 1s. 6d.

R. KENTRIDGE, who formerly sat and no doubt expects to sit again as a Labour member in the House of Assembly at Capetown, discourses on unemployment in this 116 page pamphlet. Passing over his artless presentation of the social revolution as a reform or gradual series of reforms, to be supported by orthodox facts, Royal Commission reports, figures, and weighty arguments, we at this distance and perspective are naturally interested mainly in his references to the masses of native race who form over nine-tenths of the working class of the country. Mr. Kentridge himself is chiefly concerned with white unemployment, and refers only by the way to the native workers as themselves live proletarians. Incidentally he mentions one interesting point, that just as native labour competes with white, so it is itself competed with by other yet cheaper native labour, especially that imported from a distance, and that native unemployment, too, is on the increase.

It is probably true that white unemployment is intensified in South Africa by the fact that the "colour bar" not only excludes natives

from certain jobs reserved for whites, but also, in its customary application, excludes whites from most "unskilled" work as infra dig. Mr. Archie Crawford, of the South African Industrial Federation, was publicly shuddering the other day at the very idea of "competition between black and white" as "lowering" to the whites' status and dignity-poor consolation, one would think, for the absence of any doles, insurance, workhouses, or casual wards for the South African workless. For the rest, the "colour bar" in mines and works, for which the Rand strike of last year was fought, really means a standard wage on a white scale, a wage which, bar or no bar, capitalists will never pay to natives. As such, it had to be fought for. But the fight was lost; the low "Kaffir" wage is more than ever used as a lever to reduce the standard white wage, and work hitherto involving white labour is increasingly done with native labour only. It is not communism, but capitalism, which is leading to the "equality with Kaffirs" (i.e., lowering to Kaffir wage standards) so much dreaded by the "poor whites." The moral is surely that the white workers of South Africa-a comparative handful of the working class, and a minority even of the white population-must recognise what Mr. Kentridge, in imagination addressing Parliament, is silent upon.

They must recognise the essence of the situation is the class struggle, and must join forces with their black fellow workers, drawing them, as active allies, into the common struggle (instead of ordering them, as they did last year, to continue working while the "aristocrats of labour" downed tools), and must also link up with the international militant labour movement. If they shrink from this alliance as common or unclean, the native movement of the African continent will tend to a purely racial form—as in any case it must inevitably do to some extent—resulting in colossal bloodshed. But the white workers, except for a few overseers, will—not-withstanding all Mr. Kentridge's belling the cat with "prohibition of imported indentured labour," "land taxation," and "State control" of this, that, and the other—inevitably be starved out of existence as "redundant."

S. P. B.

# THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 4

APRIL, 1923

NUMBER 4

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

### CONTENTS

Notes of the Month	Page	195
THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION  Marx and the Modern World—Marxism and World  History—From Social Unconsciousness to Consciousness  —Revolution and the Working Class—The Period of Incomprehension — The Lifting of the Fog — The Tribute of the Hour	2	
The Daily Herald: a Workers' Daily?	22	201
By С. М. Roebuck	100	
The Funeral Ceremony at Gaya	**	219
By Evelyn Roy		
Whitleyism in the Civil Service	,,	229
By B. D. Goundry		
The Pacific in World Politics	,,	235
By W. P. EARSMAN		
Revolutionary Unionism in the Engineering Trades  By J. D. LAWRENCE	,,,	244
		2.2
The World of Labour Austria—Bulgaria—Czecho-Slovakia—Italy—Jugo-Slavia —Sweden	**	249
Book Reviews	"	253
The Fabian Discovery of Capitalism T.L.		4.77

Published at 162 Buckingham Palace Road London S.W.1

Divilized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

# The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Office: 162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE RD., S.W.1

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, and can only return the same when stamps to cover postage are enclosed.

Subscription Rates:
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

Six months - 4/-

One year - 8/-

United States of America Subscription Representative:—Philip Novick, 192 Broadway, Room 15, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

Advertising Rates:

Ordinary position, per page, £5 5s. and pro rata.

Volume III (July to December, 1922) can be supplied for 7s. 6d. post free, or these numbers can be bound and returned post free for 4s. 6d.

Cases can be supplied for 3s. 6d. post free.

Title Page for Vol. III can be had on application if  $1\frac{1}{2}d$ , for postage is sent.

# NOTES of the MONTH

Marx and the Modern World—Marxism and World History—
From Social Unconsciousness to Consciousness—Revolution
and the Working Class—The Period of
Incomprehension—The Lifting of the Fog
—The Tribute of the Hour

ORTY years ago Marx died. His anniversary is being celebrated in a fashion that he would have understood. The suicidal frenzy of capitalist civilisation with its Great Powers reduced by years of protracted conflict to futile plunder raids; the world economic paralysis creeping on winter by winter without cure; the growing hold and consolidation of the forces of revolution around the first proletarian State: all this would have been to Marx in 1883 the filling up of the outlines of a picture already seen, although to any other mind at that apex of victorious prosperity it would have seemed the maunderings of a nightmare. The rapidity of the transformation of human society through which we are living, and the character of which Marx first perceived, is its most striking external characteristic. A hundred years from Marx's birth saw the first Proletarian Revolution and Proletarian State. Will a hundred years from his death see the World Proletarian Republic?

HAT is the secret of this power of Marx which makes him to-day so close to the living reality of events? The world history to-day which is confounding all the conventional thinkers is Marxism alive. There was no need to refute his critics. History refutes them. Even while they pen their last lines to their Critical Examination they find themselves having to pack up their bags before the gathering storm of the Collapse and the Revolution. The very language of the Press, the very speeches of the statesmen, become unconsciously Marxian. A hundred times "disproved" and "discredited" by critics whose names are now only known to Marxian students, for half a century declared "obsolete" and "antiquated" by theorists whose writings

already carry about them the flavour of pre-war antiquity, a thousand times denied and watered down by faint-hearted followers afraid to break with bourgeois learning and prejudice, to-day Marx stands master in the modern world—the Key to its interpretation and the power that moves it. Not as an individual, however able, not as a solitary thinker or writer, throwing out ideas to be taken up by disciples, but as the expression of the greatest force of modern history—that is the secret of Marx's dominance to-day.

HAT is that greatest force of modern history? It is the revolutionary force of the working class arising out of the revolutionary conditions of modern capitalism. Marx came at the turning point of two epochs, and he saw the character of the epoch in front. This is what singled him out from his contemporaries and that is why his writings are only becoming fully understood half a century after his death, and will only completely enter into the common currency of human speech and thought a century after. To his contemporaries Liberalism or the middle-class revolution, with its romance and terrors in Jacobin France or insurgent Italy, with its peaceful consolidation in the framework of national freedom, constitutional government, and international trade, was, whether liked or hated, the apex of human achievement. They might celebrate its achievement in utilitarian theories of progress. They might denounce it in terms of mediæval hankerings. Within the framework of its permitted liberties they might speculate daringly on the nature of religion or carry the researches of natural science to an infinitely receding horizon. In course of time their scientific speculations might lead them to the fringes of analysing and revealing the most primitive forms of human society. But all the time in the understanding of their own society they remained children, the slaves of race and place, of erratic impulse and desire. All the time, whether they praised the age in which they lived and wished it to go further, or denounced it and wished it to go back, whether they spun it into fabrics of social theory or were indifferent to it and took it for granted, they

on 2025-02-26 20141 GMT / https://hdl.handie.net/2027/uiig.30112061987290 oin in in in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access useMpd-us-g never understood that the age which they praised or denounced or took for granted was at an end and that a new one was beginning. When the first signs of that new world struck them in the shape of the first ugly shocks of imperialist clashings, they were amazed and declared that Barbarism was returning.

T was here that Marx was able to see and to understand both the force of the age in which he lived and of the age that was to come. On the one hand he gathered up into himself all the traditions of the Revolution, of the revolutionary striving to human freedom and equality that had been borne along for a period by the rising bourgeoisie, the revolutionary rationalism of Hegel and his followers, the thunderous clearing force of the French Revolution, the whole unchaining of human will and energy that had been let loose in 1789 never to rest again. On the other hand he understood, what the other successors of the revolution had failed to understand and were therefore sinking into petty nationalism, underground conspiracy, or ignoble passivity and literary indignation, that the force of the revolution was no longer in the national bourgeoisie, that they had become on the contrary the power of reaction, and that the future force of the revolution which would carry it through to its completion was the international working class. This he saw. This he worked out to its furthermost recesses. For this he fought. And this is what gave to Marx his power of understanding of the course of events: it is this, this expression of the actual character of the age in which we live and the transformation through which we are passing, and not (as is still often ignorantly supposed) some childish access of hero-worship or exaggeration of personality, that makes the growing body of thought and action and struggle in every country to-day proud to range itself under the Marxian banner.

HY has it taken so long for the meaning of Marx's thought to be understood and recognised, so that even to-day a large proportion of "educated" opinion deems itself fitted to refer to Marx as a kind of noble savage or

awkward giant, full of errors, though not without genius? The answer is to be found in the nature of the period immediately following Marx. The immediate effect of capitalist concentration, which was destined eventually to lead to its collapse, was an expansion in the form of imperialism which brought at first a flush of prosperity to the imperialist States. This flush of prosperity was the basis of the Second International and the short-lived triumph of reformism over Marx. The immediate gaining of sectional advantages and improvements in conditions blinded the view to the actual character of capitalism, and led to a short-sighted belief in possibilities of peaceful progress and change and the discrediting of the revolutionary view as abstract, unpractical, and unreal. Even where Marxism was nominally accepted as the basis, its supporters were so hypnotised by the visible facts of society around them that they sought to water down or explain away his downright statements.

T is from this period that dates what still commonly passes for Marxism in Western Europe and America-when a small band of would-be supporters sought to entrench themselves against the onrushing flood by abandoning the whole meaning of Marxism and confining themselves to the fanatical defence of a certain theory of economic value or the mechanical repetition of prophecies of the collapse of capitalism, while in actual current issues giving only conventional or sterile views. Thus Marxism was made ridiculous alike by its enemies and by its supporters, who were alike dominated by a purely empirical view of social conditions and failed to understand that what they saw around them was only one phase of a complex process, and that the truth of Marx lay far deeper and more permanently grounded.

HERE is no excuse for any such mistake now. The outlook has become clear beyond the possibility of confusion. What was before speculation of the future is to-day experience of the present. What could before be discussed or refuted in theory to-day knocks at the door in fact. The revolution, the division of the opposing camps, the breakdown of the existing 3

order, are parts of visible, tangible experience. With this concrete realisation of Marxism there has come a tremendous simplification. Before an audience of modern workers the theory of Increasing Misery would hardly need demonstration. A copy of a financial journal is sufficient to observe the concentration (including the international concentration) of capital. The most casual reader of the newspapers could scarcely fail to recognise at any rate the eternal symptoms of capitalism as a system of Recurrent Crises. The Social Revolution, that was once declared by "advanced" Marxians of the West to be a "myth," is now a political factor governing the calculations of all statesmen and parties. The Class War, which it used to be held sufficient to counter by adducing the case of John Smith, craftsman, who held a share in a building society, has now, with a complete lack of consideration for such unshakable reputations, revealed Europe and the world in two camps, with class-government, suppression, and violence openly displayed in every country. In the face of this world-situation the old controversies and perplexities appear faded and insubstantial. It was once possible for the International to be split by a controversy on socialist participation in a ministerial combination, and for elaborate arguments of relative advantages and disadvantages to lead to an ingenious resolution by Kautsky balancing both sides and saying nothing. To-day, the whole issue would be summed up in the short, but clear statement that Millerand was joining the bourgeoisie. The explosions of war and revolution have cleared the air and revindicated the downrightness of Marxism. It is not the least virtue of the Russian Communist Party, whose twenty-fifth anniversary has just been celebrated, that it maintained right through the black period of incomprehension the clearness and downrightness of Marxism and so has been able to vindicate it in the world of to-day (much to the discomfiture of many "Marxists" of the imperialist countries). In the present revolutionary period Marxism has come into its own again.

HEREFORE at this moment, when the very news of the day, whether it be the latest exploit of the troops of French heavy industry in the Ruhr, or the sudden seizure without charge or trial of a hundred British citizens by the executive

power, or the butchering of socialists by the Italian Fascist Government, or the tightening of America's financial stranglehold on Europe, or the breaking up of the Labour Movement by reformist leaders, or the bombing of recalcitrant villages in Mesopotamia, are all part of a single converging struggle more and more visibly one—the battle of the world revolution and world capitalism in its last imperialist stage—it is fitting to turn aside for a moment from the incidents of that struggle and their daily records in order to dwell on the more lasting character and meaning of that struggle in the light of which alone the incidents have their significance, and in doing so to pay tribute to the mind and spirit which first gave expression to its meaning and by giving it expression opened a new chapter in human consciousness.

# THE DAILY HERALD: A WORKERS' DAILY?

By C. M. ROEBUCK

Parliament, the assumption by the Labour Party of the historic rôle of the official Opposition—these are events of considerable importance in the history of the British working-class movement, and impose a careful survey of the existing situation by the thinking elements of the working class, with, if necessary, a revaluation of old values. That the latter course will have to be adopted is suggested, in particular, by the surprising nature of this revival in the Labour Movement—which is continuing all over the country even after the temporary excitement of the General Election—coming as it does after eighteen months of unbroken defeat in the trade union sphere. The reasons for the revival form a separate study: its meaning and results another. But one thing is certain—this big new advance of the working class must be consolidated and held.

The character of the daily workers' paper is one of the most important problems to be considered in this connection: and this is shown by the attempts finally to stabilise its financial position and develop its circulation along existing lines, at present being made by the leaders of the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party. The present article is an attempt to deal with the problem from a different angle entirely, though the conclusions to which it leads will in passing include an answer to most of the questions which have been put during the negotiations referred to. The object is, briefly, to decide whether the present lines of the Daily Herald are those which will assure it a future as a working-class newspaper, and what alterations are required to achieve this endor, alternatively, to serve as the basis upon which a true newspaper of the workers must be built.

For this purpose I have taken a month's issues of the Daily Herald—from February 3 to March 3, 1923—and subjected them

201

to an analysis which should show (1) how far the Herald gave a working-class lead on matters of foreign policy; (2) how far such a lead was given on matters of home policy; (3) what are the other principal characteristics of the paper as revealed during the month. On this analysis we can build our conclusions as to the character of the paper, and see how far it corresponds with a partly ideal and partly concrete picture of a real workers' paper.

## 1.—The "Herald" in Foreign Policy

The most important topic in foreign policy during the month was the French invasion of the Ruhr, which all the working-class organisations denounced, at one time or another, in their manifestoes as a menace to the working classes of all countries. I am not concerned here with the telegrams of the Herald correspondents in Paris and Berlin: nor with the headlines given to their and other communications concerning the crisis, which in general continued to emphasise the peril latent therein. But the leading articles are the section of a paper to which one looks for a lead as to the right policy to be pursued: through them speaks the paper, more clearly than anywhere else. Neglecting their extreme rarity, which is what first strikes one (six issues out of twenty-five)—considering the gravity of the situation, and also certain other circumstances to be mentioned later—we notice the following series of articles, which throw a flood of light on the Herald's attitude.

On February 9 there is no leader on the Ruhr, but prominence is given on the front page to Brailsford's plan for a solution of the crisis: Great Britain and the U.S.A. should jointly guarantee the Franco-German frontier, as a preliminary to the revision of the Treaties at a World Conference. This striking suggestion, with its calm confidence that the two Anglo-Saxon powers—one of whom has just withdrawn its troops—will send sufficient forces to assume the thankless rôle of buffer, as preliminary to a revision of treaties which neither of them has shown the least sign of favouring, is obviously left to sink into the reader's brain without comment because the Herald has no objection to an agitation concentrating on this object. This agitation soon took concrete form, in the appeal, published on February 17, of eighty-nine Labour M.P.'s

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 203

to the United States President for his co-operation at the present moment, "as the one hope of saving Europe." What ground there was for believing that the President would assist in this work naturally no one attempted to give. The proletarian reader is left clinging to this last foothold of civilisation—only to have it rudely kicked away from him, with no more rhyme or reason given, by another leader on February 24 headed "Europe's Only Hope."

This article exposes the French plans for de facto annexation, shows how the latter must inevitably bring about another European war, asks what can be done, and replies as follows: "The French workers alone can deal with M. Poincaré, M. Millerand, and their The German workers alone can deal with their Junkers. If they act now and in unison, they can save themselves and the world." But if, the article adds, they hang back or "expect a miracle from London, Washington, or Geneva, they and we must pay the penalty." Here it is important to observe that the Herald not only goes back upon the idea of "Washington" as the possible dove of peace, but also deliberately encourages the idea that nothing can be done in London to stop the war. I mean, practically. Of suggestions, of course, there is no lack. In particular a leading article of February 12 has already endorsed the I.L.P. manifesto-"submitting proposals" involving the cancellation of reparations, a world conference, world disarmament, and other praiseworthy objects—with the gratified comment that Labour may well (not organise mass demonstrations or a strike for these proposals, but) "claim" that it alone can save the continent. Nothing more is "submitted" to the imperialists of the world, than that they should cease to be imperialists: as one who should suggest that the present building crisis might be solved by the dissolution of the Master Builders' Federation and their joining the Labour Party.

This "appeal to Cæsar" against himself is applied again in the leader of February 16, headed "Just Folks," which, drawing the lesson of the identity of the interests of all the peoples from Mr. Baldwin's visit to Washington and the French invasion of the Ruhr, concludes: "We urge that nothing should be done without the consent of Parliament to assist the French Government in its

rash and very risky adventure. Labour in the House of Commons should say that it will make all the trouble it can if the Prime Minister allows himself to be bustled into agreeing that the French shall either run trains through or take over that part of the Rhineland territory which is occupied by us. The French Government hopes to bustle him. If that were to happen we should be discredited and even disgraced. Even total withdrawal would be better. The matter must be debated and decided by Parliament. Labour must not fail to insist upon that." Here there is not a sentence but has its pearl of price. An adventure that imperils the lives of millions of workers must at any rate have the consent of a Parliament for whom the lives of millions of workers are of less importance than a dinner at the Carlton Club; Labour must prevent consent being given without due debate by "making all the trouble it can "-in Parliament; should the French take consent for granted (as they have done since) "we"-i.e., the British Empire, Mr. Bonar Law's Government, the bringer of liberty to Egypt, India, the African native, and Irishmen living in England-would be discredited (in whose eyes?) and even disgraced: and "even total withdrawal" (from territory occupied by British troops for the purpose of enforcing the plundering and starvation of the German workers) would be better.

The thesis underlying this article is expanded on February 19 in the last leader of the series. The paper is arguing against permission being granted for French troops to go through Cologne. If France were getting coal, the article runs, and wanted to carry it off, there would have been good reason for Mr. Law to say, "Very well, you have done what you set out to do; we will help you to get the coal away." "But they are getting no coal. It is troops they want to send. And Mr. Law makes this easy for them. Neutrality, what follies are committed in thy name!" The moral, of course, is that the burglar should be assisted when it is clear that he has knocked out the householder and all his friends, and, having both hands occupied with plunder, wants the door held open for him. Mr. Law does not see this: Mr. Law wants at all costs to be "neutral": poor, simple, ignorant Mr. Law, the astute and Machiavellian Daily Herald will explain to him in words of one

syllable what is neutrality, what should be committed in its name, and what should not!

This is what the Daily Herald has to say about the Ruhr. What it has not to say (for example, when the British authorities forbid the holding of an International Workers' Conference at which Second, Two-and-a-Half, and Third Internationals will be represented, to protest against the French "rash and very risky adventure") would fill volumes.

Having dwelt with so much detail on the treatment of the major crisis, it is, perhaps, unnecessary to do the same for the minor—that of Turkey. The general characteristics are the same. On February 5 a leader on Lord Curzon's failure at Lausanne is summed up in the sentence: "lasting peace can only come by agreement"; but no hint is given of what sort of agreement is meant. This defect is rendered more comprehensible by the plaintive remark on February 9: "We should find it easier to argue with those who want Britain to keep hold of Mesopotamia if they said quite frankly why they want this." In this connection it is interesting that no comment is made on the interview with the envoys of the "Arab kingdom of Irak," on February 24, who urged the British not to withdraw entirely from Mesopotamia as "you will undoubtedly damage British interests in the East, and certainly destroy British prestige" (as in the Rhineland!). This interview was of particular importance because there could be little doubt even then that the envoy's presence in this country was for the purpose of consolidating British rule—as it turns out, through an "independent Arab federal State."

On February 27 it was announced that the Turks had taken back their order for all Allied warships to leave Smyrna harbour, faced as they were with the concentration of the whole British Mediterranean fleet upon the town; the fleet was thereupon withdrawn, leaving only one British cruiser in the harbour, to remind the Turks that Britain rules the waves, and that Angora's chief port may at any moment be reduced to ashes should they insist too violently on their sovereign independence. How does the Herald deal with this typical piece of British imperialist bullying? By drawing the moral for the workers that Angora's fight is their

fight, that bullying at Smyrna is no better than bullying in England during the miners' lockout? Not at all: "By withdrawing our ships (with one exception) from Smyrna we are showing a friendly spirit which is likely to be at once appreciated." When the Turks blustered, says our daily apostle of patience and loving-kindness, they did not gain their point: but when nations "approach one another as comrades, neither seeking an unfair advantage, neither assuming superiority, then matters are soon settled between them." The worker, of course, may perchance remember that he sees such phrases in the Daily News—or the Daily Mail—when a strike ballot is in progress: and he may wonder whether there may not be something in it after all . . .

After this, it is not surprising to find that the Herald does not mention once in its editorials the dragooning of Egypt by General Allenby, or think of utilising the vast working-class experience available in the daily practice of Soviet Russia for suggesting solutions to every-day questions now troubling the working class—particularly housing, taxation, and control of prices. The fact is that, as far as foreign affairs are concerned, there is no working-class note at present to be found in the Daily Herald where it is a matter of British policy. The vagueness of phrase, the shallowness of argument, the adoption at a moment's notice of confused and contradictory suggestions, are all characteristic of the ordinary petit bourgeois newspaper, published at one penny for the purpose of conveying to its reader, not information, but something to read in the train.

Perhaps in home policy we shall find a difference.

## 2 .- The "Herald" in Home Affairs

During the greater part of the month under review the attention of the working-class movement as a whole was focussed upon the Labour struggle in Parliament. That is not the fault of the Herald, although more attention to the local experience of the evils which the workers' representatives were sent to fight in London would—putting it mildly—have assisted the latter in their task. Let us see, however, what the Herald actually says on the Parliamentary fight.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 207

7

ź.

On February 13 there is a leader headed "Now to force the pace in Parliament." It hails the return of 142 Labour M.P.s. "eager to plead the cause of the unemployed, to show how people may get more homes, to protect them from unfair rent, to see that taxation is transferred to the backs which will bear the burden best." But supposing their "eagerness" does not meet its reward, supposing their pleadings are of no avail, their most lucid explanations fruitless, their protection in Parliament unavailing-what is going to happen then? And this is not a merely hypothetical question. It is well known that this is just the result which may be For practical purposes the Herald leader becomes expected. a collection of mere words and empty boasting. It may be quite sincere: there may be something genuinely wrong with the heads of the Herald leader writers. How otherwise is it possible to explain the leader next day (" On to Realities") which begins by the assertion that, after the King's Speech, the House came to realities, and then proceeds to devote the remainder of its space to a description of the technicalities in Parliamentary procedure which the Labour group is going to eliminate. There is no attempt to sum up the lack of reverence of the Left Wing element before ancient but purposeful ceremonies, to remind the workers that all this pomp and state is a fungus on the rotting organism of capitalist society: no, the article expatiates upon Labour's bold plan to appoint committees of the House at which subjects will be discussed before they are introduced for general debate (a singularly novel and distinctly proletarian suggestion-only that in the capitalist States abroad it has existed for years). Not "Labour in Parliament will set an example to the working masses by its contempt for bourgeois tradition and its unsparing exposure of capitalist hypocrisy," but "Labour will set an example to the whole House if it establishes its special Committees." (Why should Labour want to set an example to the Conservative and Liberal Parties?)

The first lead on policy comes on February 15, in an article headed "Labour and the More or Less Comfortable," which, however, does not contribute anything to the problem of how Labour is to be made "more or less comfortable," but devotes itself to showing the *middle class* that Labour is fighting their

battles in the housing question, and reminds them that it is the only Party which represents both the hand and the brain workers.

No one, of course, wishes to suggest that brain workers are not a part of Labour: but to differentiate them as a class is to strike at the very root of any successful Labour agitation amongst them.

The Herald was so intent upon proving this to the middle class that the Government Rent Restrictions Bill took it completely by surprise. On February 17 it made great capital out of the Government's statement that the Bill represented a compromise "A Funny Kind of Compromise," says the Daily with Labour. Herald: in reality, the Government has simply adopted Labour's point of view: it allows landlords to collect increases made after December 1, only because, in all probability, no landlords did make increases after that date. If this attitude was not criminal negligence on the part of the daily working-class organ, it would be difficult to imagine what should be so described: already on February 19 this Sleeping Beauty had wakened to the fact that "Rents Bill Satisfies No-One," while on February 23, a week after the event, it was loudly calling for "No Quarter"—the Rents Bill must be vigorously fought, because "it lifts from law-breakers the penalty of their offence." Even here it could not take the same line as the Labour member (reported elsewhere in the same issue) who bluntly described the Bill as "class war legislation of the worst kind."

This is the Herald's treatment of the most prominent Parliamentary topic of interest to the workers: it is a fair type of its treatment of the remainder. There is another field of work from which the paper is not absent: it does not confine itself only to Parliament matters, but seeks out damaging statements by capitalists and employers, and weaves a sermon round them for the benefit of the workers. So far so good: all the Socialist and Communist weeklies do the same. The question is, how does the On February 5 there is an article Herald treat its subjects? on a recent statement by Lord Ashfield to the effect that he was looking for people to hold £10,000 a year jobs, but had difficulty in finding them. First of all, says the working-class daily organ, such capacity is not at all so limited as Lord Ashfield thinks: full many a rose is born, &c. But, lest the working class should sink in

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 209

utter despair at this prospect, the Herald comforts them even as slaves were comforted in Palestine 1900 years ago—there'll be pie in the sky when you die, and a rich man will find more difficulty in getting at it than in negotiating the eye of a needle. Hear the sage reasoning: "Less and less value is attached to living in better houses, eating more expensive (and more indigestible) food . . . There is partly also a merciful rarity of Leverhulmes and Geddes, due to the intolerable grind which 'getting on' requires . . . Rich men cannot enjoy themselves. They have no time." This is printed in a paper which draws its life-blood from the subscriptions of working men, who live their whole lives in an "intolerable grind" without ever having time to "enjoy themselves," let alone get on.

Ĭ

į.

5

Let it not be thought, however, that the *Herald* has no thought for the spare time of the workers. On February 19 a whole leader is devoted to "The Demand for Leisure." Unfortunately the article only explains that all culture is the fruit of labour, adding: "A wise community would not only insist on a fair share of work and leisure all round; it would so organise the planning of towns and transport, &c.," and so on and so forth. "Will that buy the child a new frock?" will ask the working-class reader. But he is not a leader writer . . . .

There are other examples of this "New Philosophy" of the working class, but I will select only an article on "Is Education a Failure?" on February 28.

This article is not merely a leader, it is a programme. In this respect it differs from a great deal of what appears in the Herald, and is the more important. Hitherto the elementary working-class programme of education demanded free and unqualified access to all rungs of the educational ladder for every human being, on the ground that there was no one who could not benefit in some way or another from complete general education. The educational practice of Soviet Russia has shown that it is possible to combine technical education for a special profession from the first stages of the higher school without injury to the general educational standard. But the general standard

O

has always been the minimum of our demands. But what do we find the Daily Herald claiming? "Not until all start equally on the educational ladder, and only those get to the top who can reach it by their own ability, shall we remedy the present defects": and this principle is interpreted to mean that a sifting is made at sixteen, at which the promising students go on to the university, while the rest "go out into the world," to continue their education by adult evening classes. At eighteen, again, there is another "selection of those likely to profit by further schooling," and the majority again goes out into the world while the select few, "who seem likely to benefit the community most," complete their educa-In other words, the educational machine is still to go on turning out huge masses of uneducated or semi-educated " machinefodder" together with a select caste of scientists or administrators. Where is the justification for this appearing in a newspaper of the working class, which is not yet in a position even to influence the existing educational system, let alone introduce any sweeping changes into it?

Finally, it is important to note that, with one or two exceptions, the leading articles of the Daily Herald provide not a breath of comment or hint of leadership on the trade union and Labour movement on whose pence they are built up. During the month we are examining, there was a national crisis of the building trades, involving a principle of vital importance to the whole working-class movement. The London 'busmen, by displaying their determination to fight for the maintenance of existing conditions in their industry, won a signal victory over the employers. In several industries, particularly the mining, there were a number of strikes to enforce trade unionism. In London itself there were a series of stubbornly-contested minor strikes, which however were of great importance because they were taking place in the capital city, and after a period of unheard-of defeat for the organised workers as a The increase in membership of the fighting builders' and miners' unions became so noticeable that even the capitalist press had to comment thereon; while even the fall in the membership of the engineers' union, steadily developing towards the end of 1922, almost came to an end during this very month. Yet of all

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 211

this not a word. The place of such matter was filled by articles such as the following.

## 3.-Other Features of the "Herald"

ť

11

Ċ

4

j.

Ø

11

1

Ŕ

8

Ŷ

3

ű

ı

9 .0.0

On February 3 we find a leader headed "Broadcasting and the Public," discussing the important subject of the monopoly instituted by the British Broadcasting Company. The trend and essence of the article may be gleaned from the following characteristic conclusion (for a working-class organ l): to the listening-in community to look after their own interests." Who are this listening-in community, for whom the watchword of self-defence is so resolutely thrown out, and to whom column after column is devoted in the paper through the month? On February 28, according to a reply given in Parliament, there were 56,000 broadcasting licences held by individual receivers, and in addition over 30,000 "experimental licences," i.e., for individuals who had constructed their own apparatus. These are the wide masses to whom the Daily Herald can devote its first leading article on a day on which the rest of the paper contains the following items: the death of a baby from starvation in a family of four which was receiving thirteen shillings a week; Edo Fimmen's comment on the failure of the organised working class to prevent the Ruhr adventure: "In every country the Labour Movement is either dormant or concerned only with its own interests"; the refusal of ten London boroughs to sit on the Municipal Employees' Joint Industrial Council, because the Labour boroughs were naturally sending Labour men to sit as employers, thus giving the workers a majority on the whole council; and, finally, the beginning of the series of conferences for industrial unity convened by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

This is one case out of many. On February 13, the day of the opening of Parliament, we find the second leading article deals with the absorbing subject of "The Husband as Half-Timer," informing the working-class reader of the views of Miss Stancioff, daughter of the Bulgarian Minister, concerning the duty of the husband to do his share of the washing-up, and so on. This is on a day when the paper reports a forthcoming national rally of

working-class tenants to resist increases in rent: in addition to the unending terror on the Ruhr. On February 15 we find a leading article headed "The Helping Hand" which waxes eloquent on the fact that film actors or artistes singing into the broadcaster don't get an audience that is tangible, lose inspiration, and have to leave the profession: ending with a profound meditation on whether so high a level is obtainable in the new forms of mechanical art as in the old. And this on a day when the rest of the paper includes such topics as the fraud of emigration as a cure for unemployment (a cure which was being extensively advertised by the capitalist press at the moment); a scene in Parliament because George Hardie referred to the absurdity of rejoicing over a birth of a son to the Princess Mary; the decision to employ no married women as teachers in London for the future; and the British terror and constitution-breaking in Egypt. Further examples of this utter lack of proportion between the subjects dealt with in the leading articles and the topics of working-class interest may be found almost every day (the actual list noted includes February 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 19, 23, 26, 27, 28, March 2, 3); one striking example that may be quoted in addition is that of March 3. The leaders are: "Minds that will Not Change" (which deals with the introducers of the Bill for the suppression of Socialist Sunday schools, but in a spirit illustrated in the sentence: "The more their power ebbs, the more pathetic do they become") and "What's in a Name," which ridicules the pretensions of people who do well in life, exemplified in their adopting pompous names for their houses, or altering the spelling of their own names from Smith to Smythe, while all the while the "average householder suffering from burst pipes" requires the aid of a simple plumber, This valuable article whether his name be Smith or Smythe. not only forms a useful contrast with the subjects in the body of the paper, particularly the Unemployment "Gap" Bill, to which a half-inch note is devoted saying briefly that it " falls far short of what the Labour Party regards as necessary to meet the immediate situation": but also shows for whom in his mind the leader writer of the Daily Herald is penning his little sermons.

This forgetfulness of the average worker and weakness for the average householder has already been noticed in connection with

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 213

2

ž.

17

ž

ř

2

the strange excitement shown by the Daily Herald on the broadcasting question. It is particular to note in this connection an article on February 15, headed "Listening-In for Every Home," and speaking of the way "to-day's back gardens fairly bristle with aerials." The workers' back gardens, of course !

The news pages of the Daily Herald are a strange mixture, fully in keeping with the mixed character of its leading articles. Side by side with foreign news and home news of direct concern for the working class, we find the most extraordinary collection of reports of deaths of peers, royal betrothals, "human stories," suicides, robberies, sudden deaths, mishaps at weddings, and troubles of cinema stars, aged eight and upwards. This leads to the most V extraordinary deviations from the line of policy proclaimed by the Daily Herald itself, obviously owing to the free hand granted to the various reporters and "writers-up." Thus, on February 7 there is an interview with Sir Allan Smith, the notorious chairman of the engineering employers who led the lock-out in 1922. interview is on the subject of unemployment, which Sir Allan naturally attributes to the French invasion of the Ruhr, appending his own solution: "fix liabilities, fund the whole lot, then you can get trade going again." Would it be believed that the sole comment of the Daily Herald is: " Nothing could more powerfully testify to the wisdom of Labour leaders in insisting upon the direct connection between unemployment and the state to which Europe has been reduced by the Treaty of Versailles." Not a word of the effect of the "provisions for avoiding disputes" forced upon the organised workers by Sir Allan Smith last April !

Most striking as an illustration of the haphazard and unthinking way in which topical material is treated are the articles writing up important towns of Great Britain. Glasgow is dealt with on February 9, Newcastle on March 2. The tone of the articles is exactly the same. Class differences are kept in the background, or are treated lightly. The article on Glasgow says the class war spirit prevails in the city, which divides into Reds and Blacks who "quarrel with each other when at home, but combine abroad in defence of their native heath": or again, "politics is another recreation in which everybody joins." The article on Newcastle

in the same way emphasises that the city (irrespective of classes), when it goes in a progressive direction, moves by steady steps and not by leaps and bounds. Each article treats the class struggle as an amusing interlude, dwelling particularly upon the geography, architecture, and cultural life (concerts, lectures, and theatres), with never a word of the fact that these cultural recreations are not available for the workers in actual practice. The Newcastle article, which in a couple of words informs you that behind the magnificent broad streets you may find slums, does however refer to the support extended to the local artistic and cultural life by "a highly-appreciative artisan and professional class." This pearl, which might grace the jewel box of The Times or the Daily Telegraph, is left to waste its brilliance upon the pages of a daily paper which is supported in the main by the workers whom it is intended we should recognise under the name of "artisans" (so dear to the apostles of industrial harmony), but who, of course, do not coincide except for a very small section with the people who have the opportunity to be " appreciative."

Thus the news items, as well as the leaders on foreign and home affairs, show that absence of a determined and clear line of policy, those vague and general phrases intending to soften class differences, that unexpected and irresponsible shooting off at a tangent, which are characteristic of an ordinary middle-class newspaper of the cheaper sort (i.e., intended for the lower ranks of the middle class), and which are none the less characteristically middle class because they are mingled with news and occasional comments breathing a working-class spirit.

### 4.—Middle-Class and Working-Class Journalism

Why is this? What is the underlying reason for this defect, which expressed itself in the instances quoted during the previous pages?

George Lansbury, on February 17, summed up the position in a nutshell. "It is no use thinking we can ever succeed by being lopsided, giving only one sort of news and being too superior to give people the ordinary news of the day." And it is in their interpretation of what is "the ordinary news of the day"—according to

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 215

their lights—that those who are now responsible for the Daily Herald supply the answer to the question asked. Middle class themselves, guided largely by the necessities of the middle-class policy which is being forced upon the Labour Party, they are conducting the "Daily Herald" upon middle-class and not proletarian lines.

The bourgeois press falls naturally into two categories. One section is the press of the ruling circles of the bourgeoisie, supplying solid information, serious discussion, reliable news more or less reliably treated, and providing material for the different tendencies within those ruling circles in their daily and unceasing struggle with one another for the mastery. Such newspapers are large, contain many pages, are not interested specially in sensational headlines, and have not a very large circulation. Under this heading fall the Morning Post, the Daily Telegraph, The Times, and the Manchester Guardian. The second section, embracing all the other London papers, is the press of the lower ranks of the bourgeoisie-the middle class—and is the weapon whereby the bourgeoisie maintains its influence both on the middle classes (including the greater number of the black-coated workers) and the workers. What are the characteristic features of this section? Solidity in nothing: clarity in nothing: consistent policy in nothing: reliability in nothing: shallowness in everything: sensationalism, childish or pornographic, in everything: apparent devotion to "the ordinary news of the day" (sometimes called "all the news that is fit to print"), but in reality concentration on the task of distracting the attention, confusing the minds, and misleading the opinion of the masses upon whom depend, first, the repressive and administrative machinery of the capitalist State (the salariat) and, secondly, the whole economic structure of the capitalist system (the proletariat). Socialists and Communists often exclaim in horror or wonder at the gutter press; but quite unnecessarily. It has a deep but definite purpose—to create the delusion amongst the masses that they are informed, and to distract their attention from other issues, while these are settled by the solid papers amongst themselves, for the rulers. And, quite naturally, the workers themselves either fall entirely under the influence of "their" press, or, what is still more frequent, become entirely apathetic to all but the last pages,

containing the betting and football news, which at any rate do provide what may be the source of material interest.

From this it will be seen that the betting and football news which so many Socialists and Communists of all creeds have at various times condemned in the Daily Herald is not the cause but the result of lack of a definitely working-class note in every corner of the paper. The characteristic features of a middle-class paper, which we have seen appearing daily during an examination of the Daily Herald's pages for a month, are precisely those features which one finds in the Daily News, the Daily Chronicle, or the Daily Mail. It is not denied that in spite of everything the Daily Herald remains the trade union organ, and there is a tradition behind it which is not easily lived down. Hence the trade union page (page 6the one section of the paper where one feels from beginning to end in a proletarian world), although even this tends to be encroached upon more and more by advertisements and notices of every description. Hence also many paragraphs from the districts, and correspondents' articles from abroad, which tell the story of a moment or a day or a phase in the class struggle. But they do not give us the general impression: that is given us by the spineless, detached, or silly leading articles, and the utter hash in the news pages.

Is there a distinctive working-class line which could be applied in order to remedy this state of affairs? On the answer to this question depends the value of any review of this section of Labour's forces, such as was proposed at the beginning of the present article. The answer is "Yes": there is such a line, and it is the line which assumes as its starting point that "the news of the day" is the working-class news of the day—the class conflict or class exploitation continuing ceaselessly in every factory, workshop, store, shop, bank, insurance company, parish, trade union, &c. Foreign news is interesting to the workers in proportion as it tells more or less plainly and straightforwardly of the successes or defeats of their brothers abroad. Parliament and the other existing institutions of capitalist society must be explained every day in terms of concrete events, in order to make the worker realise that he is interested in their fate. Even a burglary or a murder may become

# The "Daily Herald": a Workers' Daily? 217

a subject of interest instead of open or subconscious morbid excitement, if the account is an analysis of the class circumstance which made it possible and inevitable for such things to happen. And the leading articles must lead instead of trailing at the tail of events: they must lead instead of halting half-way with Christian or philosophic maxims and wise sayings: they must lead, and not wander off to listen to broadcasting, interview actors, or discuss dishwashing with the daughter of the Bulgarian Minister. They must take up the principal current topics of the day, and explain their significance for the working class, and for that class alone.

The result may be a loss of the 150,000 new readers whom the Daily Herald has gained during the last six months, and maybe of even more—at first. But, as the connection of the paper with the daily life of the workers at their place of employment or in their class organisations becomes deeper and deeper, taking concrete shape in the letters from the workers and the circulation groups in each factory, the volume of readers will begin to grow, will rapidly outstrip the highest level ever yet attained by the Daily Herald, and will soon pass into the millions. Because the working class has yet many millions of reserve subscribers within its ranks, who have to be approached as their own circumstances and manner of life dictate, and not according to the standards of the bourgeois press—that is, if it is to them as workers we wish to appeal, not to them as victims of the capitalist system of delusion and false education, which leaves them with betting or football news as the only " cultural " recreation.

All the arguments that can possibly be thought of to oppose this point of view were uttered in Russia during the years 1912 to 1914, in enmity to, distrust for, or ridicule of the daily workers' paper Pravda. From the first the management of the latter decided to strike out into entirely new fields, and neglect the well worn paths leading to the results described in the preceding pages, which were just as well known in Russia as in England. The full story of the success of Pravda I have endeavoured to illustrate elsewhere (in the Communist Review); here it is important to emphasise only that the experiment has been tried, and tried successfully. The basic feature of a working-class newspaper, run on its own

distinctive class lines, must be the workers' letters or reports from every field of working-class activity. The secondary feature must be the leading or guiding articles. Given these premises, a paper is a fighting working-class organ: without them, even though the advertisements be removed from its industrial news page, it remains at best a source of confusion and weakness in the workers.

If the Daily Herald cannot be transformed in the light of these reflections, at this critical moment in the history of the working class, it is the duty of the consistently class-conscious elements amongst the workers to see that another paper takes its place—or rather, takes the place that the management of the Daily Herald refuses to fill—and as rapidly as possible.

DIVILIZED by Google

# THE FUNERAL CERE-MONY AT GAYA

# By EVELYN ROY

HE thirty-seventh annual session of the Indian National Congress met in the last week of December, 1922, at the picturesque pilgrimage place of Gaya, in the province of Behar. No more appropriate place could have been selected, for Gaya is the traditionally sacred spot in which to offer up Pinda (sacrifices) to the lingering ghosts of the departed dead, and so release them from the last earthly bond, that they may journey towards Nirvana or seek rebirth. The fifteen thousand or more political pilgrims that wended their way on foot, bullockcart, or steam car to the holy spot to attend the Congress session were, perhaps, unconscious of the fact that their eager pilgrimage to Gaya was to offer involuntary Pinda to the dear departed but lingering ghost of Gandhism, famous to the world as Non-Violent Non-Co-operation based upon Soul-Force—but such was, nevertheless, the fact. According to Hindu custom, after a definite period of mourning for the dear departed is over, the Sradh ceremony is performed, consisting of a feast given to all the friends and relatives of the deceased. The Sradh at Gaya marks the close of a definite period in the Indian Nationalist movement—the preparatory period inevitably characterised by confusion of ideas and mistakes in tactics, but valuable for the political lessons to be deduced therefrom. The new period that lies ahead was inaugurated upon the funeral ashes of the old.

The social and economic background of the thirty-seventh National Congress was wide as the poles asunder from that which marked its predecessor at Ahmedabad the year before. A full year had rolled away without the slightest approach of the promised Swaraj. Mahatma Gandhi and twenty-five thousand faithful followers fill the Government "hotels" as a reward for having followed the injunctions of Non-Violent Non-Co-operation based upon Soul-Force. The middle classes, once the vanguard of the National movement, are divided among themselves and weak in

their counsels as to the future course to follow. Boycott of schools and law courts, depending on them for fulfilment, have been an acknowledged failure; boycott of foreign cloth and liquor shops, and the propagation of Khaddar and Charka (homespun and handweaving), which depended on the masses for fulfilment, have equally failed, not for lack of goodwill or loyalty to the imprisoned Mahatma but from sheer economic disability of the starving workers and peasants to pay higher prices and work longer hours in the sacred but abstract name of Patriotism. The chief clauses of the "Constructive Programme," adopted at Bardoli in February, 1922, just after the riot of Chauri Chaura, which urged the prosecution of the triple boycott while suspending indefinitely the declaration of civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes as well as the use of all aggressive tactics, have had the ultimate effect of damping the enthusiasm of the masses for the national cause and of withdrawing from it the backbone of mass-energy, while at the same time giving free play to the forces of Government repression, let loose in all their vigour since the departure of the Prince of Wales from Indian soil.

Meanwhile, what of the masses of whom everyone in India, politically-minded or otherwise, has learned to speak? "Back to the villages" has become the slogan of every shade of political opinion. It would seem that this new and potent force in Indian national life, the hitherto dumb and inarticulate workers and peasants, has become a pawn in the political game, waged heretofore between the Government and the middle classes. How otherwise to explain this eagerness to reach the "masses"; the sudden zeal for organisation and propaganda on the part of Congresswallahs; the equally sudden desire to rush remedial legislation through unwilling Legislatures, on the part of the Government, to somewhat better the condition of rack-rented peasantry and sweated factory hands?

The thirty-seventh annual session of the Indian National Congress met this year upon a background of comparative industrial calm, broken by sporadic strikes of a purely isolated and economic nature, in no way comparable with the fever of industrial unrest which displayed itself in political strikes and national hartals during the corresponding period of last year. But it met at the same time

in a period of intense organising activity on the part of the working masses, of the slow but persistent growth of trade unionism and co-operative effort, of industrial and economic conferences and efforts at federating the loosely-scattered labour organisations whose number and influence have immensely multiplied within the preceding twelvemonth.

Three events bade fair to disturb the harmony of the prospective solemnities of the Congress, and a fourth actually obtruded itself upon the Congress meditations, forcing some recognition from the mourners there assembled of present-day actualities in the land of the living. We refer first to the publication in November of the report of the Civil Disobedience Committee, which declared the country to be unfit for the inauguration of mass Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, but recommended by an evenly-split vote the reconsideration of the boycott of the Reform Councils, with the object of contesting the elections to be held in the spring of 1924. The second discordant note was struck by no less a person than the President-elect of the Congress, Mr. C. R. Das, newly-released from six months' confinement in gaol, who after the report of the Civil Disobedience Committee, saw fit to deliver himself of two speeches which set the whole country by the ears. In addition to echoing the heresy of Councilentry, qualified with the object of "ending or mending them," the Deshbandhu (Friend of the Country) startled his compatriots and the bureaucracy alike by enunciating such heresies as the following :-

"I do not want that sort of Swaraj which will be for the middle classes alone. I want Swaraj for the masses, not for the classes. I do not care for the bourgeoisie. How many are they? Swaraj must be for the masses, and must be won by the masses." (Speech at Dehra Dun, November 1, 1922.)

A few weeks later he published a "Mass" programme in his daily vernacular organ the Bangalar Katha, which declared for the constructive programme and election to the Reform Councils, and stressed the necessity for organising labour and peasant societies as a means to declare a national strike and enforce non-payment of taxes for the final winning of Swaraj, which vague term he recommended should be defined by a National Committee.

Divilization Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Excitement and speculation were still bubbling over the Deshbandhu's heresies to orthodox Gandhism when a third event on the very eve of the Congress plunged the entire nation into a fever of fright and bewilderment. This was the cabling out to India by Reuter, evidently under Government orders, of the complete programme of Social Democracy drawn up for the consideration of the National Congress by the exiled "Vanguard" Party in Europe. The cabled document was published in almost the entire Indian press, Official, Moderate, and Nationalist, on December 21, 22, and 23, the comments thereon extending over the entire week that preceded the opening of the National Congress at Gaya. The object of the Government in this spectacular move was to alienate the Moderates by the spectre of Bolshevism, and to frighten the Congress, and especially Mr. Das's party, out of any discussion that might remotely resemble the "Vanguard" programme. Both these designs were successful. The landlords and Moderates rallied most satisfactorily to the side of "law and order," and the Nationalists busily tried to whitewash themselves of any suspicion that they might faintly approve of such rash republican ideas.

Needless to say the "Vanguard" programme, though it might have been in the hearts of some, found no one to sponsor it in the national conclave, but thanks to the crude advertisement given by the Government its text was known to the entire country. That its clauses of social and economic reform, such as the eighthour day, the confiscation of large estates for redistribution among the landless peasantry, and the nationalisation of public utilities, remained undiscussed proves the crime of the Congress to be one of deliberate commission rather than omission.

Certain outstanding figures in the Congress may be taken as symbolic of the tendencies that direct the current of national life in India to-day. The voice of Mr. C. R. Das, expressing the ideals and aspirations of the liberal Indian intelligentzia, struggling to free itself from the social and economic interests of the bourgeoisie; opposed to him, the colourless figure of Mr. C. Rajagopalacharia, the "deputy-Mahatma," expounding the principles and dogmas of "pure Gandhism," and personifying the reactionary spirit of lower-middle-class extremism, sounding the death-knell to progress

12

m

nt:

16

D.

, Œ

W.

d

10

and scurrying to cover at the slightest hint of revolution. The voice of bourgeois radicalism, speaking in the person of N. C. Kelker, the leader of the Maharashtra school of political rationalism, opposed to the metaphysical reactionaries of orthodox Nationalism and temporarily allied with the liberal intellectuals of the Left Wing in their common fight against the standpatters of the Centre, who still commanded an overwhelming majority.

These were the voices of definite organised groups, representing the needs and more or less conscious aspirations of an entire class. There were other voices, less distinct and not so clearly heard, but nevertheless symbolic of rising social forces destined to dominate the sittings of future congresses—the voice of P. K. Mazumdar, echoing that of Hazrat Mohani at Ahmedabad, demanding that Swaraj be defined as "complete independence without foreign connection by the people of India by all legitimate and proper means." Here spoke the new school of radical Republicanism, new as yet to India, but corresponding to the unexpressed desires and needs of a vast section of the people. Fainter still, and heard for the first time within the Indian National Congress, spoke the voice of the workers and landless peasants, through the lips of the venerable Mr. Singaravelu Chettiar, of Madras, who introduced himself, amid the cheers and laughter of the assembled delegates, as "an Indian Communist," and who urged upon the Congress the necessity of making common cause with labour to bring about a national strike so as to get rid of the domination both of the Government and of the bourgeoisie. Communists throughout the world, he assured his brother delegates, were with India in her battle for In a manifesto issued just before the Congress, Mr. Singaravelu stressed the necessity of adopting an economic programme which would include the immediate grievances of the Indian workers and peasants within its scope.

The great struggle between the two contending parties within the Congress, the Right and Left Wings combined against the Centre, apparently hung upon the burning issue of Council-entry—whether or not the Congress Party should change its tactics and contest the coming elections to the Government Reform Councils. But the real issue lay deeper, and was tersely expressed in the

popular names given to the respective factions, viz., the parties of "Pro-Change" and of "No-Change." Whether or not the Congress should exercise the right of private judgment upon the mistakes and failures of the past year, and reverse the programme and tactics sanctified by the benediction of Mahatma Gandhi, proven wrong by time and trial-or whether it should follow blindly the dictates of the Mahatmaji throughout the time of his incarceration, regardless of opinions to the contrary—this was the real issue of the struggle at Gaya. Every resolution brought before the house was represented in this spirit by loyal followers of orthodox Gandhism, and was voted upon in this form. "Change or No-Change," "Love and Loyalty to the martyred Mahatma or Treason to his sacred Memory "-thus was every question formulated and thus was it decided where every vote cast was a Pinda offered to the beloved memory of the revered Mahatmaji. Orthodox Gandhism scored a complete and overwhelming victory, but for all that orthodox Gandhism is dead, and what transpired at Gaya was merely the respectful offering of friends and relatives to the lingering ghost of the deceased.

A study of the resolutions accepted and rejected during the five days' Congress deliberations reveals the nature of the struggle that has raged within the ranks of the Non-Co-operators throughout the past eight months. It is the struggle between the past and the present, between the dead and the living, between reaction and progress, which resulted in the temporary and illusive triumph of the former over the latter. The orthodox No-Changers rejected all the recommendations which their own Civil Disobedience Committee had recommended—the withdrawal of the boycott of law courts and schools-and reaffirmed their faith in these con-The recommendation of the same fessedly moribund tactics. Committee to boycott British, as opposed to merely "foreign" cloth, brought forward as a resolution before the Congress, was likewise rejected on the grounds that the specific boycott of British goods implied a hatred foreign to the doctrine of Non-Violence and Love. The main bone of contention, that of Council-entry, was debated exclusively from the point of view, on the part of the orthodox No-Changers, as to whether Mahatma Gandhi would sanction such a departure from the policy laid down by him at

Ahmedabad and confirmed at Calcutta. In the words of Mr. Rajagopalacharia:—

"The Congress should remember that no great change from the present programme could be recommended by any but the wisest and greatest of leaders. It is not possible for small men to ask the Congress to take a line different from what this house, sitting at Calcutta,

decided, after careful consideration."

it m

IM:

DDE!

TITY

Ger

16

ed:

M E

MAG.

lbr.

ME

dia

icto

70

ini.

070

te

W.

15

d

ď

There were other resolutions lost, of equal if not more importance to that of Council-entry, which was stressed far beyond its due. The resolution presented last year by Hazrat Mohani, now in gaol, demanding a change in the Congress programme by declaring the goal of the Indian people to be the attainment of independence outside the British Empire, "by all possible and proper means," was presented again this year at Gaya by the spokesmen of his party, which appears to have grown considerably in the past twelve months. Needless to say, the resolution was lost by an overwhelming majority, but the number of votes cast for it was larger than last year, and the speeches made in favour were more outspoken. The annual appearance of such a resolution denotes the growth of that hitherto rara avis in the constitutional Congress movement—a party of radical republicanism.

Manifestly in order to show that the No-Change party still asserted its right to give a lead to the people, and as a counterirritant to the contagious cry of Council-entry, the Congress majority adopted two last-minute resolutions which would be laughable were they not so pathetic in their inadequacy. One was on Civil Disobedience—ambiguously worded and vague in portent, but launched as a possible objective so soon as the faithful followers should complete the preliminary requirements, viz., the collection of twenty-five lakhs of rupees (about £170,000) for the Tilak Swaraj Fund, and the enrolment of 50,000 volunteers, pledged to Non-violent Non-Co-operation and the fulfilment of the constructive programme. The resolution on Civil Disobedience, passed against the unanimous recommendation of the Civil Disobedience Committee appointed by the Congress, is one of those anomalies which can only be explained by a study of the psychology of the The very men who had most loudly cried down No-Changers. the use of this weapon as "dangerous," now proposed its adoption and carried the resolution successfully through the hypnotised

DIVILIZED by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN Congress. It was meant less as a threat to the Government than as a bribe to the sensation seeker. But the Congress has cried, "Wolf! Wolf!" too often for either the Government or people to pay heed. The resolutions affirming the boycott of schools and law courts, and providing for a conditional declaration of Civil Disobedience (which is to be individual and not mass), were best described by the Pro-change Press as "whipping a dead horse."

The other last-minute resolution thrown as a sop to the sensation-monger bordered less on the Bolshevik, as described by the Anglo-Indian Press, than on the lunatic, taking into consideration the nature of the element which proposed it. It declared:—

The Congress hereby repudiates the authority of the legislatures in future to raise any loan or incur any liabilities on behalf of the nation, and notifies to the world that, on the attainment of Swarajya, the people of India, though holding themselves liable for all debts and liabilities rightly or wrongly incurred hitherto by the Government, will not hold themselves bound to repay any loans or discharge any liabilities incurred on and after this date on the authority of the so-called legislatures brought into existence in spite of the national boycott.

This heroic gesture of defiance before the Government, the Councils, and the world was presented on the last day of the Congress without having been fully discussed in the Subjects Committee, where it was proposed for the first time late on the previous night, and in the absence of some of the leaders. Mr. Rajagopalacharia himself, who proposed the resolution, seemed a little amazed at his own temerity in departing so far from the footsteps of the Mahatmaji, and made little effort to support his point in the face of opposing speeches, which stigmatised the resolution as "non-moral, to say the least." But his faithful followers, trained to obedience, voted blindly in favour, and to the great surprise of everybody present the resolution was overwhelmingly adopted. By this dictum the petty bourgeoisie, represented by the Congress patriots, have driven another nail into their own coffin, since who among the financiers, whether foreign or native, now investing their capital in India will be interested in having come to power a class which has beforehand repudiated the principal and interest on those investments?

The only other noteworthy resolution adopted by the Congress was that approving the organisation of Indian labour "with a view ditt

1

k

12

ā.

ECT.

B

k st

dh:

da

1

inti icis:

SIE!

ute

20

10

nt.c

clo

(3

70

.明上

1

ji.

1

į:

2

15

to improve and promote their well-being and secure them their just rights, and also to prevent the exploitation of Indian labour and Indian resources." This resolution was passed unanimously, it being the fashion in Congress as well as other circles to talk about the "masses," and a Committee on Labour Organisation was appointed "to assist the Executive Council of the All-India Trade Union Congress for the organisation of Indian labour, both agricultural and industrial." A similar resolution was passed by the Congress two years ago at Nagpur, but nothing came of it. It remains to be seen whether the present resolution will be taken more literally.

The Congress ended, as was to be expected, in a split between the forces of the living from those which clung to the dead past. Mr. C. R. Das and his followers, on the termination of the Congress session, issued a manifesto announcing the formation within the Congress ranks of the "Congress Khilafat Swaraj Party," based upon "the attainment of Swaraj by all peaceful and legitimate means, working on the principle of Non-violent Non Co-operation." Mr. Das resigned his presidency of the Congress on the ground that his views did not coincide with those of the majority, but declared his party would continue to work within the Congress until the majority were converted to their viewpoint, meanwhile reserving the right to follow those tactics which seemed best to them. The Executive of the new party numbers among it such men as Mr. C. R. Das, President, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Motilal Nehru, V. J. Patel, N. C. Kelker, M. R. Jayakar, C. S. Ranga Iyer, V. Abhayankar, &c., &c., names which speak volumes to those even slightly acquainted with the Indian nationalist movement.

It means that the Left, represented by C. R. Das and the liberal intellectuals, has temporarily joined forces with the Right—that school of rationalist politicians who have long since headed a revolt away from Congress leading-strings back into the ranks of the co-operating Moderates, and whose philosophy of nationalism is summed up in the phrase "Responsive Co-operation." The new party, which met at the end of January to draw up a programme and line of action, has not yet published the result of its deliberations, which covered such questions as the formation of a Pan-Asiatic Federation (to supplant Pan-Islamism), boycott of British goods,

and participation in elections to the Reform Councils. A committee is at work drawing up a tentative scheme of Swaraj, which the new party has set itself the task of defining, and will place before the country for discussion and approval through the press and platform. The scheme includes the main points set forth in Das's presidential address before the thirty-seventh National Congress, viz.: (1) The formation of local autonomous centres on the lines of the ancient Indian village system, integrated into a loosely-federated national unit; (2) the residuary power of control to remain in the hands of the Central Government, so exercised as to interfere least with the local autonomy of the integrated village units.

In view of Mr. Das's reiterated insistence on the importance of attaining "Swaraj for the masses and not for the classes," which raised such a clamour in the British and Indian Press, and led to his being stigmatised as "Bolshevik," the specific declaration of the first convention of the new party on the rights of private property has a double interest and significance. The members declare that " private and individual property will be recognised and maintained, and the growth of individual wealth, both movable and immovable, will be permitted." This frank declaration of class-affiliation and class-consciousness betokens more than the mere winning over of Mr. Das and the school of liberal intellectuals to the protection of bourgeois property rights. It shows the rapid crystallisation of ideology in the Indian national struggle, and the presence of a predominating bourgeois element, determined to protect its classinterests from the very outset against the rising flood-tide of massenergy that may some day find an outlet in revolution.

# WHITLEYISM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

210

nd plan press

城

ME

1

2

2 0

1012

10

: pro

dit:

**300** 

1000

OK

div

200

#1

s de

By B. D. GOUNDRY

(Whitleyism affects other sections of Labour besides those at present "enjoying" the benefits of a system of Whitley Councils. several industries it is still in being under a modified form, while in others it is held in reserve for the moment when the trade unions make trouble. It is a method of pacification which has served employers and Governments well in the past, and may be used by them again. The following article shows clearly how Whitleyism, advocated as a universal panacea by Lord Milner and other Liberals, has failed, even in the most favourable possible circumstances, to satisfy the needs of the employees concerned. It is of the utmost importance to the ruling classes to have a satisfied staff of Government employees, and that is why Whitleyism has been continued in the Civil Service. Its failure proves again that the Class State cannot avoid the consequences of its own contradictions. The interest of this article, therefore, is not confined to the Civil Service; it deserves the attention of every trade unionist and of all members of the Labour Movement.)

HE introduction of Whitleyism into the Civil Service has proved a failure; the hopes based upon it by the staff have not been fulfilled. This cannot be questioned, but several factors have prevented the failure from becoming as apparent as it is real. Many Civil Service publicists have an interestin the continuance of the Whitley system, whilst the mass-feeling of Civil Servants finds no voice, mainly because of the seeming utter futility of protest. The reasons for this failure, however, and its results, merit attention.

It will be remembered that the Whitley system was introduced during the war in consequence of the serious unrest in industry. Labour was scarce and organised, and was claiming a share in management as well as in profits; and the modest instalment of control involved in the Whitley proposals commended itself for the

time being to those in authority. A similar restlessness was making itself manifest in the Civil Service, due to the increasing cost of living, whilst wages or (as Civil Servants prefer them to be called) salaries were stationary. Here, too, labour, if we except women, was scarce and shared in the general unrest; and so, with a great fanfare of trumpets, Whitleyism was introduced into the Civil Service. Its working has served one purpose: that of a Hyde Park, providing an arena for the letting off of oratorical steam. Yet if Whitleyism had really been a path towards democratic control, the Civil Service gave ideal conditions for its use.

Whitleyism in the Civil Service began by taking itself seriously. It evolved a constitution that sounded promising, and the Staff Side obtained elaborate offices, a well-paid president, and a secretariat. Bonuses were secured for the staffs based on the index figure of the cost of living-borrowed money at this time being plentiful, the Treasury benevolent, the staff demands both insistent and just, and the time opportune. So for a time all went well. The National Whitley Council further embarked upon an ambitious programme of reorganisation. The times, however, became less opportune, borrowing was reduced, labour became more plentiful, and a malicious Press campaign against the cost of the Civil Service began. With the change in the economic situation came a drastic alteration in the Whitley atmosphere. The higher division of the Civil Service, having as a result of the Asquith Committee secured themselves against immediate want, began to take part in an economy campaign at the expense of the lower grades of the Service. The reorganisation of the Civil Service was, it is true, continued, but on a parsimonious scale, thoughtfully designed on the "divide and rule" principle to maintain the old divisions and ranks.

Instead, therefore, of developing into a system whereby the rank and file should secure some control over the conditions of their employment, Civil Service Whitleyism became merely a fresh debating ground for the "Old Gangs." The same individuals, now known as "staff representatives," who had bleated with more or less success for the past twenty years, still continued to approach those who had now become the "Official Side" cap in hand as before. Committees to discuss this and that were created on the slightest pretext, and became a means of delaying reform rather

than of making progress. Some of these committees are still sitting to discuss and deliberate, and their deliberations proceed with all the smooth rapidity of a Government machine.

an a

b de

ONE.

rib is

10

h

n!

500

d:

20

ded

ne lo

EE.

d!

d'i

mt !

hi

Seri

da

ď

OF

p.I

1

16

. 5

M

Eventually the death blow, so far as respects practical achievements, was given to Civil Service Whitleyism by the abolition of the Arbitration Board.

Ponderous meetings of the National Whitley Council are still held, but the proceedings have degenerated to the level of a farce. At these meetings the chairman rises and expresses the Official view upon the current subject. Then the vice-chairman solemnly rises in his turn, and expounds the Staff Side attitude upon the question. No useful discussion ever follows, and Staff and Official Sides sit facing each other in majestic silence. The secrecy of these meetings is modelled apparently on that of the Cabinet; independent thought is absent, and orthodoxy sits enthroned. A vestry or burial board meeting is hilarious in comparison. The sequelæ of these grotesque proceedings are sufficient witness to the present impotence of all this elaborate machinery, the most striking instance being furnished by the Promotion Committee's report. Early in 1920 a committee was formed to consider the subject of promotion in the service. Its first or interim report has apparently been greatly hastened, as it has recently been made operative in all departments.

The question of promotion is one which looms large in the Civil Service. The days of patronage were supposed to have vanished with the introduction of competitive examinations, but a greater mistake was never made than this supposition. Promotion in the army and navy was settled long since, when the principle of seniority coupled with ability secured contentment amongst the higher ranks. This system seems to have given entire and unqualified satisfaction.

The question of promotion amongst civil servants, however, did not apparently offer so easy a solution. The importance and the danger of the subject was realised, and a strong committee of the Official Side was appointed. The strength of this Official Side was obvious from the first; the object, of course, being to defend the class principle in the Service. The Oxford accent and the Cambridge drawl had to be protected against plebeian aggression. The Staff Side members of the committee were inevitably handicapped from

the beginning. Their educational achievements and ability were not in the same diocese as those of their opponents, and outside their own "Little Bethels" they were practically unknown. True, there was a disciple of Sydney Webb amongst them, but even he, with all the Fabian passion for minority reports, succumbed to the Official pressure, being apparently overawed by the rank and capacity of his opponents—as well he might be. This committee commenced its labours nearly three years ago, and has not finished yet. Its very first achievement was a limitation in the terms of its reference, which in truth badly needed expansion. Civil servants with salaries of over £900 a year were not to come within the orbit of discussion! This ruled out the first principle of Whitleyism, and shut and barred the door to the right of entry of the rank and file into the sacred portals of the higher division. The Staff Side, peculiarly enough, regarded this as a victory, the Official Side having tentatively suggested £500 per annum as the limit.

The proceedings of the committee were conducted in camera, the utmost secrecy being maintained. The idea of consulting the rank and file on the subject seems scarcely to have been entertained; and although a carefully prepared questionnaire was subsequently issued to some of the larger Associations, it was not discussed by all of the Executives, much less by all the branches. It is understood, however, that the idea of excluding the reference of promotions to the higher grades was acquiesced in by the Staff Side, on its being pointed out to them that considerations of high policy, and even of diplomacy, were involved in the promotion of the higher grades. Such things are not suited for discussion in a democratic atmospherel

For such "eyewash" to have been accepted seriously by the Staff Side may seem incredible, but such was the case. The Staff Side thereby deliberately excluded from their purview this most important of all points. Yet this calamity was regarded as a triumph, because the suggested limit of dealing with the £500 a year Civil Servant was increased to £900! A Pyrrhic victory indeed!

In order, however, to make certain that the principles of Whitleyism should not become dangerous, the Official Side decided that promotions should not be made other than on the recommendation of the head of the department, or to use their own words, that 710

ne, i

成社

W.

ler.

如

OW

b

1

100

100

186

150

900

in the making of promotions the responsibility of the head of a department must be maintained. In running a department of State the responsibility of the head of a department is governed by rules, regulations, and precedents. No such limitation, however, is suggested in regard to the matter of promotions. Here the head of a department is to be allowed the same absolute freedom that he has always had, and on the principle that a vicar does not usually appoint as his curate a better preacher than himself, the inevitable result is that sycophancy and spats, or a knowledge of golf, are proving useful adjuncts to a successful Service career. So much has nepotism become rife that in the Inland Revenue Department alone there are over 400 appeals awaiting adjudication, in consequence of the head of that department having been allowed freedom to run amok in the matter of promotions. Nor is this the worst feature. For those who appeal there are many more who, for obvious reasons, accept their lot hopelessly, if not with resignation. Such proceedings must of necessity give rise to a feeling of dissatisfaction that will inevitably lead to inefficiency, and the inefficiency of the Civil Service can then of course be utilised as a strong argument against the further socialisation of national services.

Details of the report will of course be of no more interest to the general reader than they are to the average Civil Servant, but the method proposed for assessing merit is deserving of consideration. The power of the head of the department is absolute. ipse dixit in this connection is considered sufficient to make or mar a career, and there is no appeal! Yet if there is one thing of which the Staff Side of the committee was proud, it was of the introduction of the form on which the head of the department reports. Of course it is ornamented "Confidential." The days of secret diplomacy were abolished merely for foreign affairs-secret "dossiers" are considered the thing so far as the Civil Service is concerned. Not less than twelve traits of character in three degrees of excellence constitute the test to be applied to the staff, from office boy to the giddy heights of the £900 a year mendicant. Marks are to be given for, amongst other things, address and tact, personality and force The fear that many members of the Promotion of character. Committee itself might not be able to pass any sort of examination in these particulars did not deter them. They enlarged upon the

beauty of standardisation of markings, ignoring the fact that no two officials would mark the same man alike, and that the form will be, and has already been, utilised to justify favouritism, and will secure the minimum of efficiency as easily as it has produced the maximum of discontent.

To quote the gloomy and acrid words of "Whitehall Court" in the Daily Herald: "The failure of the Promotion Committee is but another instance of that Staff Side surrender which seems to come with monotonous regularity. It only increases the contempt of the Official Side for their opponents, who seem to be overmatched and outmanœuvred in every encounter." The pity is that this stricture is true. Whitleyism in the Civil Service is killing itself, and will eventually cease to function. The Staff Side representatives, who have not mastered the science of diplomacy, are helpless when opposed by bolder men in whom the instinct and ability to dominate seem inborn.

Many of the Office Committees have become lethargic, others have already given up the ghost, whilst the rank and file are indifferent, and only the vested interests that have grown around Whitleyism keep the machinery in the film-like slow-motion it now displays. It is plain now for all to see that Whitleyism was forced upon the Official Side against their will. Even as a weapon of conciliation it is proving of little value, whilst any constructive use to which it might have been put has been whittled away. Opportunities, such as the Promotion Committee had, to open up the Civil Service to the democracy, so that the highest positions should be available for the best brains and intellect, have been frittered away. The Staff Side has always modestly asked too little, and has always accepted less even than that for which it asked. The rank and file have little more interest, much less control, either in their conditions of employment, or in management, than they ever had, and another alleged road to the Millennium has been proved after all to be but a blind alley.

Divilized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

# THE PACIFIC IN WORLD POLITICS

nt fr

dici:

I Ge

ME.

鰤

112

By W. P. EARSMAN

PRIOR to the European conflict of 1914 Australia was an unimportant factor in world politics. She had no foreign policy and no foreign relationships. Her rôle in the Pacific was very small and governed by her "White Australian Policy." Her economic and political outlook was coloured solely by the financiers of London. In fact her people and politicians did not for a moment conceive that the day would soon come when she would be developing towards an "independent State," with a policy antagonistic to that of the "mother country." Australians generally believed, including the Labour Party representatives, that Australia was in herself an entire entity and that the world influences did not affect her politically or economically. To-day the whole scene is changed, and the new situation is clearer.

The European War found Australia cut off from the outside world, which meant her supply of imports was practically stopped. Something had to be done to meet the situation. The Federal Government first set about this task by erecting large mills for the manufacture of wool, which in turn led to the manufacture of machinery. From the manufacturing of cloth to the making of uniforms for the soldiers was a short step. Again this led to the building of other factories for other commodities. The soldiers must have boots, their horses must have harness; so the tanning of leather was undertaken. Rifles and ammunition had to be made, this meant more factories. Then the question of ships arose, and the Government again led the way and commenced the building of merchant ships. This was the case with many other industries.

But as the Government led the way, private enterprise soon followed, with the result that many hundreds of new factories were erected in new industries. From January, 1916, to June, 1921, no less than £398,961,801 new capital was invested in

industry. In fact there is no commodity on the markets to-day that Australia is not manufacturing.

Soon there was a surplus, and then the question arose what had to become of it. A market was the next question, and Australian capitalists were soon searching round, looking for some corner where they could squeeze in their surplus commodities.

During the war Britain was prepared to accept all the manufactured goods Australia could offer. Therefore during that period no trouble existed. Manufacturing and commerce went ahead by leaps and bounds, and everything in the garden was lovely. Springtime passed, and in 1919 the autumn began to fade away and give place to winter. Few people stopped to note the change that was taking place, but towards the end of 1920 it began to be fully realised that economically winter had set in. And only then was it fully realised that Australia was part and parcel of the world economy, and that it was no more possible for her to escape the contradictions, and the evils of those contradictions, arising from the world's economic position than it was possible to stop the sun from rising.

The end of 1920 and the beginning of 1921 saw nearly a complete stoppage in the manufacturing industries. Britain had ceased to buy, in fact she had refused to accept any manufactured goods. Not only did she refuse manufactured goods, but she reduced her demands for raw material, such as wool, wheat, meat, and minerals. This, in its turn, reacted on the workers. While dealing with this aspect of the problem it is well to note that though a big falling off in trade with the United Kingdom is recorded, the records show trade increased during this crisis with America and the countries in the Pacific; Japan, China, and Java, &c. The imports from Britain were reduced, and the exports increased during the war period; but in 1920 there was a falling off by a few points. On the other hand, trade with America increased.

These returns are very significant, because they show in what direction the development of trade is taking place. The Far East is the only market Australia has to operate on if she is to take her place amongst the manufacturing countries of the world. Her statesmen claim she has taken her place amongst the nations,

because of the recognition granted to her at the Versailles "Peace Conference."

100

To-day, as a unit in the world's economic affairs, Australia is suffering from the same disease that has stricken the body politic. Factories are closed, machinery is idle, and the masses are in the streets demanding bread. The unemployed are of numbers previously unheard of in the short history of the country. The crisis has not yet reached its apex, so that daily the position is becoming worse. The capitalist offensive is proceeding slowly, but so far it has not been successful in its attack on wages and hours. The same whine is heard from the lips of the capitalists as in other countries: "Work more hours and accept less wages, and we will be able to compete with other countries."

In examining the position further, this is what we find, first, that Australia as an economic factor in the world's economy must either return to her pre-war position, that is, a mere appendage of Britain, supplying her with foodstuffs and raw material; or she has to develop as an independent economic factor in herself, competing with other nations. Can she do so? Before answering this question, let us look a little deeper into it.

The problem we have to face is a vast country approximately 3,000,000 square miles in size, with a population of five and a half millions, and unbounded resources in all kinds of raw material and minerals, with fertile plains capable of producing large quantities of foodstuffs. In short, everything to hand as an ideal investment for capitalist exploitation. Why has it not been carried Many reasons could be given, but the chief one is that the British financiers have been busy elsewhere, engaged on what they found to be more profitable business. They have been content to leave the developing process to the pioneers, occasionally granting them loans of credit to carry on the work of development. To-day even this has stopped. The London sharks have refused to lend any more. What then is the position? Simply this, that Australia has passed from the stage of being "a repair shop" to that of a "manufacturing workshop," and to carry on she must have money to be successful. Where is it to come from, and what are the prospects?

The prospects are that Australia has only one market to operate

on, and that is the Far East. There is no secret in this, because the National Government has made it quite plain in all official statements that the Far East is the market for them in the future, as the natural outlet for Australian manufactured goods. Europe cannot take those goods because she has plenty of workshops of her own, with large supplies of cheaper labour; without mentioning that at present she is bankrupt. America is out of the question, because she has developed to the largest exporting manufacturing nation, with large surpluses, and she too is looking for corners to dump these surpluses. In the Far East, Australia meets similar opposition, and of a two-fold character. First, there is an unbounded army of cheaper labourers than can be found anywhere, and second, an army of competitors composed of all nations, America in particular. This opens up the situation still further, and brings us up against the whole ramifications of capitalism.

If Australia has to develop, she must have capital. Where is it to come from? In the past credits have always come from London financiers without any trouble. This was so till 1920. In that year the first refusal took place. The Queensland State Government required money and made the usual request to London. On this occasion the reply was that no money was available, but if certain land laws which were affecting the financial interests in Queensland were amended, it might be possible to float a loan on behalf of Queensland. This State Government refused to consider the proposition, therefore got nothing. The same thing happened to the State Government of New South Wales in 1921. Both those Governments tried to carry on with the aid of local loans, but failed. Finally, the Queensland Government approached the financiers of the United States of America, and they readily agreed to lend. This is very significant. Not only is the U.S.A. prepared to lend money, but her financiers are investing money in the country, apparently prepared to assist in the development of Australia.

This fact is being more and more borne out by the knowledge of the interest American capitalists have acquired. In the frozen meat and packing industry of the north they have virtually obtained the monopoly. This industry is becoming very extensive and one of the chief industries of the country. American syndi-

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN book and the same of the same

20:43 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987296 ted States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/ecce cates have taken up the mining of copper, coal, and precious stones—sapphires and opals—also in the north. They have interested themselves in the cotton growing experiments which have been successfully carried out. They have also bought up large tracts of land along the southern sea coast by the Trans-Continental Railway, which runs from east to west. They have also invested in many of the other industries, such as steel and electrical works. To put it short, American capital appears as if it is preparing for a big industrial development. But why? Is it a sound economic investment, or is there some other motive behind it? That there is another motive no doubt exists, and it is to secure economic domination and the political assistance of Australia in the near future.

When we view the world situation, with all its misery, turmoil, and bankruptcy, with its wars and rumours of war, only one conclusion can be arrived at—that this ceaseless struggle will end in another bloody conflict. In the Near East the rumble of guns is heard, and there can be seen the direction in which the conflict is travelling. In Asia Minor, across Mesopotamia, Persia, India, till it finally reaches China and the Pacific.

To give a few moments' consideration to what is taking place in China, we will see where the cock-pit of this struggle will eventuate.

China for the past ten years has been torn to pieces by internal and external struggles. From inside, the different groups have warred with each other at the behest of British, American, and Japanese capitalists, each in turn at some time being in the ascendancy. These conflicts have marked the degree of activity of those capitalists within China, and their claims to acquire special interests for exploitation purposes. Each of those three groups have never halted for a moment and claim after claim has been made upon the Chinese Government for this concession here or that concession there. In fact, looking at the tragedy of the past eight years alone, one would be quite safe in saying that no part of China has been free from the machinations of one or the other of this profit-sucking, bloodthirsty crew. Their greed and avarice knows no bounds; blood has been spilled like water, and to-day the only record known by the Chinese of the British, American,

and Japanese Governments is that they are the most deadly warloving governments the world has ever known. This, supported by intrigue, lying, and murder, has made the Chinese believe that they are the cursed of all nations.

Britain's imperialism of might is right, acquiring colonies for mere exploitation to get food to feed her factory machinery, combined with her suspicion that all competitors in the Far East not only want to exploit China but that they have designs on India, has made her probably more callous and bloodthirsty in China than she has been in other places.

Japan, from a similar outlook, has been well up in her attempts to conquer and acquire rights and concessions also. Japan, without the necessary raw materials for a great manufacturing country, must keep a big hold on China and her supplies of unexploited and undeveloped resources of raw materials. To-day, Japan views China as a colony in a similar way as she did Corea before taking complete control.

America also, with her imperialist policy of acquiring rights and concessions to unload some of her surplus war capital, is as bloodthirsty as the others. Her "iron heel" is not so She moves under the cloak of the demand for "the open door," and hopes to attain the same end as her brother capitalists. To have the right to exploit China's raw materials and her mass army of cheap labourers without the responsibility of taking over the reins of government is only another method of doing what Britain and Japan are attempting to do.

With this tug-of-war proceeding, there can only be one ending, and one of these fine days, under some pretext of a missionary being lynched or some American or Britisher's pig having its throat cut by one of the other camps, a call to arms will be issued with the command to "go to it." Once again our masters will have fallen out, and the slaves will be ordered to kill one another.

This is the situation we have before us to-day, and this is the situation facing us in the Pacific. The master class are fully alive to it, and are looking round for assistance, and in every way preparing for an attack and at the same time a defence.

Looking at the geographical position of the countries in the Pacific Ocean, we have Japan in the north, and at the southern

This, and Chinese a series of the series of

ny min nte fei igwali strä E

ber size so, for makers upple

Too side

E E E E E

lathlitrust.org/access us

r / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/ es, Google-digitized / http://ww

senerated on 2025-02-26 20147 GMT / https://

end Australia. In between there are the U.S.A. and several groups of islands controlled by Japan and Britain. At the first glance it appears that U.S.A. is in a hopeless position, and should she be faced with the British and Japanese combination, as is threatened at present, then her hope is a small one. But does our first glance convey to us the true position? This is where Australia plays her rôle, and whom will she follow, America or Britain, in this bloody struggle? Geographically, Australia's position is important. Therefore it is important to attempt to analyse her situation.

We have already seen the attention America is paying Australia, and the degree of economic flirtation which is taking place. Will this flirtation materialise into a political marriage? Let us examine the evidence.

The first important point is, why should Australia throw off the influence of the "mother country"? Has the "mother country" not played the part of a fond "mother"? She has in the days of childhood, but we have passed that stage, and Australia has now matured and desires to play the part of a grown up daughter. She thinks, in doing so, that the time has arrived for her choosing her own partner. The "mother country's" recent treatment regarding loans has brought about a disagreement in the family circle. Also the "mother country" has failed regarding exports. Also the attempt to govern from London by some form of imperial federation has created a very strong suspicion of the "mother country," and has brought into being a strong anti-imperial sentiment. Anything smelling of imperial domination is at once attacked and rejected.

Turning to the political side, there is also an antagonism in existence, which will not be easily removed, and one that Australia has been opposed to for many years. This is the alliance with Japan. On this question we find the "long suit" of America, wherein lies the key to the political door of Australia. Australia has consistently opposed this alliance, and at the last Imperial Conference she demanded that the Anglo-Japanese Treaty be not renewed. Little notice was taken of the demand, because later Britain signed the treaty though after events are supposed to have cancelled it.

0

America and Australia are in agreement on this question. America is anti-Japanese or anti-yellow and refuses the right to Japanese subjects to enter that country. Australia has her "White Australia" policy of refusing admittance to all who are not "white," which brings the two countries together on an important political issue.

As far back as 1855, Australia adopted the policy of restriction to yellow people, and in recent years has tightened this legislation particularly towards Japanese. The British authorities have as consistently opposed this policy as being detrimental to her interests in the Far East. In 1888, one of the Australian Premiers said: "Australians are not school-children who can be called to account by the Prime Minister of England, and neither for Her Majesty's ships of war, nor Her Majesty's representatives, nor for the Secretary of State do we intend to turn aside from our purpose, which is to terminate the landing of yellow people on these shores for ever." From that time till to-day this policy has been carried out, always with the frowning looks of Britain towards it. Japan has raised the question on several occasions, but Britain has not attempted to interfere. It is here we find that strong bonds of sympathy are being tightened between America and Australia.

America's imperial policy of the right of freedom of trade, that is to compete and establish her own factories without taking over the responsibility of the State, is a policy which will further strengthen the connections of the two countries. We have seen that American capitalism, realising that Australia holds the strategical position of the Southern Pacific, is ready to pay to secure her support. Therefore money is invested in her industries. Not only will Australia's assistance be of value in that direction, but her primary products, wheat, wool, and meat, will be of great value in feeding China's millions when American capitalism has collected them into factories erected in China.

What of British Imperial capitalism? It is alive and to-day appears to realise what is going on. This is seen in the agitation started by the Premier of South Australia at the behest of London interests against the "White Australia policy." He is demanding not the abolition of the "white" policy, but that its application be only to southern States. The Northern Territory, he demands, can

only be successfully exploited by the aid of coloured labour, which, he says, is a "black man's country," because of its tropical climate. This agitation is becoming stronger, and the imperialist lackeys are rallying to its support. For the work already accomplished, this Imperial agent has been given a title and "knighted."

欧

d.

at t

1 10

章 章

10

TOP!

610

15

7

From the workers' standpoint, they are solidly against the entrance of cheap labour into the country. This because of the long and wide agitation which has been carried on by Liberal and Labour politicians for the past fifty years. To-day in the councils of the working class, both in the trade unions and in the Labour Party, the evils of this policy are beginning to be recognised. Their eyes have been opened by the developments in the Pacific, and particularly in the Far East. Politically and economically, Australia is vitally interested in this struggle, and the workers are recognising that before long an attempt will be made to lead them to the slaughter under the slogan of "the yellow peril."

This the All-Australian Trade Union Congresses of 1921 and 1922 saw and marked by the resolution which they carried. The unions to-day desire that the wrongs of the past must be righted and understood. They desire to reach an understanding with all workers in the Pacific countries, with the view of strengthening the organisations against the machinations of the imperial capitalists. Therefore they have agreed to call a Pan-Pacific Congress, to be held in 1923, of all workers' organisations, to take the necessary steps to protect themselves in the event of war.

From whatever angle we view the situation, one thing stands out clearly, that Australia is one of the big factors in the Far Eastern struggle, and her geographical position combined with her economic and political development must make this patent to all. The future is viewed with alarm, but with the strengthening of the working class ties of the workers in the Pacific countries a better position will evolve.

# Generated on 2025-02-26 20:47 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/UJug.30112061987290 Public Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access usedpd

# REVOLUTIONARY UNIONISM IN THE ENGINEERING TRADES

# By J. D. LAWRENCE

HERE are approximately one and a-half million workers engaged in the engineering and allied industries. One quarter may be described as skilled, the remainder semi-and unskilled. They work under indifferent and bad conditions for surprisingly low average wage rates, rendered worse by considerable periods of broken time.

The ending of the war enabled the employers to discharge vast numbers of workers. It is true that many secured re-employment, but there are still upwards of one-quarter of a million unable to find work because of the employers' failure to retrieve their great pre-war export trade. This is of course detrimental to profit-making, but it also serves as a formidable deterrent to the employed workers' efforts to secure higher wages and some measure of freedom in the workshop. For some years prior to 1919 trade had been brisk. Wages had risen, and small reforms had been secured in overtime payment, less fraudulent piecework conditions, better factory accommodation, welfare schemes, the provision of canteens, and, most important of all, the institution of the forty-seven hours' working week.

One result of these improved conditions was that vast numbers of young men, new recruits to the trade, never learned that these had only been secured by militant trade union action. Finding work plentiful, wages good, and discipline not too obtrusive, there was no inducement to give the matter further thought, and though they joined their unions because it was fashionable to do so, they had no time to spare from their amusements to participate in their work, or even to attend their branch meetings. The older men, engaged by continuous overtime, absorbed in house property, allotments, and fireside philosophy, also had no time for union work, which fell upon the shoulders of small bands of

men in each locality. Thus, apathy came, and developed, out of good pay and easy conditions of labour. To-day, the average wage-rate of a skilled engineering worker is 57s. 6d. for a week of forty-seven hours. His rate is 13s. 10d. lower than that of a painter, 20s. 5d. less than a cabinet-maker, and 23s. below that of a compositor. His helper's or labourer's rate is as low as 40s. 5d. or 13s. lower than the rate of a builder's labourer. In the shipyards the position is worse, as with the recent cuts the skilled man's average is 48s. 7d., and his helper's as low as 37s. 6d. By June of this year it is highly probable that the average rate of 50s. for skilled, and 36s. for unskilled workers, will become general throughout the engineering trades.

Since the lock-out of last year, wages have come down with a run, factory discipline has become tyrannical, unemployment more pernicious, and employment made casual and difficult to retain.

The unions have made no resistance to wage-cuts; some have been compelled to suspend benefits, and all have smaller member-ships.

Viewed superficially, the workers appear cowed into submission, but underneath this surface a great ferment is proceeding, which before long is bound to find outlet and expression Twenty years ago, there was little or no in definite action. revolutionary thought among engineering trade unionists. workman of that time prided himself on his skill as a craftsman, he was usually a conscientious unionist, always ready to fight for the maintenance of his standard of living, but not at all antagonistic to his employer. To-day, there is abundant revolutionary thought in the unions, propounded and propagated by a different type of He is a man of superior skill to his predecessor of a generation ago, but, unlike him, he is contemptuous of any pride or delight in the exercise of his skill. He has no intention of placing his full capabilities at his employer's service; he does the work allotted to him, mechanically, but with consummate ease, with his mind all the time upon other things.

The basic principle of his every-day thought is the problem of getting rid of the capitalist employer; getting him out of the workshop, once and for all. He sees that there is no chance whatever for him and his fellows while the capitalist remains in

iù

ď.

e.

15

.

control. Higher wages, improved conditions, are very well in their way, but amount only to a little more gilt on his chains. Therefore, his whole intellect becomes directed to finding ways and means to rid the industry of the incubus of capitalist control.

There are many men of this kind at work in the unions. They are respected and admired by the bulk of their fellows for their skill as workmen and for their knowledge of and services to the Labour movement.

The problem of getting rid of the employer involves the advocacy of certain much abused measures. From restriction of output to large scale sabotage, from "Take your own tools home" to "Seizing the Workshops," the field has been well surveyed, and though these look attractive as weapons to use in the battle with the employers, it is seen that they are impracticable without the support of an exceptionally powerful union.

It is a melancholy and indisputable fact that present-day unionism has broken down in the engineering trades. The fifty or more unions capable of representing the worker's case managed to preserve an appearance of real strength during the war years while the services of their members were in great demand. The first real test of their strength was the lock-out last year and they broke under the strain.

Since the employers' easy and complete victory they have deteriorated in membership, power, and popularity to an alarming extent. Many are bankrupt in policy, finance, and plans for the future. Their one capability seems to be a certain success in persuading the federated employers to keep refractory firms in check by compelling recognition of trade agreements imposed on the unions by the employers themselves.

All this is of course extremely galling to the revolutionaries in the unions. To their credit, they have never lost heart during the long run of misfortune. They know the kind of organisation they want to replace those existing, and have realised that only by systematic education upon a wide scale can their inert masses be made dynamic and headed in the right direction. They have been incessantly at work educating their members through the Labour College, the Plebs League, by the circulation of Communist literature, by rank and file movements, and by themselves shoul-

Digilization Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN dering the burden of branch and committee routine. It is worthy of note that revolutionary periodicals such as *The Workers' Weekly* and *All Power* are more widely read by engineering workers than by any other body of workers—not even excepting the miners.

YOT R

00 050

fuller;

bist

200

m ki

VISI"

: the

处上

10

1000

122

gal:

四日

de.

10

The chief result of this unremitting though ill-directed propoganda is the demand for a single union for the twin trades of engineering and shipbuilding. The demand has become general and is reflected in the announcement recently made that the General Council of the Trades Union Congress has decided upon a conference of thirty-five of the leading unions to be held early in the year for the purpose of forming one large amalgamation. to be hoped that the General Council will achieve a notable success, though their efforts may be frustrated by the desire of the conservative elements to retain the friendly benefit component of the existing union structures. In this connection it is time that the facts of the situation should be understood and faced. Friendly benefit finance has irretrievably broken down. Union men will no longer consent to pay upwards of one and ninepence a week for friendly benefits and at the same time be mulcted one and twopence a week by the State for National Insurance purposes. have paid for years for their benefits and have witnessed the long predicted failure of the unions to meet their liabilities at a period of extreme urgency to all concerned. In the new organisation sick, unemployment, and superannuation benefits must be dispensed with. The State is providing these, in very inadequate fashion, at prohibitive cost, thus rendering it impossible for the workers to continue the payment of heavy union dues in addition. Confronted with this position, the General Council's only course is to plan the new organisation to function by means of industrial and political action.

There should be a single union open to all workers of both sexes, with a low contribution, with, say, three benefits, viz., strike, victimisation, and legal aid. Strike pay should be high, not less than 30s. weekly, and victimisation pay equal to wages previously received. The abolition of the heavy burden of friendly benefits will enable the union to spend more freely upon organisation, propaganda, newspapers, colleges, classes, and Parliamentary and local elections. The union will be able to concentrate upon the

problem of wresting control of industry from the employers. It can train its members for workshop action, not on the strike and starve policy of the bad days now passing, but can train them to make capitalist dictation impossible in the workshop. No system of shop discipline can endure in face of enlightened and determined opposition. Restriction of output can be planned properly and efficiently executed, sabotage made a fine art, ready for instant application when lock-outs become imminent, and the idea of seizing the workshops by ousting the employers and their managerial staffs can be made a practicable proposition. This last tactic will require the utmost understanding and loyalty from the rank and file members. A long period of education, training, and preparation will be necessary. It would of course never be employed while its successful application remained in doubt.

Revolutionary workers see nothing immoral in the propagation of these tactics. They recognise that a state of war exists between the employers and employed; a war in which no quarter can be given, no truce or armistice arranged, a war in which, hitherto,

the employers have won all along the line.

The merciless pressing home of every defeat inflicted has created the need for a revolutionary policy on the part of the workers. That policy has at last emerged and its essence is the expropriation

of the employers from the workshops.

The essential next step is the establishment of the single industrial union, to educate and train the workers in the tactics of industrial warfare, to equip them for the tasks of direction and administration, in readiness for the time when the union's plans have matured for the delivery of the final blow—the ejection of the enemy in control of the industry, and the establishment of the workers' dictatorship of the engineering trades.

# The World of Labour

						PAGE
Austria:	Growth of Fascism	0.00			5.0	249
Bulgaria:	Communist Election Success					249
Czecho-Slovakia:	Anti-Sedition Measures	4.				250
ITALY:	Fascist Activities			**		250
JUGO-SLAVIA:	Independent Labour Party					251
SWEDEN:	Great Lock-Out	1.00	100		15.5	252

## AUSTRIA

#### Growth of Fascism

ASCISM is now a recognised organisation in Austria, and the Austrian adherents of Mussolini have taken the title of "Hakenkreuzler" (an anti-Semitic emblem). The Hungarian Horthy, in collusion with Mussolini, is held responsible for this development, which is planned to establish Fascism as a power in Austria so as to be a connecting link between Hungary and Italy.

The Austrian Fascisti are organised in seven groups under the leadership of a former lieutenant of Horthy's; they are said to receive a fee of 15,000 crowns every evening. The recent murder of a workman, a Social Democrat, by a man named Szabo, a leading "Hakenkreuzler," shows that the movement is, as it has been declared, not an anti-Semitic one, but directed chiefly

against the working class.

nte

運

T.

6

攤

而

(L)

The method of agitation at present adopted is to break up public meetings or workers' reunions. Pacifist meetings are also attacked. The attitude of the police seems to be one of connivance, as shown by the seizure of the edition of the journal *Der Abend*, which contained an article criticising the "Hakenkreuzler."

Unemployment is on the increase; over 140,000 were unemployed in February; those on short time numbered 210,000. In view of these conditions, and the impotence of the Socialists to oppose the tutelage of the League of Nations, which is bound to react on the workers, the ground would seem to be ready for the advent of Fascism as in Italy.

#### BULGARIA

#### Communist Election Success

THE district council elections which took place in January show that the Communist Party has gained a fourth of the votes polled in Bulgaria; 994,000 votes were registered, and the Communists polled 230,000. The Agrarian Party, by means of terroristic measures, secured the majority:

249

437,000 votes; whilst the Social Democrats lost heavily, securing but 41,000 votes; at the 1920 elections the Social Democrats polled double this vote. In 1920 the Communist Party polled 184,000; to-day it is the second party in power; whereas the Social Democrats have become the least important party.

## CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

### Anti-Sedition Measures

ONDITIONS are such in the so-called Social Democratic republic of Czecho-Slovakia that an anti-sedition law is being discussed in Parliament—the law for the protection of the republic. This law of sixty articles, if realised, will prevent all right of assembly and free speech. Those who spread "false reports" are to be punished by six months' imprisonment, as also those who are found guilty of taking part in an assembly. It is further prohibited to sing revolutionary songs, or for the Press to reproduce parliamentary reports. Criticism of the President of the republic is to be punished by imprisonment for three years, and any insult to the national flag by three months.

It is possible to suppress entirely any socialist movement by the article on sedition which provides that: "Anyone who uses or threatens to use violence, or desires to change the form of government in favour of any class, will be punished by imprisonment for the duration of ten to twenty years, or even for life in the case of aggravating circumstances." The Communist Party is agitating against this anti-sedition move; its realisation would mean the

outlawing of the party and the total enslavement of the workers.

This law proves the bankruptcy of the Government in the present economic crisis; it offers oppression to cure discontent due to its own failure. Unemployment has increased by 700 per cent. in one year. The number of unemployed in receipt of State aid in December, 1922, was 152,550; in January, 1923, these had increased to 190,000, of whom 55,000 are women; in addition there are 105,120 on short time who receive State benefit—of these 57,000 are women. Just at this juncture of the economic crisis the Government has ordered the reduction of the dole.

### ITALY

### Fascist Activities

THE Mussolini regime has given fresh proof of terrorism in imprisoning leading Communists and the chiefs of the Avanti, including Serrati. All the members of the committee charged by the Communist International with preparing the fusion between the Socialist Party, under Serrati, and the Communist Party have also been arrested on the grounds that they were engaged in a plot against the State; that they had sent some of their members to Moscow to solicit the economic intervention of a foreign Power to the detriment of Italy! Serrati, as editor of the Avanti, was charged in addition with publishing the manifesto of the Communist International to the Italian Proletariat; but so did all the other Italian dailies!

The Nationalist Party of Italy decided on March 5 to be absorbed by the Fascisti. In so doing the party acknowledges the identity of aims, that is to say, it sees in Fascism the perpetuation of the idea of extreme nationalism and

militancy which it has pursued since its inception in 1910. The resolution declared:—

The Nationalist Association of Italy renounces all political and social action as a party, and joins up with the Fascist Party. A Nationalist institute of culture is to be founded at Rome, presided over by Mussolini and will be regarded as the direct result of the National Fascist Party.

This political move puts an interesting interpretation on the Fascist trade unions or trade union corporations, as they are henceforth to be called. Workers will no longer doubt their nature since they must realise that they are under the protection of the most extreme jingo party.

Instructions were issued recently on the manner of the organisation of the affiliated local bodies; every province is to have its federation of unions to include all the provincial unions for separate trades. Local committees are to be instituted in each commune representing all the unions in the commune, and will be entrusted with the organisation of new unions.

Trade union federations are prohibited from convening congresses without the permission of the secretary of the confederation. The trade union federations are obliged to inform the Fascist Party of any economic disputes involving political questions, and must restrict their activities to purely non-political matters. The Confederation of Trade Union Corporations (Confederazione nazionale delle Corporazioni Sindicali) has its headquarters now in Rome.

The only party that has agitated against this muzzling and oppression of the workers has been the Communist Party, and that, should Mussolini continue his present tactics of imprisonment, may soon be impotent.

## JUGO-SLAVIA

## Independent Labour Party

A Independent Labour Party was formed in Jugo-Slavia in January last. It may be recalled that since December, 1920, the Communist Party has ceased to exist officially, and that the country has been and is still subjected to a White Terror of unusual virulence. The formation of this new party denotes the beginning of the recovery of the Left Wing parties from the suppression of the past years.

It has issued the following statement of its aims :-

The Independent Labour Party of Jugo-Slavia has for its chief aim the substitution of Socialism for the Capitalist system by means of the class war.

The Independent Labour Party realises that the workers are now on the defensive against the attack of brutal and reactionary methods of the Capitalist class. Therefore the first and most important duty of the moment, to carry on this defensive, is to restore the most elementary political and economic rights to the workers. This struggle will be carried on independently by the Independent Labour Party, which will never participate in the policy of bourgeois governments or in the work of bourgeois cliques.

The party's first duty will be to regain freedom for the economic organisation of the workers and for the Press; the right of congregation, and a uniform labour law throughout the country. The formation of a united front will be worked for as the best means to ensure ultimate liberty.

Digitized by Google

Ė

The Government has fought the formation of the Independent Labour Party and did all it could to prevent the publication of the decisions of the congress at which the Independent Labour Party was founded.

## SWEDEN

#### Great Lock-Out

THE wages-war, which has been carried on uninterruptedly for the past two years, has come to a deadlock, and the employers in the big industries declared a lock-out on February 1. The chief industries of Sweden. In the paper mills the employers demanded a wage-cut of 16½ per cent. in January, although since 1920 these workers have submitted to reductions totalling 42 per cent. of the 1920 rates. The workers, because of the improvement in this trade, demanded an increase in wages, and in default struck work wherever reductions were made. Finally all the employers declared a lock-out in February which affects 17,000 workers.

The workers in the saw mills had also been subjected to wage-cuts amounting to 46 per cent. of the 1920 rates, and were threatened with a further cut of 12 per cent.; a lock-out ensued which involves 25,000. Similarly the woodcutters and timber-workers generally have been locked-out; about 15,000 workers are concerned. Thus the whole paper-making and timber trades of Sweden are at a standstill in the fight to reduce the wage-level below that of 1914—since 1920 wages have been reduced by about 50 per cent., whereas

the cost of living has only fallen 30 per cent.

Workers in the iron-smelting industry are threatened with both wage-cuts

and a longer working week.

It is noteworthy that these trades, in which the employers are most determined to grind down the workers, are those which made immense profits during the war.

The workers are resolute in the present crisis and the lock-out may become

more general before any settlement is made.

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE FABIAN DISCOVERY OF CAPITALISM

The Decay of Capitalist Civilisation. By Sidney and Beatrice Webb.

ė lė

kı

de

ini Sie

旭

6:

M

ali.

yok

des

26

00

40

A BOUT thirty years ago Sidney and Beatrice Webb began their researches in municipal administration and "the facts of social organisation." Since then they have published some two dozen books, many of which are of a very considerable size; some of them cost as much as a guinea each. They are weighty and learned books. And they are all based on one very simple assumption.

This assumption can best be stated in our authors' own words: "Our former abstention from a moral judgment of capitalism can be justified only by belief that those who are in control of the government and the legislation of the country are aware of the gravity of the social diseases from which we are all suffering . . ." "Before the great war there seemed to be a substantial measure of consent that the social order had to be gradually changed . . . This acquiescence in the progressive development of political and industrial democracy

was manifested during the generation that preceded 1914 . . . "

This assumption was not founded on any theoretical considerations. The influence of a system of production and distribution on the social and political growth of a people, and on the ideas and "acquiescences" of the classes into which that people is divided, was never greatly the subject of their study. Their passion for the digestion of statistics, and their habitual use of the mental microscope, prevented them from watching and realising the meaning of the forces that were really working behind the mutations of "progressive" politics. They chose to "examine the lines on which reform may proceed "—to quote the advertisement of one of their books—without examining whether these reforms were steps towards the consolidation of the present regime or towards the weakening of it.

The same inability to reason from cause to effect robs their latest book of much of its value, even for what it is claimed to be—a moral indictment, not an analysis, of capitalism. Thus the poverty of the poor is certainly treated as due to the capitalist organisation of society, but it is nowhere shown to be a necessary result of that organisation. The Webbs merely invoke "a whole century of experience" to show that it is "the outcome, or at least the invariable concomitant, of the divorce of the mass of the people from the ownership of the instruments of production." This argument leaves it open to the Malthusian to argue that poverty is also the invariable concomitant of an unrestricted birth-rate—in fact that economic divorce is not so important as sexual union. And in the same way Major Douglas can point to several centuries of experience to show that destitution is the outcome of private credit-control. The argument "poverty depends on capitalism because a century of capitalism has also been a century of poverty" is bad logic; it lacks a vital premise. It only becomes logical if we add "and because capitalism-i.e., the present system of ownership -produces, controls, and dominates all the institutions and accepted ideas of society." This is a premise that the Webbs accept in phrase; the name of their book has no meaning without it. But when it comes to applying it in real life

—or perhaps we should say in literature, for the value of "moral indictments" of an economic system is mainly literary—the Webbs have no grasp of social theory with which to work.

This lack of logical method and of social theory has proved fatal to the Webbs' whole life work. It has blinded them to the realities of capitalism: class rule and all that it implies. Its final result is this book—in effect a

confession of failure.

It is because the authors of this tract for the times have not worked out the interconnections between the various institutions that make up our capitalist civilisation that they can write the following sentence: "The existence in any neighbourhood of a non-producing rich family . . . is by its evil example a blight on the whole district, lowering the standards, corrupting the morality, and to that extent counteracting the work alike of the churches and the schools." It would seem ridiculous to the Webbs to argue that without the work of the churches and the schools the rich family and their like might find the neighbourhood unhealthy. And yet it would be difficult to say which is the most useful weapon of persuasion in the hands of the capitalist classes, the church or the

school-or the Fabian Society.

The Webbs have devoted much of their lives to the study of local government. They have written with intense admiration of the extension of municipal services to cover activities hitherto in private hands; and in this book they speak of "the effective democratisation of local government." They will never realise that at certain stages in the development of capitalism the communal control of various services becomes increasingly necessary, in order to prevent the profit-making inefficiency of some key service from hampering the development of a town. The same applies to certain industries; if for instance the reorganisation of the railways fails to reduce freights sufficiently to meet the insistent demand of the Federation of British Industries, it is quite possible that they will be nationalised—when Mr. Webb will presumably believe that the industrialists have been converted by his arguments. As for the "effective democratisation" of local government, the meaning of the phrase depends on whether an extension of the franchise is the determining factor in the acquisition of democracy. It cannot have occurred to the Webbs that the growth in volume and effect of the "stream of suggestion, biassed information, and corruptly selected news" that is poured out by the modern Press has any connection with the extension of the franchise, both locally and nationally. And we may presume that the exploits of Poplar, though tiny in comparison with the problems attacked, have yet been too big to fit under their microscope. For Poplar has at least shown clearly that however far the control of local government by the exploited working classes may be pushed, even when all the weapons of persuasion wielded by the ruling classes have failed, they have still other and more powerful weapons which, combined with minor concessions, can be relied upon to reduce the insurgents to comparative quiescence.

There are scores of minor points in this book, some of them wonderfully revealing of the Webbs' manner of thought, on which criticism might fasten. There is the devotion of several pages to "The Lack of Good Manners," "The Corollary of Bad Manners," "The Emergence of Really Good Manners"; there is the delightful phrasing of their warning to the capitalists:



-"We must therefore solemnly warn our capitalists that if they are well

8

k

Senerated on 2025-02-26 20148 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiig.30112061987290 Sublic Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/ac de

advised they will no longer dare to say 'After us the deluge' . . . The evil fate which we have seen dogging capitalism in foreign affairs pursues it pitilessly in home affairs also; and compels it to imbue its slaves with the very instinct of plotting, outwitting, overreaching, grasping, and fighting that makes revolution as inevitable as war. All the more reason for a vigorous disowning and discrediting of the profit-seeking motive, before its prevalence makes reasonable and peaceful social solutions impossible." There is the rather pitiful appeal which ends the book-an "attempt, possibly vain, to make the parties (i.e., the workers and the capitalists) understand their problem and each other better." But the most important thing about this book is the fact that the working-class movement, in the form which it is gradually assuming to-day, scarcely appears in it at all. The growth of class-consciousness, which to a member of the working classes seems mainly an increase in fellowship and solidarity with his mates, seems to Mr. Webb only a factor in a disastrous class war, which "varies in its capacity for sheer destructiveness and its incapacity for social reorganisation" according to the degrees of formal democracy within the countries concerned. The slow process by which the workers are coming to realise the ruthlessness of the capitalists' dictatorship, and the hopeless futility of "moderate" leadership, appears to him to be merely a tendency towards "universal sabotage threatening the existence of civilisation." Mr. Webb speaks of a war of attrition against capitalism that has been carried on by "the Socialists" during the last half-century, but the workers' war of attrition by "ca'canny" seems to him immoral and absurd.

In a recent review of this book we read: "This is a good book, one which Plebs will do well to buy and enjoy." After a long quotation this curious phrase follows: "And I like much the sentence about Marx—that his great significance is not that he revolutionised economics and political science, but

that he called the moral bluff of capitalism."

We do not know whether this reviewer, who may be presumed to be a Marxist, also liked much the Webbs' next sentence: "The theoretic mistakes of Marx are as patent nowadays as the mistakes of Moses." Nor do we feel that the naiveté of this unsupported sentence, or the excellence of a superficial summary of the connection between capitalism and war, are sufficient reasons for calling this book "good." But it certainly should be read—and enjoyed—by all who wish to study one of the most important symptoms of the decay of capitalism. For that is what the Fabian discovery of the effects of capitalism amounts to; it is a sign that one of the most powerful inhibitions imposed by the psychology of a ruling class is breaking down. Even the blind can feel now that the daylight is coming; but since they have been persuaded, by those who prefer to work in the dark, that daylight is sure to be destructive, all they can do about it is to issue a "solemn warning."

T. L.



MISS LUMSDEN, 14 JERMYN STREET, REGENT STREET, S.W.1

SECRETARIAL SERVICE

Typewriting,

Duplicating

Shorthand

Moderate Charges.

Personal Attention.

Divilized by Google

# THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 4

, 0

MAY, 1923

NUMBER 5

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

## CONTENTS

Notes of the Month - MEDIATION IN INDUSTRI	 AL DISPUT		Page	259
The Materialist Conception Karl Marx	A 10 10 1	and	,,	265
The German Arbeitsgemeinsc	chaften - By Paul	- Hoyer	,,	269
Proletarian Poetry—I -	By A. Boo	- DANOV	"	276
Egyptian Nationalism and th	ne Class Str By G. A.	uggle Hurr	"	286
The Frankfort Conference -			,,	300
The World of Labour - Canada—France—Germany—Jug	- go-Slavia—Norv	- vay	**	312
Book Review  Dual Unionism and its Results	× 1		>>	318

Published at 162 Buckingham Palace Road London S.W.1

2025-02-26 20:48 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987290 ig the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access useMpd-us-g

# The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Office: 162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE RD., S.W.1

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, and can only return the same when stamps to cover postage are enclosed.

Subscription Rates:
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

Six months - 4/-

One year - 8/-

United States of America Subscription Representative:—Philip Novick, 192 Broadway, Room 15, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

Advertising Rates:

Ordinary position, per page, £5 5s. and pro rata.

Volume III (July to December, 1922) can be supplied for 7s. 6d. post free, or these numbers can be bound and returned post free for 4s. 6d.

Cases can be supplied for 3s. 6d. post free.

Title Page for Vol. III can be had on application if  $1\frac{1}{2}d$ . for postage is sent.

enerated on 2025-02-26 20:49 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug)30112061987290 ubijc Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathlitust.org/access used

## NOTES of the MONTH

PRIL, 1921, saw the first big development in the closeknit series of events that have led directly to the present industrial situation. Month only differs from month, in the industrial history of the two years that have passed since the miners' lockout, by the extent and importance of the wage reductions forced upon the workers, and of the increases in working hours. But April, 1923, is an exception; within the last few weeks the rank-and-file workers in half-a-dozen industries or more have made it clear that they are eager to resist any further deterioration of their conditions, if given the opportunity. During the past month, in at least three industries, an actual struggle has been in progress. The farm workers in Norfolk and the jute workers of Dundee were The eastern locked out for four and five weeks respectively. counties building workers, whose struggle received little or no attention in the Press, whether Labour or capitalist, maintained an unwavering stand against the lockout of their employers, and seem, even after the builders' truce has made it impossible for them to remain out longer, to have forced their employers to offer considerably better terms than were at first proposed. struggles, three months ago, would have seemed merely single incidents in a series; to-day their importance is not due to any objective change in the situation, but to the fact that in the trade union world as a whole there is a new spirit at work.

HE builders voted by a very large majority against acceptance of the employers' terms, and their officials' action in accepting the settlement is in direct contradiction to every expression of opinion that has come from the men. The insistence of the railwaymen has driven Mr. J. H. Thomas almost to tears; he states that his position has been made impossible because he has not been allowed to negotiate. The spontaneous and scarcely organised action of the seamen in various ports has held up ships from sailing; another wage-cut, and the seamen will not be kept quiet much longer. The pottery workers seem to have reached an agreement (the union officials state that they gave way owing to lack of funds with which to fight), and the position in the

cotton industry is obscure; but here also there is a stir of revolt. And among the miners there have been successful local strikes against non-unionism, the aims of which are admittedly to strengthen the Federation in preparation for the new struggle that cannot be very far off. Over forty per cent. of the miners' delegates voted at the Easter conference in favour of an immediate denunciation of the present agreement.

HE attempt to secure lower wages and longer hours, which these workers are either resisting or preparing to resist, is not simply a normal product of "three years of trade depression." It is not an accidental result of some temporary fluctuation in trade. It springs from deeper causes than these, and carries a much greater weight behind it. There is scarcely an employer in Great Britain who is not fully convinced that a reduction in wages and an increase in productivity is necessary in order to restore industry to health. But there can scarcely be many employers who really believe that such changes are really sufficient to secure an immediate revival. A stone slips in the crumbling ruins of Europe, exchanges begin to rattle down once more, and here in Britain the drive against wages and hours has to be begun all over again before an "economic level" is in sight. Nevertheless, the attack cannot be checked for a moment, if only to keep industry going even at its present level. There is less talk now of a trade revival in the immediate future than there has been since the beginning of the slump. But the pressure on the workers cannot be relaxed, because capitalism, even when it abandons immediate hopes of reconstruction, needs ever greater sacrifices from the workers in order to produce at all.

APITAL'S need for cheaper production is so obvious to everyone concerned in industry that in this country, where more than in any other the workers are under the influence of capitalist agencies of opinion, there has been, during the past two years, a very general feeling in the trade unions that the wage-cuts demanded were inevitable. This feeling did not touch the question of longer hours, and here there have been far fewer concessions made, and less ground lost. Increases in hours have 计可以存储的 医阴道性 医乳蛋白 医乳蛋白 医乳蛋白

d F

拉

町.

been bought off at the expense of wages on several occasions. But the surrender of wage-gains—payment of Dane-geld—only put the employers in a stronger position for the attack on hours that has developed later. The only big movement of resistance, since the miners' fight—that of the engineers—was based mainly on the right to some small measure of control of industry, a right gained during the war, and swept away by the employers in their search for efficiency in production. To-day the process has almost reached its limit. Something has got to break under the strain. The thing that seems to be cracking, if not yet broken, is the psychological dominance of capitalist needs over the minds of the rank-and-file workers. Their spirit of resistance is vague and unformed as yet. It has no definite aims. There is simply the feeling that something has got to be done, that things cannot go on as they have been doing. There is not even a definite conception yet of the attack on wages as a single process that can only be turned back by some form of united action. But with the growth in the spirit of resistance there is growing up also a hazy feeling that it is time for a reconsideration of the methods and tactics of trade unionism. There has been a sudden growth in interest in the idea of "One Big Union," and considerable pressure towards the amalgamation of the craft unions in various trades. Councils in various parts of the country have been reorganised on industrial lines, and there are proposals for national conferences of the Trade Councils to organise the united action of all Labour. A campaign is on foot for a conference of all working-class organisations in the country to work out a national minimum of agreed demands and methods by which these demands can be secured. All these are signs of the new spirit at work in the rank and file.

But if the grip of capitalism on the minds of the rank and file seems to be breaking, under the pressure of continually worse conditions, the more obvious bonds that hold their leaders show no signs of slackening. Trade union officials are quite frankly reluctant to fight. They recognise the spirit of the members of their unions, but they are "willing to run the risk of repudiation by the men" (as a leading article in the Daily Herald pointed out, with approval, in regard to the officials of the Building Trades

States, Mongole-digitized / http://www.hathirusi.arg/Access.use#fmins-google

Federation). The phrase of pained disapproval with which Mr. J. H. Thomas greeted the cheers for a strike by a meeting of railwaymen—" no strike gets enthusiastic support from me"— has been quoted in almost every paper in the country, and ought to become a classic. In every case where a dispute is only developing the union officials are "holding back the men," and in many cases where disputes are or have been in progress the men's leaders have offered or accepted terms that their followers have definitely rejected. How far their action is dictated by their own political opinions and hopes is not easy to determine, but they certainly lack the will to win necessary in order to prevent the disastrous intervention of the leaders of the political Labour Party, whose view of industrial disputes is dictated by their fondness for middle-class votes.

T was the intervention of one of these leaders that led the building workers to an agreement that is not very far from being a complete disaster. The position of the operatives was strong; the employers were divided, and those in the south might not have faced a lockout. The number who had actually posted lockout notices on April 7 was small as compared with the membership of the Employers' Federation. The men were defending a principle—the forty-four hour week—that they had fought for in the past and were willing to fight for again. But now this principle is submitted to the hazard of regional negotiation or "impartial arbitration," while a further reduction of wages below the level of the cost of living agreement seems almost certain. The workers are -wisely-given no chance to reject this agreement; their choice in the regional ballots is between local negotiations, in which they will not have the support of their Federation behind them, negotiation through the National Wages and Conditions Council, or arbitration by a representative of the ruling classes. This is Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's solution.

N another and not less important dispute the same thing has occurred. Mr. MacDonald has used his good offices to end the farm workers' struggle in Norfolk. Here the solidarity of the men and their splendid temper had given real chances of success.

1 100

血統

100 2

100

desc

ale:

世

D più

trail.

OBE

शंह

仙

r is

B.

II.

Their leaders were carried with them into counter-attack; they put forward, to the amazement and disgust of the farmers, a demand for something that comes near to being a living wage—thirty shillings for a fifty-hour week. But the flush of fighting energy, in the Union officials, did not last long. Through the mediation of Mr. Harry Gosling an offer of a futile "three months' truce" was put forward. That failed; Mr. MacDonald succeeded. The terms which he induced the men to accept include a fifty-hour week, but the provision with regard to overtime make it certain that whenever the weather conditions are possible a fifty-four hour week will be worked. For the "overtime" hours up to fifty-four are to be paid for at the same rate as the ordinary working hours, and in practice will not be considered overtime at all. The men have gained two things: the guarantee of a minimum of twenty-five shillings, whatever the number of hours worked, and the shilling difference between the present terms per week and the employers' last offer, To gain these they have had to give up the extraordinarily strong position in which a month of solid resistance had placed them. Mr. MacDonald's intervention was not aimed at helping these workers in their fight for a living wage. He had other aims, and seems to have achieved them.

HESE interventions by the political leaders of Labour are not mistakes in tactics that can be passed over, or steps taken under the pressure of extraordinary necessity. The Labour Party is steadily developing a whole philosophy of mediation between employers and employed. "Mediation," writes Mr. Arthur Henderson, "in the period of industrial unrest that appears to have started, will evidently be an important part of the work of the Parliamentary representatives of the working classes." The Labour Party, in fact, only considers itself representative of the working classes when no particular issue is involved; when there is a struggle on, and middle-class opinion is touchy or definitely hostile to the workers, the Labour Party remembers its phrases about representing the interests of the whole community, and "mediates" between the workers and their opponents. technique of class collaboration is evolving. A year ago Mr. Henderson secured the surrender of the A.E.U. with considerable

difficulty; to-day Mr. MacDonald has settled the builders' and farm-workers' struggles with an ease that recalls the Lloyd George of pre-war days. The Labour Party has avoided the issue of the class war and deliberately excluded from its organisations those who have that issue continually in view. The result is that the Party can no longer help the workers in their industrial struggles, and its leader has come to play the part of an agent of the (capitalist) community.

T. L.

# THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY AND KARL MARX

ildes : nd Gz

SIE G.

T.L

## By N. LENIN

HE realisation of the inadequacy and one-sidedness of the old materialism convinced Marx of the necessity of bringing social science into accord with the materialist foundation of society. If materialism lays down the general rule that consciousness is to be explained by being, then the application of materialism to the examination of society demands that social consciousness be explained by social being. "Technology," says Marx, "reveals the active attitude of Man towards Nature, the immediate productive process of his life, and at the same time the social relations of his life and the mental conceptions arising therefrom." Marx gives a consistent formulation of the fundamentals of materialism in its application to human society and its history in the preface to his book, "Critique of Political Economy," in the following words:—

In the life of social production, human beings enter into definite and necessary relations which are independent of their will, and correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these productive relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis, upon which a legal and political superstructure arises, and which corresponds to definite forms of social consciousness. The methods of production of man's material existence determine the whole process of social, political, and It is not the consciousness of human beings which determines their existence; the reverse is the case; their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or, in juridical language, with the relations of property within which they have hitherto functioned, These relations are transformed from forms of development of the productive forces into fetters of production.

Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, æsthetic, or philosophic—in short, ideological—forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out.

Just as little as one can judge an individual by what he thinks himself to be can such a revolutionary epoch be judged by its consciousness; it must necessarily be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflicts between social productive forces and relations of production. No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. Broadly conceived, Asiatic, antique, feudal, and modern bourgeois methods of production may be designated as progressive epochs of the economic social development. The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production.

The materialist conception of history, or, strictly speaking, the application of materialism to the sphere of social phenomena, has removed two of the main defects of the theory of history as hitherto understood. History has, at best, up to now, considered the ideal motives of the historical activity of human beings, without examining into the cause of these motives, without discovering the objective law behind the development of the system of social relations, without seeking for the root of these relations in the degree of development of material production. Secondly, the theories applied up to now have overlooked precisely the activity of the great masses of the population, while historical materialism has for the first time made it possible for us to examine, with the precision of natural science, the social conditions influencing the life of the masses, and the changes taking place in these conditions. Pre-Marxian "sociology" and history writing achieved at best an accumulation of bare facts, and have provided us with nothing more than a representation of some separate phases of the historical process. Marx showed the way to a comprehensive and thorough examination into the process of origination, evolution, and decay of socialeconomic formations, in that he regarded all contradictory tendencies

Generated on 2025-02-26 20:33 GMT / https://hdt.handle.net/2027/uiug.303 Public Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hethit

13

-02-2G 20:53 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug/: the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hatl

in their totality, and traced them back to accurately definable conditions of life and production in the various classes of society; he thus eliminated subjectivism, as well as arbitrariness in the choice and interpretation of some "leading ideas," and laid bare the roots of all ideas, without exception, and of all the different tendencies in the state of social productive forces. Human beings make their own history, but Marx was the first to show what determines the motives of human beings, and particularly of the masses of human beings; he was the first to show what the totality of all these conflicts is to human society, what are the objective conditions of the production of material life, forming the basis for every historical activity among human beings, and what is the evolutionary law of In this way Marx pointed out the way to the these conditions. scientific study of history as a consistent process, following definite laws through all its multifarious immensity and in all its contradictions.

That in every society the strivings of some members of this society are opposed to the strivings of others, that social life is full of contradictions, that history shows us a struggle between and within peoples and societies, that history is composed of alternating periods of peace and war, revolution and reaction, standstill and rapid advance or decay—all these facts are well known. gave us the clue which enables us to discover the law underlying this apparent labyrinth and chaos. This clue is the theory of class war. It is only the study of the sum total of the strivings of all the members of a society, or of a group of societies, that can lead to a scientific determination of the results of these strivings. The source of conflicting interests lies, however, in the difference of position and living conditions of the classes into which every society is divided. "The history of all societies up to now has been the history of class war," wrote Marx in 1848 in the Communist Manifesto (and Engels added later: "except the history of primeval society"). Free men and slaves, patricians and plebeians, barons and serfs, guild citizens and journeymen, in short, oppressors and oppressed have always stood in opposition to one another, have carried on an uninterrupted struggle, at times open, at times concealed; a fight which invariably ended with a revolutionary reformation of the whole society, or with the common decay of both fighting

rted om 2025-02-26 20:53 GMT / https://hdt.hanfle.net/2027/wing.30112061987290 : Domsin in Une United Steles, Google-digitized / http://www.hathirust.org/access useWpd-us-gmogle classes. In earlier epochs of history we find almost everywhere a complete stratification of society into various classes, a multitudinous graduation of social positions. In ancient Rome we see patricians, plebeians, knights, slaves; in the middle ages—feudal lords, vassals, guild citizens, journeymen, serfs; and within almost all of these classes a still further special graduation. The modern bourgeois society which has arisen out of the decay of feudal society has not annulled class antagonisms. It has only replaced the old classes by new ones, created new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle. Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, however, is distinguished by having simplified class antagonisms. The whole of society splits up more and more into two large hostile camps, into two large classes directly antagonistic to one another: bourgeoisie and proletariat...

Since the great French revolution, European history has revealed in a number of countries, with special clearness, the real fundamental of events, the Class War. Even during the epoch of restoration there were a number of French historians (Thierry, Guizot, Mignet, Thiers) who could not but designate-when forming a generalisation on events-Class War as the key to French history as a whole. And the latest epoch, the epoch of complete victory of the bourgeoisie, of the parliaments, of extended if not general suffrage, of cheap daily newspapers read by the masses, the epoch of mighty and ever growing labour organisations and employers' unions, &c., has shown even more graphically, though often in a very peaceful constitutional form, class war as the motive force underlying events. In a number of historical works, Marx has in fact given us brilliant and profound examples of materialist historical writing, analysing the position of each separate class, and thus demonstrating why and how every struggle of class against class is a political struggle.

## THE GERMAN ARBEITS-GEMEINSCHAFTEN

sveyric militar

FIG.

1 alax

he mi

ed fr

hore

leve

DA-

mi:

hista

-他

TOC

fol

'n

I

## By PAUL HOYER

(Reprinted with acknowledgments to the Labor Herald of Chicago, U.S.A.)

T the triennial congress of the General Federation of Free Trade Unions of Germany last July in Leipzig, one of the most hotly debated subjects was that of whether or not the Federation should participate further in supplying delegates to the Arbeitsgemeinschaften (Joint Industrial Councils) that were set up in 1918, or whether they should abandon the policy and leave the field open to the "Christian" trade unions, the Hirsch-Dunker Gewerkvereine, and other non-socialist federations of workers to fill their vacancies. So close was the vote that those who stand for continuing the policy of collaboration with the bosses can take little comfort from the result, even though they won a technical victory. For the number of delegates voting against the proposal of continuing was larger than the number voting in favour—the vote stood 345 for abandoning the Arbeitsgemeinschaften and 327 for retaining them—and only the fact that the 327 delegates represented 3,803,186 members while the 345 represented but 3,582,362 saved the day for the reactionaries by a narrow margin.

What, then, are these Joint Industrial Councils about which opponents and friends are so stirred up?

During the great world war, under the slogan of preserving the unity of the empire, the unions and the bosses had agreed to refrain from measuring their strength in strikes and lockouts, and to try to compose their differences over the green table. Then, in 1918, came the revolution with its tremendous upheavals. For a while it looked as though Germany might go the way of Russia and become a Workers' State. The bosses saw two alternatives—one, of losing all they had and seeing their industries nationalised; the other, of continuing the "industrial peace" policy of war time, and of admitting the workers to equal partnership, on the surface at least, in the management of industry. They chose the latter—and the workers fell for the bait.

Thus on November 15, 1918, an agreement was arrived at between the leading associations of employers on the one hand, and the general commission of the Free Trade Unions of Germany, the Federation of Christian Trade Unions, the Federation of German Workers' Associations (also known as the Hirsch-Dunkers, after their founders), the Polish Unions, and the Joint Councils of shopkeepers' assistants, of non-manual workers' federations, and of technical employees, on the other. This agreement provided for certain reforms, and the establishment of a central committee with equal representation of employers and employees to settle all disputes.

Further negotiations ensued, and by December, 1919, a definite constitution had been adopted for the "Central Joint Council of the Industrial Employers and Employees of Germany," the

preamble of which reads as follows:-

Imbued with the realisation and the responsibility, that the reconstruction of our national economy demands the co-operation of all economic and mental forces and an all-embracing, harmonious working union, the organisations of industrial employers and employees associate themselves in a central joint industrial council.

It will be seen from the very wording of the preamble that an harmonious living together of the lion and the lamb is the object

sought.

Space will not permit the reproduction of all the provisions of the constitution. Suffice it for me to construct a picture from it as to how the joint industrial councils are made up, what classes of workers and of industrials they embrace, and what the tasks are

that are delegated to them under the rules adopted.

German industry is, for the purpose of the councils, subdivided into fourteen branches; iron and metal, food and drink, building, textile, mining, glass and pottery, wood, clothing, paper, leather, chemical, oils and fats, and stone industries, as well as the electrical, gas, and water works. Each of these forms a national joint industrial council for its particular branch. Each council is made up of an equal number of representatives of the employers and of the employees. The basis of representation is the following: for the first 150,000 workers employed in the industry, one representative each of the employers and employees constitutes uir.

des

GE

habe

.De

THE

31 4

扩

ett.

4

1

07

Œ.

5

11

2 8

the joint council; for 150,000 to 250,000, two each; for 250,000 to 350,000, three each, and so on. The national councils may be subdivided geographically or as subdivisions of the same industry.

Each national joint industrial council has jurisdiction over questions pertaining exclusively to that industry, each regional council over those affecting that geographical district, and so on. Each national joint council determines independently the size of its executive committee and its general committee, and regulates its own order of business. The tasks of these bodies are described in the constitution as "the autonomous regulation of questions pertaining to the particular industry or trade."

Out of these national councils and their regional or trade subdivisions is created the Central Joint Industrial Council, the Zentralarbeitsgemeinschaft for all Germany. Its purpose is that of "solving by common effort all economic and socio-political questions affecting German industry and trade, as well as all matters of legislation and administration pertaining to same." It has two national organs-a Central Executive Committee (Zentralvorstand) and a Central General Committee, or Board of Directors (Zentralausschuss).

The Central Executive Committee is composed of twenty-three representatives each of employers and employees, each of the fourteen branches of industry having the right to at least one from both sides. The election of the twenty-three workers' representatives is one of the chief bones of contention in the present fight in the Free Trade Unions. The Central Board of Directors varies in size, but it has one fixed quantity in the provision that it shall have, besides delegates from the joint national councils, "nine representatives to be designated by the central federations of employers and employees." The functions of this Central Board of Directors are defined as follows:-

> The tasks of the Central Board of Directors consist in the discussion and regulation of all questions that are common to all national joint industrial councils, in other words, to the entire industry and the entire trade of Germany, as well as such questions as go beyond the jurisdiction of the individual national councils. The Central Board of Directors is the final authority on questions at issue between the various national joint industrial councils.

Unless there are provisions to the contrary in the collective agreements between employers and employees, the national joint industrial councils have the right and duty of interpreting collective agreements and of mediating in the event of differences between the bosses and the workers.

Such, then, is the general structure of the Arbeitsgemeinschaften system. What next are the questions which it undertakes to solve?

The report for 1922 is not yet complete, so that my more recent data are not from official reports, but were supplied by the labour secretary of the Zentralarbeitsgemeinschaft in Berlin. For the years 1919 and 1920, however, a detailed printed report is available, from which can be seen the wide range of subjects touched upon.

One of the first tasks was that of clarifying the relations of this voluntary association to the National Economic Council, and the Ministry of Labour, bodies created by the new German constitution.

Conferences brought about the official recognition of the joint industrial councils, which were given consultative and nominative powers. Relations having been established with the Government, the councils got to work. I will not deal with the various national sub-councils, but rather review the work of the Zentralarbeits-gemeinschaft, for all questions of national importance came before that body. Chronologically, the following are some of the things with which the Central Joint Council dealt:—

Protested against separation of Saar Valley from Germany, and against provisions of Versailles Treaty; obtained representation of the joint council in delegation to Versailles; worked out plan for restoration of devastated areas in France and Belgium, which was frustrated by France's refusal; sought to stimulate production of coal by placing miners in a specially preferred category, the proposal failing of adoption; issued an appeal for greater production in name of patriotism, and opposed shortening of work day; protested against chaotic conditions prevailing in the railway system; brought about reorganisation of the National Economic Council; proposed an extra duty on exports to improve social insurance, which collapse of the mark and Governmental delay brought to nothing—Government agreed to this extra tax, but put it in the general treasury; and co-operated in the establishment of national employment bureaux.

ale

002

12 ch. 10 NO. T ď. de

1 t.E 12 E. ċ

The above topics, taken from the official report for 1919 and 1920, indicate the problems with which the Central Industrial Council concerned itself in that time. According to the Labour secretary of the council, more recent activities include:-

On the question of the eight-hour day, the council agreed that "in principle" the eight-hour day must be adhered to, but that under certain conditions overtime work must be permitted, in view of the economic plight of Germany; "stimulation of production," insisted upon by the bosses, brought about by winning over unions to agreements with the bosses for overtime work; prevailed upon railroad workers to accept compromise on pay for time when held in readiness for service, at 50 per cent. to 70 per cent. of regular wage; sought to prevent strikes by securing automatic rise in wages as index figures for cost of living rose.

Having traced the origin and composition of the joint industrial councils, and having shown with what kind of questions they concern themselves, I shall now try to give as objectively as possible the two points of view prevailing in the organised Labour Movement as to the advantages and disadvantages of the scheme to the workers themselves.

Those who favour the Arbeitsgemeinschaft advance several arguments in substance as follows: That in comparison with the times when trade union leaders were jailed for trying to organise, the granting of formal equality in the joint councils is a big step forward; that the joint councils are a training school for the workers in learning the management of industry; that the joint councils afford favourable conditions for carrying on the class struggle on the basis of equality with the employer; and finally, that the scheme is, after all, nothing more than an extension of collective bargaining.

This point of view is held by the official leaders of the trade unions, and was urged strongly before the Tenth Congress of the General Federation of Free Trade Unions of Germany at Nuremberg in 1919, when already grave objections to the scheme were voiced. It was put forward with even greater emphasis before the Eleventh Congress at Leipsig in July, 1922.

The attack against the joint councils was led chiefly by the Communists, but was also supported by those Socialists who until

recently constituted the Independent Socialist Party, and even by a number of Majority Socialists, and rested upon arguments somewhat as follows:—

The fundamental idea underlying the Arbeitsgemeinschaften is that of industrial peace. This, says the militants, is something we do not want, for there cannot be peace until the workers have been victorious. Victory cannot come through joint councils of workers and bosses, but only through wiping out the boss-worker relationship—through the abolition of capitalism. To go into the joint councils is to prop up the capitalist system.

Secondly, experience has shown that almost every worker delegate to a joint council loses his Labour viewpoint. He soon sees matters through the eyes of the employer. He becomes filled with pride at the thought of being on an equal footing with the boss and suddenly thinks the employer not such a bad fellow after all. Also, the employers, having great financial resources, can send as their delegates men who are skilled in making argument most attractive and innocent looking, and who "put one over" on the workers without their being aware of it until it is too late.

Thirdly, say the militants, the joint councils do not at all place the workers on equality with the bosses. Part of the "equal" representation of the workers is made up of delegates, like those from the "Christians" and Hirsch-Dunkers, that are so many tools of the bosses, and ready in decisive moments to betray the interests of the workers.

As for the argument that the joint councils are a training ground for management of industry, this is stoutly denied by the militants. The bosses use one set of data and figures in these councils and another set in their own employers' and manufacturers' associations. And finally, the militants challenge the defenders of the Arbeitsgemeinschaften to name a single advantage thus far gained that could not better have been secured by the workers in their own organisation, dealing with the employers, not as joint councils for industrial peace, but as exponents of the class struggle.

Such is the line up on this great issue in Germany to-day. The movement against the Arbeitsgemeinschaften is growing stronger. One national union—the shoe workers'—has withdrawn from the joint councils. How fast the others will follow suit depends upon

200 00

all r

In:

die

TIE

也工

额

the degree of strength the militants can muster. Certain it is that the Communist members of the General Federation of Free Trade Unions stand unalterably opposed to the idea, and that the great majority of the former Independent Socialists favours cutting loose from the semi-fraternal relationship with the bosses. To the extent that the German workers regain their spirit, and recover from the general weariness now prevalent, the struggle against the Arbeitsgemeinschaften will once more sweep the great German Labour Movement into the active class struggle. With growing turmoil in the industrial and political life of the German nation these joint councils and the question of collaboration within them are becoming the storm centres of the Labour Movement.

# PROLETARIAN POETRY—I

## By A. BOGDANOV

PROLETARIAN poetry is, first of all, poetry, a definite form of art.

There is no poetry, just as in general there is no art, where there are no living images. If we put the multiplication table or the laws of physics into verse—no matter how smooth and finished the verse may be—this will not be poetry, for abstract

ideas are not living images.

There is also no poetry, just as in general there is no art, where there is no harmony in the combination of images, where there is no conformity and connection between them, no "arrangement" one might say . . . If, for instance, the figures in a painting are not connected by uniformity of plan, or if they are arranged in a casual, disorderly manner, there is no picture, and the result has nothing to do with the art of painting.

It is necessary to know and remember this maxim: art is the arrangement of living images; poetry is the arrangement of living

images in verbal form.

Poetry began where human speech itself began. The spontaneous cries which accompanied the efforts of primitive men were the embryos of words, the first indications; they were natural and intelligible indications of those actions during which they sprang up. And these labour cries became also the origin of the labour song. Song was not simply a matter of amusement or distraction. When labour was being done in common it served to unite the efforts of the workers, giving them a certain harmony, a rhythmic regularity and coherence. Consequently, song was a means for the organisation of collective effort. This same significance is preserved by it at the present day.

In the war song, which developed later, this same organisational significance is manifested in a somewhat different way. It was

1 c.f. Hauling songs and chants-Translator.

usually sung before battle, and it creates a uniform mood, unity of the collective spirit, the first condition for concerted action in battle. It is, so to speak, the preliminary organisation of the forces of a collectivity for the difficult task before it.

The second root of poetry is the myth. The myth is also the beginning of knowledge in general.

Originally words indicated human actions. But only by means of these same words could men communicate with each other about the phenomena of external nature and of its elemental forces. Thus it happened that, in every tale or description, even the most crude, nature inevitably became personified. No matter what was spoken of, animals or trees, the sun or moon, a river or the sea, the impression was always conveyed that some man was being talked about—the sun "walks" over the sky, in the morning he "rises," in the evening he "goes to sleep," in winter he "sickens, becomes weak," in spring he "gets well again," &c. This involuntary transference of ideas from the human to the elemental is called the "primary metaphor." Without it, thinking of the surrounding non-human world would be impossible, and consequently knowledge could not be created.

Later on, thought little by little assimilated the distinction existing between itself and external surroundings, but it did not completely emancipate itself from the primary metaphor. The word "mir" (the Russian for "world") is one of its vestiges, for it means a community, a collectivity of men, and in some provinces mir means simply "the village" or the village community. And in poetry the primary metaphor has always retained its great rôle: the personification of nature is still the most important method of poetry.

Originally there was no element of fiction in the myth. When a father related to his children all that he knew from experience about the changing fortunes of the sun during its annual cycle, this crude lecture on astronomy invariably took the form of a tale about the adventures of a man, powerful and good, carrying on a struggle against hostile forces which sometimes had to retreat before him, and sometimes overpowered and defeated him, &c. In the course of time poetical myths developed out of this tale, such as the Babylonian epic of the hero Gilgamesh, or that of Hercules amongst

ģį

the Greeks. If a man wished to inform his less experienced friend that the corpses of the dead are harmful to the living, that they cause sickness or even death, he could do so only in the form of a tale about the wickedness of the dead, about their enmity to the living. In time this gave rise to the myth about ghouls. At that time this was the only possible form of imparting knowledge to others in society.

Poetry, prose, science, all these were inseparably fused in that indefinite embryo, the primitive myth. But the vital sense of the myth, its significance for society, was quite definite: it also was an instrument for the organisation of the social toiling life of men. Why is the knowledge of man about himself, about life and nature, gathered and handed down from generation to generation? In order to harmonise the practical efforts of men, to direct them according to this knowledge, to arrange them—in a word, to organise them upon the basis of this knowledge.

The original sun-myth—a description of the seasons of the year—gave directions as to the cycles of agricultural work, and the times for hunting and fishing; and these directions were necessary for men whose social organisation was based upon the systematic division of their labour according to the seasons. The myth about the dead furnished directions for the hygienic measures that must be taken with regard to corpses; they must be buried deep enough, at a considerable distance from dwelling places, &c. In those times primitive poetic knowledge played the same organising rôle as modern exact science plays in modern production.

Has the vital significance of poetry changed in its essence since then?

Let us recall what the epics of Homer and Hesiod were to ancient Greece: they were an important educational means. Now, what is education? It is the fundamental organisational work which introduces new members into society. Human raw material is developed and prepared so as to become useful living links in the system of social connections, each occupying his own place and accomplishing his own part in the general social process. Education organises the human collectivity just as drilling, discipline, and instruction in the technique of war organises an army.

Ž

ė

Ď.

ŕ

è

Those of our art theorists who, following the aristocratic or partly bourgeois traditions, consider art as an "adornment of life," a kind of luxury, do not understand to what extent they contradict themselves when they admit at the same time that art has an educational, i.e., just a practical and organisational significance.

There are two bourgeois theories: the theory of "pure art" and that of "social art." The first maintains that art must be an end in itself, must be free from the interests and strivings of the practical struggles of humanity. The second maintains that art must carry out in life the progressive tendencies of these struggles. We may discard both theories once we discover what art actually is in the life of the world. Art organises the forces of life quite independently of whether it has any social aims or not. There is no need to attach any aims to art—they are only an unnecessary and harmful constraint on it. The artist can give the most harmonious arrangement to his living images when he does so freely, without compulsion or direction. But it would also be absurd to prohibit art from taking from its subject political and social themes. The material for art is the whole of life, without any limitation or restraint.

Lyrical poetry, the art of individual moods and emotions, is the "purest" type of poetry. What or whom can this type of poetry organise socially?

If lyric poetry expressed personal emotions only felt by the artist, and nothing else, it would not be comprehensible or interesting to anyone beside himself—it would not be art. The significance of this poetry lies in the fact that it reveals a certain type of mood, which may be characteristic of various persons. It expresses an association of emotions felt also by a great variety of people. The poet reveals and elucidates to men the moods they have in common, and so he unites and welds them together unobserved, by the unity of mutual understanding in the sphere of sentiment, by the "sympathy" that he awakens in all of them. At the same time the poet educates this aspect of their souls in one direction, and thus deepens and broadens their congeniality, the durability of their group, class, or association. This makes for and develops the possibility of combined and co-ordinated action; here also then, just as in the case of the war song, we have to deal with a

certain preliminary organisation of the forces of a group for the different expressions of their common life and struggle.

The poetry which represents and describes life, as the epic, drama, and the novel, has an organisational significance similar to that science, and serves to direct, on the basis of past experience, the arrangement of mutual relations between men. Thus, epic poems give living images of mass actions, of the connection in such acts between the "heroes," or leaders, and the "crowd" that follows them. They represent the struggle and reconciliation of the collective forces of the people. Most novels in their romantic aspect represent the solution, on the basis of concrete examples, of one type of problem: how individual men and women come together under different conditions to create elementary organisations in the form of families; and then how different individuals adapt themselves to those who are around them, to their social surroundings. Drama represents in action organisational conflicts and their solutions, &c. In our times poetry and fiction in general, for the city population at least, is probably the most popular and important means of education, i.e., of introducing the individual into the established system of social relations.

Modern society is divided into classes. These are collectivities separated by many vital differences; therefore they organise separately, along dissimilar lines, one against the other. Naturally their instruments of organisation (i.e., their ideologies) are different, disparate, not only out of harmony with each other, but simply excluding each other. The same is true with regard to poetry; in a class society, poetry also is representative of the different classes: of the landlord class, the peasantry, bourgeoisie, or proletariat.

Of course, this should not be understood in the sense that poetry defends the interests of one class or another: sometimes this is the case, especially in political and social poetry, but comparatively seldom. The class character of poetry lies much deeper. It is rooted in the fact that the poet sees life from the viewpoint of a certain class; he sees the world with the eyes of that class; he thinks and feels in the way peculiar to his class because of its social nature. Behind the individual author is hidden the collective author, his class; and poetry is part of its self-consciousness.



0

Ţ

ľ.

E

ď.

-

The individual author may not even think of it, not even suspect it. In the works themselves there is sometimes no direct indication of their class source, no mention of it at all. Take for instance the lyrical poetry of Fet. This beautiful poetry, in which the expressions of the life of nature are gracefully intermingled with the finest emotions of the poet himself, seems, at first glance, to be an example of "pure art," apart from every class element. And yet, even before Marxism was known in Russia, there were men who saw that it was "aristocratic" poetry. "Aristocratic," that means typical of the landed nobility; it originated in the moods, in the surroundings and the forms of life and thought, of a certain caste, a class in Russian society. And such is actually the truth of the matter.

That deep and absolute aloofness from all material, economic, prosaic cares, which is so characteristic of Fet's lyrics, was only possible for the truly aristocratic nobility of the countryside which had become more and more divorced from production and its struggles. Even the bourgeoisie, which was then developing and was concerned with profits and competition, could not cultivate those sort of subtle emotions and sentiments; and besides, being for the most part an urban class, it was not able to see and understand nature as sensitively as the gentry and the lords of the manor. It is quite easy to see that this poetry must have, indeed, served as an organising force for the landlord caste. This caste was already in a state of decadence, but, of course, it did not want to leave the historical stage, and was still vigorously defending its interests. Fet's poetry not only united the representatives of the landlord caste in a certain community and identity of mood, but at the same time it put them indirectly in opposition to the rest of society, and so strengthened their feeling of unity. It strengthened their consciousness of their spiritual superiority over all other classes of society, and consequently their consciousness of their right to a privileged position. It was as though this poetry said to them: "See, what æsthetic and sublime beings we are, how tender and subtle our souls are, how noble our culture is." And hence followed naturally the desire to defend this culture firmly and unitedly, so to defend the fundamental basis of this culture: material wealth and a ruling position.

ed on 2025-02-26 20:53 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/ulug/30112061987290 Domain in The United States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathlrusf.org/access\_usedpd-us-google In a society of classes there is no room for non-class poetry. But this is not to say that in every given instance poetry belongs to one particular class. Thus, in the poetry of Nekrassov there is a fervent defence of the exploited peasantry, and a deep and sympathetic understanding of its life, together with a vivid expression of the strivings, ideas, and sentiments of the urban "intelligentzia," a class then just developing, but restrained by the old régime. Nekrassov belonged to this class by his occupation. At the same time there are in his poetry remnants of the psychology of the landed gentry to which he belonged by birth. This is inter-class poetry. Such, for the most part, is also the democratic poetry of our own days: the elements of the peasant class, of the working class, and of the "intelligentzia" are here intermingled. This can also be easily seen in many of our modern poets, who rose from among the people.

The character of proletarian poetry is defined by the primary and vital conditions of the working class itself: by its position in production, by the type of its organisation, by its historical destiny.

The proletariat is a toiling, exploited, struggling, developing class. It is a class which is concentrated in masses in the cities, and the fellowship of co-operation is its characteristic. All these traits tend equally to distinguish proletarian poetry, and make it different from

any other poetry.

Toil, exploitation at the hands of the ruling classes, the struggle against exploitation, the striving towards progress—do all these traits distinguish the proletariat from the poorer peasantry, from the lower strata of the toiling "intellectuals"? Obviously not; they are inherent in these groups too; they bring them nearer to the working class. These groups have had earlier opportunity than the proletariat to create their poetry; and in its first steps on the path of poetic creation the proletariat naturally joins with them. Its attempts are here still of an undefined class character: it is revolutionary-democratic poetry. Let us take, for an example, the beautiful song written by a young worker, Alex. Gmiriev, who died in the penitentiary under the régime of autocracy.

#### SCARLET

We are come to meet the sunrise. We are come, And to freedom do we sing our scarlet song. 京は大田市

世 祖 田 田 田 田 田 田

//hdl.handle.net/2027/uilig.30112061987298 igitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/acces

erated on 2025-02-26 20155 GMT / https://hdl.har Nic Domain in the United States, Google-digitized Hear the scarlet sounds resound above the earth; They awaken, horrifying all, like songs of war.

As a summons to the proud of heart and soul, Mightily our song resounds across the world,

We are come to meet the sunrise. We are come, With the scarlet flag of freedom we march on.

See our banner with the Sun-blood for its hue, See it burning, conquering eternal gloom.

Crèpe for the fallen is our standard's staff of black. . . . .

We are come with scarlet banner, we are come With a song of scarlet, on the scarlet road of Sun.

Long, incessant as the ages, is our way, But it is the purest and most scarlet way.

We are few, we're small in numbers—have no fear— Millions more are come to join us, and to bear

All our burdens, and our banner—freedom, blood! We are madmen, but immortal as our love.

Let us then not tarry to mourn above the tombs, Onward, onward, all who love the sun!

We are come to meet the sunrise, we are come, And with song and scarlet banner we march on.

There is nothing about this song, except the personality of the author, to make it really proletarian. It could inspire workers to revolutionary impulse, or equally well inspire the former champions of the progressive intellectuals—the narodovoltzi (fighters for popular freedom)—or the peasant fighters for land and liberty. And the bulk of the old revolutionary poetry is of the same sort, whether it originates from among the intellectuals, the peasants, or the workers.

What essentially separates the proletariat from all the other democratic elements is the distinctive type of its labour and the way in which it works together.

The deepest breach in the nature of human toil was made when the "brains" became separated from the "working hands," when "managing" became separated from "execution," when one man started to think and solve problems for the others, and directed them, while the others had to do what he ordered them, and do it in the way he ordered. This was the separation of the "organiser" from the "executor," it was the beginning of authority and subordination. One man became a superior being in relation to the others, and this gave rise to the feeling of admiration. On the basis of this feeling the religious view of life began to develop. Previously there was no such view of life, and there was even no room for it, for elemental nature with its sullen forces causes in man only animal fear, not the "fear of God." Man was in awe of these powerful hostile forces, but he had no idea of superior beings, or of meekness and admiration, the indispensable elements of religion. Authoritative co-operation, growing and deepening, saturated the whole consciousness of men with the spirit of authority: nature became subjected to ruling organisers—divinities; each body received its ruling organiser—the soul.

By the very character of his work the organiser is a higher type, the executor a lower. The one has initiative, observation, control, for which he must use experience, knowledge, and exerted attention; the other knows only mechanical execution, for which he has no need for all these qualities, but only for passive discipline, blind obedience. The slave, the serf, or the soldier in the army of an ancient despot does not need to take thought while doing his work; on the contrary, thought might even prove harmful. He is only a living tool, no more.

The second breach in the nature of human labour is specialisation. Every specialist has his own task, his own experience, his distinct little world. The tiller of the land knows his field, plough, and horse; the blacksmith knows his forge, bellows, hammers; the shoemaker his leathers, awls, and blocks. No one wants or can afford to know anybody else's profession, because everybody is anxious to concentrate on his own business and master it to perfection. The breach is still more deepened by the separation and independence of the specialised enterprises, which meet only on the market, whither they come to exchange their goods. There, their mutual connection is completely hidden behind the struggle of all against all: the sellers against the buyers for prices, the sellers between themselves for sales, the buyers between themselves for the goods, if there is a scarcity of them.

This second breach in the nature of human labour gives rise to individualism. Man becomes accustomed in his thoughts and feelings to separating himself from all other men; he looks upon himself as existing quite apart from all others, with distinct interests, independent of his social surroundings in his strivings and actions, an independent creative being. For him his own individuality, his personal "ego," is the centre of his view of life and of his sense of the world; the freedom of his "ego" in his highest ideal.

Both these changes in the nature of labour run through all the consciousness of the old classes; consequently they manifest themselves also in their poetry. The poetry of the purely authoritative epoch and of the epoch of feudalism is penetrated with the spirit of authority; the myths and epics, such at the Book of Genesis with the Hebrews, the Iliad and Odyssey with the Greeks, the Mahabharata of the Hindus, the "Billinas" and the "Lay of Igor's Regiment" of the Russians, limit the whole course of life, all the chain of its events, to the activity of deities, heroes, kings, and leaders; the lyric of this period—the best example of it are the Psalms of David-perceives nature as a revelation of the will of God, and is saturated with a spirit of prayer and submission. In the poetry of the bourgeois world individualism reigns supreme : there the centre is the individual, with his fortunes and experiences. The poem, novel, drama, describe the conflicts of the individual with the rest of the world, his relations to other people and to nature, his struggle for happiness or for his career, his creative activity, his victories and defeats; lyric poetry is also limited to individual psychology, to the emotions and moods of the individual: his perception of nature, his joys, sorrows, dreams, disappointments, sexual love with its sufferings and exaltations .

(To be continued)

k

## EGYPTIAN NATIONAL-ISM AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

By G. A. HUTT

OR British imperialism Egypt means primarily three things. First, it means a source of raw cotton and a market for cotton piece goods. Second, it means a highly profitable field for investment and financial operations of all kinds. Third, it means the Suez Canal. Ever since Mohammed Ali introduced the culture of fine cotton into Egypt four years after the battle of Waterloo, British commercial interests have driven an extremely lucrative trade at Alexandria in this important raw material: about the middle of the century the Egyptian Government began to be wrapped more and more firmly in the toils of European financiers-English, French, and Greek: finally, with the development of imperialism, it became increasingly evident that British imperialism was intent on securing the monopoly in exploitation of Egypt. It is true that for many years critical relations subsisted between British and French imperialism in Egypt, and this period of crisis was not finally liquidated till the Anglo-French agreement of 1904, by which France found her quid pro quo in Morocco. In fact, however, the ultimate dominance of British imperialism in Egypt had been secured by Disraeli's notorious coup of the purchase of the Suez Canal shares in 1875. This acute stroke of imperialist policy arose very simply out of the needs of the political situation: for a glance at the map will show that, with sea communication between the Mediterranean and Red Seas, Egypt is the key position of the British Empire. It is unthinkable that British imperialism should lose control of Egypt and yet maintain its grip on India. And the imperialists of Britain realise this with perfect clearness. Egypt has been variously described as the "coping stone" or the "occipital nerve" of the British Empire; and either metaphor will serve. Further, Egypt is the centre from which British imperialism can dominate the Sudan, the Hedjaz and Arabia, Palestine, Mesopotamia-and from which, too, it can exercise an effective surveillance

## Egyptian Nationalism and Class Struggle 287

over the operations of French and Italian imperialism in northern and eastern Africa, to say nothing of the French Syrian mandate. But in Egypt itself the solidarity of the different imperialisms is complete. They group themselves naturally round British imperialism, as the one with the strongest hold, and nothing illustrated this more vividly than the way in which, on the outbreak of the 1919 mass revolts, the foreign commercial communities in Egypt unanimously took their stand behind Britain in the struggle with the rising. Those sections of Egyptian nationalism who still nourish hopes of a return to the dual control, whereby they may be enabled to play off Britain against France to the advantage of the nationalist cause, are indeed embracing a chimera. The struggle against British imperialism is for Egypt the struggle against all imperialism.

It should be noted that Egypt has achieved a more advanced stage of capitalist development than any other country in the Near East: the differentiation of classes on the basis of the class struggle is appearing in a very marked way. Of course, feudal relations still subsist, and anyhow the Nile Valley is likely to remain agrarian. But the British imperialist regime has meant that from a typical self-sufficing agrarian country Egypt has been transformed into (largely) a cotton plantation for the benefit of Lancashire cotton capitalists. This, although Egypt is eminently capable of developing economically on European industrial lines: for with the development of hydro-electric technique the potentialities of Egyptian water power become immense. However, it is clearly not to the interest of British imperialism to permit such a technical development to be utilised in Egypt. So the structure of British imperialism is here most plainly acting as a curb on the productive forces of Egyptian society. The fight for economic self-determination at once becomes an integral and vital part of the nationalist and antiimperialist struggle.

There is no need here to trace in detail the course of the nationalist agitation against the British occupation which has occupied the last forty years. From the days of Colonel Arabi to the outbreak of war in 1914, this agitation changed very little, either in content or in the people engaged in carrying it on. It fluctuated in intensity from year to year and decade to decade with an almost completely moribund period in the early eighteen-nineties. The nationalists

M - M

li i

I

13

11

1

11

d

were large landowners, officials, professional men, lawyers, intellectuals, and so forth—the so-called Pasha class. In 1906, when hopes of help from France in the carrying on of nationalist agitation had disappeared, a party known as the Khizb-el-Uma, or People's Party, was organised. It was essentially composed of the elements mentioned above, and was moderate to the pitch of loyalism in character. The more radical Left Wing formed the Khizb-el-Watani, or Nationalist Party, which took up the nationalist struggle as a revolutionary struggle against British imperialism, at the same time recognising the important part the masses of workers and peasants were destined to play in this struggle. In fact, as might have been expected, the leadership of the Khizb-el-Watani coming from the rising native capitalist class and the professionals, it dared not give the masses a fighting lead when the moment came for action.

With the war came the declaration of the British Protectorate over Egypt-" for the duration." At first the Egyptians were assured that they were only desired to maintain a benevolent neutrality in the struggle of imperialisms: but it was not long before requisitions of farm beasts and food supplies were in full swing, and the young fellaheen were forced to "volunteer" for the Egyptian Labour Corps by the most rigorous martial law brutality. The martial law regime roused the keenest resentment and fury among the Egyptian masses: and in addition their economic position grew steadily more deplorable. The first months of the war were accompanied by an acute fall in prices. The crops were not worth the cost of reaping them, and were left to rot; the distressed fellaheen wandered up and down the country in faminestricken crowds, and the workers in the towns suffered considerably. After a time prices began to recover, and then swept upward to an unheard-of height. In 1919 prices were in many cases ten times more than they were in 1914: the average wage had only increased three times. When, on the cessation of the war, the British Protectorate and the hated martial law regime continued to exist without the least sign of abolition, the temper of the masses reached boiling point. The objective situation was undeniably revolutionary-but the masses were leaderless and unorganised. Who was the eagerly awaited leader to be?

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN fr.

Pe

2

1

1

15

51

4

1

2

K

M - M - M

ij

It was hardly to be expected that the culturally backward masses would throw up their own leaders. Besides, Egypt had not yet experienced the bourgeois revolution. It was, therefore, not surprising that the man who came forward was a representative of the interests of the progressive capitalist class—an ex-Minister of Education, Zaghlul Pasha. Zaghlul organised the Egyptian deputation to the Peace Conference—the Wafd-el-Mosri—and applied to the British military authorities for passports, which were refused: at once the whole nation ranged itself behind Zaghlul, and virtually gave him a mandate to speak in the name of the nation. The subsequent deportation of Zaghlul and his companions led directly to the mass uprising of March, 1919. The workers struck, the civil servants struck, women demonstrated, students demonstrated, the fellaheen cut telegraph wires and tore up railway tracks. Repression, with all its accompaniment of imprisonment, exile, floggings, hangings, did not stop the revolt. The British Government was forced to allow the Wafd to come to London for negotiations: and out of these negotiations one vitally significant fact emerged, namely, that the Wafd, while using the mass revolt as a means of forcing a compromise on the British Government, while adopting the revolutionary slogans of the Nationalist Party to this end also, was essentially and fundamentally opportunist. The Wafd was a centre group, and formed a rallying point for the capitalist Right Wing of the Nationalist Party. Zaghlul himself, it should be noticed, retained his membership of the old People's Party. The initial negotiations of the Wafd with the British Government resulted in an impasse—the Zaghlulists declaring that the British terms meant a continuation of a veiled protectorate, while the more conservative followers of Adly Pasha were prepared to compromise to the fullest possible extent, in order to put an end to the (to them) unpleasantly tense political situation. Zaghlulists, in thus affecting intransigeance, were but swayed by the determined pressure of mass revolt.

Meanwhile the Milner Mission had visited Egypt, ostensibly to inquire into the causes of the "late disturbances," and had issued its report. One sentence in that report stands out: it is in the place where the Mission go out of their way to say polite things about the "moderate nationalists," who, it is said, are perfectly willing

T

to recognise special British interests in Egypt; why, then, is there any need for a formal protectorate?—

Would not an orderly and friendly Egypt, in intimate association with Great Britain, serve British purposes as well, or even better, while removing all sense of grievance and all spirit of revolt on the

Egyptian side?

This admirably expresses the aim of enlightened imperialism: it is the classic policy of "rallying the moderates;" and the report went on to observe that this aim might best be secured by a treaty between Britain and Egypt, which would secure the protection of (a) imperial communications, and (b) all "legitimate" foreign interests in Egypt. To get an Egyptian Government which would sign and operate such a treaty became the object of British imperialist policy in Egypt right through the year 1921. Supported by the British power, Adly Pasha formed a Ministry. Zaghlul returned to Egypt, receiving a hero's welcome from the masses of the population, and the political issue that at once arose waswould Zaghlul come to some agreement with Adly, and would the Zaghlulists agree to support Adly's government? In other words, would there be a consolidation of the thin upper strata of feudal lords and the bureaucracy represented by Adly and the progressive capitalists and professionals represented by Zaghlul? As it happened, neither the Zaghlulists nor the British power were convinced that the time was ripe for such a step. reactionary elements in British imperialism-Lord Curzon most notably, seconded by Field Marshal Allenby, the real ruler of Egypt-were not at all convinced that their policy of repression, of the maintenance of direct imperial rule over Egypt, was in any sense bankrupt. Popular feeling in Egypt against Adly was growing in intensity, and negotiations in London between Adly and Lord Curzon broke down. Adly resigned, and the formation of a new Ministry proved quite impossible. Zaghlul Pasha was again deported in December, 1921. This new crisis led to the gradual realisation that the policy of repression had failed, and at the end of February, 1922, the formal restoration of Egyptian "independence" was announced. It was a very formal restoration indeed, as the most important questions, such as the Suez Canal and the protection of foreign interests, were absolutely reserved for future discussion between the British Government and the Egyptian

## Egyptian Nationalism and Class Struggle 291

Parliament, when elected. Practically, British imperialism, by this "Unilateral Declaration," was proclaiming to the world its monopoly-interest in Egypt, was crying "Hands off Egypt!" to the other imperialist Powers in order to tighten its own grip.

24,80

200

100

nie.

OM

12.70

112

512

in.

ħ

id!

Ę

1

10

mi

10

F

11

Ė

16

6

A Ministry was formed by Sarwat Pasha, a member of the Adly group. This Ministry dragged out an existence for several months, without being able to achieve anything that either the Egyptian bourgeoisie or the British power wanted. Suddenly, after the acting president of the Wafd had had a mysterious interview with King Fuad, and the Wafd had published a violent manifesto attacking the Government, Sarwat resigned. His resignation was virtually a dismissal, and in his stead Tewfik Nessim Pasha formed a Ministry. Nessim was pro-Zaghlulist, and his Ministry meant an alliance between the Palace—and hence the British power—and the forces of native progressive capitalism organised in the Wafd. At last it seemed that British imperialism had realised the necessity for striking a bargain with the nationalists, of rooting itself more deeply in the organism of Egyptian society than it could by an alliance with the Adly-Sarwat feudal-bureaucratic elements. The struggle between the two classes, the old aristocracy and the new capitalists, as to which should share the exploitation of Egypt with British imperialism, now appeared definitely resolved by the victory of the latter. In future it appeared quite certain that imperialist exploitation would be carried out through the medium of the native bourgeoisie; the basis of British imperialist rule in Egypt had been significantly widened.

As it happened the alliance between the Palace and the Wafd was far from being a permanent one. The British power remained unconvinced of the immediate necessity of striking a bargain with the nationalists in order to make Egypt safe for imperialism. Consequently, from December of last year up to date a peculiarly tortuous series of political intrigues has been taking place in Egypt. The Nessim Ministry was forced by Lord Allenby to resign, early in February, nominally over the Sudan question (which nationalist opinion desires to unite with Egypt), and Adly Pasha once more was discreetly pushed to the front of the political scene by the British power. Meanwhile, the growth of mass unrest was symbolised by the increase of bomb outrages and terroristic

attentats on British troops and civilians. British martial law, still the only reality of Egyptian government, grew daily more brutal. Whole districts were held to ransom for outrages committed in their areas. Even *The Times* correspondent admitted that Egypt was suffering from:—

a martial law regime severer than in any previous period, not excepting in some respects the critical days of 1919.

After much hesitation Adly refused to form a Ministry: but there was no gainsaying Lord Allenby, and rumours soon began to spread that Adly was reconsidering his decision. Just at this moment of crisis, the anti-Adly polemic of the Wafd became mysteriously mild. Adly made advances to the Wafd, which were rejected, it is true, but in a manner that was far from precluding the possibility of such a union in the future. While a particularly violent series of outrages in late February and early March was horrifying imperialist opinion, the British power delayed the arrest of the leaders of the Wafd (which had earlier been threatened if the outrages continued), hoping against hope for a rapprochement between the Wafd and Adly Pasha. In a most revealing dispatch on March 5, The Times correspondent declared (a declaration the significance of which was only heightened by the very disingenuous "recantation" published, obviously under pressure from the British Residency, a few days later) :-

In view of the apparent bankruptcy of martial law, a solution may be found in a new orientation of policy—possibly in entrusting the maintenance of order and security to the Egyptian Government. If this policy were developed it would seem that the only possible course to take would be to release Zaghlul Pasha, the sole Egyptian strong enough to inspire a Government with sufficient power to maintain order without the British support given under martial law.

. . Zaghlul Pasha, or a Government enjoying Zaghlulist support, would also alone be able to "deliver the goods" the British Government requires—namely, an Indemnity Act, the settlement of the conditions of retirement of British officials, &c.

However, repression remained the order of the day: and a stop-gap "Ministry of Affairs" was formed by Yehia Ibrahim Pasha (previously Minister of Education), to deal with the vast amount of administrative business that had accumulated since Nessim's fall. Both the Adly-ites and the Wafd received the new Ministry with suspicious reserve: and the Wafd severely criticised the

## Egyptian Nationalism and Class Struggle 293

(doubtless intentional) vagueness of Yehia Pasha's official utterances. Again the persistent rumour spread that Adly was making advances to the Wafd, which was alleged not to be meeting these advances with much enthusiasm. But the fact is now clear, beyond a doubt, that a consolidation of the feudal-bureaucratic elements under Adly with the bourgeoisie of the Wafd is a political possibility of the fairly near future. Adly has declared against the continuance of martial law, and has won thereby the approval (albeit guarded) of the Zaghlulist Press.

north t

ly son

匾

nd in

dm

y:t

JE:

Wit

007

MITE

M

ikt

100

prot

10

嬔

Par I

100

150

3

15

西西海 丁五

Á

S

4

Ś

Yehia Pasha's Ministry is unlikely to live long: there have already been rumours of a crisis. The enlightened sections of imperialist opinion are calling (as *The Times* dispatch above) for the release of Zaghlul and for a compromise with the Wafd as the only way out of the impasse. The *Manchester Guardian* correctly summed up the whole business by saying:—

With the release of the nationalist leaders and the resumption of normal law we can probably still get a representative Egyptian Cabinet willing to promulgate the new constitution in a form that will satisfy Egyptian aspirations, while reserving essential British interests.

It is with statements of this kind that the release of Zaghlul on March 30 (officially for reasons of health) must be related. The tide of imperialist opinion has now, it seems, finally turned. And the Wafd are fully aware of this: in a manifesto issued on the release of Zaghlul, expressing their satisfaction with the action of the British Government, they state that:—

The aspirations of Egypt are not in contradiction with the protection of foreign interests.

This, then, is the end of the opportunist centrism of the Wafd, of the nationalism of the Egyptian bourgeoisie—"independence" plus safeguards for imperialist interests, the very formula of the imperialists themselves!

The fact that emerges from the foregoing analysis of the nationalist movement is clear enough, namely, that a purely nationalist movement can never give real national independence to the Egyptians. When we turn to examine the nationalism of the Left Wing of the Khizb-el-Watani, depending on the discontented small traders and shopkeepers, lower grade civil servants, students, &c., substantially the same fact appears. Under the leadership of Dr. Hussein Pasha the Left Wing nationalists pursued

a revolutionary nationalist propaganda among the town workers and the peasant masses; but it was typical petty bourgeois revolutionary nationalism-high-sounding revolutionary slogans and phrases, with a shrinking from the actual revolutionary struggle. And further, it was still, though anti-imperialist and to that extent revolutionary, concerned (like the similar Indian movement) with boycotts and non-co-operation-which could be carried to a certain point and then led nowhere. There was no fundamental appreciation of the impossibility of achieving a purely nationalist revolution: no realisation that only a revolution at once social and political, a revolution of the Egyptian labouring masses, led by the organised working class of the towns, could liberate those masses from both their foreign imperialist and their native bourgeois exploiters. Without such a liberation national independence must be either the shallowest trickery or the most hopeless illusion. The masses of the Egyptian people, in their struggle for national independence, are fighting, and will have to fight, both the forces of British imperialism and the combined forces of Egyptian feudalism and bureaucracy and the Zaghlulist bourgeoisie. It is in this respect that the development of an organised Labour Movement in Egypt in the years since the war is of the first importance.

There are 2,000,000 workers (strictly speaking, an urban proletariat) in Egypt, 4,000,000 "unclassified occupations and unemployed "-chiefly agricultural labourers-1,000,000 poor peasants (with holdings of less than half an acre) and half a million only slightly less poor peasants (with holdings averaging just over two acres). These masses of workers and peasants were the driving force of the 1919 revolt. The spirit of mass revolt, lacking conscious direction as it did, forced nationalism into a revolutionary channel. The nationalists on their side, as has already been remarked, simply exploited the mass revolt in the hope of frightening British imperialism into a compromise satisfactory to the aspirations and interests of the Egyptian bourgeoisie. But gradually a workingclass movement began to appear as an independent political force. The revolt of 1919, and the strikes of that year and of 1920, produced a great crop of trade unions, mostly small and local. A number of these federated in the General Federation of Labour in 1921, which body was stated to comprise 60,000 members. In

## Egyptian Nationalism and Class Struggle 295

1921, too, had been formed the Egyptian Socialist Party (actually the Egyptian Communist Party), which itself was responsible for organising certain unions, and has considerable influence in the General Federation of Labour.

That the party is making itself a power in Egyptian politics is witnessed by the recent arrest of its secretary and several leading members while they were taking part in a strike demonstration at Alexandria The police attacked the demonstration as it was leaving the offices of the General Federation of Labour, wounding several workers. The party offices, as also those of the General Federation of Labour, were closed by the police—acting, it is said, under the orders of the British military authorities—after all papers and documents had been removed. This was on March 18, though the news did not leak out in Europe till ten days later. No protests have been heard from the nationalists or from the British Labour Party.

The party is working to unite the forces of the town workers, and through this union to gain for itself a leading position among the masses of agricultural labourers and peasantry. The analogy of the Russian Revolution is evident.

The party has formulated a "popular and concrete" programme for the everyday struggles of the workers and the peasantry. For the town workers the programme includes:—

- (a) Labour protection laws.
- (b) Factory inspection.(c) The eight-hour day.

(075 F

alogue slogue

to the

dose

tal and

TOTAL

他

t Car

· fre

all a

tec

he E

nta!

100

10

04

Ŋ,

1 70

Ď.

10

S. S.

PAC-18A

- (d) Recognition of trade unions and working-class political organisations.
- (e) Equal pay for Egyptian and European workers.
- (f) Establishment of industrial committees.
- (g) Formation of producers' and consumers' co-operatives.

The agrarian question is, undoubtedly, the most urgent of all the questions confronting the Egyptian working-class movement and the Socialist Party: everything turns upon it. The proposed agrarian programme of the party includes:—

- (a) Suppression of farm tenure, by which the landowner secures the larger half of the products of the soil.
- (b) Cancellation of debts of peasants owning less than thirty feddans.1

1 1 feddan = 1.036 acres

- (c) Total exemption from land taxation for all peasants owning less than ten feddans.
- (d) State confiscation of all land holdings over 100 feddans (including Crown and Shrine lands)—the surplus land to be divided among the landless peasants or used to inaugurate communal farms, (It should be noted that 13,000 landowners own nearly half the cultivated land of Egypt.)
- (e) Organisation of committees of poor peasantry and agricultural labourers in the villages to agitate for these demands.

At the same time it must be emphasised that these are all provisional half measures. The full demand of the working class and the poor peasantry is the entire socialisation of the land.

In the matter of immediate political demands the Socialist Party stands uncompromisingly for the revolutionary nationalist struggle, recognising that insofar as the nationalist movement is anti-imperialist it is fulfilling an historically revolutionary rôle—and that also the bourgeois revolution, that the nationalist movement implies, represents an historic advance on the existing social condition of Egypt. The immediate political demands of the party are therefore:—

- (a) Union of the Sudan with Egypt.
- (b) Nationalisation of the Suez Canal.
- (c) Cancellation of the national debt.
- (d) Abolition of the capitulations.

The bourgeois character of these demands is not denied: they are put forward (for instance, the nationalisation—that is, the return to Egypt—of the Suez Canal) because of their anti-imperialist nature. It would be a profound misconception of the tasks of an Egyptian fighting working-class party to consider the nationalist struggle as one with which the party had no concern.

What is the attitude of the Labour Party towards the Egyptian nationalist struggle against British imperialism? Has this, the premier political party of the British working class, realised the true significance of the nationalist movement, and the movement, as yet unorganised and unled, of the Egyptian masses that lies behind it? A few statements taken at random of representative leaders of the Labour Party will provide the answers to these and similar questions.

In November, 1920, Mr. Arthur Henderson, concluding an

article on Egypt in the Daily Herald, laid the gravest emphasis on the dangers to the British Empire resulting from a policy by which:

d

le

15

15

20

l.

R

ě

a key position of imperial commerce and strategy (may be) made, instead of the home of a friendly, co-operating people, a centre of sedition and revolution.

This statement needs no comment. It is frankly and unashamedly imperialist. A year later, in the same paper, Mr. H. N. Brailsford wrote a long article in which he stressed the ease with which "we" (the British imperialists) might come to an agreement with the Zaghlulists. He felt that "we" could not satisfy Egyptian claims to the Sudan, though he admitted that "we" only held it by right of conquest—and the rule there of "our" officials was more enlightened and efficient than the rule of Egyptian officials. But his main contention was contained in the words:—

The temper of the Egyptians makes it possible for the Imperial Power to do a seemingly generous thing at surprisingly little cost to itself. None of the real interests of British imperialism incur the slightest risk. It is hard to say whether we occupied Egypt chiefly because it is a rich field for investment, or still more because it is the half-way house to India. There would be under an alliance recognising the independence of Egypt ample recognition of both these interests.

This statement also requires no comment. Mr. Brailsford, author of "The War of Steel and Gold," was as imperialist as Mr. Henderson. In January, 1922, the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive of the Labour Party issued a joint manifesto, in the course of which they mournfully deplored that the report of the Milner Mission (to judge from the tone of the manifesto, quite the last word in far-seeing statesmanship, so far as Egypt was concerned) was never adopted by the Government. The Milner report, they said:—

explicitly recognised the right of the people of Egypt to independence, and proposed measures "in order to establish the independence of Egypt on a secure and lasting basis." It was incumbent upon the Government to take immediate steps to act upon the report of this commission and to establish Egyptian independence through a treaty negotiated between itself and a duly-elected Government of the Egyptian people.

It was a favourite expression on Labour Party platforms at this time—that the policy of the British Government was making a "second Ireland" of Egypt. When British imperialism achieved

Digitized by Google

its masterstroke of the Irish Free State, it was followed with blind adulation by the Labour Party. If British imperialism attempts, by a bargain with the Zaghlulists, to make a "second Ireland" of Egypt in this newer—and, perhaps, more sinister—sense, there can be no doubt whatever that the leaders of British labour will come to heel as blindly as before. Mr. Ben Spoor, who was taking his holiday in Cairo this spring, declared, as a result doubtless of his observations on the spot that:—

No solution of the Egyptian question is possible until militarist control has been replaced by diplomatic control.

Could there be a more concise and perfect expression of the views of enlightened imperialism on the problem of Egypt?

Mr. E. D. Morel, that valiant exposer of the iniquities of imperialist exploitation of backward races, described Zaghlul Pasha quite accurately in an interview with the Manchester Guardian as an "Anglophile constitutional agitator," who was persona grata with Lords Cromer, Kitchener, and Milner: he went on to say that he was convinced that it would be perfectly easy for "us" to reach agreement with Zaghlul on the "reserved points" (Suez Canal, protection of foreign interests, &c.). He did not approve of giving up the Sudan to Egypt, but thought this a matter that could be amicably settled between "our" Government and a Zaghlulist Government. He concluded with these words:—

We should adopt towards Egypt the same policy so signally successful in the case of South Africa under the inspiration of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. To keep down Egypt by force would be a costly and difficult, dangerous and, above all, stupid policy.

The Labour Party have crowned their imperialist record in the matter of Egypt by the publication of a letter in *The Times* of March 29 signed by the best part of a hundred Labour M.P.s (including one or two "independent" minded members of other parties). This letter, while praising Lord Milner, and appealing (not in vain, for he was released a couple of days later) for the release of Zaghlul, could actually say that:—

Among the signatories to this letter are many who had hopes of the success of Lord Allenby's policy in Egypt. There are none who question his sincerity and patience in endeavouring to make it succeed.

After which astounding piece of soft talk over reactionary imperialism at its worst, the letter, with scrupulous courtesy, points

## Egyptian Nationalism and Class Struggle 299

out the failure of the Allenby policy—and draws the moral on the approved Zaghlulist lines.

Œ

í.

3

2

54

ď

The leaders of the Labour Party have, then, no conception of the true significance of the Egyptian nationalist movement. They do not even seem to have heard of the existence of an Egyptian working-class movement. They cannot view the rapidly advancing agreement between the British power and the Wafd as a part of the process of imperialist development. They cannot see that such an agreement, though it is a widening of the basis of imperialist rule, is at the same time an abdication of imperialism, is, in fact, a stage in imperialist decline, which offers a magnificent opportunity for the organisation of the further step in the Egyptian revolutionthe revolution of the Egyptian toiling masses. The statesmen of His Majesty's Opposition follow all the time in the track of British imperialism. They do not view the Egyptian question as part of a universal struggle—the class struggle. But then the very outlook of the leaders of the Labour Party is itself a product of the imperialist stage of capitalist development. And those same leaders would be the first to deny that it is a party of the class struggle.

# THE FRANKFORT CONFERENCE

N Friday, March 17, the International Conference called by the Rhenish-Westphalian shop stewards met to formulate a working-class programme of action in view of the occupation of the Ruhr. The Conference derives its extraordinary importance from the fact that it is the sole attempt that has been made to unite the forces of the workers of Europe against both protagonists in the struggle for the undivided control of Lorraine iron and Ruhr coke.

Although the President of the Conference was a German Social-Democrat, the German Social-Democratic Party refused to take any official part in the Conference. This refusal was typical of similar parties in other countries—for instance, the I.L.P. and the Labour Party. The Communist International at once accepted the invitation to the Conference. Their letter of acceptance expresses clearly their willingness to collaborate with workers of all parties or of no party to plan and push forward united working-class action against imperialism.

We give this letter in full below :-

FROM THE EXECUTIVE OF THE COMMUNIST INTER-NATIONAL TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN FRANKFORT-ON-MAIN

WORKER COMRADES-

When the Executive of the Communist International received the invitation (sent to all organisations of the workers by the Rhenish Workers' Councils) to participate in an International Conference at Frankfort-on-Main, they did not hesitate a moment before accepting it. The Communist International places the whole of its influence at the disposal of those sections of the German proletariat which realise the nature of their international task. A special delegation of the Executive of the Communist International will bring to your Conference our messages on all the burning issues which have arisen out of the occupation of the Ruhr.

The Executive believes that it is vitally necessary to explain clearly, definitely, formally, to the entire working class of the whole world that the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals have again failed, that they have once more openly neglected to fulfil what was their most elementary duty.

300

All the resolutions recently adopted by the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, at their Peace Congress in the Hague, have become scraps of paper. One of the best-known leaders of the Amsterdam International, Edo Fimmen, recently declared that nobody dreams of carrying out these resolutions. Edo Fimmen tries to make out that the proletariat is responsible for this, saying that the international working class stands on one side divided and helpless.

Exactly the same method was used by various disguised Socialist Chauvinists in 1914 at the beginning of the war. They also tried to avoid responsibility for their wobbling and treacherous conduct, blaming the working class instead of their leaders. The Second and Amsterdam Internationals are helpless because they have no inclination to fulfil their duty. The working classes are helpless and divided because the Second and Amsterdam Internationals divide them and consequently make them impotent. If the leaders of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals were ready to set up a united front with the Communists, and make it a reality, the workers would be in a very different position. We ask the leaders of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, once more, if they are willing to form a united front with the Communists. We are quite ready to negotiate with Social Democratic and Reformist trade union leaders, although our opinion of these leaders has been repeatedly confirmed in the most glaring way possible.

The principle enemy at the present moment is French Imperialism. The German workers can only be successful in overcoming this enemy after they have suppressed their own, the German, bourgeoisie and in that way have linked themselves closely with the revolutionary working class—with Soviet Russia in the first place, and also with the French proletariat.

The Communist International is ready to do all it can to build up a genuine united front with the workers who belong to the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals. But if certain leaders who dominate the Social Democratic Party machines succeed in wrecking the united front, the Communist International will in any case give a lead to the fighting sections of the German and the French proletariat.

Only the Communist Parties and the Revolutionary Trade Unions have done their duty up till now. Only the German and French Communist Parties, following the lead of the Communist leadership, have worked out a common line of action and begun to act upon it. Only the Communists have fulfilled their international duty in the fight against French Imperialism, and have found their way into the prisons of Poincaré the Brute.

The very fact that at such a critical moment two big Communist Parties, the German and the French, have consulted together is an event of the greatest importance for the workers of the whole world.

International conferences are, for us who are Communists, no mere parades or simple demonstrations. What we are striving to achieve is a real effort to link together the daily fight of the various sections of the international working class. Political life is now internationalised to a very high degree. The very reactionaries are forced to prepare international measures in common; the revolutionary movement of the workers has far more need to do so. The workers must learn not merely to pass resolutions in common, but also to act together, to unify their methods of fighting, and to plan common struggles.

180

13

As a milestone on the path towards the inevitable proletarian revolution, the Conference in Frankfort-on-Main cannot be disregarded. Stubbornly, remorselessly, and with inexhaustible energy the workers of the various countries must aim at creating a real combined fight.

The Executive of the Communist International sends the heartiest fraternal greetings to the much-tried workers of the Ruhr, to the fighting section of the French workers, and to the vanguard of the proletariat throughout

the whole world.

Our slogans are yours also:-

Down with French Imperialism! Down with the German Bourgeoisie!

Up the Revolutionary Labour Movement in France and Germany!

Moscow, March 16, 1923. The Executive of the Communist
International.

In the Bürgersaal at Frankfort, guarded night and day against local Fascists by workers' defence groups—"centuries"—Communists sat in conference with members of other working-class parties and working-class militants from no political party. The President's opening remarks gave the note of the Conference—declaring that with the invasion of the Ruhr had sounded the hour for the preparation of international working-class action against world imperialism. An agenda was drawn up, comprising:—

(1) The situation in France.

(2) The situation in Germany.(3) The occupation of the Ruhr and the danger of war.

Reports were delivered by French, German, and other delegates on the situation in their respective countries. Great enthusiasm was evoked by the reading of the declarations in favour of a united front of the German Social Democratic and Independent Socialist groups at the Conference. Both declarations condemned the anti-working-class stand taken up by those working-class organisations which had refused to participate in the Conference. In particular the declaration of the Majority Socialist (now United Social Democrats) group deserves reproduction, as a significant indication of the desire of workers in an avowedly reformist party to form a revolutionary united front with all other sections of the working class.

#### DECLARATION OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC GROUP

By occupying the Ruhr, the French and Belgian imperialists have committed an act of war full of danger for the German workers as for the workers of France and Belgium. The occupation of the Ruhr is an outrage like a whip-blow to the German working class. It is a grave menace to the French and Belgian working classes.

It signifies the danger of a new slaughter of peoples. Even if an agreement is arrived at between Poincaré-Loucheur and Cuno-Stinnes, this would only be to the detriment of the workers on both sides of the Rhine. The exploited masses of the three countries will be the victims equally of war or of peace between French and German capitalists.

The occupation of the Ruhr has given new strength to French and German chauvinism. In both countries Fascism is arming, with national defence as its pretext. In both countries Fascism desires, in order the better to enslave Labour, to provoke a new national war.

Face to face with this situation, the working class must form, both nationally and internationally, a united front of resistance against imperialism, against the danger of war created by the Ruhr occupation, against Fascism. The working class can only expect victory from its own unity.

Accordingly, we demand that the United German Social Democratic Party and the General Federation of German Trade Unions (A.D.G.B.), breaking with their policy of coalition and collaboration with the exploiters, enter into the struggle for the Workers' Government in the different States of Germany and in the Reich.

Similarly, the German bourgeoisie is in a large measure responsible for the

war and the Ruhr occupation.

10

/ https://hdl.handle.net/20

For union with the bourgeoisie must be substituted union with the revolutionary working class, by the alliance of the United Social Democracy and the German Communist Party. We can only realise a united front with the workers of France, of Belgium, of England, and other countries by fighting against the German bourgeoisie. In this great struggle we must place ourselves side by side with Soviet Russia, the first and only Workers' State. We demand from the Second and Amsterdam Internationals the support of their organisations in the international class struggle. The international situation is as serious as on the eve of the world war. We will not have a new 1914. We demand from the international organisations of the workers—War Against War!

The Social Democratic group of the Frankfort Conference declares that it will do all in its power to encourage this will to action in the Social Democratic Party and the trade unions. United with the bourgeoisie the working class is damned. Forming a united front, national and international, it is invincible. We will conquer perceased freedom.

it is invincible. We will conquer peace and freedom.

Long live the International United Front!

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC GROUP OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

In one of the outstanding speeches of the Conference, Losovsky analysed the Ruhr occupation and the resultant political problems facing the working-class movement, both nationally and internationally. The long resolution of the Conference on the Ruhr

Digitizan by Google

and the danger of war embodies the salient features of Losovsky's address.

A further resolution, instructing the Committee of Action set up by the Conference to establish by all possible means a united front with the Right-Wing Internationals and their chief constituent parties is appended to the main resolution.

#### I

#### THE RUHR OCCUPATION AND THE DANGER OF WAR

The Frankfort International Conference—which has been summoned on the initiative of the Rhenish Westphalian Workers' Councils, and which has been attended by delegates from the most important countries in Europe, and by workers belonging to all political parties: Social Democrats, Independent Socialists, Communists, and Revolutionary Trade Unionists—resolves, in view of the situation created by the occupation of the Ruhr, as follows:—

(1) That the national and international struggle against the occupation of the Ruhr, especially in Germany, France, and Belgium, must be continued and intensified. The slogan is Evacuation of Occupied Territory.

(2) That in order to secure the annulment of all international treaties of spoliation, and above all the Treaty of Versailles, the most energetic struggle

must be organised and carried on in all countries.

(3) That in pursuit of this struggle a systematic agitation must be carried on in the army in general and more particularly among the troops in occupied territory. The work of enlightening the white and coloured troops is one of

the most important tasks of the present and the near future.

(4) That an unceasing propaganda of fraternisation must be carried on among the workers in occupied territory and the occupying troops, both equally wage-slaves whom the bourgeoisie are trying to set at each other. It is necessary to prove to the French, Belgian, and English soldiers that the German workers are in an equal degree the irreconcilable foes of the ruling class in Germany and France.

(5) That the necessary work of reconstructing the devastated areas must be carried out at the expense of the ruling classes in all countries, under the control of workers' organisations, till the reconstruction of the devastation caused by the war gives place to the general socialist work of reconstruction.

- (6) That work among the young people, among women, ex-service men, and war invalids must be carried on much more seriously in every country. The Revolutionary Young People's organisations and the Ex-Service Men's International organisations, which have already made a successful beginning to their fight, are bound, just like the revolutionary women, once more to be drawn into the active fight of the entire working class against war, imperialism, and Fascism.
- (7) That it is necessary to organise inquiries on the spot in the Ruhr, by representatives of the workers in the shops and in the trade unions of France, Belgium, and England, in order that the workers of these countries may get to know the position of the workers in occupied territory, who are exploited under the double yoke of their own employing class and of foreign imperialism.

- ik si:
- BI.
- 1 四 四
- THE REAL PROPERTY.
- a16006
- opp-su-pdpass ssado
- hathitrust.org/aggess
- / http://www.hathitru
- United States, Google-digiti

- (8) That German-French-Russian fraternal unions must be formed among the workers of the most important industrial groups at least, above all the railwaymen, the miners, and metal workers. It shall be the task of such fraternal unions to plan and carry out actions of solidarity and, further, to help in co-ordinating international action in concert with the Committee of Action.
- (9) That control commissions, international as well as national, must be formed among the workers in those industrial groups which are employed in the transport and preparation of munitions (workers in the armament, aeroplane, and chemical factories, miners, seamen, railwaymen, and transport workers). These control commissions must be formed in the first instance on the frontiers, at railway junctions, and at the most important harbours.
- (10) That special conferences of representatives of workers' councils and trade unions from Germany, France, Belgium, and occupied territory, especially from Paris, Brussels, and Rhenish Westphalia, as well as Berlin, must be immediately summoned for a discussion of all questions which are connected with the position of the workers in the occupied territories, in order to consider what may be the most practical immediate action.
- (11) That from April 15-22 will take place an International Week of Protest against the occupation of the Ruhr territory. The demonstrations of this week must be the occasion for tremendous manifestations against the predatory Treaty of Versailles, against the danger of war, against Fascism. Workers' organisations of all parties, and especially the wide sections of the labouring masses who belong to no party, must be attracted to join in these demonstrations.
- (12) That the demonstrations of this week must be supported by an agitation, both inside and outside Parliament and all public bodies, against the Ruhr occupation and the danger of war.
- (13) That during this International Week of Protest the fight against any policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie must be taken up everywhere. The creation of a united working-class front and the organisation of an international strike in case of a threat of war can only be the fruit of a continual and unrelenting struggle against the capitalist offensive in all its forms.
- (14) The International Conference appoints delegations which it empowers to negotiate with the Amsterdam and Second Internationals, the Vienna Union, as well as with the workers' organisations in the various countries with regard to the preparation and carrying out of this Week of Protest against the Ruhr occupation and the formation of a united working-class front in the fight against Fascism, war peril, and the Versailles Treaty. These delegations shall be made up of representatives of the various political tendencies represented at the Conference.
- (15) The Conference elects an International Committee of Action of twenty-one members, from among the delegates of all the political and economic organisations represented at the Conference. If any organisations not at the Conference should, after its conclusion, join in the international united front they also can send their representatives to the International Committee of Action.
  - (16) As a body that is above party, the International Committee of Action

is instructed to set up and maintain amicable relations with workers' organisations, whatever their political tendency. When the leaders of the national and international organisations refuse to work with the committee, the latter is empowered to make a direct appeal to the masses, over the heads of their leaders, through the workshops, the works councils, and local organisations.

(17) The International Committee of Action has the task of uniting all the political and economic organisations of Labour in the struggle against international imperialism. For this purpose the International Committee of Action is to negotiate with all workers' organisations for the convening of a Workers' International Conference for the struggle against imperialism, war,

and Fascism.

(18) The Conference authorises the International Committee of Action to set up a fighting fund to which all workers are invited to subscribe.

As the occupation of the Ruhr is a result of French-German-English conflict for European hegemony, the workers of those countries have special

duties to perform in addition to their general duties.

The struggle must be still further intensified and widened in France, where the Communist Party and the C.G.T.U. have up to now splendidly sustained the fight against the imperialist designs of the French bourgeoisie.

Scrap the Versailles Treaty! Get out of Germany!

These must be the slogans.

Agitation and propaganda must be followed up by public demonstrations against the rise in prices, against the tax on wages, against colonial exploitation, against the use of the army—and, above all, black troops—in the conflicts of Capital and Labour, and for the taxation of the propertied classes alone, for the emancipation of the colonies, for the abolition of standing armies, for the freedom of State officials to hold what opinions they please, for the arming of the working class.

The tactic of the united front which has already had good results in France must be carried on both by the political party and the revolutionary trade unions. Since in France works councils are only being formed, it is necessary to begin with a campaign for the summoning of congresses of delegates from all workshops, factories, and mines, firstly according to districts, and later on a national scale, to consider the question of the unity of the trade

unions and the danger of war.

In Germany the duty of the revolutionary working class involves the struggle on two fronts. The immediate aim is the expulsion of the French imperialists from the Ruhr with the aid of the international action of the

workers.

In opposition to 1914, the German working class is to-day the only force which can defeat the external foe and end the conflict in the interest of the working class. They thus stand for the interests of the wide mass of the population, whereas the bourgeoisie, in consequence of their readiness to come to an understanding with the French bourgeoisie for the common exploitation of the workers, is paralysing the defence of the Ruhr.

The workers are gathering and organising the cadres of the revolutionary

配

E

甘軟

14

de

10

70

蓝

ii.

1

B

Ø

8

d

struggle against French imperialism, the only struggle by which Entente imperialism can be conquered. In order to defeat the imperialist aims of the French rulers and to create the strongest bond of international solidarity among the workers, what is required is to set going a mass fight for the overthrow of the Cuno Government and the formation of a revolutionary Workers' Government.

While the Social Democratic Party and the reformist Trade Unions subordinate the interests of the workers to those of the bourgeoisie, by supporting the Cuno Government, it must be the task of the revolutionary workers to bring together all the forces of their class, especially those outside the Ruhr district, for the struggle against the Cuno Government. That is only possible when everywhere—in opposition to the endeavour to lower wages and to lengthen the working day, and in opposition to the murder gangs of Fascist nationalists who are maintained by the big industrialists—the united revolutionary working-class fighting front is set up.

The works councils and workers' control commissions must increase their agitation against the rise in prices, for control of production, and for the creation of workers' "centuries" for defence against Fascism.

To the evasion of taxation by the propertied classes, the labouring masses have to oppose the claim for the seizure of values in kind by the Workers' Government. The working class refuses to stand the expense of the sham resistance of the German bourgeoisie to the French bourgeoisie. It is opposed to all policies of capitalist reconstruction.

The revolutionary workers of Germany are more than ever opposed to any new capitalist war. They would far rather hand over to the avidity of French imperialism the wealth accumulated by the German bourgeoisie—in order to gain the breathing-space necessary for building up the power of the working class—instead of sacrificing workers' lives in a capitalist struggle. If these efforts to maintain peace were wrecked by the greed of French imperialism, in spite of the enthusiastic support which a German Workers' Government would not fail to evoke in all countries, and if the forces of Entente imperialism did not give up their attempts to wage war on the German Workers' State, the German and Russian Red armies, allied with the revolutionary workers of the Entente countries, would be able to beat off the forces of imperialism and counter-revolution.

The revolutionary workers of Great Britain have as their task to urge the Labour Party and the trade unions to decisive action against the occupation in Germany, and against the danger of a new war. In the Press, in public meetings, in a ceaseless Parliamentary agitation, a great campaign must be carried on to enlighten the British working class on the situation in the Ruhr, and also on the results of predatory British imperialist policy in Ireland, in the Near and the Far East, especially in Turkey, in Egypt, and in India, and to unite them in opposition to this policy.

Propaganda in the army and the fleet is of the first importance. The wholesale unemployment, the capitalist attack on wages and hours, the taxation of the workers, and the housing question provide the opportunity for a fruitful agitation for the united working-class front.

In Italy, where is still going on the Fascist orgy, which has dragged the

labouring masses into an actual state of slavery, the more easily to drive them into new wars, the most urgent task is first the unification of all the revolutionary forces of the country, and then the reconstitution of the workers' mass organisations, and the concentration of the forces of the workers in

town and country, without distinction of party.

A struggle must be carried on for the freedom of assembly, of the Press, and of association; for the release of political prisoners; for the guarantee to the workers of housing without rent increases: against wage reductions, wage taxation, the rise in prices and the arbitrary dismissal of workers and officials for their opinions; for placing all taxation on the propertied classes; for the guarantee of peasants' labour contracts; for the complete application of the eight-hour day.

Legal and illegal work must be vigorously carried on in the army and in the Fascist organisations. This work of organisation and unification of all the forces of the workers in the struggle for the defence of the vital interests of the labouring masses, relying on the solidarity of the international working class, will provide the necessary forces for the overthrow of the Fascist regime.

In Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Rumania, and Jugo-Slavia the Governments are directly controlled by French imperialism, and through these States French imperialism stretches its fingers out towards the frontiers of Russia and towards German territory. In these countries, when war is threatened, our slogans are: "Down with the French financiers and their funkeys! Down with those who are pledged to sell the blood of the workers for French gold!" In these countries which border upon Soviet Russia it should be specially noted that the workers, if war involved Soviet Russia, would fight on the side of the Workers' Republic. Here our work must be closely connected with that of the revolutionary workers of France and Germany. Agitation and propaganda must be closely bound up with the fight against unemployment, the rise in prices, oppressive taxation, political oppression, &c.

The Russian workers who have shown their international solidarity during the Ruhr crisis by big demonstrations, by collections of money, and by sending corn to the Ruhr, will give a decided support to the French and German workers in their fight against their exploiters. The revolutionary Governments of the future will receive unstinted support from the Russian workers, and will find them ready to enter into a common struggle in order to gain power for the workers and assure their rule. An alliance of the Russian Soviet Power with the victorious Workers' Governments of Western Europe will render the

power of the working class invincible.

#### II

## THE REFORMIST INTERNATIONALS AND THE UNITED FRONT

The Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions, the Second International, and the Vienna Union of Socialist Parties have not accepted the invitation of the German Works Councils to take part in the Frankfort Conference, and indeed have not replied to the invitation. Nevertheless, the German Independent Socialist Party has sent a delegation to this Conference and Social Democratic groups have—despite the ban of the official organs of

90

161 21

12

i

N.

1.6

Si

10 10

F 11 6

8

日本三日本日本日

their party—sent delegates. English trade unions, affiliated to Amsterdam, have sent fraternal greetings to the Conference. The great masses of the workers desire the united front of the working class in spite of the sabotage of their leaders. Accordingly, the Frankfort International Conference instructs the Committee of Action it has set up to invite the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions, the Second International, and the Vienna Union of Socialist Parties to organise, both nationally and internationally, the United Working-class Front against the occupation of the Ruhr and against Fascism, on the lines of the other resolutions of the Conference. Further, the Committee of Action is instructed to open direct negotiations with the most important sections of the before-mentioned International organisations.

The Conference spent some time in the discussion of Fascism and the organisation of the workers' struggle against it; and in her address on this subject, Clara Zetkin analysed Fascism as a symptom of social pathology, and pointed out its intimate connection with the whole question of the Ruhr occupation. Fascism, she said, divides the working class and infects it with the poison of nationalism, so that the sole force—the organised working class capable of conquering at once the Comité des Forges and the German coal magnates, is threatened with destruction. It is not enough to dismiss Fascism as a White Guard movement. Fascism is distinguished from such movements by its demagogic appeals to the working masses, its attempts to organise its own trade unions, and so forth. It endeavours to demoralise the workers' movement from within in order finally to break it with the greater ease. It is at once a superior form of reaction and the incarnation of extremist militant nationalism. It has become, in a sense, a mass movement, rooted in wide strata of the petty bourgeoisie, the small peasantry, and even certain proletarian elements. But it has only become a mass movement because of the decay of capitalist society. This decay (following on the world war) has meant that large numbers of lower middle-class elements, intellectuals, small civil servants and State employees, unemployed ex-officers, &c., have lost the comfortable positions they held (or that their families held) before the war, and have been depressed to a level beneath even that of the working class. Further among the Fascist bands are to be found workers who were deceived by the unredeemable promises made by reformist socialists-promises of a gradual amelioration of conditions within capitalism, of a steady progress "towards Social Democracy." These various elements—political waifs they might

Divilized by Google

be called—form the basis of Fascism, which, with its glorification of the State, the neutral State above all classes and parties, its militant nationalism, and its extreme reaction, can only be described as the Bonapartism of the twentieth century. The policy of reprisals by individual workers against individual Fascists is suicidal. The reactionary force of Fascism can only be countered by the weapon of organised mass struggle.

#### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

It is the vital task of the workers to take up the struggle against Fascism, victorious in Italy, and in process of development in other countries. They must overcome Fascism politically; they must organise themselves to repulse Fascist attempts at force. To this end—

 Working-class parties and organisations of all political tendencies must set up a special body to direct the fight against Fascism. The duties of this

body are:-

(a) Collection of all information about the Fascist Movement in their own

country.

(b) Systematic enlightenment of the working class as to the hostility of the Fascist Movement to the working class by means of newspaper articles, pamphlets, leaflets, posters, meetings, &c.

(c) Organisation of the workers' defence by the formation of armed "centuries"; organisation of workers' transport control committees to

prevent the transport of Fascist bands and their supplies.

(d) To win for this struggle all workers without regard to their political differences; to summon all Labour parties, trade unions, and all working-class organisations to a common resistance to Fascism.

(e) To carry on a campaign against Fascism in all Parliaments and public

bodies.

(f) To devote special attention to the anti-Fascist enlightenment of the youth amongst whom the Fascists recruit most of their militant followers. To invite the organisations of working-class youth to take

an active part in this work.

(2) Fascist organisation takes place on an international scale. It is therefore necessary to organise the struggle of the workers against Fascism internationally as well. For this purpose an International Workers' Committee must be set up. The duty of this International Committee must be, besides the collection of information, to organise an international struggle in the first place against Italian Fascism. In this struggle the committee will adopt the following methods:—

(a) An international campaign for spreading information through newspapers, posters, pamphlets, and mass meetings as to the anti-Labour character of the Italian Fascist Government, and as to the systematic destruction of all workers' organisations and institutions by the Fascists.

(b) Organisation of international mass meetings and demonstrations against Fascism, against the representatives of the Italian Fascist State in foreign countries, &c. Spe.

bis

5

100

52

200

16

do

2

Generated on 2025-92-26 21:96 GMT Public Domain in the United States.

(c) Employment of Parliamentary action; appeals to the Parliaments, especially the Labour groups in them, as well as to the international Labour organisations, to send delegations to Italy for investigating on the spot the position of the workers.

(d) Demands for the immediate release of all imprisoned working-class

(e) Material and moral support of the persecuted workers of Italy by collections of money, asylum for refugees, support of their work in foreign countries, &c. To this end the action of the Red International Relief must be extended to the victims of the repression, and all workers' organisations invited to collaborate with it.

(f) Investigation of the possibility of a political, material, and moral boycott of the Fascist Government.

The International Committee of Action is instructed to put itself in touch with the Provisional Committee for the fight against Fascism and with the organisation which it has set up in order to establish a permanent committee.

It must be impressed on all workers that the fate of the Italian workers will be their own if they do not prevent by means of an energetic revolutionary fight against the ruling class the giving over of masses of the less class-conscious elements to Fascism. The workers' organisations must consequently apply all their energies in defence of the toiling masses against exploitation, oppression, and usury, i.e., against capitalism, and oppose the sham revolutionary and demagogic watchwords of Fascism with a serious and organised mass struggle. Further, they must resist with all their strength the first attempts to transplant Fascism to their own country.

## The World of Labour

					PA	GE
CANADA:	Workers' Party Congress	1.5	12	4.0	3	12
FRANCE:	Defeat of Moselle Miners			15.0	3	13
GERMANY:	Labour Government in Saxony	4.4			3	95
	Trade Union Collaboration				3	-3
TUGO-SLAVIA	Election Figures				3	15
Norway	The Left Wing Movement				3	16
	Trade Union Congress			Y. 6.1	3	

#### CANADA

#### Workers' Party Congress

HE Workers' Party in Canada has made noteworthy progress during the first year of its existence. On the occasion of its second convention, during the last week of February, 1923, the strength of the Party was declared to be 4,808, composed of the Finnish section numbering 2,028, the Ukrainian 880, and the general section with 1,900 members. Since the first convention a year ago the party has succeeded in organising groups in sixteen labour councils, over sixty local railroad bodies, two big metal mining camps; the railroad groups include representatives of thirteen out of the sixteen standard crafts, with three of the Big Four.

The policy of the party and its attitude to the question of the United Front against capitalism were discussed; the difference between European parties and those of U.S.A. and Canada was clearly shown in the resolution on the United Front. It was urged that the first essential was to work in the industrial field for the amalgamation of existing craft unions into a series of massive industrial unions, in which connection approval was expressed of the Trade Union Educational League work, and in the political field the chief work is to consist in being in the forefront of the Labour Party. To this end the Workers' Party decided to join and strengthen the sections of the Labour Party wherever they exist, and to help to create them where they are non-existent.

This co-operation with the Labour Party, the resolution declares, in no way signifies that the Workers' Party will sink its distinctive aims and principles; on the contrary, the maintenance of its independence as an organisation is rather regarded as an essential guarantee for the further progress of the Labour

Movement in Canada.

It was therefore decided, in accordance with this policy, to work out a common programme of action to fight the following questions of immediate importance to all workers:-

(1) Unemployment; (2) "open shop"; (3) eight-hour day; (4) free speech; (5) freedom to picket; (6) espionage, both by Government and employers;

(7) injunctions as a means of intervening in Labour struggles; (8) establishment of complete political and economic relations with Russia; (9) intervention of police and military forces of the State in Labour struggles.

In view of the wretched conditions of the farmers and their dependence on large corporations the Workers' Party decided to co-operate in their struggle against capitalism, pointing out, however, that the farmers cannot hope for success unless they gain the co-operation of the industrial workers in the cities.

It was decided to conduct a campaign against the immigration policy of the Dominion Government which aims at increasing the number of available wage-slaves in a country where unemployment is all too rampant.

#### FRANCE

#### Defeat of Moselle Miners

N April 5 the delegates of the Moselle miners decided to terminate the strike which had begun on February 8 and involved 25,000 men. Negotiations with the employers broke down on February 12, when they refused to consider an increase in the wretched wages of the miners. Time strengthened the hands of the employers, for after a few days' embarrassment coal deliveries from England and America began to arrive and operate against the struggling French miners.

The strike, it must be pointed out, was supported by the Unity Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.U.), and the General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.) issued instructions to its followers not to support the strike, though it is reported that they did down tools.

The demands of the miners were:-

W.

TELLE .

14.7

虚

W.

بتقا

050

3

22

選出

Š

3

10

8

Ř

3

- (1) Restoration of wages to the level before wage reductions took place and, to meet the increased cost of living, a general increase of 1.50 francs for underground workers, and 2.50 francs for surface workers.
  - (2) Incorporation of the cost of living bonus in the wage.
  - (3) Establishment of workers' councils to control loading and unloading.
  - (4) Abolition of the deduction of income tax from wages.
- (5) Examination of the pensions system in force in Alsace-Lorraine, and of the special claims of the miners in Alsace-Lorraine.

The Moselle workers' wages were reduced by four francs since 1919, and are twelve to sixteen francs a day, and skilled hewers receive twenty francs. They have now returned to work unconditionally after a brave stand of eight weeks. More than 300 militants were imprisoned, and many were deported because of alleged pro-German tendencies!

#### GERMANY

#### Labour Government in Saxony

THE Social Democratic Buck-Lipinski Government in Saxony was forced to resign on January 30. The immediate cause of the fall of the Cabinet was the failure of the Home Secretary, Lipinski, to grapple with the growing Fascist forces. The then Cabinet was dependent on the Communist deputies' support for its majority, and when the Communists put forward a vote of no confidence in the Social Democratic Government,

which had only been in office since December 1, 1922, the hourgeois parties voted with them because they regarded the Government as too advanced.

On March 21 a new Cabinet was formed, with Dr. Zeigner as Premier. This decision was reached after long deliberations, the more reactionary Social Democratic favoured a coalition with the bourgeois parties; but the Social Democratic Congress in Saxony decided against any such coalition by a three-fourths majority and in favour of approaching the Communist Party. The Communist Party promised support on certain conditions, which were accepted by a delegate conference on March 20; the result is that the new Government is composed of left-wing Socialist elements.

A summary of the Communist demands, which the Zeigner Cabinet has

accepted, is as follows:-

(1) The formation by the United Social Democrats and the Communists of a Workers' Defence Force, under the direction of the police, for the protection of the workers' demonstrations, meetings, and organisations.

(2) The establishment of special workers' commissions to control profiteering in all centres with more than 10,000 inhabitants, and elsewhere if necessary.

(3) A law to be enacted for the establishment of a Chamber of Labour, which should be based on the fact that the Chamber is a body of public justice. Amongst other duties it is to prepare laws and formulate complaints and proposals to be put before the Government and public bodies. The members of the Chamber are to be subject to recall.

(4) Amnesty to be granted by law to those imprisoned for crimes committed through economic want. Further, the Government should continue the present practice of granting amnesties to certain political prisoners (wholesale amnesty on this head is not insisted on so as not to include counter-revolutionaries).

On April 10 Dr. Zeigner announced his programme in the Diet in accordance with the above summary. He further declared that the Government would do everything in its power to substitute communal production for the present system of private enterprise; that it would defend the eight-hour day and support the workers' struggles for better conditions generally. The Premier pointed out that Fascism was organising its forces, and that unless drastic measures were taken to suppress these organisations the Government and the workers would be defenceless, hence the necessity for the formation of the Workers' Defence Force.

The chief Fascist organisation is the Storm Division (Sturmabteilung) of the German National Socialist Labour Party, composed chiefly of ex-officers, students, higher officials, who take an oath to "obey unconditionally" any

call to duty issued by the organisation.

The acceptance by the Social Democrats of the Communist conditions is the first actual step in forming a united front, and it is generally expected will lay the foundation of a real Workers' Government in the province of Saxony.

#### Trade Union Collaboration

For the preservation of the common interests of all workers adhering to the German General Federation of Trade Unions (A.D.G.B.), the Federation of Clerical Employees (Afabund), and the General Federation of German Civil Servants (A.D.B.) an agreement on the following basis has recently been entered into:—

ST.

1

1

£3

2

3

F

1

¢

(1) That the common good is to take precedence of private interests in questions of economic policy. The preservation of the republican form of government, as essential to the social advancement of the German workers, is to be worked for by all means at the disposition of the signees. The A.D.G.B., together with the other two organisations accessory to this agreement, declares for the International Federation of Trade Unions as a means for the advancement of united trade union action of all grades of workers.

(2) The A.D.G.B., Afabund, and A.D.B. undertake, as independent organisations, to work together in all matters appertaining to trade union, social or economic affairs involving the interests of the workers. Each organisation is to maintain its independence in questions which only involve the interests of a section, though discussion should take place with the other organisations prior to action on points that might influence the interests of other sections.

(3) The A.D.G.B. is to be regarded as the central organisation of the workers, the Afabund as that of the employees, and the A.D.B. as the central organisation of the civil servants. Accordingly the affiliated societies to each of the three central organisations should organise the various specific categories. Any departure from these rules must be mutually agreed on. Disputes not settled by agreement should be referred to arbitration.

(4) To further joint work between the A.D.G.B., Afabund, and A.D.B. in instances when common questions arise, delegates in a consultative capacity should attend executive and committee meetings as well as congresses. When necessary congresses and conferences can be jointly arranged from time to time. The rules as to voting and representation should be those of the A.D.G.B.

(5) Local and district organisation should work on the lines recommended in (4) for the central organisations. Groups of the A.D.G.B., Afabund, and A.D.B. in similar industries and trades should form joint committees.

(6) The agreement signed on April 12, 1921, between the Afabund and A.D.G.B. is in no way effected by this new arrangement.

This is generally welcomed as a step towards united action, at least amongst the right-wing trade unionists.

#### JUGO-SLAVIA

#### Election Figures

THE results of the recent elections in Jugo-Slavia, which were carried out under a shameful system of terror, are finally available, and show: Radicals 120 seats; Raditsch (the supporters of independence for the Croats) 70 seats; Democrats 50, Bosnian Mussulmans 18, Serbian Peasant Party 9, German Minorities 6, Rumanian Minorities 1, and the Socialists 3 seats (a loss of more than two-thirds).

The terror, aimed at the newly formed Independent Labour Party (see LABOUR MONTHLY, April) and the independent trade unions, did not prevent a considerable number of votes being given in various centres to the Communists viz., Belgrade 1,255 against 529 for the Social Democratic candidate, Laiback 866 (Social Democrat 132), Zagreb 1,249 (Social Democrat 286), Krain 5,589, and in the Styrian territories they gained 5,782 votes.

Divilized by Google

#### NORWAY

#### The Left Wing Movement

THE Communist Party in Norway is still called the Labour Party, and though its twenty-sixth congress at Christiania, February 23-26, decided to change the name of the official organ from "Socialdemocraten" to "Arbeiterbladet," the name of the party remains unchanged. This congress was faced with a difficult position due to divergent views within the party. The Tranmael section favoured accepting the decisions arrived at by the Communist International Congress last November, with certain reservations; whereas the Scheflo, or left-wing section, demanded the whole-hearted acceptance of the decisions of the World Congress.

After much discussion at the congress the Tranmael resolution was passed by a vote of 94 to 92. Subsequently Tranmael put a resolution, which was passed, in accordance with the decisions of the International; thus enabling the congress to decide on the reorganisation of the party so as to permit membership

on an individual basis.

It must be recalled that the Norwegian Labour Party is built up on the trade unions which are affiliated en bloc, and hitherto there was no provision for individual members, hence non-Communist elements within the party were easily possible.

The congress was attended by 186 delegates, representing about 55,000 members; three delegates were present representing the Communist

International.

#### Trade Union Congress

The reorganisation of the Trade Union movement in Norway has been contemplated for some time, and conferences have dealt with the question at great length. It was expected that a final decision would be made at the recent Trade Union Congress at Christiania, March 4-12; however, the present position is a compromise between the rival suggestions, which were: (1) The formation of local trade union councils from the existing local trade unions and the formation in every locality of groups of unions belonging to the same industry, thus realising the principle of industrial unionism; (2) the dissolution of both existing national and local trade unions and the formation of local trade union councils from the workshop and factory clubs.

The congress decided to adopt the recommendations of the Executive Committee, which involve:—

(1) Substitution of the present national Trade Union Federations by national industrial unions.

(2) Additional powers for local trade union councils, which are to be

formed in every district.

(3) The place of work to be the unit of trade union organisation, to be represented usually by an industrial union.

These proposals are to be put into effect not later than June 30, 1924.

The question of international orientation was another important topic of

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN discussion. In October, 1922, withdrawal from the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam was decided on by a vote of 62 to 15 of the Representative Body. The congress, however, came to no definite decision on this issue; it approved withdrawal from the I.F.T.U. and appointed a committee to examine the question of affiliation to the Red International of Labour Unions at Moscow, this proposal received 151 votes to 64, with 7 abstentions. The procedure will entail submission of the committee's decisions to the vote of the members before October 31, 1923; after which the Representative Body will be responsible for the final decision. A considerable section of the congress favoured approaching the new Syndicalist International, a proposal which received the support of the Social Democrats as well as that of the Syndicalists.

book

etrum ?

2 45002

IN MI

I FICE P

108157

NO.

der.

, 山山

m.

3

10.00

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

## BOOK REVIEW

DUAL UNIONISM AND ITS RESULTS

The Bankruptcy of the American Labour Movement. By Wm. Z. Foster.

N page 6 of this booklet the writer, Wm. Z. Foster, astonishes us by declaring that the British workers have made wonderful strides towards acquiring a revolutionary point of view. But as the reader continues he will excuse him for this extravagant remark, for he will realise that Mr. Foster is seeing the British Labour Movement through American horn-rimmed spectacles. It is somewhat of a shock to find our unions here quoted with envy as instruments of industrial unionism; to be told that the leaders of the British Labour Party have advocated, to a greater or less extent, class solidarity and class action. And yet Mr. Foster is by no means of the moderate school of Labour; he is one of the leading, if not the leading spirit of the left-

wing movement in America.

The explanation of this seeming paradox is to be found in the low level of the American Labour Movement. Industrially it is years behind English and European Labour-politically, it hardly exists. Out of a population of 110,000,000, not more than 3,500,000 are organised in trade unions. That is, the proportion of trade unionists to the general population is 1 to 31 in America, while in Germany it is 1 to 41 and in England 1 to 71. But not only are the American unions weak in numbers; both structurally and spiritually they lag behind the industrial movements in most other countries of western civilisation. In spite of the consolidation of the capitalist forces, they have made little progress towards organisation by industry, and, with the notable exception of the United Mine Workers of America, still cling to the old craft union basis. This policy has been fostered by the reactionary leadership of the American Federation of Labour, inspired by its President, Samuel Mr. Gompers' policy of keeping the American Federation of Labour weak and functionless has been the source of his own strength. By zealously guarding the privileges of the craft unions, and fighting every attempt to strengthen the power of the national organisation, he has bought the loyalty of the majority of the Labour leaders. It is difficult to believe that among these leaders are to be found known crooks and convicted criminals, and that many officials have become enormously rich through robbing both employers and workers.

Nor have the American workers been better served by their own Press. British Labour, with its one daily, has often envied the American Movement with its scores of Labour papers. But Mr. Foster shows how a Labour Press can be used against the interests of the workers when in corrupt and reactionary hands. For example, during the great steel strike of 1919 (which Mr. Foster has described in his book on the subject), the three Pittsburgh Labour papers helped the employers to defeat the strikers.

But, curiously enough, Mr. Foster does not blame Mr. Gompers, the arch-reactionary, or the corrupt Labour leaders, for the bankruptcy of the American Labour Movement. He points his accusing finger to Daniel de Leon, the rebel, and to the militants of the I.W.W. and other revolutionary movements. To their policy of "dual unionism," he declares, the American

318

Labour Movement owes its present collapse. Hampered at every step by the corrupt trade union bureaucracy, it seemed so much easier to these revolutionary idealists to leave the reactionary unions to stew in their own juice, and to start afresh with the disciples of the faith. In 1905 the Industrial Workers of the World was launched by Eugene Debs and Bill Haywood with a blare of trumpets, and swept into its ranks all the left-wing elements of American Labour. To-day, with far fewer members than it had at the beginning, it is a voice crying in the wilderness. This policy of building up separatist organisations drained the existing trade unions of all life and vitality, and left them to the complete control of the tools of the employers. "In stultifying and ruining the trade unions," declares Mr. Foster, "dual unionism condemned to sterility every branch of the entire Labour Movement, industrial, political, and otherwise." Thus, the Socialist Party, which in 1912 had a membership of 118,000, and was for some years the chief vehicle of revolutionary thought in America, is to-day a negligible factor with a membership of less than 10,000. This collapse Mr. Foster attributes to the fact that the party was not based on the every-day struggle of the workers, expressed through their industrial organisation.

M

DECE

(SIE

íŒ

:01

01

etçi

1

概1

ME

100

10

E

met.

1 2

01:

Bes

T

157

個

齛

þĠ

5

į,

Ø

B . B

4

E

The one redeeming feature in this gloomy picture is the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. This union developed out of the work of an organised minority in the old United Garment Workers, and only broke away from the reactionary parent union when they could carry the rank and file with them. This union has just issued its Documentary History, together with the proceedings of its fifth Biennial Convention held in May last year,

which is a record of remarkable achievement. A new era has, however, dawned for the American Labour Movement. With extraordinary rapidity the doctrine of dual unionism has been overthrown and the militants have gone back to the unions to infuse them with new life. This change in tactics was apparently brought about by the strong stand against dual unionism taken by the Third Congress of the Third International and the First Congress of the R.I.L.U. in 1920. This movement "to keep the militants in the organised mass " is centred round the Trade Union Educational League, formed in November, 1920. The object of the league is to establish a left bloc of all the revolutionary and progressive elements in the trade unions, locally and nationally. In order to facilitate organisation by industry, national industrial sections are being organised in all the big industries, with the result that amalgamation schemes are at present "sweeping the country like a prairie fire." At its first national conference held in August last, the League adopted a programme of which the chief aims are the abolition of capitalism, repudiation of the policy of class collaboration, and the adoption of the principle of class struggle, and affiliation of the American Labour Movement to the R.I.L.U. Although it has been at work with this programme only a few months, the league has made great strides, its chief success being the promotion of amalgamation schemes; also it has secured the affiliation of many local unions and central labour councils to the R.I.L.U. The league also publishes a monthly journal, the Labor Herald, which Mr. Foster edits. has managed to get into sixty-two pages an extraordinarily clear and comprehensive survey of the American Labour Movement, though some aspects of it perhaps suffer somewhat through congestion.

#### PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Business Methods and Accountancy in Trade Unions. By Joseph Lynch. Labour Publishing Company, 12s. 6d.

Through the Russian Revolution. By Albert Rhys Williams. Labour Publishing

Company, 7s. 6d.

Un Livre Noir (Diplomatie d'avant-guerre d'après les documents des archives russes, novembre, 1910-juillet, 1914). Tome Second. Preface par Réné Marchand. Correspondances d'Islvosky et de Benckendorf, Rapports de Sazonof et de Kokovtsef, &c. Librarie du Travail, 96 Quai de Jemmapes, Paris, 20 fr. Job Analysis and the Curriculum. By Edward K. Strong and Richard S. Uhrbrook.

Williams & Wilkins Company, Baltimore, \$1.50 and \$2.50.

Production. By George Belt. Foreword by George Lansbury. The Herald League, 35. 6d.

Shall Trade Unions be Regulated by Law? Affirmative by Samuel Untermyer. Negative

by Morris Hillquit. Hanford Press, New York.

Guild Socialism. A syllabus for class and study circles. National Guilds League, 6d. Apprenticeship in Modern Industry. By G. W. Thomson. National Guilds League, 3d. The Real Enemy and other Socialist Essays. By Dan Griffiths. Foreword by J. Ramsay MacDonald. Grant Richards, 2s. 6d.

The Revolutionary Act. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Henry Kuhn. Appendix by Daniel de Leon. New York Labor News Company. (London

Agency: L. Cotton), 9d.

## THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 4

d Inti

Labor h

Mes le e Sans

13 km

Here

bla

JUNE, 1923

NUMBER 6

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

#### CONTENTS

Notes of the Month	4	-	-	-	Page	323
THE LABOUR P.	ART	r con	FEREN (By T	VCE		17/7
The Labour Party's Appr	oacl	to Po	wer	2	,,	329
	$\mathcal{B}y$	R. Pa	ge Ar	NOT		
The Rupture of the Trad		greeme By C. J		- NTLY	,,	340
The Dominion of Canada		- H. P.	- Rathi	- BONE	,,	346
Proletarian Poetry—II	H	- Ву А.	- Bogd	- Nov	"	357
The Metamorphosis of M	Ir. (		- VELYN	- Roy	,,	363
The World of Labour Bulgaria—France—Germany	– –Ital	– ly—Russia	_	-	**	377
Book Review - A Journalist Tells the Truth	2	14	-	÷	"	38 r

Published at
162 Buckingham Palace Road
London
S.W.1

ed on 2025-02-26 21:11 GMT / https://hdt.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112001987290 Domain in the United States, Google digitized / http://www.haihitrust.org/acces.use#

DIVILIZED by Google

# The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Office: 162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE RD., S.W.1

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, and can only return the same when stamps to cover postage are enclosed.

Subscription Rates:
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

Six months - 4/-

One year - 8/-

United States of America Subscription Representative:—Philip Novick, 192 Broadway, Room 15, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

Advertising Rates :

Ordinary position, per page, £5 5s. and pro rata.

Volume III (July to December, 1922) can be supplied for 7s. 6d. post free, or these numbers can be bound and returned post free for 4s. 6d.

Cases can be supplied for 3s. 6d. post free.

Title Page for Vol. III can be had on application if  $1\frac{1}{2}d$ . for postage is sent.

onerated on 2025-02-26 21.11 GMT / https://hdt.handle.net/2 nblc Dommin in the United States, Google-digitized / http:

## NOTES of the MONTH

MONTH that began, in Britain at least, with a May Day so unlike a real demonstration of the will and vigour of the working class that it seemed almost meaningless, has seen the swift development of events that threaten the working classes of all countries with the blackest terrors of reaction and of war, and is ending with the loosing of forces which neither capitalism nor the workers can control. No body of workers in Central or Western Europe has yet achieved the solidarity necessary to resist these forces, but as they come into the daylight the workers everywhere are beginning, slowly, to realise their strength and aim, and to see the links that bind them together in the framework of modern Imperialism. In every field of the class struggle these events have come so nearly simultaneously that this fact alone would seem almost enough to prove that they are parts of one historical process. The British Ultimatum to Russia was followed in two days' time by the murder of Vorovsky; and these two events came just at the time when the King of England was engaged in bestowing honours and compliments on Mussolini, the most striking figurehead in the ranks of the Terrorist reactionaries of Europe. The results of the Labour Party's mediation between British workers and capitalists were made clear at the moment when the Labour Party was trying, with perhaps even more disastrous results, to mediate between the Russian workers and the capitalist rulers of Britain. When the accession to power of Witos in Poland, with a programme of war and repression before him, was being expected almost daily, the resignation of Bonar Law came, and the path was open in this country for the Diehards to secure control. It is these events that shape the issues that the workers have to face, and it is their decision on these issues that will dictate the progress or failure of the workingclass movement throughout Europe.

HEN any one of the issues that have to be decided becomes so clear, and touches so directly and immediately the interests of the whole working class that there scarcely seems room for any disagreement within the movement, it is seen at once that the clearer these issues

vites

become, the more obviously do they converge on one central point. Wages, hours, hunger, war-whenever the issue on these is sharply cut, and almost every organisation in the movement is forced by the obvious determination of the workers to line up on a common policy, this simplicity is found to be due to one fact. The class struggle has for a moment, on this point, appeared plainly in the open. As yet there is only one main issue that has become really clear in this way—the question of war with Russia. But half a dozen others are sharply enough defined; mediation by Labour leaders in industrial disputes, analysed in these notes last month, has been lifted out of the class of debatable questions by the award of the arbitrator on building wages and by the action of the Norfolk farmers during the past month; the position as between the Communist Party and the Labour Party received its most adequate illustration when the chief bodies that go to make up the Labour Party in London formally refused an offer of Communist assistance in a demonstration against war with Russia; and the tangled morass of the Labour Party's attitude and declared policy in foreign affairs has, in the same way, had a piercing light thrown upon it by the Russian debate in the House of Commons on May 15 when the Government's most effective arguments were drawn from the writings of J. R. Clynes and Philip Snowden,

Republic does not, for the workers of this country who have any consciousness of class whatever, admit of argument. It is the clearing of this issue that has shown up the others in sharper relief. What the rank and file think, and what they are determined to do, has already been shown; anyone who has been in the big industrial centres during the past fortnight must be aware of the volume of protest that is gathering force every day. In clear distinction to this is the formula, put forward by Ramsay MacDonald, that the Labour Party's duty in international affairs is to perform the "great and godly work" of leading the Government out of its difficulties. This smoothing of the path for Imperialism is seen at once to be exactly on a level with the principle of mediation in industrial disputes, and it is worth while turning for

, Google-digitized / http://www.hethitrust.org/acc

a moment to the demonstrable results of this principle as applied to the builders' struggle before considering its almost disastrous results with regard to Russia.

HE building trade workers were induced to submit all their position on wages to arbitration. What was that position? Their rates of pay were supposed to be governed by a sliding scale, varying with the cost of living, and this scale could be revised by agreement if the state of trade was exceptionally good or bad. They had agreed to the first revision put forward; accepting owing to the state of the industry a reduction in wages beyond the fall due to the decrease in the cost of living. A second such revision was demanded, and the builders refused. The volume of protest against the employers' terms from the branches was greater than in many first-class strikes. Division amongst the employers was in sharp contrast to the solidarity of the men. And the strongest point in the builders' position was that the employers were breaking the original contract by insisting on a revision of the wage-scale without agreement in the Council. The whole of this position has now been given away; the sliding scale has been altered to give a larger decrease in wages for a given fall in the cost of living, and an immediate cut is being enforced. These are the results of mediation and of arbitration.

"mediated" in the case of Russia? The British Government's ultimatum is not a single act, unconnected with other international developments. It is obviously to be linked with the visit of Viscount French of Ypres to Roumania, where a group of British staff officers have been "studying old battlefields," and the similar visit of Lord Cavan, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, to Poland just after Marshal Foch had spent some time in that country. Poland's attitude during the trial of Czepliak and Budkievich (both of whom were in communication with the Polish Government while Russia and Poland were at war) was provocative in the extreme; and before these lines are in print a war govern-

ed States, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrusb.ard/access.useWhd-us-unbol

ment may be in power in Poland, practically led by Korfanty, the invader of Silesia. Lord Curzon's ultimatum, therefore, has got to be taken as one move in the diplomatic preparations for a new war. That the leaders of the Labour Party realise this to some extent is obvious from their speeches. But instead of exposing the flimsy basis of the charges against Russia that are heaped together in the Note, Ramsay MacDonald laid stress on what he considers the disquieting nature of the Russian Government's ordinance forbidding the teaching of religion in the schools. Accused during the debate of having slurred over this question, he intervened to boast that he had emphasised it. In effect he admitted the validity of Lord Curzon's arguments, pleading only that these arguments should not be carried to their logical conclusion until time had been given for discussion and negotiations. Once the Government promised, not to negotiate, but to "explain the terms" of the Note with Krassin, the Labour leaders ceased their opposition, and withdrew their amendment. Their failure to press the debate to a division enabled the Government to judge accurately the quality of the opposition they had to face. What the result of this will be may be clearer by the end of the month; a foretaste has been given by the Government's refusal to guarantee that relations would not be broken off while the Commons were in recess.

he faced, not with these policies alone, but with their results—results which future action can repair to some extent, but which cannot be reversed. Yet the Conference is almost the only place where issues as significant as these can be brought forward by actual representatives of the rank and file of the Party. Nine-tenths of the representation at the Conference is mechanical; it is part of the official machinery of the Trade Union Movement or of the Party itself. But amongst the representatives of the local organisations, however few these are in proportion to the rest, there are workers who can fight to reassert the control of the Party membership over the Executive and the Parliamentary group. The latter are at present carrying out a policy of co-operation with the opponents of the working class. None of tactics or strategy by

Digitized by Google

NO.

THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

-26 21:17 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/20 .United States, Google-digitized / http:/ which this policy is put into effect have ever yet been sanctioned by the Party as a whole. This policy if not stopped in time, will be found to have bound the Party, helpless, to serve the needs of the Capitalist State. At the Labour Party Conference it is possible at least to ask: "Why have you not fought for the workers in industry, in the Ruhr, in Russia?" And it is possible at least to fight, once again, for the first and most important need of the working-class movement—the need for unity in action.

HE constant pressure to reduce wages and extend hours, the struggle for industrial control of Europe waged by methods that impose crushing burdens upon the working class, and the attack on Soviet Russia, are all parts in a movement that can only be described as the capitalist offensive. Against this offensive the working classes are forced, by every condition of their lives, to fight wherever it touches them. But because the workers have never yet been organised, or have organised themselves, to fight internationally, and because they are still prevented from doing so by "Internationals" composed of leaders who are swayed by national patriotism, international action has so far been made impossible, and the struggle to organise such action has had to meet the sabotage of the "moderates" as well as the opposition of the governments. Because there is no clear conception of what is working-class policy in this country, and no possibility of rank and file control of the Labour Movement, each section of the workers has to struggle along alone; and the influence of the accredited representatives of other sections, or of the whole movement, is thrown on the side of the capitalists.

by a policy of inaction or of compromise. No one can expect a unity of aim or action between those who are struggling and those who are assuming the offices of an arbitrator. The formal unity established by the General Council has had absolutely no results whatever. Nothing can persuade the workers of the Ruhr to consider the Labour Party's consultation with French

and Belgian "Government Socialists," or their reports (blessed by Lord Curzon) as effective action on their behalf. The workers of Russia and of the Continent, organising to prevent the attack on the Soviet Republic, must find in the manifesto that states "there are faults on both sides" little sign of real support. Unity can only be achieved in action; and resistance to the capitalist offensive in all its forms and phases, is the only test by which working-class policy can be judged. The policy of mediation will leave the whole movement divided and impotent. It is the business of the delegates to the Labour Party Conference to see that this policy is not passed by without a vigorous protest from the rank and file.

T. L.

# THE LABOUR PARTY'S APPROACH TO POWER

(Alex

: NOTE

17011

·fee

the D

Li

#### By R. PAGE ARNOT

HE Labour Party is now accepted as the next Government of this country. It is accepted by the other Parliamentary parties, by the Civil Service, and by the Court. It has become the official Opposition, His Majesty's Opposition, the alternative Government. It is accepted by the Press even when they fight against it. True, it may or may not win at the next election: there is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip. But the actual fortunes of war are of less importance than the general acceptance of the idea of a Labour Government in the near future. It is "accepted": that is the cardinal fact.

How has this enormous change in public opinion come about? Ten years ago the Parliamentary Labour Party was despised, was being sneered at as "the tail of the Liberal dog." The idea that the Liberals might be displaced by Labour was the Utopian vision of "fanatics like Snowden." The idea of Labour men on the Treasury Bench was regarded not so much with horror as with incredulity. How comes it that incredulity has given way to expectancy, and horror been replaced, at any rate in some quarters, by equanimity?

The process has been extraordinarily rapid. The year that saw the end of the war saw also the end of the old Labour Party, a classorganisation as it seemed, a federation of trade unions and socialist societies, pursuing certain common aims; and the beginning of a new party, open to men of all classes who accepted the vision of a new social order, to be attained by strictly constitutional means. In the four years that followed the new party grew towards maturity. The follies of youth were shed, the influx of former Liberals brought in men of ripe judgment and experience in parliamentary tactics. With them came a new atmosphere, an increasing awareness of exactly what would and what would not "go down with the electorate."

It began to be felt, more strongly than ever, that so long as the party appeared to be concerned only with the interests of one

class, even though that was a subject class, it could never win general acceptance, far less a general election. Everything had to be done to make it clear that Labour stood for the interests of the community as a whole, that community comprising both an employing class and a working class. The Labour Party, it was stated again and again, was "not a class party." But fine words butter no parsnips. It began to be recognised that in its composition, in its policy, and in its action, the Labour Party must approve itself in the eyes of the public. So long as the Parliamentary Labour leaders gave, however qualified a backing to great strikes (a classstruggle activity), so long as acknowledged Communists (pledged to an unrelenting class-war) remained within the Party, so long as the charge could be brought that the Labour Party were "out to break up the Empire," so long the electorate would fight shy of it. These matters had to be remedied. Accordingly Labour leaders began to appear as mediators in industrial disputes, even at the cost of antagonising some of the unions concerned.' repudiation of the Nationalist movement in India and the abstention from any agitation against General Smuts' provocation of a rebellion on the Rand and subsequent shootings of workers. took away the reproach of "empire wreckers." The affiliation of the Communist Party was firmly rejected and the door was bolted and barred by a resolution which limited the right of unions or local labour parties in the choice of their delegates.

But if it was remarkable how quickly in the last few years the Labour Party learnt the art of making an appeal to all classes in the community, it was nothing compared to the development of the last six months. The difference is made still more remarkable by the altered character of the new Parliamentary party. The Parliamentary party returned in the 1918 election was what would be called extreme right-wing in its outlook. The Jingo election of 1918 had rejected almost all Labour members of a pacifist tendency. The

DIVILIZED by Google

Apart from earlier incidents, the most significant act of this kind before the General Election was the intervention of Mr. Arthur Henderson in the engineering lock-out of a year ago. Sir Allan Smith had refused to meet the Amalgamated Engineering Union except on the basis of a document which the A.E.U. were unwilling to accept. The Ministry of Labour failed to bring the parties together. Where the Ministry of Labour had failed, Mr. Arthur Henderson, by signing a basis of agreement, succeeded.

## The Labour Party's Approach to Power 331

1918 Parliamentary Party had supported the war, demanded reparations and stood by the Treaty of Versailles. One would have thought that a Labour Party with such recommendations would have been received with the utmost respect by the others. But it was not so, and if there was a double-headed coalition on one side of the House, there was a double-headed opposition on the other. No one was ever quite sure whether Mr. Adamson or Sir Donald Maclean was the Leader of the Opposition.

055

1000

7531

est.

#1

14

ηť

12

1

The new party is different in its composition. It contains a large number of pacifists—most of the party are members of the I.L.P.—and the small but energetic group from Glasgow includes personalities most unacceptable to the Old Etonians and Harrovians sitting on the Government benches. If composition and personality were anything, one would expect the new party to be greeted with horror. Precisely the opposite has happened. It is with this new party that the rapid developments of the last six months have occurred.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has filled the rôle of Leader of the Opposition in an irreproachable manner. He has dined with the King, and with hardly any comment the Labour Party has accepted that fact. Other Labour leaders have come into close contact with their Majesties, and the circle of Labour leaders to whom this privilege is extended is being widened month by month. At the moment I am writing this Mr. Will Thorne has been explaining to a newspaper man what he said to the Prince of Wales with whom he had just been dining. He found the Prince of Wales "broadminded," and he said to the Prince, "I shall have some dirty bouquets thrown at me for this."

Mr. Thorne's remark is significant because he clearly felt that he was right in what he was doing, though he knew that members of the working class would object to his doing it. It is a little over four and a-half years since Mr. Thorne made another significant remark which really sums up the policy and success of the Labour Party. He was urging the Labour Party Conference, just before the 1918 General Election, not to withdraw its support from the Lloyd George Government. Some phrases about class struggle had been used in that Conference, and Mr. Thorne met at once his interrupters and his memories of the past by saying: "If you go

into Parliament you must be prepared to play the parliamentary game."

If you go into Parliament you must be prepared to play the parliamentary game. That sentence, and not "Workers of the World Unite" might well become the slogan of the labour parties. If it is correct then all the rest follows—the extreme correctitude of the front Opposition bench, the country house parties, the Astor dinners. What is this game, this parliamentary game? It is the capitalists' game that they are playing. The bourgeois party system makes certain demands which are all unknown to the ordinary labour man who thinks that by simply voting in a majority of the House of Commons at the General Election a Labour Government is thereby assured. It is not so. There are traditions, there are principles and methods of government, there are certain questions of policy and outlook which must not rest upon the chances of a snatch General Election.

Again and again in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords on certain fundamental issues which arise it is proudly stated by the Leader of the Opposition and proudly accepted by the Government that "the question is one on which there can be no division of opinion," that "every section of the House stands behind the Government in its attitude on this matter." Fundamental issues of this kind are usually those of foreign and imperial affairs (with which are connected the Army and the Navy), or questions of the maintenance of law and order inside this country. If there were any chance that a General Election might be a revolution, then you may be sure Conservatives would fight against the advent of Liberals or Labour men with other methods than those now employed. If victory of a party meant victory of a class then it would be resisted by every conceivable means. But it is understood that party changes will operate only on a certain limited range of matters: that certain other matters are, in the cant phrase, "above party." What are these matters that are above party? They appear to be now one thing, now another, but a very little thought reduces them to one single conception—that is, the assured continuance of the rule of the bourgeoisie. It is the continuance of capitalist civilisation as we know it that is above party. These " certain matters that rise above party issues," these be Your Gods,

## The Labour Party's Approach to Power 333

O Israel. The Labour Party have entered the House of Rimmon, and they must bow themselves before Rimmon. If you go into Parliament you must be prepared to play the parliamentary game.

Still, it may be said that it is possible to do much for the working class within the framework of the British Constitution, that the interests of the community as a whole are very largely the interests of the largest section of it. That is a profound mistake. The interests of the community as a whole are largely the interests of the governing section of it. What has playing the game meant in the last few months, even with the new and militant parliamentary party? It has meant already that the Labour members, long before they form the Government, have raised no objection to certain questions that are "above party." When it was clear upon what official programme the Labour Party had won the Election, it was possible to prophesy that unless the Election programme was reversed the Labour Party must be more and more compromised with imperialism. But it did not seem likely that the process would have been so extraordinarily rapid. Writing in another article in this magazine last December, I said :-

It is not necessary to enter into formal relations with bourgeois parties in order to become a supporter of the existing system. To compromise the working-class position it is only necessary to refrain, in a significant manner, from wrecking the capitalist plans. When in the Reichstag elections of 1907 the Social Democrats endeavoured to curry favour with the jingo electorate by not voting against the war credits, they lost the future of European Socialism. Their tacit consent was given to the enormous expansion of German navalism which rushed neck and neck with the building of British Dreadnoughts to the catastrophe of 1914. There was no need for them to make a pother about voting the war credits in August, 1914. They had sanctioned them in advance by their election programme of 1907.

Within five months the Labour Party in the House of Commons refrained from opposing the Naval Estimates. The Naval Estimates were on May Day; and it had been arranged that the business to be taken that day should be non-contentious, that is, one of these "certain matters that rise above party."

A further instructive example was furnished by the debate on Soviet Russia on May 16. There was a division of opinion amongst the parliamentary parties as to the policy which should be pursued towards Soviet Russia. The Leader of the Opposition was at pains

THE PERSON

to make his disassociation from Soviet Russia rather more clear than his disassociation from the particular policy of the British Government. No one who heard it could have had any doubt as to the honesty of Mr. MacDonald when he repudiates, as he has often done, any idea that the primary issue is the struggle between the workers of every country against their oppressors. On questions of foreign policy there may be a difference of opinion with the Government of the day; there can be no question of taking the part of a "foreign government" against "our own."

Nor is it only the attitude of Mr. MacDonald. The most telling points in the reply of the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in this debate were the passages he cited from articles, speeches, and behaviour of members of the Labour Party. The situation has entirely changed from the time of 1920. Here again there is a threat of war, but this time there is no determination to resist that war expressing itself in a Council of Action. In 1920 the Polish jingo propaganda received short shrift from the Labour Party members: here it was some of the best-known left wingers who allowed themselves to accept the anti-Soviet propaganda of "religious persecution."

Some of the moves in the parliamentary game have to be played outside the House of Commons. Reference has already been made to the necessity for mediation in strikes rather than partisanship. In the last two months this policy has had new and startling developments. The farm labourers' strike was a most hopeful movement of resistance by the most sweated section of the British pro-The Bishop of Norfolk, a paid advocate of industrial harmony, had failed to induce the farm labourers to accept a settlement. The Ministry of Labour, after it in turn had failed, made way for the Leader of the Opposition: the strike was settled by Mr. MacDonald, and the labourers were induced to accept terms by which they will receive 27s. for a 54-hour week-an offer which they had unanimously rejected during the negotiations. From the point of view of the labourers, Mr. Harry Gosling, who has never been an extremist, could write in the Daily Herald of April 23 :-

I regard the settlement as the poorest one regarding wages with which I have ever been connected,

## The Labour Party's Approach to Power 335

That is the one side of the picture. The other side is reflected in the laudatory comments of the capitalist press. The Manchester Guardian said:—

r:

ń

12

135

E

Ü

Ø

It is an excellent thing that Mr. MacDonald should not only have resumed neutrality himself, but have been regarded as neutral. The suspicion that the Labour Party is, as its name implies, a class party will, whenever it takes office, make its handling of labour disputes a kind of touchstone for public opinion. If Mr. MacDonald has helped to dispel the suspicion, there is something gained.

The matter could not be put more plainly. For the sake of the prestige of the Labour Party as a non-class party the farm labourers of Norfolk have been sacrificed.

Greek wrestlers used to anoint themselves with oil to prevent their opponents from getting a firm grip: modern parliamentary parties in their struggles are rather like those wrestlers. It would give the bourgeois parties a firm grip if they could prove that the Labour Party was a class party, and thus rouse on the other side the class instincts of every section of the bourgeoisie. The possibility of their gaining that grip is being steadily removed. The attempts of papers like the Evening Standard to raise prejudice by calling it the Labour-Socialist Party, and by allegations of class bias read like feeble slanders contrasted with the unwavering repudiation made by the Labour leaders, both in speech and in action, of any taint of class feeling. They are admirable tacticians. They out-general the bourgeois parties at their own game: they are playing the parliamentary game, and they are playing to win.

In the history of English sports it is known that after a game has been played long enough it tends to fall into the hands of professionals. From the point of view of many of the workers the parliamentary game appears to be one of these old English sports. The importance of this comes out in considering the relation of the Parliamentary Labour Party to the Labour Party. It has for many years been an anomaly that there should be no control exercisable over the parliamentary group either from the executive or the conference of the Labour Party. It might have been thought that after the strength of the Party in the House had been doubled, the question of the relations between the two bodies would have arisen. A fact of enormous significance in the agenda for the forthcoming conference is that the question is

VT / https://hdl.hangle.net/2027/wilug.30112061987296 tes, Google-digitized / http://www.hathirmst.org/accmss use#pd-us-goog

not raised, There is not the slightest sign that any local labour party or any other constituent body realised that the positions of the two bodies had reached a new stage of development. Yet it is perfectly clear that the r. sing of the Labour strength to nearly 1 50, Labour members occupying the position of the official Opposition, called upon to decide their tactics in the urgency of debate, means that henceforward the Parliamentary Party is bound to decide the policy of the Labour Party as a whole. It is they who will commit the whole party to policy after policy, to issues of strategy as well as day to day tactics. Even if they overstep the mark they are certain to receive an indemnity from a Labour Party conference, unwilling to give the bourgeois parties any chance of saying that the prestige of the Labour leaders is lowered, or that "they cannot control their followers." Gradually the Labour Party as a whole is bound to develop in the direction of a mere electoral caucus: at the best it will be like the National Liberal Federation. From the lines on which the Labour Party has developed there seems no escape from this future. This forthcoming Conference agenda is noticeable on the one hand for the flood of resolutions on purely electoral questions—in future the main business of the local parties as such-and secondly by the absence of any attempt to settle the broadest issues of policy. The feeling seems to be that there is no longer need to do anything except trust the Labour The significance of this future development is that it assimilates the structure of the Labour Party as closely as possible to the traditional structure of the bourgeois parties. Thus the Labour Party is still further introduced within the British party system.

Of course, the grosser abuses of the capitalist parties do not exist in the Labour Party. There is no secret war chest, there is no buying a seat in the House of Lords, and the suggestion that if you cannot buy one in the House of Lords you can buy one in the House of Commons either if you are a wealthy trade union or a wealthy ex-Liberal would be treated as merely flippant and cynical.

All these things to which attention has been drawn have happened within the last six months. In the ordinary course of parliamentary history it will be at least a year or two before the Labour Party come near their goal, but already the consciousness

## The Labour Party's Approach to Power 337

of the approach to power is producing this extraordinary effect: this determination to play the parliamentary game, and to sacrifice everything in order to win it. Let us see what is likely to happen when the position is reached of actually discussing whether to assume power or not and on what conditions. Let us remember the traditions of British politics. It is true that the idea of coalition is at once banned by the Labour Party, and condemned by the Independent Liberals and the Conservatives as well. It is, therefore, clear that an open coalition is unlikely, but the Labour Party resolution which excludes any alliance or electoral arrangement does not and cannot prevent the sort of tacit understandings which we are told inevitably arise in the atmosphere of the House of Commons. These understandings, of course, are perfectly legitimate for the purpose of Opposition. It is when the combined Opposition has been successful that the difficulty will arise. Now what has been the practice? For over fifty years—and, if we include the Peelites, for a much longer period—the two-party-system of British politics has, in practice, always included a third party. That party does not enter into coalition: it holds the balance. The Government exists upon sufferance: the party that holds the balance can make terms. In the 'eighties the Irish were the third party. From 1906 to 1914, with the advent of Labour, one might say that there were two third parties in the House. In the present House of Commons the Liberals are now that tertium quid. If the Labour Party is to consider this when faced with the problem of taking power it will not feel that it has to do something for the Liberals, but it will understand quite definitely that the Liberal support is conditional on certain things not being done. Labour may get into power, but before it does so it will have to make the final renunciation. It has shed the follies of its youth, it has shed the revolutionary wing: it must finally shed its programme.

Further, we have to face the thought of the next election. The Labour Party can go into that election with the conviction that, whatever it says, it is bound to get the trade union and working-class vote. No need therefore to waste any words in wooing it. All its energies must be bent on gaining the good will of the middle-class electorate. Pledges will be made that no radical change will be made without a further reference to the country, and in the

DIVILIZED by Google

2

21

Ü

ţ.

Œ.

2

excitement of the election the nerve of some of the leaders is bound to give way. That has happened already. In 1918, Winston Churchill announced that the Government would nationalise railways: in the heat of the election. In 1922 election several of the Labour members lost their nerve and began to wobble on the capital levy. The Labour members will return next time shackled with pledges given to the capitalist section of their constituents.

So far in everything that has been said the matter has been considered from the outlook of the Labour Movement. It is necessary also to consider the outlook of the bourgeoisie. What had they to see when they looked out on the world after the war? Ahead of them they saw nothing but trouble: they saw their Empire likely to crumble. Already at the bidding of the American bourgeoisie they have abandoned their 200-year old naval supremacy: Britain is no longer mistress of the seas. Again, they are forced meekly to accept the refusal of all their creditors to pay them a penny, while they themselves will have for many years to pay an annual tribute of many millions to the American bourgeoisie. Hastily, by a mingled show of force and fraud they have tried to patch up the position in India, Egypt, and Mesopotamia. In all these countries the aim is to ally the British imperialist bourgeoisie with the native bourgeoisie, and renew the bonds of Empire on the basis of this joint exploitation of the workers. But worse is to come. They know now that they cannot rely on their self-governing dominions. Canada is becoming planetary to the United States, and is insisting more and more on its status as an independent country. In Europe France holds the leadership. From Eastern Europe for 6,000 miles eastwards, there stretches the territory of a new power standing outside all the others, fundamentally the most dangerous. Attempts to crush that power by a combination of all the capitalists failed in 1919 and 1920. In the two years succeeding, under the Lloyd George pacifist policy, the bourgeoisie were almost deceived into thinking that the revolution could be killed by kindness and commerce. Lloyd George could say "they are abandoning Communism." Now with the failure of Genoa and the Hague, the bourgeoisie have realised that they

## The Labour Party's Approach to Power 339

cannot crush Soviet Russia by force or undermine it by capitalist commerce. The proletarian State maintains its monopoly and careful guardianship of foreign trade. With the failure of the Lloyd George policy in Europe, and his consequent dismissal from power the aims and the policy of 1919 have returned in full force. The Morning Post had never been deceived into thinking that Lenin was becoming a good bourgeois or an ordinary Labour leader, and now all of them see that the Morning Post was right; that the rea menace to their power is this possibility of proletarian rule. More and more their minds turn to the desperate policy that they must crush it, this idea of proletarian rule, by intervention abroad and Fascism at home. Nothing else but Fascism can stop it they feel, unless—unless—. It is at this point that our Die-Hard section of the bourgeoisie has adopted Fascism. The others begin to feel, perhaps, that their safest bulwark against a proletarian revolution is something like what they had in Australia or in Germany after the war, a Labour Government. That is what they mean when they accept the idea of a Labour Government: they mean something which will be the bulwark against revolution: something which can be trusted to shoot down strikers as Noske did if it is necessary for internal order. It is, perhaps, not so surprising that the Labour Party is "accepted" as the next Government in this country.

If the Labour Party proceeds along these lines of development there may be great hope for a Labour Government: there will be little hope for the workers. But if it is to reverse the present policy then it must mean a reversal of most of what has been done during the past five years. It means the assertion of control by the Labour Party over the Labour M.P.'s. It means an alteration of the whole constitution as well as the policy and composition. But to deal with the problem of how a real Workers' Party is to be built, and the question of how far the Labour Party can become that Workers' Party is impossible to treat of here. It is sufficient to point out that this is one of the tasks that lie before the workers of this country.

ā.

# THE RUPTURE OF THE TRADE AGREEMENT

By C. J. HUNTLY

The Soviet Government had then been established for a year; the Soviet idea had spread through most of Central Europe; even the Allied armies had shown signs of infection. It was no use trying any longer to pretend that the Russian revolution was merely an elaborate piece of the Kaiser's propaganda—the dreadful thing stood out blatantly as what it was: the rising of the workers against the capitalist system. The first stage of the social revolution had begun.

For a time there was considerable hesitation on the part of the capitalist governments. The old type of statesman, such as Clemenceau, wanted to strike at the revolution wherever it reared its head—whether in Russia, Hungary, Austria, or Germany. The new type of politician, such as Lloyd George, with more than one eye on the home situation, wanted above all to keep things quiet, and was prepared to come to an arrangement. The statesmen finally triumphed over the politicians with the comparatively easy overthrow of the Soviet Government in Hungary, and it was only after two years of armed struggle with the Russian revolution that the

politicians once more assumed control.

The last stage of the attempt to overthrow the revolution by force—the Polish invasion of 1920—was intended to stop the negotiations for a trade agreement between Great Britain and Russia, which Lloyd George had at last opened. The plan succeeded sufficiently to check the progress of the negotiations; and in spite of the early collapse of the Polish and of the new Wrangel attacks the trade agreement was not signed until March, 1921. Similar agreements had already been made between the new Baltic States and Soviet Russia; but the agreement with Britain was of far greater importance, and seemed to mark the acceptance by the capitalist world of the revolution which they could not overthrow. This agreement was followed by a number of others—with Germany,

Norway, Italy, &c.; and simultaneously with these developments, the "New Economic Policy" was introduced in Russia, seeming to foreshadow the continuous modification of revolutionary tactics in response to capitalist approaches. The capitalist politician seemed to have succeeded where the capitalist armies had failed. The revolution was to be undermined, or at least rendered harmless, by peaceful penetration.

In fact, 1921 was a year of crisis for the capitalist world. The slump in industry and employment which developed towards the end of 1920 was undoubtedly an important factor in stopping any suggestion of further war on Russia, and in determining capitalism to seek the Russian market, even though it were a Communist market. For the revolution, also, 1921 was a critical year. strain of seven years of war had almost destroyed Russia's industries and transport; and the disastrous crop failure in the Volga provinces seemed to threaten an inevitable collapse. The way to recovery it was hoped might be found in some kind of joint work with the capitalist world. Very large schemes for the participation of foreign capital in Russian industry were worked out, and there is no doubt that a large section of the Soviet Government thought that these schemes would materialise. To the capitalists the revolution seemed to have lost its sting; the workers in all countries were being defeated all along the line; Soviet Russia was in difficulties, and there seemed to be every prospect of combining business with the pleasure of stultifying the revolution. To revolutionary Russia, the capitalist world appeared to be cracking, and there seemed to be a fair chance of making it serve the immediate needs of the revolution.

The year 1922 shattered the illusions on both sides. Capitalism began to realise that it had not quite understood the New Economic Policy in Russia. Far from opening the door wide to every form of capitalist exploitation, the new policy, in its most important aspects, merely involved the Food Tax, which won the support of the peasants, and the State Trusts, which enabled the separate industries to drop the worst features of war-time bureaucracy while remaining national property. Above all, to the intense indignation of the capitalist world, the monopoly of foreign trade was rigorously maintained. True, private shops had opened, and some private

business was being done in Russia; but over 90 per cent. of Russia's main industries remained under State control, and there were no signs either of the collapse of the Communist Government or of any real change in Communist policy.

For its part the Soviet Government began to realise that the benefits it had hoped to derive from an agreement with foreign capital were largely illusory. The Genoa and the Hague Conferences showed that capitalism was not prepared to compromise with revolution: there must be nothing short of complete surrender. Russia might, if she liked, call herself revolutionary, but she must pay tribute to capital, and capital would not lend money for reconstruction by a revolutionary Government. In spite of the willingness of some individual capitalists to come to terms, organised capital, acting through the western governments, would do nothing. The Hague Conference finally destroyed all hope that foreign capital would consent to help revolutionary Russia.

The mutual abandonment of faith in the possibility of an alliance between the revolution and foreign capital has been the keynote of Russia's relations with the outside world since the middle of 1922. It is difficult to say with any certainty that this has also governed the course of events in other countries. But it must be remembered that the whole of the Near East episode—the Greek attack on Angora, the Lloyd George threat of war which led to his downfall, and the Lausanne Conference—was intimately connected with the growing prestige of Russia in the Near East. Another aspect of capitalist disillusionment was, undoubtedly, the growth of Fascism: revolution must not be compromised with; it must be destroyed. Now we have the Polish preparations for war, and Marshal Foch's visit of encouragement; and, probably, the termination of the trade agreement by the deliberate act of the British Government.

The signing of the trade agreement in 1921 marked the end of the first period of war on the revolution, and the beginning of the period of attempted compromise. It is fitting that the termination of this trade agreement should mark the end of compromise, and the renewal of armed attempts to suppress the revolution.

Why has the attempt at compromise failed? To a certain extent because the financial interests, in the last resort, have been

able to hold the purely trading interests in check. But to a far greater extent, because there has not been that continuous pressure from labour in capitalist countries which might have forced a capitalist compromise. In 1919 and 1920 the menace of revolution was constantly before the eyes of the capitalist governments. Safety lay in compromise with labour at home and the "ring of steel" round Russia. That policy was only too successful; and though the industrial slump of 1921 created some danger from the large numbers of unemployed, at the same time it weakened the unions and created a general sense of hopelessness in the ranks of labour. By 1922 labour had lost the courage even to strike against constant reductions in wages; revolution was out of the question. Fascism rose in Italy and Germany; Militarism revived in France; Conservatism, shaking off the compromising Liberal politicians, formed its own government in Britain. Under the skilful handling of British Labour leaders the rising spirit of the workers in the spring of 1923 was crushed, and the way lay open for an international Fascism.

But what of Russia at the present juncture? What effect has the failure of compromise with foreign capital already had, and what will be the result of the renewed capitalist offensive?

In the worst period of 1921 it seemed to many that the only hope of permanent success lay in an alliance with foreign capital. Substantial concessions would undoubtedly have been granted if the Western Powers had come forward quickly.

But even Lloyd George could not take quick enough action. The Genoa Conference was delayed because the Western Powers still had some hopes that the famine might bring about the fall of the Soviet Government. Their hopes remained unfulfilled, and by the time the Conference opened an enormous improvement in the Russian situation had become clear. Even the famine had been unable to check the recovery of industry; the transport system had proved itself capable of coping with the immense new needs caused by the famine; the Soviet Government emerged from the crisis stronger than ever, and the new system was realised by the workers and peasants to be their one secure defence against

ŗ

E

13

threatened disaster from internal causes, as it had already proved to be their one defence against danger from without. Above all the sowing campaign had been unexpectedly successful, weather conditions had been excellent, and a good harvest for 1922 was assured. Russia sent her delegates to the Genoa and Hague Conferences in a new spirit of confidence: Soviet Russia was making good in defiance of the outside world. She came to the Conferences as an equal, not as a suppliant. The refusal of western capitalism to treat on those terms did not cause dismay in Russia, but rather seemed to remove the dangers inherent in an uncertain situation. From then on Russia must build by herself.

And as the months went by the confidence of the earlier part of the year was strengthened. The harvest exceeded all expectations; the State Trusts steadily developed their operations, and production during the whole of 1922 showed a substantial improvement on the previous year's level. Transport, too, was improving, partly owing to the import of over a thousand locomotives from Germany and Sweden, but even more to the steady progress in the repair shops and in organisation. The State's financial position had improved: by the end of 1922 over fifty per cent. of expenditure was being met out of revenue, as compared with five per cent. in the preceding January.

The recovery had actually been strengthened by the realisation that no help of any importance could be got from foreign capital. Instead of pressing forward proposals for foreign capital, all efforts and resources were devoted to setting Russian industries on their The metal industry, in particular, to which no substantial funds had previously been devoted, was given a fillip by the placing of large orders for locomotives and other railway material which had previously been obtained from abroad. All other industries have maintained the progress begun last year; real wages are rising month by month, keeping pace with the industrial recovery; and the prospects for the 1923 harvest are very good. The area under grain has been raised to 80 per cent. of the pre-war figure; cotton and flax cultivation is also increasing. Thrown back on her own resources, Russia is making a recovery more rapid than many of her leaders thought possible. The early part of 1923 finds Soviet Russia securely consolidating her position, and although the breaking off of trade with Great Britain would affect the immediate situation in certain industries, it would not be an irretrievable disaster—for Russia. Great Britain is a good market for Russian produce, but it is not the only one; other western countries, too, can supply Russia's needs. Great Britain stands to lose more than Russia from the stoppage of trade.

It is probable that the western capitalists have begun to realise the steady improvement in Russia's internal position. They realise that the new economic policy has not, as they apparently expected, modified the fundamental principles of the revolution. Private property has not been restored; the central and local authorities are still composed mainly of Communists; foreign capital cannot ruthlessly exploit the Russian workers and peasants. Nevertheless, the Soviet Government is now the senior government in Europe, and the most secure for the future. The revolution is firmly established, and if Russia continues to progress she will soon be leading not only the imagination, but also the industry of the world.

At all costs, therefore, Russia must be destroyed. Fascism must act internationally as well as nationally. Compromise might have been possible with a weak and crumbling revolution; but a

successful revolution can only be met by force.

This, then, is the position. Lord Curzon is not playing a lone hand, nor are the stakes merely the little matter of trade between Britain and Russia. The British Note was merely the movement of one piece in a series of moves running through the Border States and the Near East. The breaking of the trade agreement would be useless to the capitalists by itself, and it would not have been engineered but for the further moves to follow it. The ring of steel must be set up once more round Russia; and Germany must be persuaded to abandon her Russian connections by a show of friend-ship from Britain. If diplomatic measures fail, Poland is ready to act: an invasion of Russia, even if repulsed successfully, would stop Russia's progress.

Therefore British labour must not imagine that the present situation is not urgent. We are on the eve of a throw-back to 1920, Polish invasion and all. At that time only the Council of Action

averted disaster: but where is the Council of Action now?

# THE DOMINION OF CANADA

## By H. P. RATHBONE

T is hardly possible to emphasise too strongly the anomalous position occupied by Canada in the British Empire. Racially she is still disunited. The French-Canadian element has remained, since the cession of Quebec by France to Great Britain in the seventeenth century, in reality unabsorbed into the remaining population of European emigrants. It is estimated that there are now 3,000,000 French Canadians in Canada, or roughly 40 per cent. of the total population. Furthermore, this population is largely concentrated in the Easternmost provinces. In the province of Quebec, for instance, out of a total of 2,350,000 in 1921, 87 per cent. consisted of French Canadians. This element has remained from the beginning almost entirely an agricultural and petty landowning class; and what industries there are in these Eastern provinces are mainly developed by immigrants from Europe or the United States.

Geographically, even more than racially, Canada is an artificial entity. Her southern boundary, the 48th Parallel of Latitude, was drawn without any reference to natural formations. Consequently there have been many disputes in the past with her southern neighbour, the United States, over both the actual settlement of the boundaries and such questions as defence on the Great Lakes, and fisheries on both east and western coasts.

Owing to the more rapid growth of the United States towards becoming a highly-industrialised state the position of Canada has become even more anomalous. In what follows, we will describe, firstly, the growing economic and consequent political influence of the United States in Canada; and secondly, in a great measure the result of this Americanisation, the increasing number of points of difference between the interests of the Canadian bourgeoisie and those of the Imperial Power.

Now Canada, though still largely a wheat-growing country, has very considerable mineral resources. It is estimated by Eckel ("Coal, Iron, and War") that she has roughly 286,000 million tons of coal, or 7 per cent. of the total world reserves, mostly concentrated in British Columbia. Her neighbour, Newfoundland, a separate British colony, has a reserve of iron ore estimated by the same authority, Eckel, at 4,000 million tons. The eastern provinces of Canada, though they have but little coal reserves, have immense supplies of water power. Many other minerals, such as copper, aluminium, zinc, asbestos, gold, and silver, are found in large quantities, while the forest lands are of immense size. These resources are only now becoming fully developed and, as we will proceed to show, this has been effected, for the last eight years mainly with capital from the United States.

The effect of Americanisation and the growing mood of intransigeance to control by British imperialism, is reflected in the changed position of the bourgeois political parties in Canada.

Before the war the configuration of the bourgeois parties, was to some extent, akin to that of Great Britain, for the Liberals represented largely the petty-trading bourgeoisie, while the Conservatives stood for the heavy industrial and privileged classes. The Free Trade Liberals received also support from the bulk of the farmers.

The war and its after-effects, however, modified the policy of both parties, and has produced a third party, the Party of the Western Farmers. The influx of American capital and American immigrants into Canada has created a definite split in the solid Conservative vote of the industrial districts; for these new American interests are opposed to tariff barriers. In the election of 1921, the Liberals, to the surprise of the English press, made serious inroads into the Conservative bloc in Ontario, the big industrial province of Canada. Accordingly the Conservatives, in order to retain their industrial vote, have thus had to modify their attitude towards reciprocity and have also tended to lose some of their loyalist outlook and have become more and more nationalist. It is, for instance, a most significant fact that it was a Conservative Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, who insisted on the right of Canada to separate representation at the Peace Conference. In spite of the fact that the Liberals continually endeavoured so to modify their policy as to obtain the support of the western farmers,

Ø

r.

these farmers have not been prevented from forming their own party, the Progressive Party, based on the now immensely strong co-operative productive and selling organisation, the United Grain Growers, Ltd. On the question of free trade and reciprocity this Party, therefore, acts as a kind of radical wing of the Liberals.

It is thus clear that the Liberals once successfully accused of "disloyalty" by the Conservatives, are now rapidly approaching the day when they will be able to take the lead in a definitely anti-British direction and will have no fear from the proportionately dwindling band of imperialists. Further, that while nationalism is well on its way to becoming a united policy of all three bourgeois parties, the future division will lie between Canadian nationalism and political, as well as economic, union with the United States.

#### U.S.A. INVESTMENTS IN CANADA

In no other foreign country has American capital penetrated to such a large extent as in Canada. Even before the war, when American foreign investment was almost unknown elsewhere, quite a considerable amount of American capital was exported over the border to Canada. This is brought out in the following table which gives the total sales of capital for government and municipal as well as for industrial enterprise:—

	SALES C	OF CAPITAL FOR	ANADIAN ENTER	PRISE
Period		Canada	Great Britain	United States
		\$	\$	\$
1908-14		285,644,000	1,419,849,000	177,503,000
1915-18		1,487,991,000	65,775,000	593,568,000
1919-21		1,020,543,000	17,256,000	600,645,000

This shows very clearly at once the enormous stride which the United States made during the war in its investments in Canada and the still more striking falling off to practically nothing of the flow of British investments. Furthermore, it shows that with the conclusion of the war Britain has proved totally incapable of regaining any measure at all of her pre-war foothold in Canadian industry; it also shows that the United States has still further increased its grasp on Canadian industry—a grasp which it has again increased in 1922, while Britain has made no headway at all.

In 1918 the Canadian Department of Commerce estimated that the capital invested in Canadian industrial enterprise amounted to a total of about \$1,675,000,000. It further calculated that 34 per cent. of this total was held in the United States, compared with only 9 per cent. in Great Britain, and 56 per cent. in Canada itself. The proportion held by America according to all accounts has now increased to about 50 per cent.

These are the actual figures. But as we will now proceed to show this growth in the economic influence of the U.S.A. in Canada has been first achieved and then strengthened by many and various means.

(a) The Branch Factory.—This was already a factor of some importance even before the war in districts of Canada just over the United States border. It became of increasing importance after the failure of the proposed reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States. United States capitalists found that it was more profitable, on account of the Canadian tariff regulations, to erect factories over the border in Canada, in order to manufacture certain classes of goods to be sold within her borders, than to export them Consequently, especially since the war, and hastened by the "Made in Canada" campaign at the end of the war, American factories have greatly increased in number. Before the war it was estimated that there were 350 of these American branch factories. In 1921 they had increased to 575, and by the beginning of this year it was estimated (by the Financial News of January 18), that the number had now approached to 800. This compares with an estimated total of 20 British branch factories at the beginning of 1922, the latest date for which information is available.

The importance of this development to British capitalists has lately been much taken up by the British capitalist press. They have pointed out that the establishment by America of these branch factories in Canada means that the Americans can in this way take advantage of any trade and tariff preferences which are accorded to Canadian commodities by other British or foreign countries. The Times Trade Supplement of September 9, 1922, refers, for instance, to the establishment by a large American motor company—believed to be the General Motors Corporation of America, the largest motor manufacturing combine in the world—of an extensive plant in which will be concentrated the whole of this combine's export business.

Digitized by Google

The point of view of a Canadian capitalist (unnamed) who visited Great Britain in 1922 in order to interest British capitalists in Canadian development, is worth quoting here (from a report on Canada for 1922 by the Department of Overseas Trade):—

The United States manufacturer regards a branch factory in a foreign country, whether in Canada or Europe, as a decentralised portion, but still a unit of the organisation. As such the branch is subject to the same rigid inspection and management as the main or parent concern, and has therefore been a source of profit in a great majority of cases. The British manufacturer, on the other hand, looks upon a branch as a foreign investment, an agency which will detract from the business of the home plant, and for this reason not a particu-

larly desirable form of expansion.

(b) Loans to Public Authorities.—As we said above, the flow of capital from Britain to Canada practically ceased with the declaration of war in 1914. But Canada in consequence of the war was compelled to borrow large sums in order, as the Manchester Guardian Commercial said (January 11, 1923), "to meet her military expenses, to help finance the export of wheat and other foodstuffs and of munitions of war." Consequently her Government and municipalities were compelled to turn to the United States. No details are available of the amount of Government or municipal loans floated in the United States during the war, but for the years 1919-1922 the Guaranty Trust Company in its survey for January, 1923, gives the following figures:—

1919 1920 1921 1922 (Millions of dollars)

Canadian Government and Municipal Loans sold in New York

12 84 74 100

During this period it is known that neither the Federal Government nor any of the States or municipalities applied for a single loan publicly on the British market. The result of this has been that not only have the United States got a firm if not a dominating hold on the industries of Canada, but they have now also entered into effective competition in a field of financing which was almost exclusively the property of British financiers before the war.

(c) Educational and Other Influences.—The influence of the United States on Canadian education has become predominant. Technical apparatus for research, demonstration or laboratory work in all the numerous universities, colleges and technichological schools are loaned free of any charge by United States manufactur-

ing concerns. This results in a natural leaning towards American products. For as the Department of Overseas Trade report on Canada for 1921 points out: "Owing to the fact that the Canadian mechanic has been educated in the use of United States tools, and also on account of the accessibility of supply, most machine tools are still being imported from the United States."

11

T

American films are reported to have, more than in other countries, a predominating place in Canada. Though the following quotation, from an article from a Canadian correspondent emphasising the influences of the United States, is probably intentionally alarmist, it is of interest nevertheless as showing a tendency:—

The Americans have recognised the importance of the influence of the moving picture business in Canada. Over 75 per cent. of motion pictures exhibited in Canada are the product of American brains. This results in Canadian audiences almost unwittingly so accustoming themselves to the American view-point as to become Americanised in their thinking. The film news service is largely permeated with pictures calculated to draw attention to the people, places, and things of the country to the south of the Canadian border. The possibilities of the moving-picture film for purposes of trade propaganda are now receiving the earnest attention of the great American manufacturers.

(Yorkshire Post, April 18, 1922.)

Again, United States magazines have become increasingly imported into Canada. During a debate on this question in the Canadian Parliament in March of this year, a member stated that in ten years the value of American magazines entering Canada had grown from \$800,000 to \$3,000,000.

Lastly, Canadian merchants and importers have very largely adopted the American trading customs and rules. This facilitates commerce with the U.S.A., and in the same measure hinders transactions with Great Britain.

ECONOMIC CONFLICT BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S.A.

The growth of United States influence has naturally been viewed with alarm by British capitalists interested in Canada. The latter, especially through the press, have persistently stressed the importance of British capitalists devoting attention to the Canadian market and the exploitation of Canadian resources. They put forward patriotic grounds for maintaining that the economic development of Canada must be undertaken by themselves and not by the U.S.A. It is implied, but usually not expressed, that

225-82-26 21.17 GMT / https://hdi.handie.net/2027/ulug.30112061987290 in The United States, Google-digilized / NIKp://www.hathirusi.prg/access use#pd it is the patriotic duty of Canada to leave its resources undeveloped rather than submit to American overtures. A revealing declaration by the Canadian correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* (March 26, 1923), inadvertently exposes the "economic sacrifice" demanded of Canada for the sake of patriotism.

Speaking of the possibility of there being a movement for annexation to the United States in Western Canada, it says:—

But in these apprehensions the pessimists forget that if the national problem of Canada was purely an economic one there probably never would have been any Canada. There would certainly be no Canada now. Even if it is true that Western Canada is called upon to make an economic sacrifice for the sake of a patriotic idea, the West will not thereby be differentiated from Eastern Canada. For if there was no international boundary it is conceivable that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec would by now have populations comparable with those of the States of New York and Pennsylvania. Were there no international boundary the centre of the motor industry of America might be in Windsor, Ontario, instead of across the river at Detroit; and the seaport of Montreal, owing to its far inland position, would undoubtedly be a close rival of New York. It is not economics that preserved Canada's identity on the American continent. And it is not likely that "Snappy Stories" (referring to the flood of American literature into Canada) and such like will succeed in Americanising Canada where serious economic pressure has failed.

The significance of this quotation lies in its clear statement of the contradictions between the interests in Canada of British and American imperialism. It implies, in fact, the accusation that British imperialism is responsible for holding up the economic development of Canada, which, if it had not been for Great Britain, would have been undertaken by the United States.

In opposition to the attempt in the above quotation to prove that patriotism is more important than economics, we find the following frank statement of the Canadian correspondent to the Yorkshire Post whom we have already quoted. He says, for instance:—

There is probably no better way of exerting influence upon another country than by investing in it large sums of capital. That this is true is evidenced by the adoption in Canada, to a very large extent, of United States standards of living and business conduct.

. . . He (the American) is investing immense amounts of capital in Canadian industries by the purchase of the securities of these industries. Underlying these securities are mortgages of property and equipment, permitting Americans to dictate to a large extent the destinies of many important Canadian business organisations.

Or again, take the Empire correspondent to the Financial News on January 18, 1923, who, though he was arguing in this case from the general, i.e., from all the colonies of Great Britain, to the particular, i.e., Canada itself, realised only the "economics" of the matter:—

"We are trying," he said, "to increase the production of the United Kingdom by increasing our exports to Dominions which want to import less as they are determined to manufacture their own. The Dominions are arranging among themselves tariff agreements which provide for reciprocal preference and which will tend to increase the volume of business between them and lessen that with the home country. Branches of English firms, as I suggest establishing, would be entitled to profit by these Dominion agreements. The business men of the United States have sized up the position in this way and are arranging their plans accordingly."

It is, therefore, significant that the chairman of the British Empire Producers' Organisation, the most influential and most directly connected with industry of all the imperialist propagandist societies in Great Britain has just recently made a speech objecting to the investment of United States capital in Canadian industries (reported in *The Times* for February 26, 1923).

#### TARIFF RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES

Until recently the demand for reciprocal tariff concessions between Canada and the United States was put forward only by one section of Canadian capitalism, viz., the Liberal Party, representing small landowning interests. The Conservative Party, representing the British-loyal manufacturing interests, stood for high tariffs to prevent the entry of American manufactured goods. With the growth of American penetration there has been a corresponding movement of opinion away from Britain and in favour of friendly relations with the United States. Consequently the question of tariff reciprocity with the United States has developed from a purely Liberal issue to a nationalistic demand like that for a status of greater independence within the British Empire. The history of the development is as follows:

As early as 1891 the Liberals appear to have been advocates of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. The influential supporters of the Liberals comprised the French-Canadian land-owning-farmers, the tenant-farmers of the west, and immigrants

Z

from the United States. They demanded free trade for the purchase of agricultural machinery and the sale of livestock, &c.; and were anti-English and pro-U.S.A. in their general tendency. The Conservative opposition consisted of manufacturers and Britishborn Canadians who were strongly loyalist and pro-British and in favour of tariff restrictions against American competition. They were, undoubtedly, supported by the imperial power in their opposition to reciprocity. According to the Manchester Guardian 1920 Supplement on Canada, the 1891 campaign was defeated owing to fear of the possible effect of reciprocity on the British connections.

When the Liberal Government, headed by Sir Wilfred Laurier, was in power in 1910-11, the issue again came to the front largely owing to pressure from the western farmers. In response to their agitation Sir Wilfred Laurier began negotiations with the United States, and in 1911 an agreement was signed (the Taft-Laurier agreement). This agreement never came into operation. Fear of the consequences with regard to relations with Great Britain led to the defeat of the Liberal Party. They lost the General Election owing to the "loyalty" campaign waged against them. Mackenzie King, the Liberal leader, records in the Manchester Guardian Canadian Supplement that "the protected and privileged classes made a vigorous campaign against the agreement." Thomas A. Crear, now leader of the Farmers' or Progressive Party and President of the United Grain Growers, Ltd. (the western farmers' co-operative productive and selling organisation), states outright in the same paper:-

> Reciprocity, on which the farmers had set their hearts for its enormous economic advantages to them, was defeated by a "loyalty" campaign, which its chief sponsors find unpleasant to recall.

Finally we have Professor Berridale Keith (an acknowledged upholder of imperialism, associated with the Colonial Office) in an article in the *Manchester Guardian* for December 8, 1921, describing reciprocity as a

scheme which seemed to involve political consequences unfavourable to the British connection.

The reciprocity issue remained shelved until after the war.

In 1919 the agreement again came to the fore, but this time

it was the United States which came out against it. In Canada in 1919, the Liberal Convention with Mackenzie King as leader of the Party, adopted a tariff programme in close accordance with the demands of the western farmers. Besides a demand for the acceptance of the reciprocity agreement, it provided for other substantial reductions in the tariff and also an increase in the British preference to 50 per cent. of the general tariff. In the United States, however, the farmers of the western States, who were afraid of the importation of livestock, &c., from Canada, were putting pressure on the Republican Party to repeal the agreement. Already they were responsible for causing Mr. Taft, the negotiator of the agreement, to lose many votes in the Presidential contest of 1912. In May, 1921, they triumphed in securing the inclusion of a clause repealing the reciprocity agreement (which had never been ratified) in the United States Emergency Tariff Act.

The issue was reopened in Canada immediately the Liberal Party won at the General Election at the end of 1921. After a visit of both Mackenzie King, the new Prime Minister, and W. S. Fielding, the Finance Minister, to Washington, it was reported (Times, March 2, 1922), that the United States would carefully consider the proposal for reciprocity put forward by the Canadian Ministers. According to the Department of Overseas Trade report on Canada, 1922, Mr. Fielding himself referred to it in his Budget speech on his return. The next move, he said, must come from Washington. The Times comment on this situation in Canada was in

in Canada was :—

ď

ì

There is no doubt that the Taft-Laurier agreement would now be accepted by the Canadian Parliament. . . The general feeling throughout Canada is more favourable to closer trade relations with the United States than was the case eleven years ago . . . It will be remembered that the Taft-Laurier agreement affected natural rather than manufactured goods, and it is possible that even amongst manufacturers there is less fear of the treaty than when it was submitted to the country by the Laurier Government.

This latter statement is very significant because, to take one particular and direct instance only in the Taft-Laurier agreement, agricultural machinery was included in the duty free list. At that time the International Harvester Company, the American agricultural machinery trust, had not yet set up any factory in Canada.

It follows, therefore, that what agricultural machinery manufacturing interests there were in Canada had good reason to "fear" this agreement. But by 1922 the American Trust had obtained a completely dominating place in the manufacture of agricultural machinery in Canada itself through its establishment of a branch factory therein. The independent Canadian manufacturers were no longer in possession of the field, and there was thus no longer the same resistance to the importation of agricultural machinery from the U.S.A.

Meanwhile, however, in the United States, Harding and the Republican Party had come into power, a position which they partly owed to the support of the American western farmers. Now, as we have pointed out, these western farmers were opposed to the 1911 agreement. This would appear to be because of the competition of Canadian livestock, which would result from any conclusion of a reciprocity agreement. It thus seems that for the time being, at any rate, the opposition of the United States will prevent the conclusion of the reciprocity agreement.

Sufficient evidence has now been given of the increasing grasp of American capitalism on Canada. The effect of this development on Canadian politics and outlook has also been indicated. A further article must trace the result of this tendency on the relationship of Canada to the British Imperial Power; and show how the economic conflict for the possession of Canada between American and British imperialism has resulted in the strengthening of Canadian nationalism and the consequent increasing desire of the Canadian bourgeoisie, if not to become an independent nation, at least to become strongly critical of any control from Downing Street. The two alternatives therefore before the bourgeoisie of Canada will be in the immediate future not Liberalism or Conservatism, but full Canadian Nationalism or—Union with the United States.

### PROLETARIAN POETRY—II

(Concluded)

#### By A. BOGDANOV

It should be noted that the poetry of the bourgeois world still preserves a great deal of the authoritative consciousness, because bourgeois society has preserved also many elements of authoritative collaboration, of authority and subordination. The variety of the bourgeois groups—big capitalists and petty ones, higher intellectuals, landowners, backward and progressive, stock exchange speculators, rentiers, &c., together with the different intermixtures and combinations of these groups—naturally gives rise to a variety of forms and subject matter in their poetry, but the basic type is general for all of them.

In machine production the fundamental divergences in the nature of labour begin to disappear. The "working hands" are no longer merely hands, the worker is not a passive mechanical performer. He is subordinated, but he also rules his "iron slave"—the machine. The more complicated and perfect the machine, the more his labour is reduced to observation and control. The worker must know all the aspects and conditions of the work of his machine, and interfere in its motion only when necessary; while, at the inevitable moments of caprice or derangement on the part of the machine, he must be capable of quick perception, initiative, and resolution. All these are fundamental and typical traits of organisational work, and for them one must possess knowledge, intelligence, the capacity for exerted attention, which are the traits of the organiser. But there still remains the physical effort; together with the brains, the hands also have to work.

At the same time sharp distinctions between the workers also begin to disappear; specialisation is transferred from them to the machines, the work at different machines is in its essential "organisational" contents almost the same. Thus there is room for contact and mutual understanding in work done in common, an opportunity to assist each other with counsel and action. Here is the origin of that fellowship in collaboration which is the basis upon which the proletariat constructs all its organisation.

357

9

g)

on 2025-02-36 21.22 GMT / https://hdt.handte.net/2027/ujug.30112061987290 min in the United Stetes, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrusi.arg/access use#pm This form of labour is characterised by the fact that organisational work is closely connected with execution. Here the organiser and the executor are not individual persons, but collectivities. Things are discussed and solved in common, and executed in common; everyone takes part in working out the collective will and in its accomplishment. Organisation is accomplished not through authority and subordination; instead of these there is fellowship, initiative, and management on the part of all, fellowship discipline controls every individual.

There have been germs of fellowship collaboration before, but only in our epoch has it become a primary type of organisation of a whole class. It grows in depth to the degree of the development of technique; it grows in width in the degree that the proletarian masses are gathered in the cities, to the extent that they are con-

centrated in gigantic enterprises.

This concentration of the proletariat in the cities and factories has a great and complicated influence upon the psychology of the masses. It contributes to the development of the consciousness that in labour, in the struggle against the elements for existence, the individual is only a link in a great chain and, taken separately, would be a powerless plaything of external forces, a shred of fabric cut from a mighty organism and unable to survive alone. The individual "ego" is reduced to its actual dimensions, its proper place.

But while the masses are gathered in the cities, they become removed from nature. The latter reveals itself to the proletariat only as a force in production, not as a source of live impressions. At the same time city life affords the proletariat very few joys and amusements, however many it may give to the ruling classes; and so the workers' longing for live nature becomes greater, a longing which sometimes passes into a feeling of anguish. This is also one of the reasons for his dissatisfaction, for his struggle to organise new forms of life.

Comradely collaboration is not a ready-made form—it is in a state of development, and has reached different stages in different places. It is followed by the consciousness of fellowship, which is, however, of slower development. This is the primary line of the course of the proletariat. But it is still far from accomplishment

even in the most advanced countries. Its accomplishment will be Socialism, which is nothing else than a fellowship organisation of the whole life of society.

The spirit of authority, the spirit of individualism, the spirit of fellowship, these are the three consecutive types of culture. Proletarian poetry belongs to the third, the highest phase.

The spirit of authority is strange to proletarian poetry, it cannot help but be hostile. The proletariat is a subordinated class, and is struggling against subordination.

However, the proletariat is a young class, and its art is still in the stage of childhood. Even in politics, where their experience is greater, millions of the proletarians of Germany, England, and America still follow in the wake of the bourgeoisie. This may happen all the more easily to proletarian poets. So far the poetry of workers is, for the most part, not real poetry. This is not due to the individuality of the author, but to the viewpoint. The poet may not even belong to the working class by his economic position; but if he has become deeply familiarised with the collective life of the proletariat, if he has actually and sincerely become imbued with its strivings, ideals, with its way of thinking, if he exults in its joys and suffers in its sorrows, if, in a word, he has fused his soul with that of the proletariat, then he may be able to give the proletariat artistic expression, he may become the organiser of its forces and its consciousness in poetic form. Of course, this can very seldom happen, and in poetry, as in politics, the proletariat should not count upon allies outside its ranks.

A small prose-poem by a worker—a poet and economist :— WHISTLES

When the morning whistles resound over the workers' suburbs, it is not at all a summons to slavery. It is the song of the future.

There was a time when we worked in poor shops and started our work at different hours of the morning.

And now, at eight in the morning, the whistles sound for a million men.

A million workers seize the hammers at the same moment.

Our first blows thunder in accord. What is it that the whistles sing? It is the morning hymn to unity.

From "The Song of the Workers' Blow," by A. GASTEV.1

Digitized by Google

t

ğ

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Gastev says: "My poems should be read in an even voice, with definite rhythm, like that of paper being fed into a printing machine."—Translator.

This is lyrical poetry, but it is not the poetry of the individual "ego." For the worker as an individual the whistle is, of course, a reminder of his involuntary labour, it is sometimes even a torturing sensation. But for the growing commune its significance is quite different. The actual creator of the poetry, expressing itself through the poet, is not the same as before, and the things it finds in life are also different. It is the spirit of fellowship.

The investigator must have a foothold in reality. We were in a difficult position at one time, as the few enthusiasts for proletarian art, when we had to speak of things which could not be found in life, when we could not say clearly: "Here, this is real proletarian art; by this model you may judge, with this you may compare." And I must cite here the poem in which I personally found my foothold.

In the year 1913 there was printed in the Pravda a little poem of Samobitnik:—

TO A NEW COMRADE
See the wheels that whirl around,
See the mad belts dancing here...
Comrade, comrade, have no fear!
Let the chaos of steel resound,
Though its many fires be drowned,
Quenched by bitter sea of tears—
Have no fear!

You have come from peaceful haunts, Quiet fields and brooklets clear. Comrade, comrade, have no fear! Here the limitless is bound, The impossible come round... This is the dawn of coming years— Have no fear!

Foaming crests of waves resound With our fortune coming near... On our kingdom gloomy, drear, A new sun is shining down, Burning brighter now than e'er— Have no fear!

Like a giant carved in stone
At the mad belts stand and steer. . .
Let the wheels go turning still,
Closer now the ranks are drawn—
You're a new link forged in here—
Have no fear!

. t = .

X 44 H . H . H . H . H

tps://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112061987290

rated on 2025-92-36 21:22 GMT / https://hdl.handle.ne is Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / ht It is not the artistry that interests us most in this poem. What is most striking is the purity of the contents. I doubt whether one could be more proletarian in feeling and thought.

The thing happened during the old régime. A new worker has come to the factory straight from the village. What is he to the old habitual worker? A competitor, and a most inconvenient one, too: for he lowers the wages, his demands are smaller, and he can hardly assist in the general cause since he is unable to defend even his own interests. Of the general cause he has no idea at all. His thought is slow, his feelings narrow, his will limited, his heroism small. . . . . It is hard to rely on him should there arise a need for concerted action. But observe the attitude of his fellow-worker, the poet, towards him, the strange newcomer. With what chivalrous attention, with what gentle care, he encourages the timid novice and leads him into a world which is unknown, incomprehensible, strange, and even fearful to him! With what simplicity and force, in few words, but with clear images, the poet tells him all that he should know and feel in order to become a comrade among comrades: he draws for him the picture of the gigantic forces of the "steel chaos" of modern technique, he tells him the bitter truth about the "sea of tears" which it costs humanity, and the joyous tidings of the "new sun" of the great ideal, of the proud fortune of common strife. Touching is the recollection of the wonderful far-off nature, of the peaceful haunts, "quiet fields and brooklets clear" amidst stone and iron—the heart of the proletarian is longing for nature, but it is seldom that he gets the joy of meeting with her. But everything will be accomplished by the growing, steady, irresistible effort of the collective creative will. . Victorious confidence sounds in the concluding lines :-

> Closer now the ranks are drawn— You're a new link forged in here— Have no fear!

It is the introduction of a new brother into the knighthood of the Socialist ideal.

Well, is not the poet the organiser of his class?

Proletarian poetry is still in its embryo stages. But it is developing. It is a necessity, because the proletariat wants a full undivided self-consciousness, and poetry is part of this. It is still in its child-hood. But even when it grows up the proletariat will not satisfy itself with this poetry alone. It is the legal heir to the whole of past culture, and the heir of all the best things in the poetry of the feudal and bourgeois worlds.

It must acquire this inheritance in such a manner as not to submit to the spirit of the past which reigns in these works—many proletarians have done this before now. The inheritance should not rule the heir, but be a tool in his hands. The dead should serve the living, but not restrain, not chain them.

And for this reason the proletariat must have its own poetry. In order not to submit to this alien poetic consciousness strong in its centuries-old maturity the proletariat must acquire its own poetic consciousness, immutable in its clearness. This new consciousness should unfold and enclose the whole of life, the whole of the world, in its creative unity.

Let proletarian poetry then grow and mature, let it help the working class to become what it is destined by history to be—a fighter and destroyer only from external necessity, a creator by all its nature.

[The earlier portion of the above article appeared in the May issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY, which can be obtained, post free for 8d., from the Publisher at 162 Buckingham Palace Road, S.W. I]

## THE METAMORPHOSIS OF MR. C. DAS

1

ė

15

y.

#### By EVELYN ROY

N the eve of the Gaya Congress Mr. Das published his sensational programme calling for the destruction of the Reform Councils, the boycott of British goods, and the organisation of labour and peasant societies with the object of preparing the country for what was termed "the final blow"a complete and protracted national strike, accompanied by the simultaneous and wholesale resignation of services under Government all over the country (especially in the ranks of the police and army), and a general declaration of civil disobedience in the form of non-payment of taxes. By this series of steps, as outlined in his short-lived organ, the Bangalar Katha, did Deshbandhu Das and his coterie of personal followers propose to restore life to the fast-ebbing nationalist movement and to attain the rapid consummation of Swaraj. This skeleton programme called further for the formation of an Asiatic Federation, the organisation of foreign centres of Congress propaganda to enlist "the support of all lovers of freedom in all free countries," and for the drafting of a Swaraj constitution which would fully define the goal towards which Indian Nationalism was striving.

The country had little time to discuss the project in full, launched as it was within a few weeks of the annual session of the National Congress, whose function it was to adopt a programme of action for the ensuing year. What comment there was time for concerned itself more with that other programme, published about the same time and precipitated upon the country in the third week of December—through the dubious connivance of Reuter—the programme of Social Democracy, drawn up for consideration at the Thirty-seventh Congress by the Communist Party of India. If the bureaucracy had hoped to kill two birds with one stone, to convict Mr. Das of being in collusion with Indian Bolshevism, and thereby damn his programme in advance, as it sought to damn that of the "Vanguard," it was doomed to disappointment. The Deshbandhu was acquitted by the unanimous voice of his own countrymen of being in collusion with anybody but himself, but it

was, nevertheless, considered by those who differed from him that his ideas bordered dangerously near to Socialism, if not dipped in the deeper dye of Bolshevism. His repeated protestations that he stood for the constructive programme, subject to the alterations mentioned above, and his declarations of faith in the revival of cottage industries, as exemplified by the sacred *Charka*, could not save him from the taint of dangerous heterodoxy. His frequent references to a need for change in tactics made him an object of suspicion to the high priests of orthodox Gandhism, while his apocryphal utterances about the "masses" alarmed the propertied classes and brought him into the limelight of official displeasure.

Thus, on the eve of Gaya, Mr. Das stood practically alone with his own conscience; no party had yet rallied to his banner, though the air was thick with speculation. What he said and did may be regarded for all practical purposes as the utterances and acts of an individual mind, undeterred and uninfluenced by party responsibilities and allegiances. All factions awaited his presidential address at Gaya—here was the key which would unlock the mystery of his intentions and reveal the full purpose of the new leader. Negotiations behind the scenes there must have been and were, on the part of those discontented elements seeking a new standard to rally round, but as to which of those elements, exclusive of the rest, would relieve the isolation of the Deshbandhu and elect him their chief, Gaya alone could determine.

The presidential speech at Gaya is a monumental record of Mr. Das's legal mind at war with his poet's soul. It is the Gotter-dämmerung, where the gods of the earth and heavens wrestle in titanic conflict for supremacy. Beginning with an eloquent exposition of historical precedents, a host of facts is marshalled before his thousands of auditors (and for the benefit of the listening bureaucratic ear), to prove the legality of revolution. Then the Deshbandhu proceeds to prove, by another set of historical facts, the utter futility of exercising this indubitably legal right to rebel, and ends in a grandiose and self-contradictory climax, which seeks to demonstrate that India will succeed in doing that which history has failed to furnish any precedent for—the conquest of Swaraj by non-violence, such as will start a new chapter of human relationships and usher in a new historical era of peaceful revolutions.

Divilization Google

Ŀ

The inaugural address may be taken as the complete expression of the Deshbandhu's individual philosophy and political ideology, worked over for many weeks with meticulous and loving care. It is likewise the last expression of pure Deshbandhuism, since events following rapidly on the conclusion of the Congress session swept Mr. Das and his personal devotees into the strong current of party politics, where his dominant personality no longer reigned supreme. A study of the Gaya presidential address is, therefore, a revelation of the full mind and heart of Chittaranjan Das, an authentic document of his own making at what may be regarded as the turning point in his career.

There is little that is new. His speech at Dehra Dun, the statement to the Press at Amraoti, and the statement of policy in Calcutta appear to have been incorporated bodily in this wider and all-comprehensive document, wherein its author conscientiously attempts to indicate a new path for the national movement to follow. Of greater interest than its objective statements are the subjective forces of his own mind that struggle for supremacy, now the cool, reasoning brain of the lawyer, now the passionate warmth of the rebel, and again the imaginative idealism of the romantic poet. In the beginning the lawyer reigns supreme, and Deshbandhu the barrister treats his hearers to a masterly exposition of "Law and Order" as the basis of all tyranny, and the legal right of the subject, as furnished by good historical precedents, to rebel against the tyrannical dictates of this doctrine. His arguments are irrefutable, and one imagines they are intended less for his Khaddar-clad auditors, the majority of whom, perhaps, could not understand the language he addressed them in, than for that august tribunal of bourgeois justice and morality-western civilisation and history -that he proceeded later to hold up to such scorn. Here spoke the product of bourgeois English education, quoting English historical precedent to substantiate his country's claims to freedom, and hoisting the British rulers of India on their own petard, so to speak, by proving from the Revolutions of 1640 and 1688 the legal right of a people to rebel. He concludes this part of his thesis as follows :-

This, then, is the history of the freedom movement in England. The conclusion is irresistible, that it is not by acquiescence in the doctrines of law and order that the English people have obtained the

d on 2025-02-26 21:27 GMT / https://hdl.handie.net/2027/ujug.38112061987299 omein in the United States, Gaogle-digitized / http://www.hathifust.arg/access useMpd-usrecognition of their fundamental rights. It follows, firstly, that no regulation is law unless it is based on the consent of the people; secondly, where such consent is wanting, the people are under no obligation to obey; thirdly, where such laws profess to attack their fundamental rights, the subjects are entitled to compel their withdrawal by force or insurrection; fourthly, that law and order is and always has been a plea for absolutism; and lastly, there can be neither law nor order before the real reign of law begins.

To all of which arguments there is and can be no answer, and were British rule in India a mere question of legal quibbling, the representatives of that haughty Empire must withdraw in confusion, and leave India bag and baggage for sheer lack of any adequate defence. But, unfortunately, British rule in India is based, not upon the justification of law courts, but upon the strength of armies, and Mr. Das would have done better to have based his arguments upon

the latter supposition, or to have saved his breath.

However, having concluded this phase of his pleading, Mr. Das takes his stand on another ground to prove the right of the Indian people to freedom—this time, not by historical precedent, but by "sacred and inalienable right." And once more, to the confusion of his Christian preceptors, he quotes the Bible, and the words of Christ. Here he warms to his task and plunges into a dissertation on the sacred and inalienable right, not alone of individuals, but of whole peoples, to resist unjust oppression and "to take their stand upon Truth."

For myself, I oppose the pretensions of "law and order," not on historical precedent, but on the ground that it is the inalienable right of every individual and of every nation to stand on truth and to offer a stubborn resistance to ruthless laws. . . . The development of nationality is a sacred task—if, therefore, you interpose a doctrine to impede

that task, why, the doctrine must go.

By this narrow bridge, Mr. Das, the lawyer, passes over into the precincts of Deshbandhu Das, the patriot and friend of the country. The realms of dry historical facts are forsaken for that richer field of political speculation and philosophy, already enriched by the minds of Jean Jacques Rousseau and his successors. But the tools of the lawyer are not abandoned—the appearance of proving his point by logical deduction, the falling back upon authority and precedent, this time not mundane but divine. The next part of the address is devoted to an exposition of Mr. Das's theory of nationality, wherein western ideas and education are forgotten, and

the Vedanta school of Spiritual Imperialism is given full play. The patriot, the poet, and the mystic are happily combined, and Mr. Das becomes once more intelligible to his own people as he soars into the realms of metaphysics:—

What is the ideal which we must set before us? The first and foremost is the ideal of nationalism. Now what is nationalism? It is, I conceive, a process through which a nation expresses itself and finds itself—not in isolation from other nations, not in opposition, but as part of a great scheme by which, in seeking its own expression and identity, it materially assists the self-expression and self-realisation of other nations as well. Diversity is as real as unity. And in order that the unity of the world may be established, it is essential that each nationality should proceed on its own line and find fulfilment in self-realisation.

Mr. Das then goes on to declare that his ideal of nationality must not be confused with that conception which exists in Europe to-day:—

Nationalism in Europe is an aggressive nationalism, a selfish nationalism, a commercial nationalism of gain and loss—that is European nationalism.

And in contradistinction to this horrid spectre he conjures up a vision more pleasing and familiar to his auditors, fed with the same spoon from other hands, that of the new nationality of spiritual India which is to be realised through soul force, nonviolence and love, and which will save the world.

Throughout the pages of Indian history I find a great purpose unfolding itself. . . . The great Indian nationality is in sight. It already stretches its hands across the Himalayas, not only to Asia, but to the whole world; not aggressively, but to demand its recognition and to offer its contribution. . . . True development of the Indian nation must necessarily lie in the path of Swaraj. A question has often been asked as to what is Swaraj. Swaraj is indefinable, and is not to be confused with any particular system of government. Swaraj is the natural expression of the national mind, and must necessarily cover the whole life history of a nation. Nationalism is the same question as that of Swaraj.

Here is the transcendentalism of Mahatma Gandhi, highly flattering to a people accustomed to think of itself as a special creation of Providence, and charged with a spiritual mission to save mankind from the materialistic abyss towards which it is speeding. The Mahatma was wont to declare: "First realise yourself, then Swaraj will come of itself"; the Deshbandu affirms: "Let each nation realise itself, then Swaraj will come, the Swaraj

of entire humanity." The soul of the poet had not purged itself of the mysticism bred of solitary confinement nor of the tendency to make politics a metaphysical adjunct of speculative philosophy. Mr. Das belongs by nature to the school of Transcendentalists who have picturesquely adorned the pages of Indian history in her transition from mediævalism to modernism, and are now rapidly becoming extinct in the march of events.

We cannot leave the subject of the presidential address without reference to a few more pronouncements which provide a key to the ideology of India's new leader. Mr. Das reaffirmed in strong words his faith in the doctrine and tactics of non-violent non-co-operation, and gave as his reasons therefore, "apart from any question of principle," the "utter futility of revolutions brought about in the past by force and violence." Taking the French, American, English, Italian, and Russian Revolutions as historical precedents (the ghost of the lawyer still lingers), he proceeds to demonstrate to his own satisfaction, and presumably to that of his auditors, that it is impossible to attain Swaraj by violent means (Swaraj here taken in its mystical sense as described above). Says Mr. Das:—

I maintain that no people has yet succeeded in winning freedom by force and violence. The use of violence degenerates those who use it, and it is not easy for them, having seized power, to surrender it Non-violence does not carry with it that degeneration which is inherent in the use of violence.

He seeks to prove this assertion by a hasty and dogmatic analysis of those great historical convulsions described as "national' revolutions, which in the past have ushered in new political institutions to correspond with fundamental changes in the economic and social orders. The vast upheaval in France from 1789 to 1812 means nothing more to Mr. Das than a struggle "as to which of the various sections shall rule France." He fails to glimpse beneath the apparent clash of individual hatreds and ambitions, the grim struggle between two opposing and mutually-exclusive classes, the corrupt monarchy and decayed feudal order on the one hand, and on the other, the rising bourgeoisie whose allies were drawn from the ranks of the exploited peasantry and city proletariat. Against this struggle the whole of Absolutist Europe ranged itself, for the challenge of the French bourgeoisie was a challenge against feudal absolutism and corruption wherever it existed; and so we find

civil war and terror within, accompanied by invasion, starvation and blockade from without. Napoleonism was the answer of the new social order, determined to maintain itself; and the overthrow of Napoleon, followed by the reaction that overswept Europe, could not delay forever the inevitable triumph of the French bourgeoisie, and of the bourgeoisie in every country. The great French Revolution, the English Revolutions of 1640 and 1688, the American and the Italian Revolutions were successful, in that a new class came to power, shaping its own political institutions in accordance with the dictates of its economic needs and interests. Modern bourgeois democracy is not the Utopia dreamed of by Jean Jacques Rousseau, nor the abstract Reign of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and Reason proclaimed by the Jacobins-but it remains, nevertheless, the logical heir and successor of the mediæval feudal autocracy which reigned in Europe before its advent, and it represents one step forward on the road of progress that will lead mankind to its ultimate goal. The victory of the bourgeoisie over feudalism is but the prelude to another and fiercer class struggle, now being waged, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; which must end in the victory of the latter and the abolition of all classes with the institution of private property which gave them birth. The presentday politics of Europe bears this contention out.

Such is history as viewed in the light of the Marxian dialectics, which reads success or failure, not in approximations to an abstract ideal, but in the development of new productive forces and the corresponding rise of new social classes, ideas and institutions. The faulty and shallow analysis which Mr. Das and all bourgeois libertarians bring to bear upon the great revolutions of the past is the result of their lack of understanding of the underlying social and economic forces involved. We can expect nothing better when we read, further on in the presidential address, that Mr. Das "looks upon history as the revelation of God to man." With such an attitude towards history, where every event is a special dispensation of Providence and not the result of material economic laws, no wonder that Mr. Das fails to draw useful analogies from the great revolutionary movements of the past to apply to the Indian struggle, and no wonder that he declares that India will not repeat the history of other nations, but will offer the world something unique.

 $2_{\Lambda}$ 

.26 21:23 GMT / https://hdl.handle.nrt/2027/ujug.38112061987290 United States, Kongle-digitized / http://www.halhitrust.org/access useMpd-us

And yet Deshbandhu Das and his associates are playing out their unconscious rôle as the leaders of India's bourgeois revolution against the decayed feudal autocracy of the native princes, and the absolutism of the imperial overlord. The Congress and its leaders are but the tools and instruments of those powerful social forces that have been silently developing themselves within the past century—a native bourgeoisie, reinforced by a rebellious peasantry deprived of its land, and by an exploited industrial proletariat, the product of machine industry and a ruined system of handicrafts. The struggle of these social classes for supremacy is masked beneath vague phrases and idealistic abstractions about "Swaraj," "Self-Realisation," and "Truth," even as the struggle of the French bourgeoisie, exploited peasantry and city proletariat was concealed beneath the eloquent perorations on "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das and his fellows, despite their sentimental Utopianism, are the Dantons, the Patrick Henrys, and the Garibaldis of the Indian Revolution, whose unexpressed and as yet half-conscious purpose it is to usher into power the Indian bourgeoisie.

But is not Mr. Das something more, one is tempted to inquire, in the light of his eloquent pronouncements on the subject of "the masses," whose cause he champions so valiantly against the "classes." Is his rôle to be not that of eighteenth century Republicanism of America and France, but of a twentieth century Messiah of the masses? How nobly he champions their cause in his speech at Gaya, and on innumerable occasions before and after. Does he not say:—

Many of us believe that the middle classes must win Swaraj for the masses. I do not believe in the possibility of any class movement being ever converted into a movement for Swaraj. If to-day the British Parliament grants provincial autonomy in the provinces with responsibility in the Central Government, I for one will protest against it, because that will inevitably lead to the concentration of power in the hands of the middle classes. I do not believe that the middle classes will then part with their power. How will it profit India if, in place of the white bureaucracy that now rules over her, there is substituted an Indian bureaucracy of the middle classes? . . . I desire to avoid the repetition of that chapter of European history. It is for India to show the light to the world—Swaraj by non-violence, and Swaraj by the people.

And how does Mr. Das propose to realise this "Swaraj of, by, and for the people "? By the revival of the ancient Indian Panchayet, or village community, which he terms "real democracy." According to his idea, "the most advanced thought of Europe is turning from the false individualism on which European culture and institutions are based to what I know to be the ideal of the ancient village organisation of India." We do not know if Mr. Das confuses, in his ignorance of the facts, the idea of the Soviet system with that of the Panchayet. If he does, we would point out to him that the analogy lies, not between the Soviet and the Panchayet, but between the Panchayet and the ancient Russian village Mir, which like the old Teutonic Mark, constituted the basis of primitive village self-government. Such "ideal" democracies are to be found in the early history of every country, not alone in India, during the stage when agriculture was the prevailing mode of production and the small peasant proprietor was the dominant social class, in that remote past before feudalism, with its complicated social and political institutions, superseded this very primitive stage of decentralised government. It is useless to discuss the kind of democracy enjoyed by these village communities, except to observe that, being founded upon the system of private property, it contained the germ of modern bourgeois democracy into which, by slow and painful process of evolution, it has evolved, through the intervening stages of feudalism. Useless to discuss it we say, since even were it desirable, how were it possible to revive this archaic institution, which may have corresponded to the economic development of our remote ancestors, but which cannot possibly meet the manifold requirements of this twentieth century world in which we live, with its internationalised system of production, distribution and exchange? If decentralisation is desired, why seek to revive the Panchayet? Its own natural extinction in the process of evolving society is the best proof of its own unfitness to survive. The very desire to hark back to an imagined Golden Age is but an indication of Utopianism on the part of Mr. Das and his fellow-worshippers of India's mythical past, which savours strongly of reaction. Did not Jean Jacques Rousseau paint in glowing colours the "ideal democracy" of the primitive American Indians, whom those other seekers after democracy, the fathers of the American Revolution,

Divilized by Google

were busily engaged in killing off to make room for themselves and their more advanced institutions?

But Mr. Das goes further in his advocacy of the cause of the "masses." In his presidential speech, as well as on other occasions, he specifically urged the organisation of labour and peasant societies "to further the cause of Swaraj," and earned thereby the appellation of "Bolshevik." We reproduce his words on this subject from the Gaya address, in order to discover if such an adjective is justified:—

I am further of the opinion that the Congress should take up the work of Labour and peasant organisation. . . . Is the service of this special interest in any way antagonistic to the service of nationalism? To find bread for the poor, to secure justice to a class of people who are engaged in a particular class or avocation-how is that work any different from the work of attaining Swaraj? . . . We have delayed the matter already too long. If the Congress fails to do its duty, we may expect to find organisations set up in the country by labourers and peasants detached from you, disassociated from the cause of Swaraj, which will inevitably bring into the arena of the peaceful revolution class struggles and the war of special interests. If the object of the Congress be to avoid this disgraceful issue, let us take Labour and the peasantry in hand, and let us organise them from the point of view of their own interest and also from the point of view of the higher ideal which demands the satisfaction of their special interests and the devotion of such interests to the cause of Swaraj.

We think Mr. Das should be absolved from all allegations of Bolshevism, and even of a pink shade of Socialism. What he advocates here is pure Hedonism-" pig-philosophy,"-let us help Labour in order to secure their help and to prevent their being used against us. No doubt this is put in such a utilitarian form in order to convince the more bourgeois among his audiencebut it is the special pleading of what is at best, a bourgeois Utopian Liberal's plea directed towards a bourgeoisie more hard-headed, less romantic and unsentimental than himself. That is the essential quandary of Mr. Das-to be a humanitarian bourgeois liberal intellectual, fallen among orthodox Gandhians and "Responsive Co-operators,"-each faction listening critically to all he had to say, ready to follow him if he voices their particular aspirations and unexpressed interests, but equally ready to pounce upon him and rend him to pieces should he violate any one of their cherished traditions or prove himself the standard bearer of a new economic

Digitized by Google

class, which is not yet really represented in those chaste deliberations. We allude to the turbulent class of the industrial workers and landless agricultural proletariat, whose incipient spirit of revolt against unbearable economic conditions constitutes the only real menace to the established order of things in India, and upon whose dynamic power of mass action the Congress seeks to base its tactics of civil disobedience, without committing itself to a programme of economic reform which might antagonise the vested interests behind the bourgeois nationalist movement.

25

Į.

10 10 10

10

10

西京

EN.

0

fri

di.

4

15

Ì

jo

10

d

ø

The inaugural address at Gaya closed with Deshbandhu Das, the poet and sentimentalist, riding in the saddle of Pegasus, with the discomfited barrister lost amid the cloud pictures of an India reborn, waging "spiritual warfare" against the unnamed foe—a warfare waged by "spiritual soldiers" free from all anger, hatred, pettiness, meanness and falsehood. A quotation from the "Prometheus Unbound" of that other poet-mystic and knight-errant of Liberty, Percy Bysshe Shelley, constituted the climax and close of an undeniably eloquent oration, which equally undeniably is a masterpiece of contradictions and sentimental confusion.

The die was cast. It remained for those who had heard to choose sides and elect their leader, either from among the doughty champions of No-Change or the Don Quixote of Pro-Change cum grano salis. The week of discussion and resolution-making came to an end, and Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das, "Friend of the Country" and champion of the masses, found himself the head of a new party called the "Congress-Khilafat-Sawaraj Party," pledged to work within the Congress for the achievement of Swaraj by non-violent non-co-operation, but along the lines of its own programme. This programme, it was announced, would be drawn up and submitted to the public for approval in the early months of 1923. Mr. Das, finding himself and his party in the minority, honorably resigned his post of Congress President, and betook himself to a tour of the country to rally his forces. The principal clauses of his temporary programme, as announced before the Congress session, included the capture of the Reform Councils, to mend or end them, the boycott of British goods, and the organisation of peasant and Labour unions, with the object of declaring a national strike for the speedy attainment of Swaraj.

The names of those who rallied to Mr. Das's side and swelled the ranks of the new party included as a preponderating majority, that group of "Responsive Co-operators" who, in various provinces, had been long and vainly chafing against the leading strings of orthodox Gandhism, and who beheld in this eloquent exponent of "Pro-Change," a captain who would lead them on to storm the citadel of the Reform Councils. While the question of Council entry was a secondary consideration in Mr. Das's programme, the whole issue of the Gaya Congress turned upon this disputed point, and to the new faction which unexpectedly swelled the ranks of the "Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party" this question was allimportant and supreme. Wherefore we find that by sheer force of numbers they overwhelm Mr. Das, and make this point supreme for him as well. It begins to figure in every speech and declaration of policy as the decisive point at issue, on the part of the leaders of the new party. On the other point-that of the organisation of the Indian workers and peasants—the statement of Mr. N. C. Kelker, one of the Chiefs-of-Staff of the new party, and veteran leader of the Tilak School of "Responsive Co-operation," is exceedingly interesting. In an article called "The New Party," published in the Mahratta of January 14, 1923, the first comprehensive statement of the purpose and intentions of this organisation is given from the viewpoint of that rationalist faction which constitutes its chief strength. Mr. Kelker's views about Labour, as compared with those of Mr. Das's, are significant :-

The new party will, I think, whole-heartedly favour the formation of Labour unions and peasant unions. And while the formation of co-operative societies may represent its constructive activity, its destructive activity may, if occasion demands it, be represented by the advocacy of Labour strikes for a just cause and the non-payment of unjust taxes or dues by the peasants, not necessarily in the big name of Swarajya, but as a legitimate measure of resistance to unlawful acts of authority.

This measured statement of the case comes like a cold douche after the warm-hearted advocacy of the Deshbandhu, and should have somewhat prepared the unwary for a further shock that came towards the end of January in the form of a statement by the first

Digitized by Google

d

不 . . . . . . . . . . . .

1

d\$

16)

T.

1

ď

0

r,

convention of the Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj Party on the "Rights of Private Property." This statement takes the form of a special clause in the first draft of the party programme that " private and individual property will be recognised, maintained, and protected, and the growth of individual wealth, both moveable and immoveable, will be permitted and encouraged." This clause, it is remarked by contemporary journals, "seems to have been particularly included in order to counteract the statements made in some quarters that the non-co-operation movement represented a form of Bolshevism." But the fact that such a statement was published, far in advance of any other clause of the party's programme is an important indication of the true nature of the men who lead it. It is a frank declaration of class-affiliation and class-consciousness on the part of the rising Indian bourgeoisie, whose special interests the Swaraj Party is dedicated to defend. Under the influence and pressure of this class the school of liberal intellectuals to which Mr. Das belongs, is being willy-nilly converted from the erstwhile champion of the exploited masses, into the protector of bourgeois property rights. This is, indeed, a metamorphosis little expected on the part of those who were carried away by the eloquent speeches of the Deshbandhu in the cause of Labour and the Indian masses, but not very surprising to those who have learned to draw a hard, clear line between sentimentality on one hand, and class-interest on the other. The presence of a class-conscious bourgeois party within the ranks of the National Congress is rapidly beginning to crystallise the political ideology of the non-co-operation movement as a whole. The leaders of the new party are determined to protect their class-interests from the very outset against the rising floodtide of mass-energy that may some day find an outlet in revolution. The day is fast approaching when Mr. Das must either abandon his own party and the social class to which he belongs, to throw in his lot with a purely proletarian movement conducted on the lines of the class-struggle against capitalist exploitation, both foreign and native, or give up altogether his sentimental effusions about the masses and take his stand unequivocally by the side of the propertied classes.

The new party has been captured by a very clear-headed set of individuals who have long been the standard bearers of political

rationalism inside the Congress ranks, and who will do their best to guide the movement back into the folds of parliamentarism and constitutional agitation, where they will eventually become His Majesty's most loyal Opposition. The difference between this "Responsive Co-operation" and the co-operating Moderates is slight indeed. Mr. Das now finds himself in the anomalous position of being the nominal head of a party which will end by negating the very principles of non-co-operation upon which it was originally founded. As he was isolated on the eve of Gaya, a solitary figure of dreams and illusions, so is he isolated now-pushed into a minority within the ranks of his own party whose guidance has passed into other hands. Deshbandhu Das may be no less the friend of the country, no less the champion of the oppressed masses than he was before his spiritual kidnapping by the Responsive Co-operators. But he is caught upon the horns of a dilemma which correspond to the poles of his own temperament—the lawyer in him struggled to escape from the metaphysical toils of orthodox Gandhism and so fell into the meshes of bourgeois rationalism, against which his poet's soul rebels. He still talks about "the masses," still dreams of the coming of an Indian millenium wherein peace and prosperity shall descend upon the people through the medium of the village Panchayet. Even in his most recent utterances before the third session of the All-India Trade Union Congress, celebrated in Lahore towards the end of March and over which he presided, he declared :-

If the middle classes ever win Swaraj, and I live to see that day, it will be my lot to stand by the workers and peasants and to lead them on to wrest power from the hands of the selfish classes.

But ere this day dawns the metamorphosis of Mr. Das from bourgeois liberal intellectual and Don Quixote of the masses into a true leader of the Indian working class must be complete.

# The World of Labour

						PAGE
Bulgaria:	Election Terror			 .0.00	20	377
France:	United Front		4.4	 		377
GERMANY:	Workers on Cuno Note			 		378
ITALY:	Maximalist Congress			 	4.4	379
RUSSIA:	Twelfth Communist Congress		50	 		379

#### BULGARIA

#### Election Terror

LECTIONS to the Bulgarian Parliament took place on April 22 under terroristic conditions. Prior to the elections the Proportional Representation law was suspended, hundreds of left-wing propagandists were arrested and the lands of the Communist peasantry threatened with confiscation. As a result the Agrarians have secured 215 seats, the Communists 16 (a loss of more than half their seats), the Bourgeois bloc 14, and the Socialists 1. The election was openly proclaimed to be a fight between the Agrarian Party and the Communists, and the former desisted from no measures to secure a "victory."

#### FRANCE

#### United Front

A GAIN the French Communist Party has tried to form a united front with the Socialist Party on the occasion of the May Day celebration, and again nothing has been attained. The Socialist Party, in the face of the intensified capitalist offensive and the occupation of the Ruhr, refused to join issue on the following points laid down by the Communist Party:—

(1) A joint propaganda week against the occupation of the Ruhr, against the Versailles Treaty, against the imperialist policy of the Nationalist bloc, and the economic consequences detrimental to the workers caused thereby; such as the increase in the cost of living, reduction in wages, suppression of the eight-hour day law, &c.

(2) Joint action on May Day by giving the trade unions the full support of our followers.

(3) Support of the principle of a world congress, as decided by the International

Congress held at Frankfurt.

On the majority of these problems it is certain that we advocate different solutions; but the realisations of those solutions is dependent, in both cases, on the awakening of the conscience of the working masses and the active collaboration of our supporters.

Only the United Front can realise the first condition.

377

þ

Œ

1

N

4

BOTH in the Reichstag and the Prussian Diet much opposition to the recent Government Reparation proposals has been offered by the Left Wing Parties, notably the Communist Party, many of whose members have been suspended. The position to be adopted by the Communist Party to the Cuno Note was discussed and the party decision drawn up as follows:—

(1) The workers must continue a more intensive international struggle than ever against the policy of brigandage of the French imperialists, and against the reparation which the Entente countries demand for France.

(2) The Allies must be forced to evacuate the Ruhr and the occupied territories. Any manner of international occupation of the Ruhr (neutralisation or internationalising) must be fought against with the same energy as the Franco-Belgian occupation.

(3) The workers cannot make any offer to pay reparations until all the forces of resistance, both national and international are mobilised. The workers must conquer the reins of power so as to mobilise all the forces of defence.

(4) The working class can only take the responsibility for such an offer under the following conditions:—

(a) Immediate and complete evacuation of the occupied territories;

(b) Seizure of values which assure the State a preponderating influence in the important branches of key industries, in commerce, banks, and in agriculture so as to transfer the burden of reparations solely to the possessing classes.

(c) The reconstruction of the German economic position side by side with the reconstruction of the devastated region in Northern France, and above all, the guarantee of sufficient nourishment to the working masses, which have been under-nourished for years.

(5) As regards the Cuno Government offer, the workers can in no respect be held responsible. The proposal proves once again that the Cuno Government is anxious to solve the question at the expense of the workers. The big industrialists and lords of finance have refused the guarantees of payment asked, and Cuno's Government, like its predecessors, is submissive, just as it was in January last. Big Business having refused to pay, Cuno and the parties which support him, whether actively or passively (People's Party, Centrists, Democrats, and Social Democratic Party) make an offer diametrically opposed to the workers' interests. This offer entails the imposition of new taxes and presupposes the aggravation of the exploitation of the workers in the factories. This is a mean manœuvre of the German bourgeoisie and will not terminate. It has been made with a view to rousing British and American capital against Franco-Belgian capital. Should this manœuvre succeed—but it will not—it will mean that the workers will be placed between Charybdis and Scylla. Instead of becoming a Franco-Belgian colony, Germany will become a colony of French, Belgian, British, and American capital. At the same time the German bourgeoisie weaken the defence against French imperialism on two decisive points: The question of the transport of coal and by bungling financial and fiscal policy.

In its own interest German capital has opposed the Ruhr workers' efforts to prevent the French from transporting coal. It was also self-interest that made capitalists sabotage the action to consolidate the mark, and lower real wages. The present situation must lead to a catastrophic debacle, to complete capitulation, at the expense of the workers, to French imperialism.

(6) The only possible solution for the workers is the united front against the bourgeoisie; it should take over the continuation of the struggle against Poincaré by overcoming Stinnes and Co.

Divilizantly Google

(7) All coalition Governments, just as the Cuno Government, are incapable of taking up the fight against big industry and finance. The great coalition in process of preparation by the Social Democrats is only another form of the dictatorship of Stinnes supplemented by Fascism.

Only a workers' Government can save the working class from a catastrophe and

total enslavement, because it will have the support of the united proletariat and its organs and because it will have the confidence of the proletariat in the Entente countries

and of Soviet Russia.

10

12

YY

Z.

ili

12

25

10

Œ

35

22

12

21

西西

115

母田世田

E 17.

13

#

ø

2

şî.

(8) Factory councils and committees of control must become the nuclei of the proletarian united front and develop the struggle both against the internal and external enemy. The sabotage of the Social Democrats necessitates the intensification of the class struggle to create a basis for the workers' Government.

#### ITALY

#### **Maximalist Congress**

THE Congress of the Italian Socialist Party held in Rome in October, 1922, expelled the Reformists or Turati section from the party by a vote of 32,106 to 29,119. This decision left two possible courses open: either the Maximalists, under Serrati, should join the Communist Party or form an Independent Socialist Party. At a congress of the Maximalists held at Milan on April 15 it was decided by a vote of 5,361 to 3,698 not to join the Communist Party. The feeling of the congress was entirely against an independent party, and the formation of a united Communist Party, as proposed by the Communist International, is regarded as merely a question of time.

#### RUSSIA

#### Twelfth Communist Congress

HE Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party opened in Moscow on April 17. Although for the first time Lenin was absent, he provided the basis for the most important discussion, which centred on a couple of articles that he had written earlier in the year on the dangers

of bureaucracy in Soviet Government.

Lenin's proposals to reform the Central Commission and Central Committee of the Communist Party had led to a vigorous discussion in the Press, and the matter was finally thrashed out at this Congress. The chief question at issue was the rôle of the Communist Party. Krassin put forward the view that the problem of economic reconstruction was fundamental, and no interference on the part of the party ought to hinder this work. Ossinsky went even further, declaring in favour of the Communist Party concentrating on propaganda and agitational work and leaving the tasks of government solely to the Soviet His main proposals were: (1) The Council of People's organisations. Commissaries to become a purely administrative body; (2) the All-Russian Central Executive Committee to be the only legislative body; (3) the Central Committee of the Communist Party to be propagandist only; (4) contact to be maintained by half of the members of the Central Committee being members of the Council of People's Commissaries. On the other hand, the view of the majority of the Central Committee and that arrived at by Lenin himself was that it was necessary to intensify the political control of the party.

Anticipations of a serious split were gleefully heralded throughout the foreign anti-Russian Press. Nothing of the kind occurred. After the complete discussion at the Congress the resolutions elaborated by the Central Committee of the Party were all unanimously adopted. The resolutions confirmed the inviolability of the State foreign trade monopoly, insisted on the importance of union with the peasants and emphasised the necessity of a division of labour between the Soviet and party organisations. It was unanimously agreed that the party must have the lead in all political and cultural work and that the dictatorship of the proletariat could only be expressed through the Communist Party.

The second most important subject for decision was the report on the development of Russian industry submitted by Trotsky. His theses, which were unanimously adopted, dealt with the development of State industry on Socialist lines. Krassin again brought forward criticism from the point of view that Trotsky's programme for the restoration of industry was on too small a scale, and that it was necessary to obtain greatly increased assistance of foreign capital through concessions and loans, but the weight of the argument went

against him.

The result of the Congress was a new assertion of the supreme importance of the Communist Party in the life of Soviet Russia. A new Central Executive of fifty members was elected, including nineteen members taking office for the first time. Among prominent Communists who failed to secure re-election were Krassin, Ossinsky, Chicherin, Litvinoff, Krestinsky, and Joffe.

### BOOK REVIEW

#### A JOURNALIST TELLS THE TRUTH

Through the Russian Revolution. By Albert Rhys Williams. (Labour Publishing Company. 7s. 6d.)

A Press towards the Russian revolution will find a most striking exposure of the common fallacy (recently restated by Mr. Norman Angell in one of his latest books) that newspaper proprietors are simply concerned with the commercial profit to be derived from constantly exploiting the popular love of sensationalism. It is only necessary to read Through the Russian Revolution to understand that the Russian workers' struggle for power provided material for a "scoop" with a far greater appeal to the imagination than, for instance, Sir Philip Gibbs' despatches from France. The duty of the Fleet Street News Editor, however, is not simply to thrill his million net readers with "human stories," but consciously to select only that news which suits the proprietor's class interests; about other events—irrespective of their historical or news value—the well-trained journalist must lie or be silent. Mr. Albert Rhys Williams' book is evidence that our Press has been the duller in consequence.

Through the Russian Revolution is not a profound history of Bolshevism, such as Mr. Philips Price's work; it is simply a record of the experiences of an American socialist journalist who has lived through revolution as an active and enthusiastic observer. Mr. Williams is gifted with a style comparable to John Reed's, and the period he covers is not ten days, but four years.

Mr. Williams opens his Introduction by introducing us to the Cadets:-

Looking at the red-flagged troup from his window, Milyukov exclaimed: "There goes the Russian revolution—and it will be crushed in fifteen minutes."

But it was the Cadets, with their Liberal foresight and their attitude of contemptuous tolerance towards the proletariat, who were to be crushed:—

It was mainly the workers and soldiers who made the revolution. They had shed their blood for it. Now it was assumed that they would retire in the orthodox manner leaving affairs in the hands of their superiors. The people had taken the power away from the Tsarists. Now appeared on the scene the bankers and lawyers, the professors and politicians, to take power away from the people. They said:

"People, you have won a glorious victory. The next duty is the formation of a new State. It is a most difficult task, but fortunately, we, the educated, understand this business of governing. We shall set up a Provisional Government. Our responsibility is heavy, but as true patriots we will shoulder it. Noble soldiers, go back to the trenches. Brave working men, go back to the machines. And peasants, you go back to the land."

Now the Russian masses were tractable and reasonable. So they let these bourgeois gentlemen form their "Provisional Government." But the Russian masses were intelligent, even if they were not literate. Most of them could

not read or write. But they could think. So, before they went back to the trenches, the shops, and the land, they set up organisations of their own—Soviets.

. . . deputies were elected by trades and occupations, not by districts. The soviets consequently were filled, not with glibly talking politicians, but with men who knew their business.

The intelligentsia, with the capitalists and landlords, lined up behind the Provisional Government, while, on the other side, the workmen, soldiers and peasants rallied to the soviets. And when the Communists won the confidence of the soviets came "the refusal of the intelligentsia":—

Among the delegates were scores of these intellectuals. They had made the "dark people" the object of their devotion. "Going to the people" was a religion. . . . the intelligentsia had made a god of the people. Now the people were rising . . .

But the intelligentsia reject a god who will not listen to them and over whom they have lost control. . . . They disavow all faith in their former god, the people. They deny their right to rebellion.

The intelligentsia, as usual, wish to compromise the issue by a coalition of all parties. "Only one coalition possible," is the retort, "the coalition of workers, soldiers, and peasants."

That was the position at the opening of the historic Second Congress of Soviets in Petrograd on November 7, 1917, and when, indignant at the revolutionary will of the people expressing itself, Martov, Kutchin, and Abramovich, with ome eighty delegates, rose to leave the Congress: "Let them go," cries Trotzky, "let them go! They are just so much refuse that will be swept into the garbage-heap of history." By 6 a.m. the following morning the Provisional Government had been declared overthrown.

When the intellectuals deserted the revolution they also isolated themselves; they found themselves rejected by the masses whom they had tried to patronise. The attitude of the intellectuals had made that situation inevitable for some months before the actual break occurred. Mr. Williams describes the meetings, at which bored audiences listened to the half-hearted and platitudinarian sentiments expressed by the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, until suddenly enthusiasm would be awakened by the appearance of Lenin, Zinovief, or some other Bolshevik leader, whose critics and opponents would be instantly shouted down.

Mr. Williams spent fourteen months among the peasants, he addressed meetings of Red sailors, he was present at the capture of the Winter Palace, he journeyed across Siberia; in every one of its phases and from Kronstadt to Vladivostock he saw the revolution. The chapter headings, "Mercy or Death to the Whites?" "The War of the Classes," "Building the New Order," "The Steppes Rise Up," "A Red Funeral," only hint at the scope of his experience. He was personally responsible for organising a foreign detachment of the Red Army, and in his military connection was for a time associated with Kuntz, a life-long Tolstoyan, who, to defend the revolution, took up arms.

The book is enlivened with many individual character sketches and personal anecdotes. It contains numerous excellent photographs, a well-

Digitized by Google

documented appendix, and nine coloured reproductions of Bolskevik posters; by means of the latter, as the author explains, "What ever the Soviet does, it strives to make the people understand the reason."

Through the Russian Revolution is already well known in the United States, and the English edition has now been printed from the American plates.

A. E. E. R.

#### PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- Trade Unionism and Munitions. G. D. H. Cole. (Economic and Social History of the World War, British Series.) Published on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace by Humphrey Milford, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press.
- Workshop Organisation. G. D. H. Cole. (Economic and Social History of the World War, British Series.) Published on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace by Humphen Milford Orford and Claude B.
- International Peace by Humphrey Milford, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press.

  The Workers' Register of Labour and Capital, 1923. The Labour Research Department. Labour Publishing Company. 58, and 28, 6d.
- ment. Labour Publishing Company, 5s. and 3s. 6d.

  Report on an Inquiry into Working-Class Budgets. G. Findlay Shirras. Labour Office,

  Secretariat, Government of Bombay, Rs.3-14-0.
- The Community's Credit. C. M. Hattersley. Credit Power Press, 5s.

21

on 2025-02-26 21:27 GMT / https://hdl.han nain in the United States, Google-digitized Workers' Opposition in Russia. Alexandra Kollontay. Dreadnought Publishers, 6d.

CHARLES AUSTRALION (\*)

ublic Domain in the United States, Google-digitized / http://www.nathlinst.org/acense useMpd-u

Divilizad by Google

## LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 4

June, 1923

Number 6

#### PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

The Labour Party's Approach to Power

By R. PAGE ARNOT

The Dominion of Canada

By H. P. RATHBONE

The Metamorphosis of Mr. C. Das

By EVELYN ROY

Published at

162 BUCKINGHAM PALACE ROAD, LONDON, S.W. 1

ARECECTOR CONTRACTOR C

PRICE SI

SIXPENCE

Digitizan by Google



EUGENE V. DEBS, Chief Contributing Editor, writes a stirring Article each month on the most vital topics.

### Read DEBS' MAGAZINE

Editor: IRWIN ST. JOHN TUCKER

Contributing Editors: Rabbi Juda Magnes, Alexander Howat, James H. Maurer, Emil Herman, Isaac McBride, Charles L. Drake, and many others.

\$1 per year. Published Monthly, 10c. a copy. Liberal Terms to Agents and Unions.

59 EAST VAN BUREN STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

## THE Monthly 6d. PLEBS

Organ of the National Council of Labour Colleges

June Number Includes:

ASIA MINOR (with special map)

Mark Starr
SOME FACTS ABOUT AGRICULTURE H. Lekoy
THE REVOLT OF THE ROBOTS Eden & Cedar Paul
THE EDUCATION QUESTION—

STILL BURNING!

H. Wynn Cuthbert

and a Special REVIEW Section

162a Buckingham Palace Road, London, S.W. I



#### FIRST WORKERS' LOAN FOR SOVIET \$200,000 RUSSIA

for financing the agricultural and industrial undertakings of the Workers' International Russian Relief. Loan shares now available. 10/-, £2 and £5 each. Interest 5 per cent. per annum. Redeemable 1st January, 1933. Loan fully guaranteed by the Russian Soviet Government. The Best and Safest Investment for all Workers. Place your savings to help the Russian workers build up the First Workers' Republic as a Tower of Strength against World Capitalism.

#### SUBSCRIBE TO-DAY

Applications for allotment of Loan shares to EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD, Secretary

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL RUSSIAN RELIEF INDUSTRIAL AND TRADING Co., Ltd. (Incorporated in Germany), BEDFORD ROW,

#### NOW READY!

Resolutions and Theses of the IVth Congress of the Communist International

Report of the IVth Congress of the Communist (250 pp.) International

Terms to Wholesale Agents.

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP,

KING STREET COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

Weekly, Price Three Pence.

Postal Subscription Rates, 6 months 7 |- ; 12 months 14|-

## Russian Information and Review

The progress of the Workers' Republic of Russia is of extraordinary importance to all interested in the International Labour Movement. But the difficulty of obtaining accurate information about Russia is very great, and Russian Information and Review is the only journal published in Britain from which such information can be obtained. The section on Economic Reconstruction gives a clear picture of the industrial revival now going on in Russia. The Code of Labour Laws has recently been published in full. Other Codes of Law and Criminal Procedure are to be published.

## Russian Information and Review

Order Direct from THE INFORMATION DEPARTMENT, RUSSIAN TRADE DELEGATION, Sample Copy on Request. 68 Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C. 1.

Digitized by Google



D d t H v V l t o ii i

DEOLOGY is not always evident in the design of type faces, and still less evident in their subsequent presentation by the average printer. Yet type is important: word after word, line after line, of inscribed ugliness will weary the most intent of readers.

Notice the even white space between the letters of the text-type used in this magazine, the symmetrical outline and absence of widely contrasting lines; in short the harmony that is the characteristic of the famous Caslon Old Face series. We stock the utilitarian faces,

of course, but like to print in this type. To make it an economical possibility we have installed the Caslon series on our composing machines, and are

#### ALWAYS AT YOUR SERVICE

In your first communication to us please mention "The Labour Monthly."

## Caledonian Press Ltd.

TRADE UNION IN ALL DEPARTMENTS
W. FRANCIS MOSS, Managing Director

74 Swinton Street, Gray's Inn Road London, W.C. 1

Telegrams: Edcalopres, Kincros, London

Telephone: Museum 1311 Museum 7777



Published by the Trinity Trust, 162 Buckingham Palace Road, S.W. 1, and Printed at London Caledonian Press Ltd., 74 Swinton Street, Gray's Inn Road, W.C. 1—w 5105

Digitized by Google