

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

---

Official Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International



## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

### Britain's Balance-Sheet for 1926

A full and searching analysis of the breakdown of British Capitalism, and of the probabilities ahead

John Pepper

### From Marxism to Malthusianism

The "Marxist" Left Wing of the Second International adopt "Birth Control and Emigration" as their main slogans!

B. Smeral

### Notes of a Trade-Unionist

A. Lozovsky

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

English Edition Published at 16 King Street, London, WC2

## C O N T E N T S

THE EXTENDED EXECUTIVE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL Editorial ... .. 2	THE PROBLEM OF AUSTRO-MARXISM Joseph Strasser ... .. 16
FATHERS AND SONS A. Martynov ... .. 3	THE FRANCO-GERMAN ENTENTE F. ... .. 19
BRITAIN'S BALANCE-SHEET FOR 1926 John Pepper 5	INTERNATIONAL REFORMISM IN ITS TRUE COLOURS A. Lozovsky ... .. 22
FROM MARXISM TO MALTHUSIANISM B. Smeral 14	

## The Extended Executive of the Communist International

**T**HE Extended Executive of the Communist International, which is to meet in the course of the next few days\* will have to review the following points:

It will have to investigate the changes which have taken place in world economics during recent years, in general, and since the time of the last Extended Executive in particular. It will have to investigate in what spheres or countries capitalist economy has achieved some successes—if only transitory and partial—with respect to stabilisation, in what regions the capitalist economy of the world is still in a state of crisis, and in what countries the most active forces of the international revolution are concentrated.

It will have to take into account the re-groupings which have been taking place lately among the Great Powers, as well as the fierce struggle for markets which they are waging. We are living in times when economic forces are continually playing havoc with the relations created by Versailles and Locarno. The capitalist world is mobilising against the U.S.S.R., where the proletarian forces are making tremendous efforts to lay the foundations of a Socialist Society. The capitalist world is mobilising its forces also against the great struggle for freedom of the Chinese people. Mankind is again faced with the terrible peril of new imperialist interventions and wars. The Plenum must impress all this on the workers, taking very energetic action against the false pacifist illusions spread by Social Democracy.

It must—and this is one of its main tasks—determine the tactical lines of the Communist movement in the struggle for the capture of the masses of the working class, taking into account first and foremost the important lesson of the British strikes. It must link up the great events of our times, the Chinese revolution and the struggle of the British proletariat, with the tasks of the world Communist movement in general. The British strike and China will run like a red thread through the entire work of the Plenum.

Our Enlarged Plenum is meeting under conditions

which demand careful consideration and the maximum of revolutionary determination. The bourgeoisie is carrying on everywhere a struggle for the stabilisation of capitalism. Everywhere the success it achieves is linked up with the lowering of the workers' standards of life. A fierce attack is made all along the front on wages, on the eight hour day, on all forms of social insurance, on all the achievements of the proletariat.

The stubborn determination of the British miners, which is the first mighty reply to this concentrated offensive, is an indication of the acuteness of the struggle which is now developing. But in some countries zest is added to this attack on the proletariat by Fascist terrorism. In the Balkans, in Hungary and in Poland, the Communist movement is declared illegal, just as during the most acute stages of civil war. In Italy, Fascist dictatorship knows no bounds and adopts the most brutal and sanguinary forms of White Terror. What is needed now is a mobilisation of the working class on a large scale, and the greatest possible concentration of its forces to resist this pressure.

**A**LL over the world we see that the enemy is organising his forces and feels now much more secure than in 1918, at the time of the demobilisation of big armies, at the time of complete economic disorganisation. The capitalist world is carrying on a stubborn struggle, it is amalgamating scattered enterprises into trusts; it is even organising international amalgamations. Capitalists of various countries are forming blocs in the struggle against the British miners as well as in the struggle against the Chinese coolies and against the workers of the U.S.S.R., who keep alive the revolutionary flame of class struggle throughout the world. Just because the enemy is now organised much better than before, the international working class must unite all its efforts in one anti-capitalist front. More than ever it is essential for the working class to be united in its struggle against the oppressors. More than ever must the tactics of the united front of the workers be brought into play.

\* Written just before the Extended Executive meeting (or "Plenum") of the International which opened in Moscow on November 22nd.

**The Extended Executive**—continued

**T**HE Extended Executive of the International cannot shut its eyes or ignore the lessons taught us by the British strike. It must be openly admitted that support for the British miners on the part of the international proletariat was very weak. These lessons too must be taken into account by Communists throughout the world.

Neither can we ignore at this Plenum of the E.C.C.I. the fact that just at the moment when the greatest possible concentration of the forces of the Communist Parties of all countries was imperative, in order to support the struggling British proletariat and the revolutionary masses in China, in some countries attempts to disorganise our Parties were made by "oppositional" groups. This sign of the times, which bears testimony to a desertion of the Communist movement by the disillusioned and by those who are tired of the struggle, must also be taken into account by Communist workers throughout the world. They will not forget that at the moment when the capitalist world was surrounding with a network of mutual agreements, as with a barbed wire fence, the country of nascent Socialism, when it jeopardised peace in the Far East through Chang-Tso-Ling and when Pilsudski was rattling his sword on the Western frontier—some small opposition groups endeavoured to bring about an ideological demobilisation of the proletariat.

That is why the Enlarged Plenum must not be a mere demonstration of solidarity with the British

miners, with the Chinese revolution and the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., but a coming together of the foremost champions of a revolutionary army, capable of criticising their own errors, of exposing petty-bourgeois deviations and of pointing the way to a practical revolutionary mobilisation of the proletariat. From this Plenum the Communist workers of the world expect the consolidation of our Communist Parties and complete liquidation of the petty bourgeois tendencies which endeavour to bring the alien influence of other classes to bear on the proletariat.

**T**HE struggle against Right as well as against so-called "ultra-left" tendencies must be carried on relentlessly, for it is only through such a struggle that our Parties can develop and grow strong.

In connection with this we must also raise the question of the leaders of our Parties. The need at present is to have in all leading positions the type of proletarian revolutionary that is in close contact with the masses, one who has emerged from their midst and is capable of approaching them and working in the very thick of them, in all their mass organisations and primarily in the Trade Unions. The question of gaining control of the Trade Unions has never been so peremptory as at present.

The entire work of our Plenum will give an impetus to confidence and a fighting spirit. Serious struggles are ahead, but proletarian revolutionaries do not fear them. Communists, prepare your forces for the coming struggle!

## Fathers and Sons

A. Martynov

**P**EPINO GARIBALDI, nephew of the hero of the Italian national revolution, has proved to be a traitor, and Ricciotti Garibaldi, the grandson, an agent provocateur.

At the time of the Matteotti affair, Pepino Garibaldi organised an anti-Fascist legion in Italy. All the members of the legion turned out to be spies, with the exception of Bellini. At Bellini's trial Pepino Garibaldi himself, the organiser of the legion, appeared in the witness box against him instead of being in the dock together with the accused. This fact proves clearly that this entire adventure was staged by Mussolini, who used Pepino Garibaldi as a tool to further his regime of Fascist terror.

Simultaneously, in September, 1924, the grandson of the famed Giuseppe, Ricciotti Garibaldi, organised an anti-Fascist legion in Paris, assuring the duped workers whom he had cajoled into joining the legion, that they were being called upon to accomplish "a second Garibaldi expedition" to Italy. This was apparently mere bluff, for the legion found another destination. The French police have established the fact that Ricciotti Garibaldi was making immediate preparations to dispatch this legion to Spain, to instigate a rising in Catalonia with the express purpose of causing discord between Spain and France.

Other factors served to show clearly that Ricciotti Garibaldi had these provocative aims in view. The

French police have arrested an Italian police agent, Rappollo, and ascertained his connection with Ricciotti Garibaldi. They also found on him a document faked in Paris by Garibaldi for a certain Chevoli, whom the Italian police declared was about to cross the Franco-Italian border in order to make an attack on Mussolini's life. When the French police arrested Ricciotti Garibaldi, another document was found on him concocted in Paris. After the attack by the anarchist Luchiotti on Mussolini, Ricciotti Garibaldi faked a membership ticket for Luchiotti in France proving that Luchiotti belonged to the French anti-Fascist League; this he intended to send to Rome as evidence that France was a centre for plots against the Italian Government.

Thus both nephew and grandson of the famous Italian national revolutionary hero have turned out to be agents provocateurs, serving Mussolini with dirty provocative methods to incite both Spain and Italy against France. What does this mean? Is this simply a game of chance? A vicious caprice of history, the game of a random atom in the brain of degeneration? No, this is a profound symptomatic phenomenon. It is a glaring reflection of social evolution of European and especially of Italian bourgeois democracy.

Giuseppe Garibaldi was the hero of the epoch of "Young Italy," the time of the Italian movement for national freedom against the rule of Austria. He chose

**Fathers and Sons**—continued

revolution, a popular rising, as the path to the unity and liberation of Italy.

**“Patriotism” has Changed**

Giuseppe Garibaldi was an advocate of a people's revolution and consequently an internationalist. He was everywhere at his post wherever a struggle for freedom was being waged. Cavour, on the contrary, set himself the task of uniting a part of Italy through extending the Piedmont boundaries by diplomatic combinations, by give and take, by gaining the sympathy of Napoleon III. for Piedmont, at the expense of betraying Savoy and Nice. Not only did Giuseppe Garibaldi organise a national rising in Italy, he also fought for the political liberation of Rio Grande do Sul from Brazil, he organised a rising in Uruguay against the Argentine dictator, Roges, and took part in the armed struggle against Prussia at the time of the Franco-Prussian War. His dream was a free federated republic of European peoples; he sent enthusiastic greetings on the occasion of the rising of the Paris Commune. In him was personified bourgeois democracy at its early dawn, in the epoch of its struggle with feudalism, when it was imbued with revolutionary enthusiasm, when through its patriotism it was not in conflict with oppressed classes and nations, but, on the contrary, closely bound up with them.

Ricciotti, Giuseppe Garibaldi's eldest son, also followed in his father's footsteps, he participated in his father's military exploits. In parliament he was with the extreme Left, he took part in the Greek rising against Turkey and organised an Italian legion to aid the insurgent Albanians. What happened to Ricciotti the younger, and Pepino, reared in the tenets of these glorious family traditions? Did they cease to be Italian patriots? Not at all. But the very nature of Italian bourgeois patriotism has undergone a profound change. “Young Italy” has been transformed into “Great Italy.”

The generation of the bourgeois democratic epoch, of the struggle of oppressed Italy against feudalism, has made way for the new generation of the epoch of post-war imperialism. This generation now dreams of acquiring colonies and exploiting colonial slaves. It is steeped in a patriotism of spoliation and in the name of “patriotism” suppresses the liberty of the people in Italy itself. It is ready to wage war to the knife against all oppressed classes and against all oppressed nations.

**Symptoms of Decay**

Ricciotti and Pepino Garibaldi are also Italian “patriots,” they, too, are heroes, only the bourgeois patriots of our time, the bourgeois “heroes” of our time. For this reason, they are not averse to using the great name of the Garibaldi family, its immense popularity, to organise volunteer legions for the new aims of the Italian bourgeoisie, to strengthen the Fascist dictatorship in Italy, and to help forward the realisation of Mussolini's plans for the conquest of a dominant position in the Mediterranean and the seizure of African and Asiatic colonies from France.

Other times, other minds! Liberating patriotism is reincarnated as the “patriotism” of oppression and spoliation. Together, with this change the personal ethics of Italian “patriotism” are also re-born. When the Italian parliament in 1874 granted a national gift of 100,000 lira to Giuseppe Garibaldi he refused for a long time to accept this gift. When Mussolini's police offered his grandson Ricciotti 400,000 francs for his services as a provocateur, Ricciotti Garibaldi accepted this gift with gratitude. Money does not smell.

If it were necessary to seek out a tangible illustration of the decline and rottenness of present-day capitalism and of contemporary bourgeois society, could a better one be found than this profound ideological degeneracy in the Garibaldi family? Garibaldi's descendants have killed and dragged in the gutter the glorious Garibaldi tradition. This is a forerunner of the death of the Italian bourgeoisie.

**BUILDING UP  
SOCIALISM**

By N. Bukharin

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

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

Price 1s.  
Post free  
1/1½d.

# Britain's Balance-Sheet for 1926

John Pepper

**C**LEAR and unmistakable is the balance sheet of the first half-year of the British miners' struggle: the General Strike and the miners' struggle signify a decisive turning point in the history of Great Britain.

The tendency of the mighty British Empire to fall to pieces, revealed more and more clearly during the last decade, has been hastened greatly by the events of the last half-year. England's position in world economics has become still more undermined. The world monopolist position of Great Britain has suffered a series of shocks. The very structure of the British Empire, the inner cohesion of the component parts of the Empire has been markedly loosened during the last half-year.

In domestic politics there appears a sharpening of class antagonisms hitherto unknown in England. A far-reaching restratification of the classes and a regrouping of the political parties is in progress.

## The Meaning of the Miners' Lockout

The Government and bourgeois press, and the Right and Left Labour leaders, have all tried to make out that the miners' lock-out is an "ordinary," "orderly," "industrial," trade union struggle. In reality, however, the miners' struggle developed every day more and more into an open political struggle for power. In reality not only the economic but also the whole political life of Great Britain revolves around this struggle.

The feverish efforts of the parliamentary gasbags and trade union bureaucrats were aimed at portraying the miners' struggle as a mere repetition of former miners' struggles, a repetition of the miners' struggle in 1921. Of course, the present miners' struggle has certain points of resemblance to former miners' struggles in England, but it nevertheless possesses peculiarities that stamp it as an entirely new kind of struggle. The following fundamental factors play the decisive role in this connection:

(1) This miners' struggle is taking place after the first tremendous General Strike.

(2) The leaders of the miners' union are no longer Right Wingers, such as Hodges, but "Left" leaders like Cook.

(3) The miners' struggle is being carried out in the atmosphere of the Emergency Powers Act.

(4) The question of power as between mine magnates and mine workers has been brought up extremely sharply. According to the apt comparison of the "Economist," an "irresistible force" has clashed with an "immovable object."

(5) The struggle is proceeding within the shadow of a general bourgeois offensive against the trade union movement.

(6) The miners' struggle broke out at a time when the British mining industry found itself in a crisis that cannot be solved within Britain alone, nor upon a capitalist basis. The British bourgeoisie is confronted with the dilemma: what is it to do with its "surplus" coal, or what is it to do with its "surplus" miners?

(7) As the arena of this struggle there is no longer a booming but a declining British Empire—and this is fundamental. The British capitalists are less and less in a position to be able to make important concessions to the working class. Mere defence of the prevailing working hours and wages meets with the resistance of the capitalists as a whole, and thereby becomes a political struggle of first magnitude.

## The Economic Catastrophe

The six months miners' strike has resulted in the internal disruption of British industry and has also severed very important world economic relations. The economic journals of Great Britain give one a picture of a tremendous economic earthquake. To be sure, the British capitalists are trying to keep secret and minimise the consequences of this economic earthquake, but the truth nevertheless leaks out: devastation, ruin, economic dead and wounded are seen everywhere.

British coal production, the foundation of the country's mighty economic structure, is completely paralysed. In April, 1926, the month prior to the struggle, British coal production amounted to 22 million tons. In May, June, July and August, nothing was produced, and only in September was a weekly production of 500,000 tons reached. ("Economist"—Monthly Supplement, October 23rd, 1926.) Not less than 100 million tons of production have been lost, according to the figures in the "Economist"—about 26 per cent. of the annual production of coal in Europe.

The shortage of fuel has sapped the vitality of the other basic industries also. British heavy industry is gradually ceasing to produce. In April, 1926, 147 furnaces were in use with a pig-iron production of 539,100 tons. By the end of September only five furnaces were working and the total British pig-iron production amounted to only 12,500 tons. Steel production in April amounted to 661,000 tons, but in September was only 95,700 tons. The "Economist" is necessarily forced to admit the catastrophe: "Pig-iron production has sunk almost to a vanishing point."

## Heavy Industry Paralysed

By the end of September, all available reserve stocks of pig-iron were exhausted. "Reserves of British pig-iron have now reached the point of exhaustion."—"Economist," Monthly Supplement, October 23rd, 1926.) The paralysis of coal production has its effect in the paralysis of heavy industry, and the lack of iron and steel production of course makes itself felt in the finishing industries.

The longer the struggle lasts the more devastating will be its effects. The capitalists boast that between 200,000 and 300,000 miners have already resumed work.\* The bourgeois press is lying, the number of blacklegs is much lower, but the bourgeoisie itself is compelled to admit that blackleg coal thus far

\* This article was written before the decision to negotiate district agreements.

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926**—continued

has played no real role whatever. In desperation "The Economist" writes on October 30th: "If the rest of the men dribble back as slowly as the first quarter of a million it will be next August before the miners are fully at work again. This is the hard fact with which the Government is faced at the end of six months."

The situation is actually becoming more and more catastrophic for the British capitalists. No coal is being produced, and the chances of keeping up coal imports are steadily decreasing. Great Britain, the mightiest coal exporter in the world, has now become not merely dependent upon European and American coal production, but it must beg for coal. "The Iron and Coal Review" at the end of September reckoned the British coal imports at about a million tons a week. The total weekly deficit is estimated by this periodical, at the end of September at about 2,350,000 tons weekly, that is, 10½ million tons a month. (White Paper on the Coal Shortage, Labour Research Department, October, 1926.)

The catastrophic coal shortage is evidenced also by the declaration of the Secretary of State for Mines, Col. Lane-Fox, in Parliament on November 9th, that the stocks of coal at the beginning of the British miners' struggle amounted to 10½ million tons. During these six months imports from abroad amounted to 15,400,000 tons. Production of blackleg coal cannot be accepted as higher than three million tons up to the end of October. Taking these three figures together, we have 29 million tons. The normal demand for coal in Great Britain amounts to about 15 million tons per month. For a period of six months, therefore, 90 million tons are needed, and this without taking into consideration the amount of coal exports and bunker coal.

**Freights and Food Prices**

The elimination of British coal production marked the beginning of a world shortage. The "Economist" states: "Naturally the dislocation is no longer confined to British industries. It may be said to be world-wide."

America, Japan and Poland have increased their coal production, have re-installed their miners that were out of work, and are boosting production with all kinds of extra shifts; but despite all efforts Europe is being "progressively denuded" of coal reserves, and "the limit of elasticity by way of overtime is approximately being reached in Germany and elsewhere."

The British coal miners' struggle has, therefore, caused an upheaval not only in coal relations, but also in shipping relations. There is an apparent "dislocation in international shipping" ("Economist," October 30th, 1926). Maritime cargo rates are constantly increasing. British shipping, which formerly went out loaded with coal and returned carrying foodstuffs, now sail with ballast instead of with coal cargoes, so that the cargo rates on food imports are doubled.

American tonnage is also being called upon for coal transport to England, but this cargo space would in the ordinary way be utilised, during this harvest period, for grain exports. As a result manifold complications arise. On the one hand the cargo rates on coal are raised terrifically, with a consequent steady rise in coal prices, of course; on the other hand, British food

supplies are being disorganised and this must bring about a rise in the price of food.

The demand for cargo space for American coal export to Britain has reached "phenomenal dimensions" ("Economist.") Freight rates on Canadian grain for England have gone up to 6s. 6d. per quarter, as compared with 3s. 4d. a year ago. Freight rates from the River Plate to England have gone up from 16s. 6d. to 42s. 6d. per ton.

**Trade Balance Unfavourable**

Stoppage of coal production, vanishing iron and coal production, a decimated textile production, transformation of Great Britain from a coal, iron and steel exporting country, into a coal, iron and steel importing country, tremendous losses in national income caused by the coal struggle, the constant rise in coal prices as well as shipping rates—these have inevitably resulted also in a collapse of the trade balance of Great Britain.

The British trade balance is becoming more and more unfavourable. In the first nine months of 1925 the excess of British imports over exports amounted to £273 million, but in the first nine months of 1926 it had already reached £316 million. This represents a rise in the excess of almost 16 per cent. England is increasingly living at the expense of its foreign reserves, its chances of capital exports are becoming constantly narrower.

According to the estimates of the Board of Trade, the 1923 trade balance allowed £153 million for new investments abroad. In 1924 it was only £63 million, in 1925 only £28 million. The growth of excess of imports by £43 million in the first nine months of this year has eliminated the last possibility of the export of capital this year. The half-year's coal struggle has had the result that not only is England unable to export capital, but that it had to dig quite deep into its foreign reserves in order to be able to meet its everyday living requirements.

In connection with the general depression, the wiping out of profits of heavy industry, the unfavourable trade balance, there is also the shattering of the State Budget. Up to October 4th, 1926, the budget showed a deficit of £82 million, as compared with the deficit of only £57 million in the corresponding period of last year. The devastating effect of the economic catastrophe is not fully expressed in this deficit however, since the decrease in revenue from taxes will really not make itself felt until the later months.

**Bank Rate to Go Up?**

A steady drain of gold from the Bank of England treasury is taking place. According to the estimates of the "Economist" of October 30th: "The steady drain of gold has continued. The net efflux since the re-adoption of the gold standard now amounts to £4,111,100."

The pound sterling is below par, it "is still depreciated in terms of gold at the moment." ("Economist.")

The fear that the Bank of England will have to raise the bank rate is quite general. More and more frankly the possibility of a collapse of the gold standard is being discussed. A demand for a prohibition of the export of capital is being raised in various British

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926—continued**

capitalist camps. The "Statist" of August 28th, speaks of the existence of a "virtual embargo." The "Economist" of October 2nd, speaks about the "probability" of a new embargo on foreign loans. J. M. Keynes, the noted Liberal economist, who has already expressed himself against the raising of the first embargo and against the introduction of the gold standard, predicts that it will be impossible to rehabilitate British industry and the recovery of British trade without the reintroduction of an embargo on the export of capital: "I should like to see the embargo re-imposed at once." ("Nation and Athenæum," October 23rd, 1926.)

The "Statist," defending the bankers against Keynes' accusations, writes as follows: "Where Mr. Keynes errs is in assuming that he has the monopoly of foresight." (October 23rd.) The opponents of the embargo on the export of capital do not dispute the necessity for such an embargo, they only dispute Keynes' monopoly in foreseeing this necessity!

**Effect on Foreign Politics**

Britain's foreign trade is shrinking. The trade balance is becoming increasingly unfavourable. The gold reserves of the Bank of England are becoming smaller. The solidity of the gold standard, so recently established, is again menaced; an embargo on the export of capital is necessary and is in practice already operative. But even this is not yet all. It is becoming constantly clearer that these far-reaching financial difficulties are making Great Britain more and more dependent upon American finance-capital. The "Statist" (October 30th) states that the menace of a rise in the bank rate can be avoided only if the pound sterling does not fall below gold par in relation to the dollar.

These are the chief features of the economic situation of Great Britain after six months of the miners' strike. A half year of the coal miners' strike has thrown British industry back for years.

The economic difficulties of the British bourgeoisie have seriously hampered their activity on the field of foreign affairs. Fully occupied with home politics, British world policy has shown many weaknesses in the last half-year. Not only the economic, but the political balance of trade of Great Britain is unfavourable during this period. We will here give a brief analysis of four groups of questions of foreign politics which have during the past year, revealed a weakening in the world political position of Great Britain, part of them directly and part indirectly connected with the coal struggle.

**The Franco-German Rapprochement**

Locarno revealed the world political influence of Great Britain during the recent period to be at its height.

France's Continental hegemony was weakened, Germany's entrance into the League of Nations gave a counter-balance against France, the "Western orientation" directed against the Soviet Union was adopted, and a sort of bloc of European powers against creditor America brought into being.

But as a result of Geneva, of the jealousies among the European powers and the Brazilian veto backed by the United States, Locarno was blown up. After Geneva a regrouping of the Powers began, an economic rapprochement between France and Germany took place,

the Continental Steel Trust was founded, and at Thoiry the foundations were laid for a political entente between Germany and France. Germany's entrance into the League of Nations did not come as a British triumph; Germany crossed the threshold of the League of Nations not as a counter-weight to France, as in the British designs, but as a counter-weight to Britain, according to the designs of France.

Of course, no one can tell what lease of life this regrouping of the Powers will have, but in any case it means an essential weakening of the British position in world politics. British diplomacy is now seeking to put Italy in the place of France as its ally (Leghorn), and meetings are also being organised (Romsey) between German and British industrialists; but these are only emergency measures. Leghorn is no substitute for Thoiry, and Romsey is still less a substitute for the Continental Steel Trust.

The steel trust has not been organised expressly against England; the British steel industry was even invited to join it. But the British steel industry is not in a position to make such international agreements, and hence in the final analysis the steel trust must work out against the British steel industry.

The formation of a Continental steel trust has illuminated, lightning-like, the backwardness of British heavy industry. The British steel industry cannot join the international trust simply because it is not yet sufficiently organised:

"Our abstention is at the moment due to the practical consideration that the British steel industry is not sufficiently organised to be able to regulate British production." ("Economist," Oct. 9th, 1926.)

The British bourgeoisie is forced to admit that British industry is so unorganised that it is not in a position either to wage a "steel war" or conclude a "steel peace."

"British trade in its present unorganised condition is as little capable of engaging in a steel war as it is in co-operating in an organised manner with a European combine, and it will not be able to do either one or the other until it has devised some means of concentrating production of different classes of steel in those works, best equipped to produce them and thus reducing costs by running the most efficient works at their full capacity." ("Economist," 2nd October, 1926.)

**Anti-Soviet Plan Fails**

The British bourgeoisie is working along two lines to encircle the Soviet Union: along the lines of the League of Nations, and along the line of an alliance of the Border States contiguous to the Soviet Union. The last half-year has brought failures to British diplomacy on both of these lines.

The entrance of Germany into the League of Nations was to make the League a more complete organisation of capitalist powers against the Soviet Union. While the German bourgeoisie did complete its turn towards the "West" in its world policy, Soviet diplomacy was nevertheless in a position to mitigate the German entrance into the League of Nations by concluding a treaty of neutrality. The Anglo-French rivalry in the

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926**—continued

League of Nations itself restricts the chances of the British bourgeoisie utilising the League apparatus fully.

The other big plan of the British bourgeoisie, of bringing about a League of all the Soviet Union's border States "from sea to sea," also encountered failure recently. The Baltic countries openly refused to take a hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union, and Lithuania even broke through the anti-Soviet front by concluding a treaty of neutrality with the Soviet Union. And although Italy is coming closer to Roumania, it does not quite venture to sanction the robbery of Bessarabia.

**Victories of the Chinese Revolution**

Every battle won by the revolutionary Canton Army is a battle lost for British imperialism. The higher the waves of the Chinese national revolution surge, the more the influence of Great Britain is driven back.

The Chinese democratic national revolution looks upon British imperialism as **the** enemy. The British bourgeois press views this situation with growing concern, and during the last half-year the British capitalists have frequently tried to bring about military intervention by the imperialist powers. But Japan demanded too high a price for its co-operation; it demanded the abandonment of the Singapore naval base and a share in the spheres of influence in the richest districts of Central China. American imperialism also opposed intervention; as the "parvenu" with an "open door" policy in opposition to the "arrivé" British imperialism it considered itself very well off.

The advance of the Chinese revolution also means a breach in the British policy of encircling the Soviet Union. When British imperialism appears to the Chinese people as the personified enemy, as the foe par excellence, then the star of the Soviet Union, as the friend and ally of the oppressed peoples of the East, mounts ever higher.

**British Imperialism Falling to Pieces**

The Imperial Conference which opened in London on October 20th has exposed to all the world the progressive paralysis of the British Empire. The discussions at this conference are really discussions about whether, and how, the British Empire can even be kept in being.

The first connecting link of the British Empire consisted in the export of capital from the "home country" to the Dominions and Colonies. After the first formal embargo on capital exports, Great Britain is again compelled, even though not formally, again to put into effect such an embargo. It is true Baldwin attempted, at the Imperial Conference, to appeal to the sentimentality of the Dominion representatives by reminding them that for many decades, up to the end of 1925, Great Britain made loans to the Dominions of not less than £850 million. But at the same time he was forced to state that Great Britain is no longer in a position to be able to continue this policy of exporting capital, and that henceforth the Dominions would be more and more compelled to turn to America to meet their credit requirements.

The second connecting link of the British Empire

consisted in the fact that the Motherland was ready and able to receive the raw material exports of the Dominions. The shrinkage of foreign trade in the last nine months has noticeably reduced its ability to continue to absorb them.

The third connecting link of the British Empire was the British Navy. In the past the Dominions did not develop their own army and navy, they were "defended" by the armed forces of Great Britain. The unchallenged dominance of the British Navy is past however, and the development of the United States' naval armaments, which is progressing at a terrific pace, exerts an ever-increasing power of attraction upon the Dominions.

On the basis of the crumbling of these material connecting links of the British Empire, centrifugal tendencies have in recent years developed on the political field. In the last half-year, during which the material forces of the Motherland so obviously declined, when the British bourgeoisie and their government had to combat severe internal difficulties, when the prestige of the British Government suffered so heavily through the inner class struggle, tendencies aiming at independence lifted their heads still higher in the Dominions.

On the eve of the Imperial Conference a conflict with Australia broke out, in which the demand was raised for Australian, instead of as heretofore, British governors. South Africa raised the question of its own national flag and sovereign independence. Canada went through a stormy election campaign on the issue of the privilege of the British Governor-General, an election struggle that terminated with an overwhelming victory for the anti-British Liberal Party. On the eve of the Imperial Conference, Canada sent its own representative to Washington; Ireland had already sent its own representative to the American capital. Ireland demanded a seat on the Council of the League of Nations and thereby also complete independence in questions of foreign policy, while Canada announced its diplomatic independence by rejecting the Locarno Treaty. The Imperial Conference was confronted with the fundamental question: how far are the Dominions in duty bound to share the military activity and peace treaties of Great Britain?

**From Fiction to Breakdown**

The steady step by step decline of the British Empire's system of foreign policy is shown in the following extract from the leading British journal on foreign politics:

"The difficulty of the present-day situation is largely due to the fact that the assumption which has governed the conduct of foreign affairs since the appearance of the Imperial War Cabinet in 1917—namely, that it was possible for the six self-governing nations of the Empire to consult together sufficiently continuously and sufficiently effectively to formulate a common policy for dealing with foreign affairs and to make themselves jointly responsible for such a common policy—has broken down. The system worked triumphantly after the Washington Conference on the Pacific and naval disarmament. It began to weaken at Chanak. It was badly strained at Lausanne. It was only maintained by a fiction during the London Conference on Reparations.

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926**—continued

It disappeared altogether at Locarno." ("Round Table," No. 64, September, 1926.)

The fundamental facts of the world political situation during recent months; the Franco-German rapprochement, the founding of the Continental steel trust, the fiasco of the British policy of encircling the Soviet Union, the victories of the Chinese revolution, and the process of disintegration within the British Empire—and in the background of all these factors the growing power and increasing competition of American imperialism, as well as the growing power and stabilisation of the Soviet Republics—all these work in the same direction, towards the weakening of Great Britain's political position in the world.

**The Sharpening of Class Antagonism**

Class antagonisms in England are sharpening with unprecedented rapidity, as a result of the General Strike and the miners' struggle. The forces of capital and labour are colliding directly with one another, as never before in British industry. It was no coincidence, it was but a dramatic summarisation of the whole situation when the miners' delegate conference in London rejected the Tory Government's slave proposals, and proclaimed the intensification of the battle and the organisation of a "War Council," on the same day that the Scarborough Congress of the Conservative Party declared war upon the entire trade union movement of Great Britain.

Premier Baldwin himself characterised the situation in his Scarborough speech, by stating that the present position of British industry resembles that of Europe before the war: the very fact that on both sides there are powerful organisations armed to the teeth must in the end lead to violence. It is also characteristic of the situation that whilst the entire Conservative press rages against the "dictatorial desires" of the workers, two Liberal periodicals, the "Nation" and the "New Statesmen," carry on a big discussion on "class war."

The basic fact of the British situation is that the Government has lost its character of being "above the battle" in the eyes of the broad masses. What was formerly only said by the Communists, that the Government is but a class government of the bourgeoisie, is now being repeated by the leaders of the Labour Party and also by the Liberal Party. Lloyd George declared in his Barnstaple speech on October 17th that "Class war began at Scarborough."

One cannot over-estimate the significance of the fact that England—free, democratic England!—has been governed for more than six months under "Emergency" laws. It goes without saying that the dictatorial procedure of the capitalists and their Government must have a disruptive effect on Parliamentary illusions. The eight-hour law for the miners is called a class law even by the Liberal Party.

**British Democracy, 1926 Pattern**

During the last six months, thousands of British workers have been thrown into prison. The Communist Party has been persecuted with especial severity. Not less than 1,200 members of the Communist Party were arrested; that is, according to the political report of the

Central Committee at the British Party Congress, between a fourth and a fifth of the total pre-strike membership of the Party. The banning of meetings directed against the leaders of the Miners' Federation spoke a clear language, and one that was comprehensible to the working masses. The far-famed "self-government" of the British local authorities has been destroyed by the Tory law that empowers the Government simply to remove elected local administrative officials who show themselves to be "too friendly to Labour." Social policy has also been revised retrogressively; unemployed benefits and poor law grants have been cut.

The X-rays of the General Strike and miners' struggle have illuminated the famous British Constitution. For the first time the working class sees in surprise the skeleton of the dictatorship of capital under the soft flesh and fat padding of "democracy."

The defeat of the miners' struggle is considered by the capitalists as a political aim of the first magnitude. They fight against the Miners' Federation first of all because of its political significance as a mighty citadel of the British proletariat. On August 19th the "Times" wrote frankly to the effect that the resistance of the mineowners to national agreements with the Miners' Federation originates not so much in the thought that such an agreement standardises the wages of the entire industry, as from the realisation that this organisation of the miners has become an aggressive factor in carrying out political aims. The Liberal "Nation" busies itself with the "ideologists" of the Mining Association and cites the leader of the mineowners, Evan Williams:

"The moment you have set up a national agreement with a National Board, you bring every question that is relevant to that Board forward as a political issue, with debates in the House of Commons, and you get the Government involved . . ." ("Nation," September 11th, 1926.)

An analysis of the political situation in England gives us four basic lines which reveal the intensification of class antagonisms:

- (1) The "Diehards'" victory inside the Conservative Party.
- (2) The weakening of the Tory Government in the country.
- (3) The disintegration of the Liberals.
- (4) The rise of the Labour Party.

**The "Diehards" Win**

As a result of the General Strike and miners' struggle, important re-groupings have taken place in the reigning Conservative Party. In the elections at the end of 1924 this Party was still dominated by the moderate Centrist elements. The Conservative press was pleased to describe Baldwin, the leader of the Party, as a "quiet," "sensible" man who was inclined to compromise. Baldwin himself enthused over patriarchal conditions in industry. His chief slogan was: "Peace in our time." The crisis of General Strike and miners' struggle has now made the aggressive, militant, Right Wing diehards into the leading elements of the Conservative Party. The Scarborough Congress of the Tory Party was an avowed victory for the "Diehards." The whole Conservative policy is now directed towards an offensive against the proletariat, towards **smashing** the Labour movement.

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926—continued**

Inside the Conservative Party various questions are causing differences of opinion. These are the old question of a protective tariff versus free trade, the question of combatting the Soviet Union, the question of the methods to be used in the general struggle against the trade unions; these are the questions recently under dispute between the Centrist and the Diehard wings of the Conservative Party.

On the question of relations with the Soviet Union, Baldwin is still victorious, but a crumbling of the Party discipline became evident when twelve Conservative M.P.'s introduced a motion for the annulment of the trade agreement with the Soviet Union; and after the Premier's declaration in Parliament against this proposal, six more M.P.'s still supported it.

At that time Baldwin was still victorious. At Scarborough, however, came the complete breach and the victory of the Die-hard policy. Scarborough has pledged the Tory Government and Parliament to the smashing of the trade unions. Scarborough raised the demand for the re-establishment of the old power of the House of Lords. It is noteworthy that of the 47 resolutions proposed at Scarborough no less than 12 dealt with the trade union question and 7 with the House of Lords.

**Even Churchill a "Moderate"**

The leading Conservative organ, the "Morning Post," has been conducting a discussion on the question of the restoration of the powers of the House of Lords, which were cut down by the Liberal legislation in Lloyd George's time. The extent to which the Conservative Party has now been pushed to the Right by the Die-hards is best shown by the fact that even Churchill now belongs to the "moderate" elements of the Party. It is well known that on the question of fighting the Soviet Union and on that of aggressive policy against the General Strike Churchill was still with the Die-hards. On the questions of protective tariffs and of dealing with the miners' lock-out he has a more "moderate" policy. He wanted to bring the lock-out to an end through the Government intervention. He was, however, almost openly disowned by the Government.

The Government has continued its "inactivity" which the Liberals and Labour Party reproached it with, an inactivity which is in reality an intensified feverish activity on behalf of the mineowners. Step by step the Government policy against the miners became more aggressive. The Government took the first step towards the Right when, at the outbreak of the General Strike, it deserted the Royal Coal Commission's Report; the second step when, on the throttling of the General Strike, it simply ignored the Samuel Memorandum; the third step when it rejected the Bishops' compromise proposal; the fourth when, in September, it called its own proposals an ultimatum and withdrew them. The more moderate elements view the Die-hards' advance with uneasiness, and it is characteristic that so Conservative a periodical as the "Fortnightly Review" (November, 1926) raises the question of "Winston Churchill and the Future," and speaks of Churchill as the "man of the future" who is to destroy the "power of Die-hardism" in the Conservative camp and perhaps become a leader of the new "Centre Party."

In the elections at the end of 1924 the Conservatives succeeded in rallying around themselves gigantic masses of the petty bourgeoisie on the issue of the "defence of private property," and of the "Communist menace." At that time the working class voters of the Liberal Party went over to the Labour Party and for this reason the latter registered a gain of a million votes despite its loss of seats.

**Weakening of the Tory Government**

The Liberal petty bourgeois voters at that time streamed over in hordes to the Conservative Party. But the policy of the Tory Government, which can solve neither the question of unemployment nor the economic crisis, and its aggressive policy during the General Strike and miners' lock-out, has completely changed the sentiment of the country. The Government promised social peace, and in the last half-year England has been shaken by the worst social crisis in its existence. The popularity and authority of the Government have been tremendously weakened during the last half-year. This fact is one of the most important features of the present situation. "The New Statesman" (October 30th) is entirely right when it says:

"... everybody, both inside and outside the House of Commons, knows that since May 1st there has been throughout the country a defection of Conservative voters that amounts to a landslide. If the Government were to go to the country today it would have difficulty in holding even one half of the seats it holds at present."

The "Review of Reviews" (October 15th), unhampered by any Party ties, states:

"Its (the Government's) authority has declined so rapidly that doubt whether it can long continue to hold office is spreading ominously; and some of its opponents place the date of dissolution and a general election as early as next February. . . ."

"The opportunity for the Conservative Party to establish itself as an agency of orderly progress and national reconstruction has been lost; and for the moment there is no other party or political combination in sight to take its place."

The petty bourgeois masses which in 1924 went over to the Conservative Party are now beginning to desert the Conservative Party. In 1924 the Conservatives had no absolute majority, they polled only 46 per cent. of the votes cast; and under the peculiar relationships of British electoral geometry a relatively small reduction of its voters will suffice to turn it into a minority in parliament also. All by-elections since the outbreak of the General Strike ended with a heavy reduction of its vote or with the loss of seats they hitherto held.

**Disintegration of the Liberal Party**

Among the essentials of the situation is the fact that the decline in authority and prestige of the Conservative Party that may lead to its defeat, if an election were to take place at present, has not led to a growth in prestige of the Liberal Party. On the contrary, the General Strike and the miners' struggle have hastened extraordinarily the process of disintegration in the Liberal Party which has been going on for years.

The Liberal Party was once the classic party of the bourgeoisie. Since the rise of finance-capital, the

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926**—continued

Conservative Party has more and more become the Party of big capital, and the Liberal Party has more and more transformed itself into a Party of the petty bourgeoisie, of the technical and industrial intelligentsia, and also of certain sections of the working class.

Since then the Liberal Party has vacillated uninterruptedly between the Conservative Party and the Labour Party, just as the petty bourgeoisie always swings back and forth between capital and the proletariat. During the war Lloyd George, the leader of the petty bourgeois wing of the Liberal Party, concluded a coalition with the Conservatives; in the post-war period by his "Coal Plan" and his "Land Plan" he has been seeking a rapprochement with the Labour Party. The 1924 elections brought about the political defeat of the Liberal Party for the very reason that the elections were conducted on the basis of the pros and cons of private property, and the masses of the petty bourgeoisie preferred the Conservative Party as a better protection of private property.

**"Socialism v. Individualism"**

At the beginning of 1926 Sir Alfred Mond, an influential capitalist, left the Liberal Party and joined the Conservative Party. In his letter to Lord Oxford, he gave the following reason: "The only question to-day is Socialism versus Individualism, and the Conservative Party is a better instrument for the combating of Socialism."\*

The General Strike carried the disintegration of the Liberal Party to its conclusion. With the instincts of a demagogue Lloyd George sensed in the General Strike a popular question; he did not want to declare for the "dictatorship of the Conservative Government." The leader of the bourgeois wing, Lord Oxford, went over openly to the side of the Tories and demanded the employment of force to smash the General Strike.

Another influential member of the Liberal Party, Hilton Young, likewise left the Party and joined the Conservatives, with the following letter to Baldwin:

"I see only one chasm in our present-day politics. On the one side individual liberty and prosperity based on constitutional methods. On the other side Socialism, which more and more frankly resorts to unconstitutional and revolutionary methods. The General Strike has convinced me that in view of this deep chasm the maintenance of minor political differences is no longer compatible with our duty towards society."  
—(Retranslated.)

The resignation of Lord Oxford from the leadership of the Liberal Party restored a temporary and apparent unity in the Party. But the shakiness of this unity is shown by the resignation of a well-known representative of the "Radical wing" of the Liberal Party, Kenworthy, and his transfer to the Labour Party. The Liberal Party is to-day incapable of following an independent policy. Its bourgeois elements are going to the Conservatives and its petty bourgeois elements are more and more influenced by the force of attraction of the Labour Party.

\* This and most of the quotations that follow have had to be re-translated from the Russian.

The influence of the Labour Party is growing. Its mass influence has been extraordinarily strengthened during the last six months. All Parliamentary by-elections and all municipal elections which have taken place during the last six months demonstrate the victorious advance of the Labour Party. The significance of these victories is further increased by the fact that very often the Conservatives and Liberals are forming a coalition against the Labour Party candidates.

**The Rise of the Labour Party**

In the London municipal elections (January, 1926) the Labour Party vote rose from 35 to 38.4 per cent. of the total votes cast. In a municipal by-election at Birmingham (February, 1926), a Liberal majority was changed into a Labour majority. At the Darlington parliamentary by-election (February, 1926), the 1924 Conservative majority of 2,166 was transformed into a Labour majority of 329. In the Bothwell parliamentary by-election (March) the Labour Party increased its 1924 majority of 3,227 to one of 6,090. Under the immediate impress of the General Strike the Conservative Party was defeated by the Labour Party in two successive by-elections. At East Ham (May) the Conservative majority of 1,057 was turned into a Labour majority of 1,627. In the by-election in North Hammersmith (May), there was the transformation of a Conservative majority of 1,955 votes into a Labour majority of 3,611. In the municipal by-elections of Chiswick (June), a Tory majority of 427 was changed into a Labour majority of 541.

In municipal by-elections at Ladywood (Birmingham) the Conservatives lost their majority and the Labour Party attained a majority of 1,146. In a parliamentary by-election at Wallsend (July) the Conservative vote was reduced by 5,833 and the Labour majority was raised from 1,602 to 9,027. In the most recent municipal elections, which were conducted under the immediate influence of the miners' strike and the Government's aggressive policy against the unions, the Labour Party scored a gain of 206 seats.

An interesting estimate by the Scottish organ of the I.L.P. "Forward," (October 2nd, 1926) states that at all by-elections since the general election, the Conservative vote has been reduced. This reduction amounts to an average loss of 5,000 Tory votes per constituency. Up to the end of July, 1926, the Labour Party vote in the by-elections exceeded the Tory vote. The Labour Party polled a total of 200,093, while the Conservative Party received only 196,430 votes. The opposition votes (Labour and Liberal combined) have swamped the Tories still worse; up to the end of July they amounted to 342,216.

Not only are ever-increasing masses of workers leaving the capitalist parties and streaming into the Labour Party, but broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie are also beginning to see in the Labour Party the representative of their interests. It is no accident that at the last Labour Party Conference at Margate the question of a land policy played such a dominant role. The Labour Party wants to win not only the urban, but also the rural masses, as necessary to secure a majority in parliament at the next election. The policy of the Labour Party proceeds more and more directly toward this end. It intends to be reckoned with as not only a Party of the trade unions, but it would like to appear as a universal party of the broad masses of voters. This

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926—continued**

explains also the Labour Party leadership's expulsion policy against the Communists.

**Differentiation in the Labour Movement**

For some years we have been observing the crystallisation of a Left Wing in the British Labour movement. The basis for this has been the decline of the British Empire, the Labour aristocracy's loss of its privileged status, and the fall in the standard of living of the British working masses in general. This differentiation has been tremendously hastened and intensified by the General Strike and the miners' strike. In the last six months two historically important differentiations occurred in the British Labour movement.

The first differentiation came immediately after the General Strike. The broad Left mass movement, which had made itself felt in an indefinite manner, included the majority of the working masses and was headed by an important section of the old trade union and Labour Party bureaucracy. This underwent a differentiation at the outbreak of the General Strike. The General Strike marked the parting of the ways. The "Left" leaders went over to the side of the Right Wing and the bourgeoisie, and, of course, they have drawn with them also a section of the masses. But millions remained on the Left, especially the masses of the Miners' Federation, and also the leadership of the miners' union, which did not participate in the general disarmament after the General Strike but instead continued the struggle.

The second essential differentiation took place in the second phase of the miners' struggle. The leadership of the Miners' Federation embarked upon the ways of compromise, annested the traitorous General Council of the T.U.C., flirted with the unholy proposals of the holy Bishops, and revealed a defeatist inclination to accept the destructive proposals of the Government. But the masses of the miners did not follow their leaders in the paths of compromise, vacillation and betrayal. The masses of miners forced their leaders to carry on. By a series of votes they compelled the sharpening of the struggle.

**The Left Wing Grows Clearer**

The outlines of this Left Wing became more and more clear; though no longer so broad it was also no longer hazy, but always stronger, more radical, more under the influence of Communism. All the events of the past few weeks in the British Labour movement speak this same clear language. The majority of the largest union, of the Miners' Federation, to-day stands not only to the left of the Right Wing leaders of the General Council, not only left of the sham Leftists of the Purcell sort, but also to the left of leaders such as Cook and Herbert Smith.

The last Trades Union Congress, as well as the last Labour Party Congress, showed the appearance of a determined Left Wing. The Minority Movement in the trade unions and the strengthening of the Communist Party are also an index of the consolidation of this decisive Left Wing.

**"Co-partnership"—is it possible?**

The bourgeoisie is trying, on the one hand with violence and on the other with tricks and finesse and by means of the policy of class collaboration, to check this differentiation process within the Labour movement itself. The newest slogan of a section of the bourgeoisie and of a part of the trade union bureaucracy reads: The application of "American" methods in the Labour movement. The Government is trying to introduce legislation on "co-partnership" and "profit-sharing." Many bourgeois societies and Leagues are being formed for the establishment of "industrial peace." Organisations are being formed for the "Defence of the Freedom to Work." The organisation of company unions on the American model is being attempted as a substitute for the old trade unions. All these plans and proposals, however, will remain air-castles for the masses. The class collaboration period in Great Britain is not in the future but in the past. The economic and social foundation of class collaboration have been destroyed by the decline of the British Empire.

In view of the serious crisis of British industry a "co-partnership" can only be one of bankruptcy. Since economic life is featured by a failure of profits, any "profit-sharing" can only be a sharing in losses. The compromisers of the bourgeoisie and Labour bureaucracy propose "profit-sharing" to the working masses—that is, an imaginary, a non-existent, profit-sharing of the future—and demand in exchange a real and very obvious increase of working time and reduction in wages.

The "Americanisation" of the British Labour movement cannot succeed, cannot become a new tendency. Two powerful, actually existing tendencies can be seen in the depths of the British working masses: one trend is away from the bourgeoisie, away from the Conservative and Liberal Parties towards the Labour Party of MacDonald; and the other trend is away from MacDonald and Thomas towards the class struggle, towards Communism.

**The Outlook for the Future**

The following chief points show the trend of development in Great Britain in the immediate future:

Victory for the miners' struggle is objectively possible. Objectively the conditions were never so favourable for this victory as at present. The economic exhaustion of the country has reached the limit at which the Government under the pressure of the masses must in the immediate future exert pressure upon the mine-owners. Coal exports from Europe cannot be increased any further. All objective factors for the victory of the miners are at hand in full measure. The victory would be inevitable if the subjective factors were also present: if the will to fight on the part of the great masses of miners succeeds in again bringing the vacillating leaders into line, in overcoming the defeatist mood of the growing number of blacklegs, in eliminating the traitorous mediation of the General Council, in checkmating the intrigues of the Government and nullifying the forcible measures of bourgeois dictatorship.

But even if the miners are defeated by the betrayal of their own leaders, the desertion of a part of the workers themselves, gnawing hunger and the violence of the Government, such a forced victory will bring no real

**Britain's Balance Sheet for 1926**—continued

solution of the question. Even the more clear-sighted elements of the capitalists see that.

"The present struggle is not likely to come to a clean end. It will tend rather to assume a new form, and to keep our coalfields in a condition of unceasing trouble and confusion, until we succeed in securing the atmosphere of a new regime." ("Nation," October 30th, 1926.)

And even the "Statist," one of the avowed defenders of the interests of the big capitalists, comes to the same result:

"A frayed end to the strike, brought about by sheer exhaustion on the part of the men, would leave a residue of bitterness that would destroy all chance of establishing that industrial harmony so essential for efficient production."

For the miners' fight is no ordinary industrial fight and cannot be conducted either with ordinary "trade union" means; nor can it, for the same reason, be ended by ordinary means.

**No "Trade Revival"**

The general economic situation in Great Britain cannot radically improve in the immediate future. Its market possibilities remain unchanged—poor. Unemployment will remain constant. Economic disintegration, caused by the miners' strike, will exert its effects for years. (In this respect Churchill is a thousand times right.)

The German and American coal industry has taken advantage of the coal shortage to make many long-term delivery contracts, which will shut British coal out of important sections of the world market for a long time. The Continental steel trust, when one takes a long view, will narrow down the market for the export of British steel production to the Continent. An economic crisis in America, which is inevitable within the next year or two, will force the United States also to intensified competition on the world market.

The unfavourable balance of trade, the dwindling of the gold reserves, and the menace of the breakdown of its currency, only puts Great Britain under increasing financial dependence upon American finance-capital.

**A House Divided**

The British Empire will not be in a position, in the immediate future, to conduct a uniform foreign policy. The Imperial Conference now in process is serving far more to make conscious the clash of interests within the British Empire than to eliminate them.

British industry will now make feverish efforts to effect its trustification. It must make up for its omissions of decades. American, German and even French industries have left it miles behind in organisation and concentration.

As a result of the British coal crisis, the question of trustifying or nationalising the British coal industry becomes the question of the day. The formation of the Continental steel trust has brought it home to the British bourgeoisie that its own steel industry can neither wage a "steel war" nor conclude a "steel peace." In the immediate future rationalisation and trustification will become the slogans of the hour in England, and the capitalist offensive against the working class

already launched, will be intensified along these lines.

The prestige of the Conservative Government is declining, the Liberal Party is disintegrating, the Labour Party grows. This situation foreshadows two alternative possibilities. The first possibility is that the bourgeoisie and its Conservative Government will try to smash the Labour movement by force. There is the possibility that by dictatorial methods, accompanied by Fascist tendencies, the bourgeoisie will smash the Labour Party in its present form, rob it of its trade union foundation and thereby prevent a parliamentary victory and a Labour Party majority. This perspective would lead to a more hurried, immediate and direct differentiation in the Labour movement, and would establish the Communist Party as a mass party, as the Party of the proletarian dictatorship, against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Another possibility is that the Conservatives will have neither the power nor the time to mobilise the weapons of extreme force, that the possibilities of parliament and democracy (and with them the illusions of the masses), will nevertheless remain intact enough, although weakened, for the Labour Party to win a decisive victory at the next elections.

The question of a second Labour Party Government would then become the question of the day. There would then be a chance of the Labour Party receiving an absolute majority in Parliament, or else of being able to form as by far the strongest party, a government with the support of a section of the Liberals.

**Another Royal Labour Government?**

It is possible that a section of the Liberal Party would be ready to support such a Labour Party Government, under certain conditions. Many threads have been spun between Snowden and Lloyd George. MacDonald also has of late not altogether excluded the combination. The policy of the Liberal and of the Labour Party leadership on several questions of late has been essentially the same, e.g., in dealing with the General Strike and the miners' struggle in most questions of foreign policy and in the question of the agrarian programme.

In many respects a second Labour Party Government would have a different and greater significance than the first one. The British proletariat has already lost some of its illusions. It has gone through the school of six months of the E.P.A. The developments of the last six months, the experiences of the General Strike and the miners' struggle, really mean a turning point in the history of the British Labour movement. A more powerful Left Wing has already crystallised, and it can only be a question of more or less time before this Left Wing will transform itself into a Communist one, which will stand not only under the influence, but also under the direct leadership of the Communist Party.

The final struggle between the Labour Party leadership and the Communist Party for a majority of the Labour movement would begin. On the horizon in Britain is seen more and more sharply the contours of the Communist Party. The British capitalists with their developed, ripe class instinct, sense this. Joynson Hicks, the Conservative Home Secretary, was right when he declared: "It is necessary to keep in mind that we must prepare ourselves for a war of position against the Communists for the rest of our lives."

# From Marxism to Malthusianism

B. Smeral

**T**HE Austrian Social-Democratic Party held its Congress at Linz, October 31st to November 4th. The new Party Programme was discussed and decided on. This programme has already been criticised in detail by comrade Bukharin in the "Communist International."\* The Party Congress adopted it without any alterations affecting the principles.

Thus Bukharin's criticism stands good and there is no need to repeat it. But the course of the discussion at the Party Congress is a classic example of the reformist degeneration of those Social-Democratic leaders who look upon themselves as a "Left Marxist" group in the Second International, and were once the ideological leaders of the Two and a Half International. The Party Congress of the Austrian Social-Democracy completed the development of this Party towards the morass of avowed non-Marxist reformism. It delivered a further proof that to-day, in the epoch of imperialism and world revolution, there is no Marxism apart from Leninism, no revolutionary Socialism but that of the Communist International and its sections.

## "Birth Control, and Emigrate!"

The "Left Wing" Socialism of the Second International is represented by Otto Bauer and Freidrich Adler. To what depth this Socialism has sunk is best shown by the fact that Otto Bauer, in his report on the programme of action, declared one of the most important tasks of Social-Democracy to be taking care, as laid down in the programme, that proletarians bring fewer children into the world! We give below verbatim the statement contained in the telegraphic report of the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung" of November 2nd.

"The Monday session of the Party Congress dealt very fully with that part of the programme which lays down the immediate tasks of Social-Democracy. The discussion was opened by a two-hour report by Otto Bauer. He singled out from the mass of problems two questions: the attitude of Social-Democracy to the questions of population and religion. He said that it was the first time a Labour Party had to make its attitude clear on the question of population. Quite outside all political parties a great change is taking place in the populations of all cultured States: transition from a spendthrift to an economic method of increasing the population: to bring fewer children into the world and at the same time to care more for the preservation of the life of those who were born. As far as Social-Democracy is concerned, the problem of population is by no means solved by the struggle against the prohibition of abortion by law. Social-Democracy demands above all care for mother and child and a careful consideration of the subject of birth control. To start with, the legislation which makes abortion a punishable offence must be restricted."

While in Austria the "Left" leader of Social-Democracy has gone so far as to bring forward, as a means towards the solution of the social question, the programme that proletarians should bring fewer children into the world, in Czecho-Slovakia, Austria's next-door neighbour, the Right Wing Social-Democratic leader, Bechynie, defends in a discussion on their programme the thesis that Social-Democracy must demand systematic support for the emigration of proletarians from "their" liberated fatherland, from the beloved bourgeois democratic republic!

Both these demands are by no means a chance occurrence. The entire policy of the Second International aims at saving the capitalist system from catastrophe. It wants to save it in spite of the workers, in spite of the subjective forces of revolution and in spite of objective historical necessity. That is why it has reached the ludicrous stage when its "most Marxist," "most Left Wing" leader, Otto Bauer, descends from Marxism to Malthusianism, meeting thereby half-way the Right Social Democrat, Bechynie, who preaches emigration for the workers.

## Why Analyse Capitalism?

Our reason for singling out the concrete question of "fewer children" from the discussion of the Linz Party Congress is: that it shows symptomatically how far Otto Bauer has got away from revolutionary Marxism. We want to give yet another concrete example which is characteristic of the trend of thought of this "Austro-Marxist," showing that he does not care a rap for the scientific methods of Marxism. The foundation on which the programme and tactics of the Labour movement must rest is a correct analysis of the historical situation, of the world situation and the particular situation in the country in question. In his criticism, Bukharin has shown that the draft programme elaborated by Otto Bauer does not contain a single word about the following: the lessons of the world war, the contradictions after the war, the scientific proof of the necessity of Socialism, the inevitability of war under the capitalist regime, and the class character of the Austrian Republic. Otto Bauer replied to this criticism in his report at the Party Congress. This is what he said:

"The draft programme is found fault with because it does not contain an analysis of the world situation, of world capitalism or even of Austrian capitalism. I do not think that this is an error. A programme is not drawn up for a few years. It is natural from the present situation that an analysis of one stage of capitalism cannot be included in the programme."

This quotation, in connection with the first, shows that not a vestige of Marxism is left in the trend of thought of this Left Social-Democrat, and that he has changed into an utterly banal ethical "Socialist." Why should the present concrete situation of the world and of the country be analysed? What are present class differences, class struggles and the differences among

\* See volume iii, No. 1, page 2.

**From Marxism to Malthusianism—continued**

the capitalist powers which are pregnant with wars, against the eternity of history? What are the social laws of class society against the laws of nature? What is after all, capitalism against Nature? And, therefore, there is no need to analyse the world situation, particularly when one is afraid that the result of this analysis would be the historical inevitability of revolutionary struggle. But on the other hand it is of the utmost importance that every worker, as an individual under the influence of the Social-Democratic Party, should moderate his natural sexual instincts and that proletarians should bring fewer children into the world.

**Peace—where there is no peace**

Otto Bauer does not err on the side of modesty—he does not rest content with leading the Social-Democratic Party in the present diminutive Austria. He looks upon himself as the ideological leader and saviour of the entire Second International. The viewpoint which he propounded in Linz is meant to influence the Social-Democratic parties of all countries. At the same time he gave at the Party Congress expression to the opinion that the conquest of political power by the proletariat is not “Zukunft's Musik”\* but the “direct task” of this historical epoch, of this generation.

This raises the question: what is the tendency of the argument of Otto Bauer from this point of view? Does he want to mobilise and steel the Social-Democratic workers for the struggle for political power, does he want to prepare and organise the struggle for political power which must be carried out in this generation, or does he want to appease the workers, to make them reluctant to fight, in order to disorganise beforehand and to make impossible the struggle against the bourgeoisie? After the experiences of the world war, of white terror in all the countries where the political power of the bourgeoisie was really in jeopardy, the Left Social-Democratic, Otto Bauer preaches the gospel of social pacifism:

“The Republic cannot be properly governed unless the bourgeoisie has the majority of the people behind it. We want to wrench this moral influence from the capitalists and big landowners in the republic by democratic means—not to establish another continuous class domination but to wrest from the capitalists and big landowners the means of production. Yes, we are determined to fight with spiritual weapons, we are determined to fight for the souls of the majority of the people and to conquer power by democratic means.”

**“Let's Leave Out Dictatorship”**

He follows this up by virulent attacks on the social revolution, on its organisation and preparation, on the promotion of a fighting spirit in the proletarian class, an attack which could make any White Guard organ, any capitalist government envious of this Left leader of the Second International. The Vienna “Arbeiterzeitung” reproduced these programme statements of Otto Bauer's report in heavy type and the bourgeois newspapers repeat them jubilantly.

\* Music of the (far) future.

The old programme of the Austrian Social-Democracy contained the sentence: “The Party will carry on the struggle by means compatible with the requirements and the natural sense of justice of the people.” Otto Bauer spoke against this sentence and proposed to eliminate it. He represented the viewpoint that workers should not contemplate the application of violence except as a “means of defence” and only in very exceptional cases. “We want to lead the people in full consciousness of our responsibility and with the determination to avoid violence.” “It behoves us to warn the workers against light-hearted application of violence.” “It is only through Bolshevism that the dictatorship has been set against democracy.” Friedrich Adler spoke in the same strain, only much more clearly. Suffice it to quote the following three sentences from his speech:

“I would propose that we evade as much as possible the word dictatorship, using the term class domination of the proletariat.”

“I think it extremely dangerous to be continually saying ‘there is as yet no democracy for which there can be any enthusiasm.’”

“It seems to me that the simplest solution would be to leave out entirely the word dictatorship, which lends itself to such various interpretations.”

**The Theory of Bankruptcy**

The point of departure of Otto Bauer and all the other leaders of the Austrian Social-Democracy, which brought them to this extreme state of degeneration, is their enthusiastic love for and devotion to the “democratic Austrian Republic.” How comical are their expressions of love for this Republic, what an exaggerated description they give of its “civil liberties,” how considerably they speak about the “republican” police and gendarmerie, with what veneration was the person of the (Clerical!) President of the Republic mentioned even at the Party Congress. These people are kept in bond by a comical Austrian provincialism, and yet they want to save the entire Second International with a programme elaborated in such an atmosphere.

Otto Bauer went the length of designating the public enterprises and particularly the enterprises of the Vienna Municipality (in the capitalist State) as “a piece of Socialism,” demanding that the manual and office workers of these enterprises should not use strike methods when pressing for their demands. And this at the time when the Austrian bourgeoisie is preparing to make strikes illegal for civil servants and people employed in other public services, at a time when the Social-Democratic press, in unison with the White Guard press, denies the Socialist character of the State industry of the U.S.S.R., in order to discredit the proletarian Soviet Power!

And at the same time they are fully aware that the “republic” which they love, to the scope of which they adapt their “Socialism” and want to adapt the “Socialism” of the entire Second International, is after all an absurdity. This is what Renner said at the Party Congress:

“If at the next or at a later election the State were to fall into our hands, no one should harbour the illusion that we are taking over a State

**From Marxism to Malthusianism**—continued

apparatus which internationally has influence in the community of States. No one should harbour the illusion that the production of this State has not been reduced to a minimum or above all that our State coffers are not empty. Thus the situation is that one would like to make a revolution out of pity, rather than out of greed for power."

Renner's last sentence characterises correctly the position of the Austrian Social-Democracy and its new programme, but at the same time also the Socialist level of the entire Second International. Austria is a province which cries out for pity. Powerless, without

a standing, without money, without possibilities for its production, without a future, hopeless. A territory without an economic basis, condemned by fate to disappear. The Austrian Social-Democracy and its new programme reflect this desperate position of the country.

But just because of this, the Austrian Social-Democracy is a fit expression of the ideology of the entire Social-Democratic International, in the epoch of the decline of world capitalism. The country which is doomed to go under has brought forth in the new programme of its Social-Democracy a theory which can become the new credo of the entire Second International, which has dissociated itself from Marxism, from struggle, from the revolution and has made a life and death pact with declining capitalist society.

# The Problem of Austro-Marxism

Joseph Strasser

**A**USTRO-MARXISM is trying to conquer the world. Austrian Social-Democracy long ago aroused the admiration of its brother parties for its organisation; it seems that now the theories which dominate Austrian Social-Democracy are to become the common property of the Second International. There are dreamers who expect Austro-Marxism to re-unite all proletarian organisations into one International. Is not this an anachronism? Austro-Marxism is the Austrian game of reformism. It differs from other kinds of reformism only in that it has to adapt the Labour movement not to a strong, but to a decaying and disintegrating bourgeois State. The Austro-Marxian flashes of lightning are merely phosphorescence on this rotten mass.

From a weak State, dragging out its existence only under the greatest difficulty, the proletariat can force concessions more easily than from a strong State power—at any rate, within certain limits. This is the pride of Austro-Marxism; it was upon this that it based its theory and its practice; it was for this reason that it could feel superior to ordinary reformism, destined to a more modest role. But the overthrow of the old regime ended this glory; when the old Austria was destroyed, Austro-Marxism lost its real base, its source of strength. When this occurred, the Austrian Social-Democrats rushed into a coalition, just like the despised vulgar reformists of other countries.

Since then the Austrian Social-Democrats have become more and more like all other reformists, both in theory and in practice. It is true they have had more luck than their brothers; no proletariat was so much discouraged by the war and the consequences of the war as the Austrian proletariat; thus the Austro-Marxists once more had firm ground under their feet; they could rely upon an utter lack of all hope among the masses of workers. But even that is coming to an end. Revolution is in the blood of the proletariat; it cannot for ever remain in a state of resignation.

## Conquering the World

Austrian Social-Democracy is beginning to feel this clearly. This may be seen from the attempt of its leaders to protect themselves by organisational methods against the radicalisation of the Social-Democratic workers. Soon Austrian Social-Democracy will be able to serve as the model Party of the Second International. For although it no longer essentially differs from the other Reformist parties, although it has like them more and more only one aim, namely, to become capable of entering a coalition, it is ahead of them in one thing—prestige. The Second International now wishes to profit by this prestige: the theories which they obtain from Austria are the usual reformist truck, but in an elegant Austrian form, and stamped with the celebrated trade mark "Made in Austria." This is what is called conquering the world through Austro-Marxism.

If we wish to know Austro-Marxism in its latest phase, we must look at it not only at Party congresses and at international congresses and at other such holiday occasions on which it puts on its official garb and its official "conquering" face. Much indeed may be seen on such occasions; but it is even more interesting to see Austro-Marxism at home in its negligé, when it lets itself go. Let us look at "Der Kampf," the theoretical monthly journal of the Austrian Social-Democracy. There are about two dozen articles in the June, July and August issues of "Der Kampf." How many of these articles deal with Austrian affairs? Throughout the whole of these three months, the theoretical publication of Austrian Social-Democracy had practically nothing to say to the Austrian workers regarding Austrian

---

The Review that all serious  
students of the Working-  
Class Movement  
should read  
is the

## Communist Review

MONTHLY . . . . . FOURPENCE

**The Problem of Austro-Marxism**—continued

economics and politics. Practically nothing to say, despite the fact that during these three months the Social-Democrats and the Christian Socialists were engaged in the most violent battles!

But this was no exception. The "Kampf" has always acted as it did during those three months. Consciously or unconsciously it always takes flight from the realities of Austrian politics. How did it treat the new Party programme? The programme was published at the beginning of August. But this was kept a dark secret in the August issue of "Der Kampf." Similarly in the September issue. Finally in the October issue the paper published two short articles on the programme: these articles occupied about as much space as the article in the September number on "Max Weber as Teacher and Statesman," and not as much space as the elegaic-ironic observations in the February issue on "Werner Sombart's Tragic End."

**Educational Dairy Farming**

This seemed a violation of decorum, if not to the "Kampf" people, at any rate to their masters. There appeared in October a special issue of "Der Kampf" which, as the "Arbeiterzeitung" proudly declared "was exclusively devoted to a discussion on the Social-Democratic Programme." This was eight days before the opening of the Party Congress; that is, at a time when a "discussion number" could no longer start a discussion. When the "Kampf" is forced to break silence, it speaks to save itself, but too late.

But if the "Kampf" is so antagonistic to Austrian politics and everything connected with it, in what is it really interested? Well, it publishes reports on events abroad, and in general occupies itself with cultural questions, or to put it more accurately, with a kind of educational dairy-farming. It treats cultural questions not from the point of view of the struggling proletariat, but from the point of view of the oppressed respectable

petty bourgeoisie who wish to escape their misery. These people abhor alcohol and, therefore, collect stamps or beetles; they even try to keep up a literary paper, perhaps even to solve the crossword puzzles in the Sunday supplements of the newspapers. The "Kampf" does not wish to give the workers weapons, but a substitute for the material and spiritual values of which they are deprived.

**A Fighting Artist**

The "Kampf" wishes to comfort the workers—and can anything worse be said of a Labour paper? And it carries on this business with great zeal and devotion. Cultural questions have a good time in the "Kampf," which even permits discussions on cultural questions. For example: in the June, July and August issues of the "Kampf," we find an article on Karl Kraus. Who is this man about whom the "Kampf" spins out so lively a discussion?

Among German-speaking people he is to-day well-known nearly everywhere. For the non-German readers of the "Communist International" the following may be said: Kraus is a Vienna writer who for decades has been carrying on a bitter struggle against corruption. He has ferreted out corruption in the most hidden corners, he recognises it under whatever shape or form it may assume, even—that is his special love—in its literary and artistic forms. This man has now become a problem for the Austrian Social Democracy. The Austrian Social-Democracy does not know how to treat him, what attitude it should take towards him. Why? Kraus is no Socialist, and yet he has many followers in the Social-Democratic Party, yes, even enthusiastic admirers who have written letters of this sort to him:

"This week brings us two holidays which not only have something in common from the points of view of time, but also in their significance, and both of which have claims upon the attention of the Austrian proletariat. One is the great world festival of the workers who have hitherto fought in vain for their emancipation, and the other is the 52nd birthday of the revolutionary poet, Karl Kraus . . . an upright group which—precisely out of warm love for the noble basic idea of Socialism—is loyal and grateful to Karl Kraus! Long live international Social-Democracy!"

**The Petty Bourgeois Hero**

The writers of this letter are obviously very young intellectuals. But Kraus exercises a great influence upon the Social-Democratic workers. How can this be explained? By his literary talents? He is witty, ingenious, savage, an artist, an inexhaustible fighting cock, but a writer does not triumph merely and primarily by qualities such as these but by the social tendency of his talents. What is the content of the "Struggle" which Kraus carried on? Kraus is fighting capitalist corruption; he opposes to it the petty bourgeois ideology. This makes him the leader of all who are dissatisfied with capitalism, who are no fighting cocks, but who clench their hands in their pockets. To these people he must appear as an Individual, a Superman, a Hero—since he has the courage to struggle and demands no courage from them. And the more the

# WHAT MARGATE MEANS

by  
**HARRY  
POLLITT**

**ORDERS** for this penny pamphlet should be sent in at once; only 2,000 copies are left.

Harry Pollitt led the fight at the Margate Conference of the Labour Party against the half-hearted Liberals of the Executive. He writes a plain straightforward account of the Conference from the working-class point of view.

*Price 1d. 5/6 per 100 post free*

*Order now from*

THE COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP, 16 KING ST., COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.2.

**The Problem of Austro-Marxism—continued**

Social-Democratic Party becomes petty bourgeois, the more it avoids struggle, the more friends Kraus gains in its ranks.

The Social-Democrats do not want to understand all this. It is not for this reason that they are confronted with the problem of "Karl Kraus." This problem is more complicated. The Social-Democrats have already become so petty bourgeois that Kraus is able to say to them: Improve! And therein lies the "problem of Karl Kraus": how is it that Kraus, the bourgeois, the non-Socialist, is able to appeal to the conscience of Socialists to warn them against petty bourgeois tendencies? Is he a revolutionist? But the Social-Democrats are also "revolutionists." Or is he no revolutionist? In that case he could not upbraid "revolutionary" Social-Democrats with a lack of radicalism. And so the Social-Democrats are breaking their teeth on the problem of Karl Kraus.

**Socialist or Bourgeois?**

For example, Oscar Pollak writes ("Kampf," 19, p. 261): "As a pessimistic anti-materialist and as one who denies evolution, Karl Kraus cannot be a Socialist." Then he investigates in great detail the question as to whether Kraus is not at least a revolutionist. He comes to the conclusion: "We Socialists are revolutionist because we desire a new society. Karl Kraus, the non-Socialist, is no revolutionist, because he lacks an acknowledgment of the goal." To justify this judgment the writer says, among other things: "He who wishes to be with the revolutionary class . . . must experience the strongest events of our times: power through the rise, the consciousness of the movement, humility before the masses."

Friedrich Austerlitz, editor-in-chief of the "Arbeiterzeitung," is of a different opinion. He finds (p. 309) "that there is nothing bourgeois in Kraus, that he, whether Socialist or not, is at any rate the strongest, the most passionate anti-bourgeois which European literature possesses. . . ." "To demand humility from him is to demand no less than he should give up himself. . . ." "This bourgeois culture has failed to impress one man: Karl Kraus. . . ." "The way which we have to tread has been made lighter for us by Kraus in that he has driven out the spectres which try to bar the way. . . ." "Do not become assimilated! That is the exhortation which he shouts to the Party. And even if he is mistaken in his judgment of the facts from which he concludes that such an admonition is necessary, even if he may be wrong in his valuation of the Party—the warning against adaptation to the bourgeois world may be superfluous, it can never be harmful."

In this outpouring of his heart, Austerlitz writes a satire against his Party which is so malicious it might have been written by Kraus himself. But in this self-mockery he is beaten by another. Hanz Menzinger writes (p. 349): "If we learn from the teachings of our Socialist forerunners and masters our goal and the method of our struggle, we experience with and in Karl Kraus what it means to be unswerving, inflexible, uncompromising and logical! . . . We know that it is very

difficult to lead a life without all compromise, and to maintain the idea of unswerving humanity quite unspotted. He alone has succeeded in doing so. . . . That is why during the war he was our only anchor; we have to thank him that we did not become insane and did not despair of the mission of Socialism and of the future of humanity. When everything collapsed about us, he shone as the upright, civilised, complete man, as the conscience of Europe—if the working class is worthy of its future, would it give up this man, would it believe (as Pollak has declared) that it has left him behind on its way?"

**Freud—a Revolutionary!**

However, Kraus is not the only "revolutionary" whose praises are sung in "Der Kampf." The psychoanalyst Freud is also celebrated there as a "revolutionist": "Like all great spirits"—writes Friedjung (p. 259)—"Freud is also a revolutionist. His unswerving passion for investigation destroys inherited prejudices, breaks old idols, teaches us to understand the mysterious, builds for us new ways of knowledge, creates for us new ideals, and shows us a more beautiful future."

If we understand the following correctly, Freud has also improved and completed the materialistic interpretation of history: "We begin to understand better than before why the ups and downs of revolution, which consume time and power so senselessly, must be followed by reaction so long as education does not start on a new path. The son of the revolutionist becomes a reactionary, because only in that way can he escape the intense authoritative pressure of his father and become himself. Can we not now for the first time properly understand the tragedy of the German people, on the basis of its general authoritative education? It is magnificently disciplined, good to organise, but remained politically helpless, unripe for the Republic and for anything higher."

These then are the latest ideas of Austro-Marxism: Freud is a "revolutionist," Kraus is a "revolutionist." The most amusing part of it all is the fact that in a certain sense these Austro-Marxian theses are correct. Kraus is absolutely right when he sniffs at the petty bourgeois Socialism of the Social-Democrats, and in comparison with them appears revolutionary. Austro-Marxism begins its triumphal march through the Reformist world at a moment when it begins to tackle the task of cleansing the Second International from the ideological remnants of the "Two and a Half" International—i.e., of Austro-Marxism—to make room for unadulterated Reformism.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**

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

# The Franco-German Entente

By F.

**T**HE Versailles "Peace" which has been morally undermined since the time of Locarno is now beginning to be actually wiped out. Of course, what is lost is lost. The German navy lies at the bottom of the sea. Germany's mercantile fleet has been shared out among the victorious Allies. Many patents and other properties belonging to German firms and individual German citizens were seized by the Allies during the war. All these are lost to Germany. But in spite of the enormous sums of money this loss represents, it is a mere bagatelle compared with what was taken from Germany and the tribute imposed upon her by the Versailles Treaty in the form of reparations, the occupation of the Rhine territories, the loss (if only temporarily and not absolutely) of the Saar Valley, the military control and disarmament, the loss of colonies and the severance of territories in the East and the West. To liquidate, or at least to modify this part of the heritage of Versailles means to liquidate or to modify what is, with some slight exception, the material side of the victory of the Allies.

## The Ending of Versailles

This in its turn means the final, moral rehabilitation of Germany and her restoration to her position of equality with the other Great Powers. It is precisely such a liquidation, such a radical revision of the Versailles Peace that is about to be, nay, is already the subject for negotiations between the interested parties.

Objectively, this has been inevitable right from the beginning. Was it really possible to remove such an important link as Germany from the chain of world economics and the world political equilibrium, without causing damage to the victors themselves? A little

while before the Armistice, Lloyd George, while in his public speeches he was urging the necessity for destroying Germany, stated in private conversation that he would not permit her to be swallowed up by France because she was necessary as a political counter-balance to France. Of course, with his characteristic irresponsibility he forgot about this at Versailles, or preferred not to recall it. But his reasoning was correct. After the conclusion of peace, when British industry was plunged into a crisis owing to the lack of markets, a crisis which is continuing to the present day, this became an axiom among British statesmen.

Britain fully achieved her war aims in that part of the Versailles programme which as a matter of fact was already carried out before the Versailles conference: the lion's share of the German patents, deposits and industrial properties abroad which England had already obtained. It was to England that a service was rendered by the German naval command in sinking at Scapa Flow the German navy, which was to have been distributed among all the Allies. England obtained the greatest advantage from the dissolution of the German colonial empire, and she too obtained the greatest advantage from the disappearance of the competition of German overseas trade during the war.

## France before 1926

Of course it was most easy for England to get over the bloody intoxication of war and chauvinism, and soberly to calculate the significance of the vacancy that had been created in the system of the Powers and in the economic organism of Europe, the more so that England more than any other country was vitally connected with the world market, and for many years had regarded the

## Books YOU Must Read!

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

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

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

### The Political Meaning of The Great Strike

—J. T. Murphy

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

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

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

368 pages  
Paper covers, 2/6 [post free, 2/9½]  
Cloth covers, 4/6 [post free, 4/10½]

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

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

### The State and Revolution —N. Lenin

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

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

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

### The Franco-German Entente—Continued

even distribution of political power of the countries of Europe as a fundamental condition of her own power. Her fears for the internal stability of Germany and of a political combination between Germany and Soviet Russia, also treated as a pariah by the European concert, completed for her the mental picture of the menace that had arisen as a result of the excessive zeal of the victors at Versailles. This menace in her opinion should be removed as speedily as possible by rectifying the errors made at Versailles.

In France, this conviction was arrived at much more slowly and painfully and from an altogether different angle. Neither the economic nor the political disappearance of Germany as a Great Power from the map of Europe caused any vital loss to France. On the contrary not only was a dangerous historical rival removed, but France secured the military mastery of Europe.

From the economic point of view, France as the most self-contained country in all Europe, could without great inconvenience dispense with the German market, and with the acquisition of the ores of Lorraine could calculate on becoming the premier industrial State on the Continent. The defect in the Versailles Treaty as far as France is concerned was that it did not go far enough, that it gave her only Alsace-Lorraine when she had dreamed of the complete annexation of the Saar Valley, the subordination, if not direct annexation of the Rhine-Westphalian territories and a greater dismemberment of Germany. As she did not succeed in obtaining this by the treaty, she tried to obtain it by setting up a French administration in the Saar, by inspiring a movement for independence on the Rhine, by invading the Ruhr and by encouraging Poland's appetites in Silesia.

### France Sobers Down

She began to sober down only when she became convinced that Germany's resistance to the extension of the Versailles Treaty was stronger than she expected, because of the moral support Germany obtained from England; that England was in general in disagreement with her in the estimation of the significance of Germany and was gradually coming into opposition to her, and that she was not powerful enough to subdue Germany politically and economically.

When finally the United States came to the aid of Germany, when after the severe crisis of 1923-24, the economic power of Germany began perceptibly to be restored, while her own financial resources were rapidly becoming exhausted, a great change took place in the public opinion of France, a change which was entered in the records of diplomatic history at Locarno, and later at Geneva and Thoiry, and in economic history by the steel industries' agreement.

What does this change in the public opinion of France imply? It implies that a considerable section of the French bourgeoisie, both big and small, industrial and even financial, has come to the conclusion that the predatory plans of France are not only impracticable but even dangerous, and that since Germany is destined once again to become a great power it would be better for France to recognise this fact and try, as far as possible, to render her harmless—and if Germany agrees, even to establish a political and economic partnership with her

for the joint mastery of the Continent and to free it from Anglo-Saxon tutelage.

The idea of such co-operation more than once arose prior to the war and was revived after the war by the big industrialists and a number of Statesmen of the "Continental" school. The collapse of the Ruhr adventure, the increasing domination of the English pound sterling and the American dollar together with the collapse of the franc, the extremely rapid economic revival of Germany—all this helped to make popular what at first sight appeared to be a fantastic idea, and led to the above-enumerated stages of rapprochements between the two countries.

### Step After Step

At Locarno France gave guarantees to refrain from all further attempts to extend the Versailles Treaty without notice, and in exchange obtained from Germany the undertaking that she would abandon her dream of the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine and of a "revanche" in general.

At Geneva France publicly rehabilitated her "historical enemy," the foe she vanquished in the world war, by recognising Germany as a great power equal with herself.

At Thoiry France went further and declared that she would not insist upon the execution of the remaining rights allowed to her by the Versailles Treaty, including the further occupation of the Rhine territories and the Saar, on the condition that Germany will pay a respectable sum (there is talk of a billion gold francs) to bring about the recovery of the franc.

There is no doubt that the questions of restoring certain of her colonies to Germany and of reducing reparation payments were also brought up, and did not call forth any particular objection on the part of France. Finally, as a material basis for this new Entente Cordiale, an agreement was arrived at, with the benevolent participation of the French Government, between the heavy industries of both countries, an agreement of which Thyssen and Wendel dreamed before the war and which Loucheur and Stinnes tried to bring about after the war.

Theoretically this rapprochement is pregnant with profound consequences. In the event of it being rivetted and completed in other directions, it would become the starting point for a new development of European relations and European economics, and establish a powerful centre from which economic influence could be exercised on all the other European countries. It would give an impetus to a new political grouping of the Powers.

### Will France go Further?

As it is, France no doubt will have to proceed much further along the path of liquidating Versailles in order to strengthen her association with Germany. The questions of the Polish corridor and the regime in Upper Silesia, as well as that of Aix-la-Chapelle and Malmedy, annexed to Belgium, will have to be decided in favour of Germany by some form of compensation. The biggest question which France has yet to solve is that of relations to the U.S.S.R., for no matter what direction Germany's foreign policy may take, she will not for a long time be able to give up close economic and, therefore, friendly political relations with Soviet Russia. And France cannot compel Germany to make the choice

### The Franco-German Entente—Continued

of either herself or Russia. In the eyes of the French statesmen of the "Continental" school, the value of the French rapprochement with Germany lies to a considerable degree in the possibilities which it opens for rapprochement with Soviet Russia, as a condition for an organisation of the Continent of Europe separately from England. All this and much more is contained in the agreement towards which France is striving, and the fundamental question is: to what extent and in what degree of intimacy is this practical?

The reply to this question cannot be formulated categorically; but it may be said that in all probability no separate and close agreement of the kind France is thinking about will come into being. It will not come about because Germany is only on the threshold of recovery, and is still weak on her legs. She cannot, therefore, tie her fate with a definite partner and run the risk of hostility of so jealous a State as England, still politically and economically powerful.

### The Reply of Romsey

As a matter of fact, we see that Thoiry has found its counterblast in Romsey, where the German bankers laid a foundation of some kind (to what degree is yet unknown) for co-operation with the British and in the negotiations that are at present going on between the German and British mineowners. One-sided agreements and alliances are alien to the traditions of German diplomacy and German industry.

As her economic restoration proceeds, Germany is inclining more to the West; but she has not burnt her bridges to the East and is striving to combine both orientations. Similarly, while her present position demands the maximum expansion of her markets and financial resources; she will do nothing to cut herself off from the English markets and the British Empire, or to cause the latter to boycott her in spite of the fact that her antagonism with England will undoubtedly increase as a result of industrial competition.

Moreover such one-sided agreements will meet with the opposition of the United States, which wants to remove all the internal barriers that cut across the European market and condemns all strivings towards political and economic separatism. And both France and Germany will have to reckon with the United States, for upon the United States, in the last analysis, depends the financing of the Franco-German agreement and even the questions of reducing reparation payments and of com-

pensation for the Saar coalmines. Fundamentally, post-war capitalist economy will not stand this separatism, this conspiracy of two countries, in a certain sense, against the rest of the world.

The economics of disorganised and impoverished Europe, which are giving rise to new and profound antagonisms among the Powers, at the same time demands the organisation and the co-ordination of the efforts of all countries for the restoration of the European market and the proper distribution of commodities. The solution of this contradictory problem is totally beyond the powers of the capitalist system and the bourgeois States. This problem makes revolution and the establishment of the Soviet system inevitable.

### Full Stabilisation Impossible

The bourgeoisie fails to understand this. On the one hand it dreams of establishing over the existing State and national frontiers some kind of a co-ordinating centre, like the League of Nations, or of reducing the significance of these frontiers to a minimum by abolishing customs, introducing a uniform monetary system and establishing a fantastic "Pan-Europe," or, leaving everything as before, of regulating production and distribution according to the various branches of industry by means of international economic agreements, like the quadruple steel pact. On the other hand the French project strove to separate two Continental States from the rest, to dominate the Continent together, and organise it into an anti-Anglo-Saxon bloc. England counters this by an attempt to bring about closer relations with Italy. Both these strivings run counter to each other and merely create a situation of instability.

Confined to the simple liquidation of the remains of Versailles and to the fulfilment of the old scheme of wedding Westphalian coal to Lorraine iron, the Franco-German Entente now being established would, it is true, politically emancipate Germany and give a strong impetus to her restoration as a great economic unit on the Continent. But it would fail absolutely to bring in the so-called stabilisation of European capitalism which, as hitherto, will continue to suffer from non-European competition, from the dispersion of its own forces, from the lack of the enormous Russian market, from the impoverishment of the whole of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, from the Chinese revolution. Least of all it will bring any improvement in the condition of the working class. All that the latter can expect from the Franco-German metallurgical alliance is a fresh attempt to reduce wages and increase working hours on the pretext of "the scientific organisation of production."



# International Reformism in its True Colours

(NOTES OF A TRADE UNIONIST)

A. Lozovsky

*Gossip on Pan-Europe*

EUROPE'S loss of financial and industrial hegemony and the steady growth of the United States have given rise among a section of the European bourgeoisie and European reformism to the idea of the unification of Europe for a struggle against dangerous competitors. Talk about Pan-Europe is now the most fashionable theme in bourgeois-Fascist and reformist circles. At the beginning of October a Pan-European Congress actually took place in Vienna, where ardent speeches were made on the advantage of unity to Europe against advancing America. But all the decisions of this "Congress" are of such a meagre, colourless malaria-like nature that even the initiators of the Congress are disconcerted by the product of their creation.

Needless to say the Amsterdam International could not stand aside from these Pan-European talks; for where could they develop their inborn talents if not in this "arena"? But the Amsterdamites are not simply private people who engage merely in talk about unification of Europe. As satellites of the Solar system called the League of Nations they immediately place the question on a "practical" basis, linking up their Pan-European projects with the International Economic Conference, convened by the League of Nations, in which a "Labour group" is participating which has its own plan for saving Europe from the onward march of the United States.

## A "Respectable" Ideal

In order to get acquainted with this new discovery of the Amsterdam International, let us turn to its official Bulletin (No. 38 of October 5, 1926), which devotes a special economic supplement to the question. The Amsterdam International wants a "more composite organisation of European economy." The task is highly respectable, and it is just for this reason that the idea of Pan-Europe, in the words of the Amsterdamites, is meeting with great success. Now let us hear what the Amsterdam gossipers have to say about the Pan-European idea.

"If Europe wants to exist," we read in the Economic Supplement to the Bulletin of the Amsterdam international, "it must become Pan-Europe both in economics and politics. In politics no idea has met with such a warm response for a very long time as the idea of Pan-Europe. The rapidity with which this idea has spread throughout all camps, and struck particularly deep roots in the Labour movement within a few weeks, is a proof of the existence of something like a feeling of European solidarity.

"The fact that a section of the advanced bourgeoisie is in favour of the movement should not hold

the workers back from approving it. In Labour circles of course it is realised that the chief motive for a large part of the bourgeois support is pure sentimentalism or a temporary terror caused by the bad economic situation in Europe. The workers should also not fall under the influence of the Communists, who ridicule the whole movement and are bound to ridicule it for the simple reason that the pre-requisite for their entire policy is the economic ruin of Europe. It is in the field of economics that it is possible to separate the wheat from the chaff; and then it will become clear who really is seriously concerned about restoring Europe and at the same time its social recuperation.

"That ultimately Pan-Europe cannot be a bourgeois idea will be made clear then when everyone sees that it is not a question of the play of egoistical instincts on the European scale, but of the first step on the path of trade union international policy."

## By Eloquence and Conscience

All this is very exalting and touching. Particularly touching, of course, is the "social recuperation" of Europe and the "spirit of European solidarity" discovered by the Amsterdam Columbines. It is true that this spirit, whose heralds are Chamberlain, Briand, Mussolini, Stresemann, Benes and their Social Democratic understudies, savours about as much of solidarity as the Amsterdam Bulletin does of Socialism; but these are "home truths." What is important to us is the "exalted deception."

The Amsterdamites of course see that things are not going so very well in Europe as far as solidarity is concerned; but it is the "petty interests" of the capitalists who are to blame for this; they have begun organising "international trusts which are not being created for the purpose of European economic unity capable of competition, but from economic motives of a private nature." The official organ of Amsterdam is unhappy that these "false organisations have already begun being formed on an international scale," and therefore, proposes a method of checking "false organisations," a method elaborated of course by the "Labour group" at the League of Nations. The "Labour group" demands that "industrial cartels be put under the control of the Labour Office of the League of Nations and conducted with the support of the various governments and the workers' and consumers' organisations." Although the "Labour group" has forgotten to tell us by what measures it intends to put the cartels under control, we can tell this secret to our readers: the most important moving forces of Pan-European thought are the eloquence of the Labour group, the consciences of the leaders of the "false organisations," and the "spirit of European solidarity." All these together will lead to

**International Reformism**—continued

the "social recuperation of Europe" and the disgrace of the Communists.

The Amsterdamites believe that from this delirious "Pan-Gossip" there will ultimately arise the "ideal form of "Pan-Europe." What is this—infantile sickness or senile decay? Both!

*On the Way Towards the Old Court Livery*

Germany is quietly and easily moving forward towards her Hohenzollern. Eight years ago the German Revolution began with a government of Social Democrats and Independents; now Germany, thanks to the ingenious strategy of the Social Democrats, has been transformed into Hindenburgia, which as everyone knows very well is nothing more or less than a step towards monarchist restoration.

**A Stud Farm for Royalty**

When a revolution took place in Germany—for which the Social Democrats are not to be blamed!—the question of the monarchy came up. The Social Democrats thought with indignation and terror about the barbarity of the Russians who had meted out to the Romanoffs their deserts. The Social Democrats after all, were not Bolsheviks, not "barbarians," they were Europeans. Therefore when they had discreetly and with courtly bows removed the crown from the Hohenzollern head they immediately granted the Court and all the Crown Princes and princelets imposing pensions to the end of their days.

It is no secret that Germany, before the war, was something like a big stud farm for the supply of kings and queens to all countries. Thanks to this special kind of national industry the number of persons connected by blood ties with these "anointed sovereigns" was very great. Each one of these people, since they had given joy to the German people by their appearance on earth, were granted by the Social Democrats the chance to live without financial worry at the expense of "their" people.

But "l'appetit vient en mangeant." Having lived for a few years on rations (which cost the State many millions per year) the Hohenzollerns revolted: they wanted to receive everything they were "entitled to." Had it not been for the masses of workers the Social Democrats would never have favoured the confiscation of the property of the royal houses. Now, when the formal side of the matter has been decided by a referendum, the Social Democrats together with the bourgeois and monarchist parties are placing financial burdens on the German people in order to feed up their "most august" parasites.

**"We Only Abstained"**

It is true that the Social Democrats did not vote for the agreement with the Hohenzollerns, they "only" abstained; but everyone understands very well what this irresponsible policy of abstention means at such a moment, and on such a question. The Social Democrats, by this abstention of theirs, voted for the monarchy; that is something that no worker will ever forget! Such is the "struggle" of the court Social Democrats for

democracy. The German Social Democrats long ago put the black, gold and red tricolour in place of their red flag, but now have relegated even this banner to the archives. Henceforth they adopt court livery as their standard.

That is how the German Social Democrats are fighting the monarchy and its survivals. The Bolsheviks and Social Democrats were confronted with one and the same question: how to finish with the monarchy? We ask the Social Democratic workers: which method—the Bolshevik or the Social Democratic—is simpler, cheaper and more advantageous for the toiling masses? Which is real democracy and proletarian Socialism, and which is vain chatter and profoundly anti-democratic pseudo-Socialism?

*D'Aragona Determines Himself*

Our old friend the semi-Amsterdamite and semi-Fascist D'Aragona continues to evolve. When the waves of the Labour movement rose very high in Italy (in 1920) D'Aragona came to Moscow and took part in the inauguration of the R.I.L.U. Returning to Italy just at the time when the factories were being seized, he immediately got down to organising the break-up of this movement in which he and his colleagues met with brilliant success. No sooner was the movement squashed than D'Aragona found courage to say openly that he was and remains an Amsterdamite.

After the victory of Fascism the evolution of D'Aragona became clearly catastrophic. He issued a declaration against "Moscow gold," boasted that he had succeeded in breaking up the "Bolshevik movement of 1920" and finally, went to such extremes that he openly proclaimed the necessity for a reconciliation with Mussolini. This pro-Fascism proved to be too scandalous even for his reformist friends, and in order to avoid loss of all influence in the trade unions D'Aragona was removed from his post and replaced by less garrulous renegades.

**Loyal—to Fascism**

But Signor D'Aragona was not content to sit quiet; he continued building a bridge between reformism and Fascism. There are innumerable pretexts in Italy for displaying one's sentiments as a loyal citizen. D'Aragona chose for this the strike of agricultural workers in Molinelli. The fight in Molinelli has lasted for some years. The agricultural workers have displayed exceptional heroism in the defence of their interests. The union has frequently been disbanded, but each time it has been built up again,

In July of this year the union was again disbanded under the pretext that it was of a "clearly anti-national and destructive character" and that "the names of the present organisers concealed the old leaders of the Red organisation." In order to smash the refractory workers of Molinelli, hundreds of workers were chased out of their quarters by the united forces of the Fascist landlords and landowners.

D'Aragona made use of his presence at the International Labour Office (he "represents" the Italian workers in this den of thieves) to make a speech, not in defence of the beaten up and persecuted workers, but against them. This was such a brilliant "defence" of the workers of Molinelli that all Fascist papers are now

**International Reformism**—continued

beating a tatoon on their kettledrums in honour of the "just and correct Labour policy of the Fascist Government."

Well, how did the "Labour group" on which sit the most prominent leaders of the Amsterdam International react to this? They didn't react at all. Everything was tranquil on the battlements of Amsterdam. D'Aragona continued to determine himself, having the full and unconditional support of the Amsterdam International, for the Italian apple had not fallen very far from the Amsterdam apple tree.

*Which is Better?*

Side by side with the nice German Social Democrats should be placed the P.P.S. (Polish Socialist Party) which is nice in absolutely all respects. As "immemorial" enemies these two organisations of the Second International have always been in a state of rivalry. This rivalry is mainly in the field of adaptation to the bourgeoisie of the fatherland and in the struggle against the Communists.

The German Social Democrats only have to commit some infamy; the P.P.P. hastens to out-blackguard their German colleagues. They on their part do not miss a chance to get a few points ahead on their Polish colleagues. This fight for the championship in blackguardism has become particularly clearly manifest just recently.

**Champion Blackguards?**

The German Social Democrats had hardly had time to smash the Hamburg strike and abstain from voting as to whether or not to pay the Hohenzollerns, when the General Council of the P.P.S. met and immediately left their "hereditary enemy" far behind. The Council of this party had to determine its attitude towards Pilsudsky and towards the fact that a member of the Polish Socialist Party, Morachevski, had joined Pilsudsky's Fascist party. The position of this party, from whose womb Pilsudsky and his chief adjutants and assistants originated, was by no means easy. When one remembers that the P.P.S., like all the parties of the Second International, cries from the housetops that it is in favour of democracy and against dictatorship, and that Pilsudsky not only shoots workers (this the P.P.S. might swallow) but that he has spat in the face of the

Sejm, placing himself above the Constitution, then it becomes clear how difficult it is to avoid offending democracy and yet to support their own Morachevski somehow or other.

After two weeks' discussion between the Rights and Lefts (there are such even on the Council of the P.P.S.) they realised that no situation is so bad but a way out can be found. Success was attained. The General Council condemned the policy of Barthel, *i.e.*, of a government which no longer existed, took up a wait-and-see position (what's the use of hurrying?) in respect of Pilsudsky, and declared that the entry of a member of the P.P.S. into the Pilsudsky Government was the personal affair of the free lance Morachevski. Thus the dead received their deserts, live Fascism was not offended and a personal union with it was established through Morachevski. All this, of course, is done in the name of democracy and Socialism. King Solomon in all his wisdom could not have conceived a better policy!

**What the Horse Replied**

The Polish government paper "Epoka" writes in reference to this "historic" meeting: "In the Council of the P.P.S. the conviction gained the upper hand that excessive concentration on doctrines might under present conditions become dangerous for the equilibrium of the Polish State." As the P.P.S. has never been carried away by Socialist doctrines we might end the matter here, but the question naturally arises—which are the better, the German Social Democrats, or the P.P.S.? This question must be settled without fail, for the Hungarian, Roumanian, Yugo-Slavian, French and the British sections of the Second International all claim the palm of championship in this competition of traitors, capitulators, cowards and lackeys. Well, which is better?

To this question so full of tragedy, we can only give the following anecdote as a reply: Once a wagon and a sleigh began disputing as to who was the better. They quarrelled for a long time until finally they decided to ask the horse. "The horse has pulled us both, it will be able to tell us," decided the disputing parties. So they went to the horse. "Which of us is the better?" they both asked at the same time. The horse looked at them, winked its eye, wagged its tail, and said: "You are a swine, and you also are a swine—to hell with both of you."

