

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 3 No. 32 [14]

12th April 1923

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

HOOPER WAR
COLLECTION

CONTENTS

Politics

- A. Lozovsky:* The Commis Voyageurs of the Entente
U. Terracini: The financial policy of the Fascist State
Georg: Hungary: March 21/1919—1923
After the Essen Bloodbath
E. Hollein: Taxation in Germany

Economics

- H. P. Rathbone:* Trade and the future of the British Empire
N. Tuliakov: Agriculture in the United States, and Russia

In the International

- Karl Radek:* Leon Trotzky—the organizer of Victory
C. P. of Italy to the C. P. of Russia
The Norwegian Labor Party
2 Letters to Henri Barbusse

In Soviet Russia

- I. Stalin:* Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communists
G. Zinoviev: The Bolsheviki and the Hegemony of the Proletariat
N. Ulan: The Moscow "Blood Verdicts"
B. M.: Labor conflicts and Arbitration in Russia

E.C.C.I.

- The Essen Blood-bath
The Class Struggle.
C. E. Ruthenberg: American Democracy on trial

POLITICS

The Commis Voyageurs of the Entente

By A. Lozovsky.

The representatives of the socialist parties of the Entente countries came to Berlin to consult with their German colleagues of the International the most burning political questions of the moment. In order to render the negotiations more productive, the socialists of the Entente first held a consultation in Paris, amongst themselves, and then they prepared to negotiate with the Germans. From this we may see that the old military-diplomatic boundaries still remain: The French, Belgian, and English social democrats do not negotiate with German social democrats as if they were colleagues and comrades of the same International, but as if they were the representatives of enemy powers, and as if they considered them to blame for the world conflict.

What are the questions that interest the representatives of Entente socialism? At the Paris consultation it was resolved to negotiate with the German social democrats on the reparation question. We might assume that the occupation of the Ruhr area by French troops, with its attendant enormous injury to German economic life, would have induced these champions of justice to demand from the French and Belgian governments reparation for the damage caused by the rapacious invasion of the Ruhr valley. But we should only subject ourselves to severe disappointment if we imagined for a moment that the reparation socialists are capable of seeing things otherwise than through Entente spectacles. For them there exists solely the damage done in their own countries. Nothing exists solely in interest to these gentlemen.

Thus these gentlemen, who call themselves socialists for some unknown reason, journey to Germany at the moment when Poincaré has planted his iron heel on the breast of the German people, and put to their "comrades" and "colleagues" of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals the questions: Are you prepared to pay for the war losses and war damage? How much will you pay? How long will the payments be continued and what guarantee can you give that these moneys will really be paid? We might say that these amiable questions have already been put by Poincaré to Cuno, by Loucheur to Stinnes, and that it is scarcely the task of people having the courage to call themselves socialists to take upon themselves the task of "socializing" the imperialist plans of the French and Belgian bourgeoisie. But we should fall into error if we attempted to judge these commercial travellers for their governments by any proletarian standard. Every man Jack of them stands on the footing of the Versailles "peace" and the work and activity of these gentlemen consists of "ennobling" this monument of imperial robbery, trickery and insolence. The work of these socialists ennobles the Versailles treaty as much as holy communion does a vile prostitute.

When we, the revolutionary workers of all countries, gathered together in France, we issued our war-cry to the masses unanimsly, without debate: "Down with the Versailles treaty!" "Out of the occupied territory!" The representatives of the

Communist Party and of the C.G.T.U. of France were the first to reply to this call, for to them the question is perfectly clear: The fight against the Versailles peace and its consequences is not only a fight in the interests of the German proletariat, but at the same time of the French. But the *commis voyageurs* of the French and Belgian governments, the reparation socialists and other drawing-room chatters, can still see nothing else but German imperialism, crushed to the earth, but still dangerous. They do not observe the long ears of their own imperialists, and therefore they demand that the working class of Germany spend its last bit of energy for the purpose of throwing ever more and more milliards to the insatiable industrial and financial sharks of the Entente. We too want reparations, but of a different kind! We too are of the opinion that the devastations of the war must be repaired, but by whom? By the bourgeoisie of all countries. The bourgeoisie of France and Belgium, of England and Germany—they must all contribute their share to restoring the districts devastated by them. The reparation socialists see only Stinnes and Krupp, their German colleagues see only Loucheur and Schneider. All of them hate the bourgeoisie of other countries, and cherish a sickly fondness for the ruling classes of their own country.

We, in Frankfort, worked out measures against the war danger, and amongst us there were no second class comrades. The Entente socialists occupied themselves with the reparation problem, and did not even admit their German colleagues to their preliminary consultations in Paris. These gentlemen tolerate the German social democrats only in so far as it is necessary to keep up the appearance of an International, and because they hope to extort reparation payments for the French and Belgian bourgeoisie by the aid of their second class colleagues.

And how do the German Amsterdammers react to the behaviour of their colleagues? Oh they understand excellently the disgraceful role played by the Entente's *commis voyageurs*, they feel the contemptuous condescension of MM. Vandervele, Renaudel, and Co. They are deeply wounded at the way they are being treated, but they preserve silence, for they consider themselves the vanquished of the great war. For would they not also treat their vanquished colleagues from the nationalist International in precisely the same manner, if they themselves were the victors!

The reparation socialists are preoccupied with the occupation of the Ruhr. They put in an appearance in Berlin just at the moment when the possibility of an understanding between the French and German bourgeoisie began to assume a tangible form. Why did they not come to the Frankfort conference to join us in our struggle against war, not with words, but with deeds? They extricated themselves by making speeches, they passed resolutions without moving from the spot, without stirring a finger to throw the least hindrance in the way of the impudent attack of the French and Belgian bourgeoisies. Now they come to Berlin, and their first questions refer to reparations, guarantees, etc. We do not know whether these gentlemen are acting on the orders of their governments or not, but there is no doubt whatever that they represent the interests of their bourgeoisies, and that their dealings are those of agents of the French and Belgian bourgeoisie.

Continue to act in this spirit, gentlemen! The day is near when the working class will throw open the doors of all its organizations, will seize all such agents by the scruff of the neck, and fling them into the street with the abrupt dismissal: "Clear out!"

The financial policy of the Fascist State

By Umberto Terracini (Rome).

The financial program of Fascism is determined by the motto: "Balance at any price". This is expressed in practice in the promise given by the prime minister in his speech before the Chamber—to considerably reduce the inheritance tax. The flat contradiction between this promise and the endeavor to adapt the expenditure to the revenue of the state is explained by the now perfectly evident anti-proletarian and capitalist financial policy pursued by Mussolini; this policy is arch-reactionary; it is not directed towards the maximum development of production as a whole, but strives to lend support to certain capitalist groups, and even individuals, at the expense of the collective economics of the country. All decisions hitherto arrived at by the Fascist government in the sphere of finance, have tended to relieve the state budget of all expenditure for social purposes, and to burden it with fresh expenditures for the benefit of its protegés. On the

one hand the government reduces its revenue by doing away with the luxury tax, and on the other hand it seeks to open up new sources of income by introducing fresh taxes which fall chiefly on the shoulders of the working class. It is further characteristic of the financial activity developed by the Fascist government in the five months of its existence that, although it has the petty-bourgeoisie to thank for its victory, it has done nothing whatever for this class, but has on the contrary struck it many severe blows by various decrees and regulations.

It thus becomes evident that Fascism, while bearing the outward appearance of a middle class movement against the ascendancy of the proletariat of the left and against large capital on the right, is, in reality, nothing else than a movement of capitalism directed against all elements hostile to it. Large capital has contrived to convert the middle strata, who were incapable of creating for themselves a program and methods of action, into a tool for its own anti-proletarian dictatorship.

The chief regulations which have been issued by the Fascist government in the sphere of finance are: Abolition of certain bonds. — Dissolution of the commission which tested the contracts concluded during the war, and which has succeeded in having a milliard of war-profits paid back into the state treasury within two years. Reduction of the luxury tax on such articles of luxury as perfume, jewels, etc. — Reduction of the motor-car tax. — Abolition of the Cooperative Subsidy already included in the budget (about 100 millions). — Limitation of the right to unemployment benefit. — Abolition of state support of public schools. — Dissolution of the Supreme Labor Council. — Abolition of the emigration commissariat. — Introduction of a wage tax. — Increase of income tax for the tenants of small agricultural undertakings. — Increase of salaries for officers. — Revision of the pensions paid to the war disabled. — Discharge of 50,000 railway, post-office, and telegraph employees. — And finally it was recently announced that the inheritance tax is not only to be reduced, but completely abolished.

Another important point in Mussolini's financial program is the return of the state to purely political and administrative functions, and its renunciation of all industrial and commercial activity. With this decision the government fulfils the most cherished longing of the Italian bourgeoisie, which has been shut out from various branches of speculation and profit since the beginning of the war, by the formation of monopolies, and by the direct participation of the state in numerous branches of commerce. It is even sought to transfer the railways, telegraph, and telephone, into private hands. Rapid and decisive steps are being taken in this direction; the monopoly on electric lamps and matches has been abolished, and as early as February the telephone undertakings were left to private industry; a project for the sale of the telegraph undertakings is under way. The leaders of economic life appear to have been seized by a rage for squandering; they have renounced their previous substantiation of the struggle as one against an industrial and commercial state, and have adopted a policy which considers the interests of groups of large capitalists only. A few days ago an official notice appeared on the intervention of the state in the Ansaldo Co., the largest Italian industrial undertaking, which has been in a state of crisis for a year; this crisis was the main cause of the collapse of the Banca di Sconto. Despite the pressure exercised on the previous government, the latter steadfastly refused to interfere in the affairs of the Ansaldo, or to do anything to aid it to a sound basis. But the Fascist government, the enemy of all industrial activity, has now concluded an agreement with this company. This contract saves the company but burdens the state budget to the extent of about 200 millions, for the government renounces all claim to millions of arrears in taxes, to expend millions for useless ship-building, for tremendous railway enterprises, and what is perfectly new, and a sign of a somewhat frivolous conception of state finance,—to purchase valueless shares for about 100 millions.

When Mussolini became the head of the government in November of last year, he promised solemnly: "In two months the Italian lire will have reached half its pre-war value!" But five months have already passed since the Fascist "revolution", and the Italian lire has sunk lower than under any other government. This is a result of the general progressive depreciation of low currencies, and of the inadequate policy of the Fascist government, which has doubled the military budget in order to raise the peace army to a strength of 400,000 men, and at the same time labors under the illusion of putting state finances on a sound basis. It was expected that a collection instituted on a grand scale for the restoration of the air fleet would serve this purpose, but after four months of the most intensive propaganda this collection brought in the magnificent sum of—100,000 lire.

Hungary, 21st March 1919—1923

By Georg (Vienna).

The fourth anniversary of the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet republic finds us in the midst of a period of severest international conflicts, and finds the Hungarian working masses involved in great struggles. These struggles show that the 3½ years of White Terror have not succeeded in weakening the organized force of the Hungarian workers, and make it our duty to celebrate this anniversary, not with historical recollections, but by utilizing the teachings of the defeated revolution and of the following epoch, as a means of showing the workers how their immediate and future struggles are to be carried on.

The main experiences won by the Hungarian Soviet revolution have become the common property of the whole working class. The insufficiently comprehended role of the Communist Party as the united revolutionary vanguard, the part played by social democracy as the last reserve of counter-revolution, the illusions regarding a possible class solidarity on the part of the social imperialists of neighbouring countries, the inadequate recognition of the international solidarity of capital and of the national role of the working class—these and other short-comings in the young CP of Hungary have avenged themselves bitterly. The communists of Hungary failed also in not sufficiently neutralizing the middle strata, small holders, small craftsmen, and small traders, nor the intelligenzia, and thus did not isolate the real upholders of counter-revolution, the feudal landowners, the financial and industrial large capitalists. The war communism rendered necessary by foreign attacks raised a counter-revolutionary wave in these middle strata, and the official intelligenzia still completely under the influence of the feudal idea, undermined the state apparatus from within.

The accentuation of the national role played by the proletariat which is "constituting itself as the nation", rendered necessary by the struggle with neighbouring imperialists, could not be adequately done, for the CP, being vague as to its own role had not drawn the line of division sharply against social democracy, and thus ran the danger of supporting—by emphasis on the national moment—the national-chauvinist counter-revolutionary currents of social democracy and of the petty bourgeoisie incited by the large bourgeoisie.

The idea of the fighting character of the proletarian dictatorship, as one epoch of a violent class war being carried on under varying circumstances, was another idea which the communists were not sufficiently successful in maintaining. The social democratic pacifist teachings had taken such deep root in the proletariat that it was not immediately possible to replace the vague idea of a "realization of socialism" by a comprehension of the concrete fighting value of the dictatorship. Despite the attacks of counter-revolution from within and without, broad strata of workers were, at heart, pacifist, and cherished the conviction that the proletarian dictatorship closed the period of class struggle, and the day of peaceful socialism had dawned.

In 1919 the Hungarian proletariat proved itself too weak, ideologically and organizationally, to maintain its state power against the inner and the outer enemy. But are the lessons to be drawn from this defeated revolution to serve merely to enrich the arsenal of counter-revolution, and to strengthen the arguments against an "isolated" revolution? By no means. The revolution was overthrown, not because it was isolated when it broke out, but in part because it remained isolated. But without the experience gained during these four years, the Hungarian working class would not have been able to organize its revolutionary struggle. Like the Russian revolution of 1905, the Hungarian revolution of 1919 was a first attack on the feudal-capitalist state. Being undertaken at a period of more favorable inner and outer circumstances, the Hungarian revolution was successful in proceeding further and deeper than the Russian. Its overthrow resulted in just the same strengthening of the tide of revolution as was the case in Russia. It would be extremely wrong to misuse Marxian dialectics to smooth over historical tragedies, to justify them, and to represent them as inevitable and necessary. The defeat of the Hungarian working class was one of these historical tragedies, and its bitter consequences are being borne not only by the Hungarian working class. But today we can already confidently assert that this defeat has been overcome, and that in Hungary, compared with the pre-war and war years, and with the international situation—there is at the present time an unprecedented powerful upward trend in the labor movement, and this in spite of the most difficult circumstances imaginable.

It is the task of the Communist International, and especially of its Hungarian section, to undertake the leadership of this movement, to make clear to it the aims and paths of revolutionary class war. The clear and practical division between revolutionary and trade union tactics, the separation of the workers not only

from the obviously civic-peaceful social democrats, but also from its pseudo radical centrist wing, the laying down of clear fighting tactics against the capitalist Fascist state power and its feudal appendages, the definition of the relations of the working class to the "liberal bourgeoisie", to the "radical petty bourgeoisie", and to all the inner struggles of the ruling classes, the reaching of the landless and poor masses of peasantry, the deepening of class consciousness by Marxian training and utilization of the experiences of not only the Hungarian revolution, but of the whole international movement: all these are tasks which can only be solved by a revolutionary class party, and must be solved by it.

Besides taking active part in all questions of daily needs, this class party is confronted by another task, perhaps the most important of all: The adoption of a definite attitude to the questions falling under the term "foreign politics", the showing of the international connection of economic and political events, and of the way to be chosen by the Hungarian working class in the midst of these events.

There is scarcely another country in the whole of Europe where the whole population has been so skillfully inoculated for decades with the teaching that Hungary is a world in itself, and can arrange its destiny without concerning itself about the rest of the world. Any definition of international relations of forces, or of world political and economic relations, is entirely unknown to the mental life of Hungary. Social democracy is not in the least an exception to this rule. The world war and the events following it did hammer some idea of these relations into the heads of wide circles of the people. But the rulers of Hungary have contrived to set aside this growing realization—and in this have received the support of social democracy—by giving out stupid watchwords of "integrity" and "restoration of old Hungary". Should the class party of the Hungarian working class succeed in bringing broad masses of the population to a realization of the true state of affairs, and inducing them to replace these imbecile watchwords by the sole possible plan of co-operation with the working masses of the neighbouring countries, then the Hungarian proletariat, while fighting as the enslaved class of a conquered country for its class interests, would at the same time represent the national interests. These national interests were betrayed a hundredfold by the "national" bourgeoisie during the rule of the Hapsburg dynasty, during the great war, and during the revolutionary proletarian struggle against the neighbouring imperialists, by the innumerable pacts and conspiracies with the most various "hereditary enemies". The only possible solution of the national and economic questions, which can never be solved by imperialism, is that offered by the program represented by the communist parties of central Europe—the creation of a Danube federation of workers' republics. This program must form at the same time the fighting slogan against the Fascist plans of a Danube monarchy and against the war cry of Hungarian feudal nobility for Hungarian integrity. The fate of the Hungarian working class has aroused the interest of the international proletariat as perhaps no other has done, and has awakened solidarity everywhere. In the struggle against the rulers of Hungary, and for co-operation with the working class of the neighbouring countries, the Hungarian working class has set up an international fighting program going far beyond the limits of Horthy dominance, and securing the further solidarity of the international working class. In this struggle, the Hungarian working class will defend at the same time the national interests of the Hungarian working people against Entente imperialism, and will gather the broad masses of productive workers around its program.

After the Essen blood bath

By a French communist.

Occupation is not war; thus spoke unhappy Poincaré the murderer, with the same air of honesty which he assumed on the 1. August 1914, when he assured us that mobilization did not mean war. "The occupation of the Ruhr area is a peaceful enterprise, and only requires a certain military guard to protect the engineering commission", smiled Poincaré with his grave yard smile! And the bloody general Degoutte! With what epithet of honor do you expect to be designated, General, after your victory in Essen, which has so gloriously proved the chivalry of the French army in the land of the "barbarians"? There is only one end and aim in the whole of this policy: three dozen French millionaires want to have the Ruhr coal and the lion's share in the exploitation of German man-power. The Comité des Forges issues its commands, Poincaré organizes, Degoutte rolls up his sleeves and begins his butcher's work.

Eleven workers are dead, thirty wounded, some fatally—this is the balance of the French victory in Essen. The official reports

admit that the French troop fired with machine guns into an unarmed, crowded, and excited multitude. But, General, your victory is not quite as glorious as that of the battle of the Marne. Do you not feel a certain disgust for yourself? All the same you may well be content that you have still soldiers at your disposal who let you do anything you want with them. But take care, General! These workers, peasants, and employees, who fired upon their German brothers at your command, will awaken out of their patriotic frenzy; then they will see whose blood is upon your hands, when they reach their homes again they will be ashamed that they took part in these deeds in the Ruhr valley. And then these poor boys will at last realize the meaning of that verse of the "Internationale" which declares our bullets to be for our own generals!

If you continue to murder the peaceful population, you kill at the same time the spirit of your own White Army, which is only kept on the march by the corruption of public opinion by the press, and by the war reports. For we know very well what these unhappy and unwilling troops, whom you force to perform your detestable work really think. We have enough soldiers' letters in our hands, letters which reach us from every barrack in France despite your censor, to be able to say to you: You have still the power to have Germans and Frenchmen killed. But you are already despised by all these among your soldiers who can think, and who have a conscience. And conscience is very contagious, General!

German comrades! This is what we have to say to General Degoutte, the brother-in-arms of your Ludendorff. But to you we have to say the following: That which this executioner of a general did in Essen, he would have done with equal willingness in Creuzot. We know our generals. The factory courtyards are their net battle fields, and the working masses their most popular target. Before the war the troops of the third republic fired at workers in Fourmies (six dead), in Gravelle (two dead), in Velleneuve-Saint-Georges (several dead), in Raon-L'Etape (two dead). Our army is accustomed to "home service". The only blood which has been seen for forty years, since that of the fighters for the Commune, has been the blood of striking workers. Last August the same *Comité des Forges*, which ordered Degoutte to fire upon you in Essen, shot French strikers at Le Havre. We all have the same enemy, and that is the army of the bourgeoisie. And this bourgeois army of Poincaré's republic is the bitterest enemy of the proletariat to-day. It is this army which has kept revolutionary Russia under fire for four years; which blocks the way of European revolution; which prepares the war for the great massacres of to-morrow. It is this bourgeois army which is preparing that army of black-jacks which is our common enemy, but especially of the people of Paris, of the proletariat of Creuzot, and of the soldiers in Essen (if they but knew it), and which is determined to drown the next uprising of the French proletariat in blood.

But, German comrades, though the French army has fired upon you as it fired upon us at Le Havre, its bullets have hit more than one mark. The bullets of Le Havre and the bullets of Essen have torn down the boundary posts dividing us. We know this, and the best of us cry out from behind prison gates: Be of good cheer! The day is near, when Degoutte, Poincaré, and their capitalist masters, will receive their own bullets back again in dozens, in their heartless breasts and brainless heads.

The Taxation Question in Germany

By Emil Höllein (Berlin).

Rapacious taxation of the proletariat. — Freedom from taxation for Capitalism.

It is an old story, and yet it remains ever new: In all times and places in peace or in war, the proletariat, and the proletariat alone, must pay the costs of the criminal policy of its rulers. Ruthless exploitation and oppression in peace, increased exploitation and oppression accompanied by unheard of bloody sacrifices, in war, and the very highest degree of exploitation and oppression after the war and in the course of the so-called reconstruction.

At the present time Germany is groaning beneath the frightful burdens imposed by the Versailles peace. The German bourgeoisie and its satellite German social democracy, solemnly promised to fulfil the obligations placed upon them. And both have fulfilled their obligations in so far as they could do so at the exclusive expense of the working masses, already on the verge of starvation, and plunging ever deeper into want and misery. But with the most determined obstinacy the German bourgeoisie has consistently rejected the idea of itself offering even the smallest sacrifice. And more than this, it even claims the right to shamelessly increase its own wealth at the expense of the collapsing nation. As soon as the German bourgeoisie

itself was called upon to pay, its policy of fulfilment abruptly ceased.

Let us now cast a glance at the newer taxation policy of the Ebert republic, which was carried out by the Wirth cabinet and was continued by the Cuno government. This taxation policy resulted in the taxation compromise concluded in the spring of 1922 between the social democrats and the bourgeois parties as far as the Stinnes part, and for which the social democracy paid the following shameful price: It renounced the seizure of real values, abandoned the post-war profit tax which was to have raised 3 milliard marks, presented the propertied class with the remainder of the national emergency fund to the value of four milliard marks, agreed to the annullment of the legacy duty and the watering down of the inheritance tax, accepted the reduction of income tax on large incomes, raised the coal tax from 20 to 40% of the coal price, and the turnover tax from 1.5 to 2% on all turnovers and returns, and reduced customs dues; it increased enormously all indirect levies on beer, brandy, means of illumination, etc.

As compensation for these enormous gifts to capital, and for this unheard of burdening of the masses, the German bourgeoisie sought to grant the following ridiculous concessions to reformist social democracy: A capital levy, to be collected for the first time in 1923, and estimated to bring in 15 milliard paper marks, a magnificent total of 3 millions of gold marks if we take the dollar at 21,000 marks, while in 1913, 61 million gold marks were paid in capital levies in Prussia alone; a corporation tax, estimated to yield 4.5 milliard paper marks for 1923 to 1924; a levy on traffic in capital, comprising the taxation of company transactions, issue of securities, and exchange returns, estimated at 9.65 milliard paper marks for 1923, but bringing in—being more an indirect tax—16.3 milliards = 3.26 millions of gold marks, between April and December 1922; a compulsory loan, intended to bring in a milliard gold marks, but actually raising, in consequence of the alteration of the law and the continued depreciation of the currency, a total sum of only 49.6 milliards of paper marks, or a sum not amounting to the hundredth part of the amount originally fixed upon for the loan, for which high interest and rapid repayment were also promised.

Besides this, the proletariat is not only burdened with this crushing load of indirect taxation, but also with a ten per cent wage tax, while the capitalists, on the other hand, pay their taxes as a rule in paper marks whose real value is many hundred times below their face value, and even pay a part of the indirect taxes which they collect by this same medium.

This state of affairs has the effect of rendering the share contributed by the propertied classes to the State's revenues less and less from month to month. According to the information at present at our disposal, the share paid by wage taxpayers to the total income tax revenue for January 1923, exceeds 90%. And the total annual taxation of the propertied classes, in 1922, even if fully paid, which is very doubtful, only totals three quarters of the sum raised by the wage tax in December alone of the same year!

Despite these disgraceful figures on the actual taxation of property and income among the propertied classes, the German capitalists and their vassals still have the amazing impudence to cry out against the unbearable taxes imposed upon them, and even complain of confiscation of property and income. In reality there is no country where the bourgeoisie itself pays so few taxes, and the proletariat is so shamefully robbed, as in Germany. This fact is proved beyond dispute by the official statements made by the state financial authorities; it is only necessary to compare the direct with the indirect taxes.

According to these official figures, in the period between April and December 1922, the actual revenue from direct taxes was 178,056.29 million marks (income, corporation, property, inheritance, and capital traffic taxes, national emergency fund, compulsory loan, etc.). Of this sum alone, the income tax represents 146,394.97 million marks. During the same period the revenue from indirect taxation was 172,701.39 million marks. Here it must be taken into consideration that out of the 18 different kinds of direct taxes provided for, the post-war profit tax was annulled in the taxation compromise by the parties of the majority, including the social democrats, and the national emergency fund was reduced from 8 to 4 milliards on account of the alleged intolerable property tax. In July 1922 the compulsory loan was also decided upon and was to represent a visible sacrifice of property. According to the taxation compromise this loan was to bring in 1 milliard gold marks, but up to now the government has contented itself with 49 wretched paper milliards.

A few figures must also be given on the real distribution of taxation among the propertied and non-propertied classes. It is statistically proved that 80 to 90% of income tax is derived

from wage and salary taxation. And it is further indisputable that at least 90% of the indirect taxes are also paid by the workers. These facts are based on the appended statistical survey, which is truly calculated to raise indignation:

(in millions of marks):

	Actual revenue April-Dec. 22.
Indirect taxes	172,701.39
Direct taxes	178,056.29
Total revenue from taxes	350,757.68
Of this the working people bear:	
90% of the indirect taxes	155,431.25
80% of the income tax	117,115.98
Total tax participation of the non-propertied classes absol.	272,547.23
percentage	77.70
Total tax participation of the propertied classes absol.	78,210.40
percentage	22.30

This proves clearly that in Ebert's Germany the working people, despite starvation wages, and despite increasing want and misery, have to raise four fifths of the total burden of taxation of the country, whilst the propertied classes, despite unheard of accumulation of profits, have only to bear one fifth, and that this fifth is being constantly lessened by the continued depreciation of the mark.

Never before has the German working class been so shamefully robbed as in the democratic Stinnes republic, under the presidency of the social democrat Fritz Ebert. The abandonment of the revolutionary struggle in expectation of the gradual peaceful expropriation of capital, and of the equally peaceful and gradual realization of socialism, is being paid for to-day by the German workers with nameless hunger and misery, with disease and death.

ECONOMICS

Trade and the Future of the British Empire

By H. P. Rathbone.

From the early days of British Imperialism there has always been a section of the British Capitalists who have endeavoured to foster the idea of the all-sufficiency of trade within the empire as the goal of their activities; that it was possible so to develop the countries which had from time to time been conquered, annexed or absorbed so that they would provide an outlet for British manufactures and would in turn supply the foodstuffs and raw material necessary to the home industrial life. That in the main was the thesis on which the theory of British Imperialism was built. Consequently, it was the business of the capitalists at home to provide the capital for the development of British possessions which were disguised under the names of colonies, dependencies, protectorates or Free States.

This export of capital, when attacked by labor, was defended on the ground that it would provide more work owing to the orders it would bring for rails and steel and coal, and all the other raw materials necessary for the development of the country. And thus British labor was led into supporting imperialism, into becoming imperialist itself.

This theory of imperialism was, however, based upon two most important premises. 1. That it was possible to develop the British possessions so that they would be able to supply the home requirements of foodstuffs and raw materials and be able to absorb the surplus of manufactured goods produced at home. 2. That the British possessions would continue to order all their materials from England, and would not in consequence of their industrial development build up industries which would compete with the home industries for local orders.

The first big blow to this theory came with the conflict between German and British Imperialism which resulted in the European War. But now, when it appears that German imperialism is no longer a factor in the struggle, when British Imperialism has increased its possessions as a direct result of the conflict, the way ought to be clear for the increasing development of the British Empire as an economic unit. To achieve this, huge schemes have been initiated by the protagonists of this theory, such as cotton growing in Egypt, Australia, Nigeria and India. Every corner of the Empire has been assiduously searched for

oil. Wheat growing is encouraged in many places; vast schemes of ports and harbours have been put forward for Africa, and great mineral surveys have been undertaken.

To provide money for these and other schemes, an average of £83 millions of capital for the years 1921 and 1922 were exported to British possessions, compared with an average of £74 millions for the years 1912 and 1913. But as can be seen from the figures given below, there would appear to have been no appreciable increase in the proportion of British trade with the Colonies. The first table gives the percentage of the total of British Imports from the colonies, from Europe and the rest of the world respectively for 1913-1922.

Imports to Great Britain.

	1913	1919	1920	1921	1922
From British Possessions	27.6%	35.8%	28.9%	30.6%	31.8%
" Europe	41.6%	17.4%	26.0%	30.0%	32.8%
" Other Countries	30.8%	46.8%	45.1%	39.4%	35.5%

The second table below gives the exports from Great Britain to the British possessions, Europe and the rest of the world.

Exports from Great Britain.

	1913	1919	1920	1921	1922
To British possessions	39.1%	25.8%	37.6%	42.5%	39.6%
" Europe	36.9%	56.6%	40.2%	34.0%	38.2%
" Other countries	24.0%	17.6%	22.2%	23.5%	22.2%

In the case of imports to Great Britain the share of the British Possessions has increased very slightly in relation to 1913 but has actually declined in the period covering the post war years. In the case of exports there is practically no change in 1922 as compared with 1913, but as with imports in the post war years there has been a reduction of a fluctuating volume in the proportion of exports to British possessions. Finally the actual proportions both of exports and imports show clearly that the British Empire has not yet achieved the position of being an economic unit.

Let us now examine what has been the actual process in these chief possessions of Great Britain—in Australia, Canada and India. In Australia, in spite of the continual flow of capital from Great Britain in the form of loans to the State and Federal Governments and in the form of shares in industrial concerns, the proportion of imports into Australia from Great Britain as shown by the following percentages, have actually slightly decreased.

Imports into Australia.

Country of Origin	1913	1920/21	9 months to 31.3. 1922
United Kingdom	51.82%	46.9%	49.27%
United States	13.68%	22.0%	18.63%
Other Countries	34.50%	31.1	32.10%

The position of exports from Australia has however slightly improved in favour of Great Britain, as the following figures show.

Exports from Australia.

Destination	1913	1919/20	1920/21
United Kingdom	44.3	53.0	51.1
Other British Countries	12.6	18.6	19.7
United States	3.3	7.4	7.5
Other Countries	39.8	20.1	20.7

These figures make it clear that so far as Australia is concerned, which is the most favourably placed of all the colonies as regards trade with Britain, the proportion of inter-imperial trade is showing no very large increase.

If we turn to Canada we find that the position has actually become worse in favor of America. No actual trade figures are available for the most recent years but the following compilation of the per-capita expenditure in Canada upon imports from the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. respectively will show the position clearly enough.

Per Capita expenditure in Canada on exports from the United Kingdom and United States.

United Kingdom			United States		
1912	1922	Increase or Decrease %	1912	1922	Increase or Decrease %
£-s-d	£-s-d		£-s-d	£-s-d	
3:6:1	2:1:8	-17.27	9:8:10	12:1:5	+27.3

In Canada the position has not been helped by the flow of capital from the United Kingdom. For practically since the beginning of the War, Canada has obtained all her capital from the U.S.A. and the latter in turn has been increasing her hold

on Canadian industries. So much has this been the case, that in 1918 it was estimated that 34% of the capital invested in Canadian Industry was held in the U.S.A. and only 9% in Great Britain. At the end of 1919 it was officially estimated that the U.S.A. holdings had increased to 50% and was still increasing.

In India the proportion of British trade is not so small as in Canada but it is not improving to any appreciable extent as the following table shows.

In this table we give both the imports of India in the years 1913/14 and 1920/22, the proportion taken by the United Kingdom, Other British Possessions, the U.S.A. and other foreign countries respectively.

Indian Imports and Exports.

	1913-14			1920-21			1921-22		
	Imp-rts			Exports					
United Kingdom	64 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	61 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	57 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	24 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	22 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	20 ⁰ / ₁₀₀			
British Possessions	6 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	5 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	10 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	14 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	21 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	21 ⁰ / ₁₀₀			
Total British Empire	70 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	66 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	67 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	38 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	43 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	41 ⁰ / ₁₀₀			
U.S.A.	2.6 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	10.5 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	8.1 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	8.9 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	14.8 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	10.4 ⁰ / ₁₀₀			
Total Foreign Countries	30 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	34 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	33 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	62 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	57 ⁰ / ₁₀₀	59 ⁰ / ₁₀₀			

These figures also show that in India too the proportion of British Empire trade actually decreased as regards imports and only slightly increased as regards exports from India since 1913.

In all the countries we have dealt with, India, Australia and Canada, a large proportion of the exports of Great Britain are in the form of machinery. Textile machinery for instance is exported to India and general engineering machinery to Australia. This machinery is being utilized to create competitive industries with Great Britain in the colonies and is thus rapidly destroying the idea that the colonies are mere markets, or the producers of raw material for Great Britain.

Further, in spite of the export of capital to these possessions of Great Britain, they are rapidly developing a capitalism of their own, whose policy is coming more and more into conflict with the policy of the capitalists of Great Britain. Thus in India already protective tariffs are imposed on British goods. In Australia the nationalized merchant shipping is continually in conflict with the shipping capitalists of Great Britain, while in Canada repeated attempts have been made to obtain a preferential tariff in favor of U.S.A.

It would appear therefore, that both the premises we postulated at the commencement of this article as necessary for the theory of the self-sufficiency of the British Empire as an economic unit, are daily becoming more impossible of fulfillment. None of the figures we have given show that the possessions of Great Britain are approaching the day when they can supply Britain with her raw materials or absorb her finished products.

The outlook therefore of those leaders of the workers who in the past have supported the imperialist policy will become increasingly difficult to reconcile with the class interests of the workers. They will be faced with the necessity of supporting a policy which obviously can only mean more unemployment, lower wages and increasing misery for the workers, or of making a clean break with the past, otherwise they perish.

Agriculture in the United States, and Russia

By Prof. N. Tulaiikov (Moscow)

The writer of this article (not a communist, but a member of the Central Executive Committee), was sent by the Soviet government to the United States to study the agricultural conditions there. Although his conclusions do not altogether correspond to the views held in official circles of Soviet Russia, his report has aroused great interest in Russia. Ed.

The great war led to a tremendous extension of the area under wheat cultivation in America—this area was 75 million acres in 1919, an unheard of record in the history of the United States. This enormous extension of wheat cultivation took place chiefly in the north western states: Nebraska, Dakota, Montana, a part of Wyoming, Kansas, and a few others.

At this time the price of wheat rose rapidly, and the government guaranteed the farmer a price of 2 dollars per bushel.

In the wheat districts of America and Canada there appeared great numbers of people who frequently, had had no previous experience in agriculture; these bought sites, set up

farms, bought cattle and implements on credit, and began growing the wheat which promised them such large profits. Towns sprang up, houses and roads were built. All this required capital, and this was advanced by the banks.

The years of bad crops in the wheat areas, and the rapid sinking in the price of wheat, which, by the end of 1922, fell below post-war prices (about 70 to 80 cents per bushel), completely discouraged the farmer; he lost all hope of finding any way out of this situation. Many, especially among the fresh emigrants, left their farms standing and then, completely ruined, started some new career either in the towns, or in more favorable districts.

The departure of the agricultural population was bound to take its effect on the banks. If the farmers were to be induced to remain, they must be granted some means enabling them to hold out during the years of crisis. The question of granting credits and seed from means provided by the Federal Government was raised, and the credits granted by the provincial banks, which were too short termed to be of aid to the farmers, were, up to November 1922, supplemented by the government by about 350 million dollars. The minister of agriculture, in his report on the year 1922, states that this action saved many thousands of farmers from ruin, and that it is due to this operation that hundreds of banks in this wheat area escaped bankruptcy.

The general agricultural situation however did not improve in 1922, and the question of credits had to be brought up again. At the November and December sessions of Congress it was resolved to grant another 60 million dollars out of federal funds, through the agency of 12 of the largest banks in the country. This credit was intended to bring fresh help to the farmers who had suffered great losses by the crisis, and to prevent the farmers from leaving the wheat district.

I had the opportunity of speaking with three members of the Federal Commission on the cause of the wretched position of the farmers, and on the means of alleviation to be adopted. One of these was the chairman of the Commission, Professor Becker. This Commission has already come to a more or less fixed opinion, which may be expressed as follows: The natural properties of that part of the great prairies (Dakota, Nebraska, West-Kansas) where so many immigrants settled during the war, are not particularly favorable for wheat growing, and therefore an artificial aid to the farmers (by credits) would not only be futile but actually harmful, as the emigration of a section of the agricultural population of these districts is inevitable in any event.

The whole of the great prairie district must be reconverted into a cattle-breeding district, as it was before the war, and the farmer must chiefly rely upon this industry. He can and must utilize a part of his land for growing corn and cattle fodder, but this must be regarded as a secondary source of income.

The experience already won in cattle farming in this district shows that the possession of 100 grazing animals suffices to enable a farmer to maintain his normal standard of living. In order to be able to breed grazing cattle in this part of the United States, every farm must have from 1,000 to 2,000 acres at its disposal. The farmer can use about 100 to 200 acres of this for growing wheat, and as much for maize; the wheat straw will also provide him with a valuable winter fodder. Under such conditions the farmer will almost always be able to feed his 100 head of cattle, earn a steady income, and live without his present risks.

In the hilly districts the farmers must each have over 4000 acres of land, as the conditions are less favorable. This signifies that the population of the western parts of the great prairies must be reduced.

The increased development of corn growing in these districts, so little adapted for the purpose, has thus proved a complete failure. It was only possible at a time when the price of corn had been raised by speculation, and must now give way to cattle rearing.

In one of Becker's articles he states that, during recent years, the population of the United States has increased more rapidly than the production of agricultural necessities. This is doubtless connected with the increasing shortage of land in the United States, suitable for agriculture.

The minister for agriculture, in his Congress report—and Prof. Becker is of the same opinion—states, that all districts in the United States suitable for agriculture without the aid of artificial irrigation or drainage, or considerable improvements, are already being utilized, so that the population of America is confronted with the question as to how an ever-increasing population, accustomed to a high standard of living, is to be provided with food and clothing. The solution to this problem

consists in either cultivating the areas already being utilized much more intensely, or in letting America, like England, become dependent on foreign imports, or, finally, in expending enormous sums from national funds on great irrigation and drainage works. The first and third solutions are only practicable when the prices of agricultural produce are high, that is, when it is worth, while to invest so much capital and labor in agriculture. But this pre-requisite does not exist at present.

The possibility of the second solution depends on the world production of wheat, and on the supply of cheap corn in the markets of the world. If the question of providing the United States with corn can be advantageously settled, and the Americans are relieved from this care, then the United States can make use of the increased population, for increasing industrial production. The natural conditions of the United States render it eminently possible to convert it into an industrial country: the maritime routes for export to the West (to China) and to the East (to Russia), whose markets could be won at the present time with comparative ease, offer cheap means of transport for American industrial products to almost unlimited markets; the coal and naphtha of the eastern districts, and the enormous energy stored in the waterfalls of the western mountains, provide energy for many years; the great mineral wealth of the country, and finally the high level of technics and of working power in industry, all ensure for America the possibility of developing her industry to a very high degree.

The unexampled amount and extremely favorable geographical position of the natural riches of the country, create extraordinarily advantageous pre-requisites for the industrial progress of the nation, and in the words of the American economists, Russian Siberia can become that granary from which America can supplement her inland food supplies in the future; in the opinion of these economists, the inland supplies will be fully consumed in about 25 years by the home demands.

The main point of interest for American economists to-day is, to ascertain when Russia will re-appear in the markets of the world with her corn. The majority are not interested in the question from the standpoint of competition in the Western European markets, but from the standpoint of the necessity of a corresponding reorganization of the whole of American agriculture. All economists in the United States clearly admit the possibility, that Russia will recapture her former corn markets. The only question which makes them uneasy is with regard to when and how American agriculture is to be so re-organized that a further depression be avoided, a depression which might be greater than that by which America was overwhelmed after the war.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Leon Trotzky - the organizer of Victory

By Karl Radek.

History has prepared our party for various tasks. However selective our state machinery or our economic activity may be, still the whole past of the party has psychologically prepared it for the work of creating a new order of economics and a new state apparatus. History has even prepared us for diplomacy. It is scarcely necessary to mention that world politics have always occupied the minds of Marxists. But it was the endless negotiations with the Mensheviks that perfected our diplomatic technics; and it was during these old struggles that comrade Chicherin learned to draw up diplomatic notes. But we are just beginning to learn the miracle of economics. Our state machinery creaks and groans. But in one thing we have been eminently successful — in our *Red Army*. Its creator, its central will, is comrade L. D. Trotzky. Old general Moltke, the creator of the German army, often spoke of the danger that the pen of the diplomatists might spoil the work of the soldier's sabre. Warriors the world over, though there were classical authors among them, have always opposed the pen to the sword. The history of proletarian revolution shows how the pen may be re-forged into a sword. Trotzky is one of the best writers of world socialism, but these literary advantages did not prevent him from becoming the leader, the leading organizer of the first proletarian army. The pen of the best publicist of the revolution was re-forged into a sword.

The literature of scientific socialism helped comrade Trotzky but little in solving the problems which confronted the party when it was threatened by world imperialism. If we look

through the whole of pre-war socialist literature, we find — with the exception of a few little-known works by Engels, some chapters in Anti-Dühring devoted to the development of strategy, and some chapters in Mehring's excellent book on Lessing, devoted to the war activity of Frederick the Great — only four works on military subjects: August Bebel's pamphlet on militia, Gaston Moch's book on militia, the two volumes of war history by Schulz, and the book by Jaurès, devoted to the propaganda of the idea of the militia in France. With the exception of the books of Schulz and Jaurès, which possess high value, everything which socialist literature has published on military subjects since Engel's death has been bad dilettantism. But even these works by Schulz and Jaurès afforded no reply to the questions with which the Russian revolution was confronted. Schulz's book surveyed the development of the forms of strategy and military organizations for many centuries back. It was an attempt at the application of the Marxian methods of historical research, and closed with the Napoleonic period. Jaurès' book — full of brilliance and sparkle — shows his complete familiarity with the problems of military organization, but suffers from the fundamental fault that this gifted representative of reformism was anxious to make of the capitalist army an instrument of national defence, and to release it from the function of defending the class interests of the bourgeoisie. He therefore failed to grasp the tendency of development of militarism, and carried the idea of democracy ad absurdum in the question of war, into the question of the army.

I do not know in how far comrade Trotzky occupied himself before the war with questions of military science. I believe that he did not gain his gifted insight into these questions from books, but received his impetus in this direction at the time when he was acting as correspondent in the Balkan war, this final rehearsal of the great war. It is probable that he deepened his knowledge of war technics and of the mechanism of the army, during his sojourn in France (during the war), from where he sent his brilliant war sketches to the *Kiev Thoughts*. It may be seen from this work how magnificently he grasped the spirit of the army. The Marxist Trotzky saw not only the external discipline of the army, the cannon, the technics, but he saw the living human beings who serve the instruments of war, he saw the sprawling charge on the field of battle. Trotzky is the author of the first pamphlet giving a detailed analysis of the causes of the decay of the International. Even in face of this great decay Trotzky did not lose his faith in the future of socialism; on the contrary, he was profoundly convinced that all those qualities which the bourgeoisie endeavors to cultivate in the uniformed proletariat, for the purpose of securing its own victory, will soon turn against the bourgeoisie, and will serve not only as the foundation of the revolution, but also of revolutionary armies. One of the most remarkable documents of his comprehension of the class structure of the army, and of the spirit of the army, is the speech which he held. — I believe at the I. Soviet Congress and in the Petrograd Workers' and Soldiers' Council — on Kerensky's July attack. In this speech Trotzky predicted the collapse of the attack, not only on technical military grounds, but on the basis of the political analysis of the condition of the army. "You" — and here he addressed himself to the Mensheviks and the SR's — "demand from the government a revision of the aims of the war. In doing so you tell the army that the old aims, in whose names Tzarism and the bourgeoisie demanded unheard of sacrifices, did not correspond to the interests of the Russian peasantry and Russian proletariat. You have not attained a revision of the aims of the war. You have created nothing to replace the Tzar and the fatherland, and yet you demand of the army that it shed its blood for this Nothing. We cannot fight for Nothing, and your adventure will end in collapse". The secret of Trotzky's greatness as organizer of the Red army lies in this attitude of his towards the question.

All great military writers emphasize the tremendously decisive significance of the moral factor in war. One half of Clausewitz' great book is devoted to this question, and the whole of our victory in the civil war is due to the circumstance that Trotzky knew how to apply this science of the significance of the moral factor in war to reality. When the old Tzarist army went to pieces, the minister of war of the Kerenski government, Verchovsky, proposed that the older military classes be discharged, the military authorities behind the front partly reduced, and the army reorganized by the introduction of fresh young elements. When we seized power, and the trenches emptied, many of us made the same proposition. But this idea was the purest Utopia. It was impossible to replace the flying Tzarist army with fresh forces. These two waves would have crossed and divided each other. The old army had to be completely dissolved; the new army could only be built up on the alarm sent out by Soviet

Russia to the workers and peasants, to defend the conquests of the revolution.

When, in April 1918, the best Tzarist officers who remained in the army after our victory, met together for the purpose of working out, in conjunction with our comrades and some military representatives of the Allies, the plan of organization for the army, Trotsky listened to their plans — I have a clear recollection of this scene — in silence for several days. These were the plans of people who did not comprehend the upheaval going on before their eyes. Every one of them replied to the question of how an army was to be organized on the old pattern. They did not grasp the metamorphosis wrought in the human material upon which the army is based. How the war experts laughed at the first voluntary troops organized by comrade Trotsky in his capacity of Commissary of War! Old Borisov, one of the best Russian military writers, assured those communists with whom he was obliged to come in contact, time and again, that nothing would come of this undertaking, that the army could only be built up on the basis of general conscription, and maintained by iron discipline. He did not grasp that the volunteer troops were the secure foundation pillars upon which the structure was to be erected, and that the masses of peasants and workers could not possibly be rallied around the flag of war again unless the broad masses were confronted by deadly danger. Without believing for a single moment that the volunteer army could save Russia, Trotsky organized it as an apparatus which he required for the creation of a new army.

But Trotsky's organizatory genius, and his boldness of thought are even more clearly expressed in his courageous determination to utilize the war specialists for creating the army. Every good Marxian is fully aware that in building up a good economic apparatus we still require the aid of the old capitalist organizations. Lenin defended this proposition with the utmost decision in his April speech on the tasks of the Soviet power. In the mature circles of the party the idea is not contested. But the idea that we could create an instrument for the defence of the republic, an army, with the aid of the Tzarist officers — encountered obstinate resistance. Who could think of re-arming the White officers who had just been disarmed? Thus many comrades questioned. I remember a discussion on this question among the editors of the *Communist*, the organ of the so-called left communists, in which the question of the employment of staff officers nearly led to a split. And the editors of this paper were the best schooled theoreticians and practitioners of the party. It suffices to mention the names of Bukharin, Ossonski, Lomov, W. Yakovlev. There was even greater distrust among the broad circles of our military comrades, recruited for our military organizations during the war. The mistrust of our military functionaries could only be allayed, their agreement to the utilization of the knowledge possessed by the old officers could only be won, by the burning faith of Trotsky in our social force, the belief that we could obtain from the war experts the benefit of their science, without permitting them to force their politics upon us; the belief that the revolutionary watchfulness of the progressive workers would enable them to overcome any counter-revolutionary attempts made by the staff officers.

In order to emerge victorious, it was necessary for the army to be headed by a man of iron will, and for this man to possess not only the full confidence of the party, but the ability of subjugating with his iron will the enemy who is forced to serve us. But comrade Trotsky has not only succeeded in subordinating to his energy even the highest staff officers, he has attained more: he has succeeded in winning the confidence of the best elements among the war experts, and in converting them from enemies of Soviet Russia to its most profoundly convinced followers. I witnessed one such victory of Trotsky's at the time of the Brest negotiations. The officers who had accompanied us to Brest-Litovsk maintained a more than reserved attitude towards us. They fulfilled their rôle as experts with the utmost condescension, in the opinion that they were attending a comedy which merely served to cover a business transaction long since arranged between the Bolsheviks and the German government. But the manner in which Trotsky conducted the struggle against German imperialism, in the name of the principles of the Russian Revolution, forced every human being present in the assembly room to feel the moral and spiritual victory of this eminent representative of the Russian proletariat. The mistrust of the war experts towards us vanished in proportion to the development of the great Brest-Litovsk drama. How clearly I recollect the night when Admiral *Altwater* — who has since died — one of the leading officers of the old army, who began to help Soviet Russia not from motives of fear but of conscience, entered my room and said: "I came here because you forced me to

do so. I did not believe you; but now I shall help you, and do my work as never before, in the profound conviction that I am serving the fatherland".

It is one of Trotsky's greatest victories that he has been able to impart the conviction that the Soviet government really fights for the welfare of the Russian people, even to such people who have come over to us from hostile camps on compulsion only. It goes without saying that this great victory on the inner front, this moral victory over the enemy, has been the result not only of Trotsky's iron energy which won for him universal respect; not only the result of the deep moral force, the high degree of authority even in military spheres, which this socialist writer and people's tribune, who was placed, by the will of the revolution at the head of the army, has been able to win for himself; this victory has also required the self-denial of tens of thousands of our comrades in the army, an iron discipline in our own ranks, a consistent striving towards our aims; it has also required the miracle that those masses of human beings who only yesterday fled from the battle-field, take up arms again today, under much more difficult conditions, for the defence of the country.

That these politico-psychological mass factors played an important role is an undeniable fact, but the strongest, most concentrated, and striking expression of this influence is to be found in the personality of Trotsky. Here the Russian revolution has acted through the brain, the nervous system, and the heart of its greatest representative. When our first armed trial began, with Czecho-Slovakia, the party, and with it its leader Trotsky, showed how the principle of the political campaign — as already taught by Lassalle — could be applied to war, to the fight with "steel arguments". We concentrated all material and moral forces on the war. The whole party had grasped the necessity of this. But this necessity also finds its highest expression in the steel figure of Trotsky. After our victory over Denikin in March 1920, Trotsky said, at the party conference: "We have plundered the whole of Russia in order to conquer the Whites". In these words we again find the unparalleled concentration of will required to ensure the victory. We needed a man who was the embodiment of the war-cry, a man who became the tocsin sounding the alarm, the will demanding from one and all an unqualified subordination to the great bloody necessity.

It was only a man who works like Trotsky, a man who spares himself as little as Trotsky, who can speak to the soldiers as only Trotsky can — it was only such a man who could be the standard bearer of the armed working people. He has been everything in one person. He has thought out the strategic advice given by the experts and has combined it with a correct estimate of the proportions of social forces; he knew how to unite in one movement the impulses of fourteen fronts, of the ten thousand communists who informed headquarters as to what the real army is and how it is possible to operate with it; he understood how to combine all this in one strategic plan and one scheme of organization. And in all this splendid work he understood better than anyone else how to apply the science of the significance of the moral factor in war.

This combination of strategist and military organizer with the politician is best characterized by the fact that during the whole of this hard work, Trotsky appreciated the importance of *Demian Bedny* (communist writer), or of the artist *Moor* (who draws most of the political caricatures for the communist papers, posters, etc.) for the war. Our army was an army of peasants, and the dictatorship of the proletariat with regard to the army, that is, the leading of this peasants' army by workers and by representatives of the working class, was realized in the personality of Trotsky and in the comrades co-operating with him. Trotsky was able, with the aid of the whole apparatus of our party, to impart to the peasants' army, exhausted by the war, the profoundest conviction that it was fighting in its own interests.

Trotsky worked with the whole party in the work of forming the Red Army. He would not have fulfilled his task without the party. But without him the creation of the Red Army, and its victories, would have demanded infinitely greater sacrifices. Our party will go down to history as the first proletarian party which succeeded in creating a great army, and this bright page in the history of the Russian Revolution will always be bound up with the name of *Leo Davidovitch Trotsky*, with the name of a man whose work and deeds will claim not only the love, but also the scientific study of the young generation of workers preparing to conquer the whole world.

The Communist Party of Italy to the CP of Russia

Letter of the C.P.I. to the Convention of the C.P.R.

Dear Comrades,

Your convention greets the sixth year of your victory and of the victory of the Russian proletariat, whom you are leading forward with unexampled determination and self-sacrifice, under the leadership of the eminent heads of your party.

Russian comrades! Our proletariat is worthy of greeting you. You know well the sorrowful history of our workers during the past few years, and how bitterly the workers have to pay for the actions of the reformist and cowardly leaders. Reaction in its worst forms has raged amongst us, and in the end the armed bands of Fascism have taken over the government, in order to be better able to crush the revolutionary spirit of our workers and peasants. In the face of this difficult position, the young Communist Party of Italy has done its duty, it has held high the flag of the Communist International, it is fighting further in the name of your revolution, that first and magnificent step on the road to the proletarian world revolution. Thousands of communists are in prison, we are hunted down like the lowest criminals. Our press is suppressed almost everywhere. But we may say to you, in the name of our comrades, that the Party will remain at its post, and will prepare for the inevitable fresh rising. We promise you to be victorious.

Comrades! Despite all persecutions we are strong, because you are strong. The work which you have accomplished is so far-reaching in significance that even you yourselves cannot grasp its full importance. The bourgeoisie fears us because you are our allies, because it knows that you are fighting on our side. The bourgeoisie fears you because it knows that behind your brave vanguard there stands the mighty army of the proletariat. You have won a victory for your own proletariat, and for the proletariat of the whole world. Your leaders are our leaders, and we love them as you love them. The history of your revolution is well known to the exploited of every country. Your victories arouse the joy of the workers of the whole world, for they are their victories. You know that the Italian proletariat is in the trenches, is suffering and dying in them. Out of these bloody trenches we send you our greetings. We are proud of being able to call out to you that we shall win the victory in your name.

Long live the victorious Communist Party of Russia!

Long live the Russian proletariat!

All honor to the dead who fell in emulation of your dead!

The Executive of the C.P. of Italy.

The Norwegian Labor Party

The party convention's report on the activity of the Norwegian Labor Party during the year 1922, shows that the Party, despite the internal crisis, is firmer than ever. The widespread unemployment has reduced the trade union membership, and this has reacted on the membership of the Party. The membership statistics for the year 1922 are as follows: first quarter: 39,027 men and 7,608 women = 46,635; second quarter: 37,805 men and 7,884 women = 45,689; third quarter: 37,742 men and 7,400 women = 45,142; fourth quarter: 39,124 men and 8,391 women = 47,515.

The membership is largest in Christiania; here the Party has 19,132 members, the majority of whom are collectively affiliated to the Party through their trade unions.

In the country the Party is mainly built up on direct individual membership. The Party comprises 13 district organizations, 16 county, and 29 town organizations.

The Party Convention has now resolved that within a year the Party is to be reorganized wholly on the basis of individual membership. It is clear that this measure will considerably reduce the membership of the Party.

In 1922, the Party possessed 41 newspapers. Of these 16 were dailies, 14 were published thrice a week, 9 twice, and 2 once a week. Besides these, the Party has a periodical, a women's paper, and a humorous paper. A weekly youth paper is also published under the supervision of the Party, as well as a children's paper and a communist students' paper. The Party also has a press service, which provides the newspapers with telegrams, articles, parliamentary speech reports and information from the main organizations.

The Party possesses a publishing establishment which issued, during the year 1922, 10 books with a total edition of 57,000, and 4 propaganda pamphlets with a total edition of 25,000 copies.

The Party is carrying on comprehensive educational work, and in 1922, conducted, a day school with 33 students, course of instruction 3½ mon-hs; a day school with 20 students in one district, which lasted 2 months, and about 50 local evening schools with about 1000 students. In 1922 a correspondence school was founded, with 13 courses of instruction.

An idea of the comprehensive activity of the Party may be gained from the fact that in 1922 the Party executive arranged for 2,338 lectures and 290 agitation tours. For agitation purposes handbills amounting to a total circulation of 380,000 copies were issued.

The Young Communist League, made good progress in 1922, and has now about 12,000 members in 250 groups. The children's movement comprised, at the end of 1922, 51 children's groups with more than 6,000 members. The Women's League connected with the Party (and which the convention decided to dissolve) had in 1922, 92 groups with about 3,000 members.

At the municipal and rural district elections in 1922; the Party obtained 1786 seats in the rural district councils, and 558 in the town councils. At the same elections in the year 1919 (before the split in the Party) the figures were 2032 and 631.

Two letters to Henri Barbusse

I.

We, the communist contributors to the literary-artistic section of the *Pravda*, will celebrate that day as a festival on which our new comrade Henri Barbusse enters our ranks in the columns of our fighting organ, the *Pravda*.

With communist greeting,

The contributors to the literary artistic section of the "*Pravda*":

Demyan Bedni, A. Voronsky, D. Kunin, L. Mitnitsky, W. Popov-Dubovskoy, A. Serajimovitch, L. Sosnovsky, I. Pliptchenko, An. Charov, L. Schmidt.

II.

The group of proletarian writers: *October* welcomes with joy your entrance into the Communist Party.

We are all members of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki). We are anxious to specially emphasize that a literary artist can in no circumstances better serve the cause of the workers than when he fights in the ranks of the proletariat. "Independence" from the Party of the working class almost invariably signifies separation from it, a separation from the nourishing juices of that culture which bears the future within it. We, proletarian writers, communist writers, are doing the work of the party in the sphere of artistic literature. And when the Party (that is, the cause of the working class) demands our presence at some other fighting post, or requires our death at the barricades of the revolution, we shall obey its commands. Communism comes first. Everything else is secondary.

We welcome you as a fellow fighter in the ranks of the party of the working class.

We greet you as a champion of the working class at the front of proletarian literature.

The group of proletarian writers "October".

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

The strategy and tactics of the Russian communists

By I. Stalin.

Comrade Stalin wishes to make the observation that this article lays no claim to originality, but is to be regarded as a collective and schematic survey of comrade Lenin's fundamental views.

I.

Fundamental conceptions.

1. The two sides of the labor movement.

Political strategy and tactics alike deal with the labor movement. But the labor movement itself is composed of two factors, the objective or elementary and the subjective or conscious. The objective, elementary constituent is that group of events which

take place independent of the conscious or regulative will of the proletariat. The economic development of the country, the development of capitalism, the decay of the old power, the elementary movement of the proletariat and of the classes surrounding it, the class war, etc.—all these are phenomena whose development is not dependent on the will of the proletariat. This is the objective side of the movement. Strategy has nothing to do with these processes, for here it can neither create nor alter. It can only reckon with these processes and utilize them as a starting point. This is the sphere of the theoretical study of Marxism and of the Marxian program.

But the movement possesses another side, the subjective, the conscious side. The subjective aspect of the movement is the reflection of the elementary processes in the heads of the workers, it is the conscious and systematic movement for the attainment of definite aims. This side of the movement is subject to the fullest extent to the regulative effect of strategy and tactics, and is for this reason of special interest to us. Although strategy is unable to change anything in the objective processes of the movement, here in the subjective, conscious side of the movement the field of action opened out to strategy is wide and manifold, for strategy can accelerate or retard the movement, indicate to it the shortest path, or the path strewn with difficulties and sacrifices; all this depends on the perfection or shortcomings of the strategy itself.

To accelerate or retard the movement, to facilitate or hinder it—this is the sphere of political strategy and tactics, these are the confines of their possibilities.

2. Theory and program of Marxism.

The study of the objective processes of the movement is not incumbent on strategy. But it is none the less obliged to be familiar with these processes, and to take them into consideration, if grave errors are not to be committed by the leadership of the movement. The theory of Marxism, and then the program of Marxism, are especially occupied with the study of the objective processes of the movement. Hence strategy must rest entirely on the existing theories and programs of Marxism.

The study of the objective processes of capitalism, its development and decay, brings the theory of Marxism to the conclusion that the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the seizure of power by the proletariat, the replacement of capitalism by socialism, are inevitable.

Proletarian theory can be called Marxian only when it is based on this main conclusion of Marxian theory.

As the program of Marxism proceeds from the given theories, it determines the aims of the proletarian movement, and formulates them scientifically in the points of the program. The program may be valid either for the whole period of capitalist development, in that it holds in view the overthrow of capitalism and the organization of socialist production, or only for a definite phase in the development of capitalism, for instance: the destruction of the vestiges of the feudal absolutist state of society and the creation of the pre-requisites for the free development of capitalism. This program may consist of two parts: of the maximum and of the minimum part. The strategy proceeding from the minimum part of the program must naturally be different from that based on its maximum part; but a strategy can only be named Marxian when it is guided by the aims of the movement formulated in the program of Marxism.

3. Strategy.

The most important task of strategy is to ascertain that main line to be followed by the working class movement, the line most advantageous for the purpose of enabling the proletariat to strike its enemy that main blow required for the attainment of the aims established by the program. The strategic plan organizes this decisive blow in such a manner that it can yield the greatest results within the shortest time.

The fundamental lines of political strategy could be laid down without particular trouble by drawing an analogy with military strategy, for instance from the civil war at the time of the struggle with Denikin. All Russian comrades will recollect the end of the year 1919, when Denikin stood before Tula. At that time there were interesting controversies among the military leaders as to the best point at which to deal Denikin's army the decisive blow. Some of the military leaders proposed that the main attack be made on the line Tzaritzin-Novorossisk. Others suggested the line Voronesh-Rostov, as this would enable the breach in Denikin's line to be followed by a division of the hostile army into two sections which could then be treated separately. The first plan doubtless had positive advantages in so far as the occupation of Novorossisk would cut off the retreat of Denikin's army. But it had the disadvantage of entailing an advance through districts hostile to the Soviet power (Don province), thus involving great

sacrifices; on the other hand it was dangerous, for it left the road to Moscow, through Tula and Tzerpuchov, open to Denikin's army. The second plan for striking the main blow was the only correct one; in the first place it proposed an advance of our main forces through a district in sympathy with the Soviet power, thus eliminating exorbitant sacrifices; and in the second place it hindered Denikin's main army in its advance on Moscow. The majority of the military experts were in favor of the second plan, and the fate of the whole war with Denikin was thus decided.

In other words: The determination of the direction of the main blow signifies the pre-determination of the character of the operations for the whole period of the war, and with it, nine tenths of the outcome of the war. This is the task to be accomplished by strategy.

The same must be said of political strategy. The first serious controversies between the leaders of the Russian proletariat with regard to the main lines of the proletarian movement occurred at the beginning of the present century, at the time of the Russo-Japanese war. As is well known, one section of our party (the Mensheviks) were at that time of the opinion that the main line of the proletarian movement in its struggle against Tzarism should be the formation of a bloc between the proletariat and the liberal bourgeoisie; this plan completely, or almost completely, excluded the most important revolutionary factor, the peasantry, and placed the leading role of the whole revolutionary movement in the hands of the liberal bourgeoisie. The other section of the party (the Bolsheviks) maintained that the main blow should be carried out by means of a bloc between proletariat and peasantry, and that the leading role of the whole revolutionary movement should be placed in the hands of the proletariat, the liberal bourgeoisie being neutralized.

If we compare our whole revolutionary movement, from the turn of the century until the February revolution of 1917, it becomes clear that the fate of Tzarism and of the landowners depended in a high degree on the acceptance of the one or the other strategic plan (the Menshevik or the Bolshevik), from the acceptance of the one or the other main line of revolutionary movement.

Just as the military strategy at the time of the war with Denikin, by choosing the main lines of the blow to be dealt, also determined nine tenths of the character of all further operations until the complete annihilation of Denikin, in the same manner our political strategy, by deciding to carry on the revolutionary movement in the spirit of the Bolshevik plan, determined the character of the action taken by our party during the whole period of open struggle against Tzarism, from the Russo-Japanese war until the February revolution of the year 1917.

It is the chief task of political strategy to correctly determine the main lines to be pursued by the proletarian movement in each separate country, and to do this on the basis of the theory and program of Marxism, at the same time taking into consideration the experience gained in the revolutionary struggle by the workers of all countries.

4. Tactics.

Tactics are a part of strategy, and subordinate to it. Tactics are not occupied with the war as a whole, but with its separate episodes, with the battles and skirmishes. While strategy seeks to win the war, or, let us say, to bring the struggle against Tzarism to an end, tactics on the other hand, aim at winning this or that battle, or successfully carrying through some campaign, some course of action, by means of greater or lesser adaptation to the concrete fighting conditions at any given moment.

The most important task of tactics is to determine those ways and means, those forms and methods of fighting, best suited at the given moment to the concrete conditions, and offering the best prospects of strategic success. Therefore the results of tactics are not to be judged by themselves, not from the point of view of their immediate effects, but from the point of view of the task and possibilities of strategy.

There are moments when successful tactics facilitate the fulfilment of the strategic task. This was the case for instance at the end of 1919, in the war against Denikin, when Orel and Voronesh were liberated by our troops, and the success gained by our cavalry at Voronesh and by our infantry at Orel created a favorable situation for dealing a blow to Rostov. This was the case in August 1917 in Russia, when the workers' councils of Petrograd and Moscow went over to the Bolsheviks, and created a new political situation greatly facilitating the blow struck by our party in October.

There are other moments when tactical successes, although of brilliant immediate effect, do not correspond to the strategic possibilities, and create an "unexpected" situation disastrous for

the whole campaign. This happened to Denikin at the end of 1919, when he allowed the facile success of a rapid and effective march against Moscow to induce him to extend his front from the Volga to the Dnyepyr, and thus to pave the way for the ruin of his army. The same was the case in the year 1920 in the Polish war, when we — underestimating the force of the national movement in Poland, and dazzled by the easy success of an effective advance set ourselves a task beyond our powers, that of penetrating as far as Warsaw or further; by this we roused the great majority of the Polish population to united resistance against the Soviet troops, and thus brought about a situation which nullified the successes gained by the Soviet troops at Minsk and Zhitomir, and undermining the prestige of the Soviet power in the West.

And finally, there are moments in which it is necessary to neglect tactical successes, and to consciously acquiesce in tactical losses for the purpose of securing future strategic gains. Thus it frequently occurs in war that one of the fighting parties, anxious to save its troops and to withdraw them from the blows dealt by the overwhelming forces of the enemy, will begin a systematic retreat, and abandon whole cities and districts, in order to gain time and to collect its forces for new decisive battles in the future. This was the case in Russia in the year 1918, during the German attack, when our party was forced to accept the Brest-Litovsk peace, which, regarded from the standpoint of immediate political effect, signified a gigantic minus, but was none the less necessary in order to enable us to maintain the alliance with a peasantry hungry for peace, in order to gain a breathing space, to create a new army, and thus to gain a strategic plus in the future.

In other words: tactics must not be subordinated to the temporary interests of the moment, they must not be influenced by considerations of immediate political effectiveness, and still less may they desert the solid earth and build castles in the air — tactics must adapt themselves to the tasks and possibilities of strategy.

The main task of tactics is to determine the forms and methods of the struggle, to choose those best adapted to the concrete premises of the struggle at each given moment; the lines laid down by strategy are to be followed, and the experience gained in the revolutionary struggle among the workers of all countries are to be utilized.

5. The forms of the struggle.

Methods of warfare and forms of war are not always the same. They vary with the conditions of development, above all with the development of production. War was carried on differently under Chingis-Khan than under Napoleon III and differently in the 20th. century than in the 19th. century.

At the present day the art of warfare consists in a thorough knowledge of every form of war, and the mastery of every scientific advance in this sphere, utilizing this knowledge sensibly, and combining it skilfully, applying this or that form at the right moment and in the right manner.

The same is to be said of the forms of struggle on the political battle field. Here the forms of struggle are much more manifold than in warfare. They vary with the development of economics, of social life, of culture; with the position of the classes; with the mutual relations of the fighting forces, the character of the ruling power and the international conditions. The illegal form of struggle as carried on under absolutism, in combination with partial strikes and workers' demonstrations; the open form of struggle under "legal possibilities", with political mass strikes of the workers; the parliamentary form of struggle such as we experienced in the Duma; the extra-parliamentary mass action frequently resulting in armed rebellion; and finally the state forms of struggle after the seizure of power by the proletariat, when the latter has succeeded in obtaining complete control of all state means and forces, including the army — these are in general the forms of struggle which have been produced in actual practice by the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat.

It is the task of the party to master every form of struggle, to combine these on the field of battle, and to skilfully intensify the employment of those forms of struggle most adapted to their purpose under any given circumstances.

6. The forms of organization.

The forms of organization of an army, the kind of troops employed, are generally adapted to the forms and methods of warfare. These factors vary with the modes of warfare. In a war of manoeuvre an extensive use of cavalry is often decisive; in a trench war cavalry plays no rôle whatever, or only a secondary one: here the heavy artillery, aviation, gas, and tanks are decisive.

The task of military science is to have every description of troops ready for use, to perfect them, and combine their actions.

The same applies to the forms of organization in the sphere of politics. As in the sphere of military warfare, the forms of organization must also adapt themselves here to the special form of struggle. Conspiratory organizations of professional revolutionists, during the epoch of absolutism; enlightenment and action by the aid of trade union, co-operative, and parliamentary fractions (Duma fraction, etc.) during the epoch of the Duma; shop stewards, peasants committees, strike committees, workers' and soldiers' councils, revolutionary military committees, and a broad proletarian party which combines all these organizational forms during the period of mass actions and risings; finally, the state form as the organization of the proletariat during the period of concentration of power in the hands of the working class—these are in general the forms of organization which, under certain conditions, can and must aid the proletariat in its struggle against the bourgeoisie.

It is the task of the party to master all these forms of organization, to perfect them, and to be capable of combining their work at any given moment.

7. Slogans and directions.

Skilfully formulated resolutions, expressing the aims of a war or of its separate battles, and becoming popular among the troops, are frequently of decisive significance as a means for rousing active enthusiasm in an army, of strengthening its morale, etc. Suitable commands, watchwords, and appeals, issued to the soldiers, are as important in a war as superior heavy artillery, or superior and rapidly moving tanks.

In the sphere of politics slogans are of even greater importance, for here we have to deal with tens and hundreds of millions of human beings with manifold demands and needs.

The slogan is the concentrated and clear formulation of the immediate or ultimate aims of the struggle, and is issued by the leading group—in the case of the proletariat by its party. There are various slogans, according to the different aims of the struggle; they may be applicable to a whole historical period, or only to separate sections or episodes of the historical period in question. The slogan "Down with despotism", first issued by the "Group for the emancipation of Labor" in the eighties of the last century, was a *propaganda slogan*, for its object was to gather together the most persevering and bravest fighters and fighting groups in the party. During the period of the Russo-Japanese war, when the instability of despotism became more or less obvious to the broad masses of the working class, this slogan was transformed into an *agitative slogan*, for it could already assume the sympathy of millions of workers. In the period before the February revolution of 1917, at the time when the final bankruptcy of Tzarism became evident to the masses themselves, the slogan "Down with despotism" changed from an agitative slogan into a *slogan of action*, for now it was able to induce millions of workers to storm Tzarism. During the days of the February revolution itself this slogan assumed the form of actual directions issued by the party, that is, it called for the immediate occupation of this or that authoritative position, of this or that point in the Czarist system, for this was the moment of the overthrow and extermination of Tsarism.

To confuse slogans with directions, or slogans of agitation with slogans of action, is just as dangerous as premature or too retarded action—which can become more than dangerous, actually catastrophic. In April 1917 the slogan: "All power to the Soviets!" was an agitative slogan. The famous demonstration in Petrograd in April 1917, before the winter palace, was a premature and therefore catastrophic attempt to turn this slogan into a slogan of action. The party was right in condemning the initiators of this demonstration, for it was aware that the pre-requisites for the transformation of this slogan into one of action were as yet non-existent, and that a premature action on the part of the proletariat may lead to a collapse of its forces.

On the other hand cases occur when the party is confronted with the necessity of withdrawing or altering, "within 24 hours", mature slogans (or directions) which have already been accepted—in order to save its members from falling into some trap set by the enemy, or in order to postpone the execution of the directions to a more favorable time. This was the case in Petrograd in June 1917 when a carefully prepared workers' and soldiers' demonstration intended for July 9, was cancelled by the E.C. of our party.

The task of the party consists in the skilful and timely conversion of the agitative slogans into slogans of action, or of the latter into definite and concrete directions—or, if conditions demand it, of possessing the elasticity and determination to desist from the execution of this or that slogan, even if popular and mature.

II.

The strategic plan**1. Historical upheavals. Strategic plans.**

The strategy of the party is not something permanent, something fixed once and for all. It changes with historical revolutions, historical movements. These changes are expressed by the circumstance that an independent and specially adapted strategic plan is worked out for every historical upheaval. The strategic plan determines the main line of action to be adopted by the revolutionary forces, and the diagram for the corresponding distribution of the millions of workers on the social battle-field. It goes without saying that a strategic plan applicable to one historical period, and possessing its own specific characteristics, is not applicable to another historical period, distinguished by quite different peculiarities. For every historical revolution there is a strategic plan necessary for this special revolution, and adapted to its tasks.

The same applies to warfare. The strategic plan worked out for the Koltchak war could be of no use in the war against Denikin, and the plan for the latter again, could not be used in the Polish war of 1920, for in all these three cases both the main line of action and the scheme of distribution of the military forces had to be entirely different.

The new history of Russia knows three main historical upheavals which called into existence three different strategic plans in the history of our party. A brief description of these upheavals will be in place here, in order to illustrate in what manner the strategic plans of the party generally change in accordance with the latest historical movements.

2. The first historical upheaval and the movement towards the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia.

This upheaval began at the commencement of our century, at the time of the Russo-Japanese war, when the defeat of the Tzarist army and the great political strikes among the Russian workers aroused all classes of the population and thrust them onto the battle field of political struggles. This upheaval culminated in the days of the February revolution of 1917.

During this period two strategic plans opposed one another within our party: the plan of the Mensheviks (Plechanov-Martov 1905) and the plan of the Bolsheviks (Lenin 1905).

The Menshevik strategy struck the main blow at Tzarism on lines of coalition between the liberal bourgeoisie and the proletariat. As this plan was based on the then prevailing idea that the revolution was a bourgeois one, it assigned the leading role in the movement to the liberal bourgeoisie, and gave to the proletariat the role of "extreme left opposition", the role of motive power for the bourgeoisie, while the peasantry, one of the most important revolutionary forces, was completely or almost completely excluded from the scene of battle. It is not difficult to comprehend that this plan, ignoring as it did a many millioned peasantry, was bound to be a hopeless failure in a country like Russia; and in laying the fate of the revolution in the hands of the liberal bourgeoisie (the hegemony of the bourgeoisie) the plan was reactionary in character, for the liberal bourgeoisie was not anxious for the complete victory of the revolution, and was always ready to bargain with Tzarism.

The Bolshevik strategy (see comrade Lenin's book: "Two tactics") aimed at striking the main revolutionary blow against Tzarism on lines of coalition between the proletariat and the peasantry, the liberal bourgeoisie being neutralized. As this plan was based on the view-point that the liberal bourgeoisie is not desirous of the complete victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and that it prefers to bargain with Tzarism at the expense of the workers and peasants, it assigned the leading role of the revolutionary movement to the proletariat, this being the sole class in Russia consistently revolutionary in character. This plan was not alone distinguished by its correct estimate of the motive forces of revolution, but by bearing within it the germ of the idea of the proletarian dictatorship (the Hegemony of the proletariat). In a flash of genius it foresaw the next and highest phase of revolution in Russia, and facilitated the transition to it.

The next stage of development of the revolution, up to February 1917, fully confirmed the correctness of this strategic plan.

3. The second historical upheaval and the movement towards the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia.

The second upheaval began with the February revolution of 1917, after the overthrow of Tzarism, when the imperialist war was exposing everywhere the deadly wounds which capitalism had suffered; when the liberal bourgeoisie found itself incapable of taking the real administration of the country into its

hands, and was forced to confine itself to clinging formally to its authority (provisional government); when the workers' and soldiers' councils into whose hands the actual power fell, proved to possess neither the capacity nor the will to use this power; when the soldiers at the front, and the workers and peasants in the interior of the country, were thrown into despair by the severity of the struggle and the economic devastation; when the regime of the "double power" and of the "contact commission", eaten up by internal antagonisms and capable of neither war nor peace, entangled the situation more and more. This period ended with the October Revolution of 1917.

Two strategic plans opposed one another at this period within the Soviets: that of the Mensheviks and S.R.'s, and that of the Bolsheviks.

The strategy of the Mensheviks and of the S.R.'s which at first vacillated between the Soviets and the provisional government, between revolution and counter-revolution, assumed its final form at the time of the opening of the democratic conference in August 1917. This final form was the gradual but certain deprivation of power from the Soviets, and the concentration of the whole power of the country in the hands of the "Constituent Assembly", a model of the future bourgeois parliament. The solution of all questions on war and peace, of agrarian and labor questions, and of the national question, were postponed till the convention of the Constituent Assembly, and this convention was again postponed indefinitely. "All power to the Constituent assembly!" was the slogan of the S.R.'s and the Mensheviks. This was the preparatory plan for a bourgeois dictatorship, which, though combed and brushed into "perfect democracy", was none the less to be a bourgeois dictatorship.

The Bolshevik strategy (see the "Theses" of comrade Lenin, April 1917) aimed at the destruction of bourgeois power by the united forces of the proletariat and the impoverished peasantry, based on the *dictatorship of the proletariat* in the form of Soviet republics. The rupture with imperialism and with war, the emancipation of the oppressed nationalities of the one-time Russian empire, the expropriation of the landowners and capitalists, the preparation of the ground for the organization of socialist economics—these were the elements of the Bolshevik plan at that period. "All power to the Soviets!"—was the slogan of the Bolsheviks at that time. This plan is important not only on account of its correct estimation of the motive forces of the new proletarian revolution in Russia, but because it facilitated and accelerated the revolutionary movement in the West.

The subsequent development of events until the October upheaval fully confirmed the correctness of this strategic plan.

4. The third historical upheaval and the movement towards the proletarian revolution in Europe.

The third upheaval began with the *October Revolution*, when the death agony of the two imperialist groups of the West attained its highest point; when the revolutionary crisis in the West plainly showed its development; when in Russia the bourgeois power, bankrupt and entangled in antagonisms, fell beneath the blows of the proletarian revolution; when the action taken by the new Soviet government in the peace question, in the confiscation of land, the expropriation of the capitalists, and the emancipation of oppressed nationalities, gained for it the confidence of millions of workers the world over. This was an upheaval on an international scale, for the international front of capital was broken through for the first time, the question of the overthrow of capitalism unfolded for the first time in actual practice. Thus the October Revolution became transformed from a Russian national revolution, into an international force, and the Russian workers from a backward section of the international proletariat into its vanguard, arousing the workers of the West, and of the oppressed lands of the East, by their self-sacrificing struggles. This upheaval has not yet reached its apex, for it has not fully unfolded on an international scale, but its general trend and significance are already determined with sufficient clearness.

At that time two strategic plans strove against one another in Russia's political circles: the plan of the counter-revolutionists, who drew the active section of the Mensheviks and the S.R.'s into their organizations, and the plan of the Bolsheviks.

The counter-revolutionists, and the active S.R.'s, and Mensheviks united all discontented elements in one camp: the old officers at the front and in the interior; the bourgeois-nationalist governments of the border states, the capitalists and landowners expropriated by the revolution, the agents of the Entente who were preparing an intervention, etc. They maintained their course towards the overthrow of the Soviet government by means of rebellions or foreign interventions for the restoration of capitalism in Russia.

The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, were active in establishing the international security of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, and in extending the sphere of action of the proletarian revolution to all the countries of the world, by means of uniting the proletarian forces of Russia with the forces of the European proletariat, and of the proletariat of the subjugated peoples of the Orient, against world imperialism. An excellent and concentrated formulation of this strategic struggle is given by comrade Lenin in his pamphlet: "*The proletarian revolution and the renegade Kautsky*". Here we find the formulation of the maximum which can be accomplished in one country towards the development, support, and awakening of revolution in all countries. The value of this strategy lies not only in its correct estimation of the motive forces of the world revolution, but in its having foreseen and facilitated the subsequent process of conversion of Soviet Russia into the central point of the revolutionary movement of the whole world.

The subsequent development of the revolution in the whole world, as well as the five years of existence of the Soviet power in Russia, have fully confirmed the correctness of this strategic plan. Facts like the following: that the counter-revolutionists, the S.R.'s and the Mensheviks, who once attempted to overthrow the Soviet power, are now banished into exile, while the Soviet power and the Communist International are becoming the most important instruments in the world policy of the proletariat—these are facts speaking with the utmost clarity for the correctness of the strategic plan of the Bolsheviks.

The Bolsheviks and the Hegemony of the Proletariat

By G. Sinoviev.

Should we wish to express in a single phrase the essential character of Bolshevism, and the rôle played by it in the history of the Russian revolution, we should say: it stands for the hegemony of the proletariat. The real line of division between revolutionary Marxism and every description of "popular" policy, and later on the difference between the two currents within the so-called legal Marxism, between Bolshevism and Menshevism, between "Pravdism" and "liquidatorism" lies in this question of the hegemony of the proletariat. This has been the fundamental antagonism from which have sprung all other antagonisms. This has formed the actual knotty point of all antagonisms. The question of the hegemony of the proletariat has been the problem of problems.

The present formula is: Democracy or dictatorship? But the essential question asked in this formula is again solely, the problem of the hegemony of the proletariat, it is nothing more nor less than the reverse side of this problem.

In the Russian revolution, the founders of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat were Plechanov and Lenin. The "slight" difference existing between Plechanov and Lenin lies only in the fact that Plechanov, who appeared earlier in the political arena than Lenin, was the first to proclaim the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the Russian revolution, but afterwards betrayed this idea at the most important moment in Russia's political history, while Lenin remained true to this fundamental idea for 30 years, pursued it through all the difficult stages of the Russian struggle for emancipation, and founded a party which has realized the idea.

At the Paris international congress of the 2nd International, held in 1889, Plechanov, then the undisputed leader of all revolutionary Marxists in Russia and the intellectual ruler of the then Marxian intelligentsia, uttered the historical truth: "The Russian revolution conquers either as a revolution of the working class, or it does not conquer at all."

This was the shortest and most clear-out formulation of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat. The present generation of Bolsheviks, the working youth of today, may find this thesis of Plechanov's a platitude. Is there any conscious revolutionist today who does not realize that it was only the working class who could be the main power accomplishing the victorious Russian revolution? But at the end of the eighties, Plechanov's words were a discovery, not only for international socialism, but for the Russian labor movement of that time. Plechanov "discovered" the working class in Russia just as Marx and Engels "discovered" the working class in all the capitalist countries in Europe. During the period preceding the historical declaration made by Plechanov, the then revolutionary or rather the popularly inclined intelligentsia leant for support on the "people", that is, on the peasantry. For these popularly inclined elements the working class existed at best as an auxiliary force, as a group of the population which might contribute to the victory over despotism. It was a very great concession when one of the greatest leaders

of the "Narodnayavolya" (The will of the people), Lev Tichomirov, admitted that even the working class was of great importance "for the revolution". And Plechanov had to demonstrate in detail that if this formula were to be made correct, it was necessary to reverse it, to say that "the revolution was of great importance for the working class".

In 1903 Plechanov was still faithful to the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat; he betrayed it for the first time in 1905, that is, precisely at the moment when the great revolution approached, the revolution which served as a full dress rehearsal for the events of the year 1917; precisely at the moment when the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat had to pass through the fiery test of an actual revolution.

The discussion which arose at the 2. congress of our party in 1903, on the occasion of the drafting of the program, served to thoroughly acquaint all conscious workers with this idea. It was no other than Plechanov who settled accounts with the fetish of "democracy". The life of a parliament, universal suffrage — all these depend on circumstances. If any parliament (thus also any constitutional assembly. G. S.) takes up a hostile attitude to the interests of the working class, we should endeavor to shorten its life, to send it to the devil within two days if possible, but not to tolerate it for two years. Theoretically, the case is possible in which a victorious proletariat would deprive its opponents of the franchise. All this was said by none other than Plechanov. And the abolition of capital punishment? But in the case of Nicholas the Bloody? What other punishment was suitable here? Everything depends on the circumstances, on the place and the hour. The interests of the revolution — this is the supreme law. This declared Plechanov amidst the hisses of the future Mensheviks. One part of the congress applauded loudly, while some delegates began to hiss in token of their disapprobation: "If such speeches can meet with approval at a social democratic congress, it is our duty to hiss", declared these delegates. One of these latter was the Menshevik leader Rosanov, whom the Soviet power in 1920 was obliged to sentence for belonging to the party of landowning counter-revolution.

Lenin first formulated the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the Russian revolution, in 1894. The comrades who are engaged in the work of publishing comrade Lenin's complete works, recently discovered a hitherto unpublished and magnificent work written by comrade Lenin in 1894. The title of this work is: "Who are the friends of the people, and how do they fight against the social democrats?" It will appear shortly, and will naturally be studied with the utmost care by every thinking worker. This work is in reply to articles by N. K. Michailovsky and S. Kryvenko, published against the Marxists at the end of 1893 and the beginning of 1894, in the popular periodical *Russian Wealth*. We give the following detailed extracts from this excellent work, which formulates the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat with classic clarity and simplicity.

"It is impossible for the worker not to see that capital is oppressing him, that he has to struggle against the class of the bourgeoisie. And this struggle, which he carries on for the satisfaction of his most immediate economic needs, for the improvement of his material position, inevitably becomes a fight which is not directed against one person, but against the class, that same class which subjugates and oppresses the workers everywhere and in every respect, and not only in the factories and workshops. Thus the factory worker is nothing else than the advanced representative of the whole exploited population (the italics are mine. S.). And if he is to act as such a representative in an organized and obstinate struggle, it is necessary that he receives a simple enlightenment as to his position, an enlightenment on the politico-economic constitution of the system which oppresses him, an enlightenment on the necessity and inevitability of class antagonism."

The bourgeoisie is that class which oppresses the worker everywhere and in every respect, not only in the factories and workshops. And the working class, the factory proletariat, is nothing else than the advanced representative of all the exploited, that is, of the landless peasant as well. Therefore the working class must place itself at the head of all the exploited, that is, it must undertake the hegemony in the fight for emancipation. Vladimir Ilyitch gives further a still more exact economic substantiation of the idea of the proletarian hegemony. He writes:

"This position taken by the factory worker in the collective system of capitalist relations, renders him the sole champion for the emancipation of the working class, for it is only the most highly evolved stage of capitalism, the great machine industry, which can create the material conditions and social forces needed in the struggle. Everywhere else, where less developed forms of capitalism exist, these material conditions are not present: production is scattered among thousands of small

producers. The exploited are generally themselves owners of some small property, and thus belong to the same bourgeois system against which they should struggle. This scattered and individual exploitation binds the workers to one place, separates them from one another, and prevents them from perceiving their class solidarity; it does not enable them to unite by causing them to realize that the cause of their subjection is not this or that person, but the whole economic system. The concentration of capital, on the other hand, inevitably destroys every tie connecting the exploited to the old state of society, to a definite place, to a definite exploiter; it unites the exploited, induces them to think, and creates the conditions rendering an organized struggle possible."

He closes with the following:

"If the advanced representatives (of the working class) appropriate to themselves the idea of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical rôle of the Russian worker; if these ideas become widely spread, and stable workers' organizations arise, which convert the present scattered economic struggle of the workers into a conscious class war, then the Russian worker, having raised himself to the position of leader of all democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the Russian proletariat (side by side with the proletariat of all countries), on the straight path of open political struggle, to the victory of communist revolution."*)

These words, written almost 30 years ago, sound to-day as if they had just been written. His knowledge of Marxian theory, his profound devotion to the working class, and his personal genius, enabled comrade Lenin to make a prophetic declaration 30 years ago.

"In Russia the man of the future is the *muşjik*—so thought the representatives of peasant socialism, the *Narodniki*, in the broadest sense of the word. The man of the future in Russia is the worker—so say the social democrats. Thus in one manuscript was formulated the standpoint of the Marxists."

In this short observation, the essence of the matter is thoroughly grasped. In order to give expression to the present views of the Bolsheviks, in order to exhaustively formulate the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat, it is now necessary to alter the formula as follows. "In Russia the man of the future is the worker who carries the peasantry along with him."

The whole history of Bolshevism is nothing more nor less than a struggle for the realization of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat. Bolshevism has always carried on the same fight, since the days of the "Friends of the People" (1894), until the present day. And during the whole time the struggle has been led by V. I. Lenin. "Kornilov or Lenin"—this was the title given to a whole volume of his "History of the Second Russian Revolution" by the most eminent leader of that party, which fought against the hegemony of the proletariat and for the hegemony of the bourgeoisie in the revolution. We speak of Milyukov; and he was right. The whole character of the year 1917, which decided the fate of Russia, could not have been more briefly and clearly expressed than by these three words: "Kornilov or Lenin".

Those who really desired a hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement, naturally desired the dictatorship of the proletariat after the victory until the end of the fight. In this respect Menshevism was not consistent. When the movement was at its height during the second half of 1915, the influence of prevailing events led the Mensheviks occasionally to acknowledge, in words, the necessity of the hegemony of the working class during the fight against despotism. But on one point the Mensheviks never doubted for a minute—this was a fixed principle—that tomorrow, after the victory, the working class had to offer the power to the liberal bourgeoisie on a salver. And why should it not? A revolution can only be a bourgeois revolution, that is, power has to belong to the bourgeoisie, and the working class must be content with burning its fingers in fetching the chestnuts out of the fire for other people. The famous five volumed Menshevik history of the revolution of 1905, written by the main pillars of Menshevism after the first defeat of the revolution, is based on a clearly formulated "philosophy of history". The revolution of the year 1905 was shattered because the workers suddenly introduced the eight hour day, and alto-

*) In his "Friends of the people" V. I. Lenin draws in many respects, a line of separation between himself and the "Marxist" P. Struve (at that time still claiming the title), but still they both remained in one camp, so to speak, in 1894, and even until the end of the nineties. The opposing poles of this one camp are best characterized on the one hand by the book "Critical Remarks" by Struve, and on the other hand by the concluding words of the "Friends of the People" given above. "Let us learn from capitalism" propounds Struve; "let us lead the Russian proletariat to communist revolution"—thus Lenin. Two classes, two worlds.

gether went beyond the limits acceptable to the liberal bourgeoisie. Indeed, the whole "tactics" of the Mensheviks, during the first period of the February revolution of 1917, were based on this same "philosophy": You may take upon yourselves the whole burden of street and barricade fighting, you workers, but after the victory you must immediately hand over the power into the hands of Milyukov and Gutschkov, for it is a bourgeois revolution . . .

The idea of the hegemony of the proletariat during the movement for emancipation, is the companion idea to a dictatorship of the proletariat during the transition period to the abolition of the state. This is the essence of revolutionary Marxism, and therefore also of Bolshevism. It has been the destiny of our party to carry this great idea into practice. A great part of the difficult road lies behind us.

Through all obstacles, through all the cross-roads and blind alleys of the new economic policy we carry forward the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat; for the proletariat is the sole class able to abolish capitalism and build up the socialist state of society.

The Moscow "blood verdict"

By N. Ulan (Warsaw).

The whole press of Europe is possessed at the moment with the wildest agitative activity against Soviet justice. The Pope, as supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church, protests; he is joined by Lord Curzon in the name of English diplomacy; the Polish Sejm has passed an urgent resolution, and so forth, because the Moscow Revolutionary Tribunal has sentenced 15 priests, including an archbishop and a prelate, to death or imprisonment.

At one blow the humanitarianism of hysterical bourgeois scribblers and of the diplomatists is aroused. The workers of Europe are accustomed to the agitation against Soviet Russia, and understand how to estimate it properly.

What is the truth about the "barbaric" verdict of the workers' tribunal?

It has been proved that Roman Catholic priests, *Russian citizens* of Polish nationality, not only served as spies for Poland during the whole of the frightful civil war in Russia, but that in 1918, at a time when there was no independent Polish state, these God-fearing clericals, together with other White Guards, were preoccupied with a matter so "mundane" as the conspirative preparation of an armed attack on the Soviet power.

And in 1921, when millions of human beings were starving in Russia in consequence of the frightful elemental catastrophe, and the Soviet government was obliged to confiscate the treasures of the church to alleviate the famine by the purchase of corn, these "shepherds of souls" called upon their believing sheep, who are Russian citizens, to resist the laws, and to hinder the confiscation by force.

What government would leave unpunished such crimes against the state?

Perhaps the national state of the defendants, the "People's Republic of Poland", which sentences children from 14 to 16 years of age to years of imprisonment for *unproved* membership in the Young Communist League; which keeps thousands of workers in prison for years on the mere suspicion of belonging to the C.P. of Poland; which delivers over interned women (who were not even sentenced) to be massacred by its executioners; which slays a Russian Red Cross mission, and that—under a socialist government (Moraczewski was prime minister at that time)? The answer is plain!

The Soviet government was obliged to pay some attention to the worldly activity of these "soul-savers", and a house search brought to light an amount of unequivocally indictable material fully sufficing for the most "humane" court of justice in the world to arrive at a similar verdict to that pronounced in Moscow.

For the international proletariat, and in the first place for the Polish proletariat struggling and bleeding under the most difficult conditions, this Moscow verdict is an act of proletarian solidarity; the condemned priests will probably not suffer in the least—the Russian workers' government is neither bloodthirsty nor vengeful—it is most probable that they will be exchanged to Poland for some workers languishing in the Pilsudski dungeons; in Poland the glory of "martyrdom" awaits them, and the lives of some Polish revolutionists will be saved in this manner.

Thus, by means of exchange, Hungarian revolutionists have been saved from the Horthy prisons, and Lettish, Lithuanian, Finnish, Esthonian, and Polish, militants have been released.

For Poland, where the keenest White Terror has raged since the establishment of the "independent republic", where the Communist Party has been driven underground, where verdicts are passed on the basis of the Tzarist Criminal Code, where the prisons are over-filled with workers, this exchange of political prisoners by the proletarian state is an act of revolutionary self-defence.

Many leading Polish militants have been exchanged to Russia—the last transport included the deputies Dombal and Brand—and from here they will return at the first call to their dangerous posts in Poland; and Russia will save the lives of many more.

Thus, and not otherwise, will the Moscow "blood verdict" be judged by the whole class-conscious proletariat.

Labor Conflicts and the Process of Arbitration in Russia.

By B. M. (Moscow).

Soviet legislation provides for a number of organs whose duty it is to intervene in conflicts arising from infringement of the workers' protection laws and of the collective agreements. The supreme local court of appeal, the people's court, comprises as a rule, the people's judge and two assessors delegated by the workers and employees organized in trade unions. The judge is nominated by the Soviet. He is not always chosen from the working class; this office is frequently filled by persons of legal training. Labor disputes are also settled by this people's court.

Besides the people's court of justice, there is also a board of arbitration for the settlement of labor conflicts; on this board both sides are equally represented. Its chief duty is to decide in cases of infringement or conclusion of collective agreements. The board of arbitration endeavors to settle conflicts on lines of mutual arrangement. Should no arrangement be come to, the matter is submitted to the higher court of appeal, the court of arbitration, whose verdict is legally binding. Should conflicts arise in state undertakings, the union possesses the right of taking over the office of court of arbitration. A commission subordinate to the board of arbitration examines the question in dispute, sees that the terms of the collective agreements are observed and at the same time intervenes when conflicts arise in the separate undertakings. On this commission also the parties are equally represented.

The trade unions are given the widest possible opportunity of action in the interests of the working class. The significance and influence of the court of arbitration is illustrated by the following example: A conflict arose in the military workshops of the metal factory at Kostroma. The works management attempted to reduce wages on the occasion of a prolongation of the collective agreement. The management proposed a rise of only 10%, while the metal workers union of this district demanded 20%. The matter was laid before the court of arbitration for decision: the court raised the rate of wages by 25%. The management was obliged to submit to this verdict.

In the period from January to September 1922, the metal workers' union was able to obtain decisions in 710 conflicts in 24 districts, participated in by 47,219 persons.

Between January and September 1922 the metal workers' union recorded fifty nine strikes with a total number of 32,622 participators. Of these 83% were short strikes (up to 5 days), strikes of medium duration (5 to 20 days) 13%, and strikes of longer duration (over 20 days) 4%. In all, 36 undertakings conducted strikes during this period. 59.1% of the strikes ended with positive results for the workers. In 8 cases the strike days were fully paid. Thanks to the general rise of real wages, the strike movement among the metal workers decreased considerably during the last months of the year 1922.

E. C. C. I.

The Blood Bath in Essen.

To the Workers of all Countries!

In Essen, workers' blood has flowed in broad streams. Eleven workers, with the communist Zander at their head, fell dead in the courtyard of Krupp's factory, and some dozens of wounded have been counted. French militarism after committing numerous deeds of violence and cruelty, has begun to illuminate the import and significance of the Ruhr occupation to the world proletariat by the fire of machine guns.

After the occupation of the Ruhr area, the French generals endeavored to convince the working masses of the Ruhr that their measures were only directed against the German capitalists. The

French military authorities attempted, through their agents, to awaken in the workers the belief that they would make no resistance if the workers were to take the production into their own hands, provided the shop stewards would guarantee the fulfilment of the obligations undertaken by the German bourgeoisie at Versailles. But French militarism has been speedily obliged to unmask. The working masses of the Ruhr area, after having fought for years against the rule of the bayonets of the German White Guards, protested with equal energy against the occupation of the factories and works by the troops of French imperialism, and against the disorganization of economic life caused by the occupation. And now the dead bodies of German workers lie there as witness that the bullets of French militarism do not threaten the owners of the undertakings, do not threaten the manufacturers, but the German workers. It is true that the French soldiers did not know what they were doing. They had been commanded to go to the Krupp factory for the purpose of requisitioning motor-cars; suddenly they found themselves surrounded by a multitude of workers numbering thousands, and feeling themselves powerless against this multitude, and fearing it, they opened machine gun fire against the workers.

The German bourgeois press is now shedding tears over the victims of French imperialism. But these are crocodile's tears. This is the same German bourgeois press which approved the merciless shooting down of the workers of the Ruhr valley, when they ventured to raise a hand against the rule of German capital. It is the press of that same bourgeoisie which will call French weapons to its aid the moment that the German workers rise against its rule, and will endeavor to crush the German revolution with the aid of Poincaré. At the bottom of its soul the German bourgeoisie rejoices at the blood bath. At the bottom of their souls the gentlemen of the firm of Krupp rejoice that French soldiers have shot German workers. It is they who have provoked the blood bath, for they have created the situation which was bound to lead to bloodshed.

The German bourgeoisie hopes that the bloody misdeed of French imperialism will distract the attention and anger of the German workers from the insolence of the German capitalists, who earned milliards during the war, concealed their enormous post-war gains from the taxation authorities, and have now happily succeeded in bringing about fresh war in the Ruhr area, enabling them to win further millions by criminal usury in the necessities of life for the masses of the people. The German nationalist bourgeoisie, which thrusts all the burdens and sacrifices involved in its struggle with French imperialism onto the shoulders of the German workers, can be faced with no greater danger than that the German proletariat recognizes as his enemy not only French imperialism, not only Poincaré, but also German capitalism, and the Cuno government. The nationalist agitation carried on by the German bourgeoisie is a piece of bluff; it is certain that the bourgeoisie will continue to try to come to an understanding, and should a section of the working class, seduced by the nationalist phrases of the bourgeoisie, be induced to fight on its side, the bourgeoisie will not hesitate to stab such helpers in the back.

The work done by the proletarian vanguards, and by the communist party, has already opened the eyes of broad masses of the German proletariat. Hand in hand with the French communists, and with the revolutionary trade unions of France, the German communist party and the revolutionary shop stewards have shown the workers of the Ruhr area that they do not stand alone, that the French workers are hastening to their aid. The agitation carried on by the international communists among the occupation troops has been as much hated by the German bourgeoisie as by the French generals. Poincaré and Cuno both began to fear that the French and German proletariats would advance in one united front, against the international iron and coal kings, before they could succeed in defeating the German and French working classes singly, and in coming to a mutual agreement at their expense. The bloody events in Essen are highly welcome to Poincaré and to Cuno alike. It is their object to incite the workers of the Ruhr basin and the French soldiers against one another, to prevent the fraternization of the French and German victims of international capital.

Workers of France! You must destroy this calculation being made by French imperialism. You must make mighty demonstrations all over the country against this rule of the French bayonet over German workers, and show by this protest that you are not willing to tolerate the misdeeds of the French bourgeois government. The blood of the workers who have fallen by the bullets of French soldiers in Essen must not part the French proletariat from the German. On the contrary! The blood of the proletarians murdered in the Ruhr valley must weld us together into one single fighting army.

Workers of Germany, workers of the Ruhr area! You know very well how you must frustrate the calculations of the German capitalists who are driving you onto the bayonets of the French soldiers. Now, more than ever, you must prove to the French soldiers that you see in them the victims of French capitalism, taking the part of executioners of the German working class against their own will. Now, more than ever, you will indignantly reject the appeal of the German capitalists, that you join with them to form a nationalist united front. By fraternizing with the French soldiers you will create the united revolutionary fighting front against international capitalism.

Workers of France! Forth to street demonstrations against the bloody regime of General Degoutte in the Ruhr basin! Into the streets of Paris with the slogan: "Down with the Ruhr occupation! Long live the peace with the German working masses!"

Workers of Germany! Into the streets against the attempt being made by the German nationalists to cast you unarmed onto the French bayonets! Fraternize with the French soldiers! Prove to them that you are the enemies of German capital, and that you remain the brothers of the French workers and peasants, even when French capital sends them as docile instruments into the Ruhr area.

Long live the union of the French and German proletariat!
Down with French imperialism! Down with German capital!

Executive Committee of the Communist International.
Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labor Unions.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

American Democracy on Trial

By C. E. Ruthenberg.

The boasted "American Democracy" is on trial in the little town of Saint Joseph in the State of Michigan, where thirty-two Communists are facing a court because of their advocacy of Communist principles.

The Communist Party of America after a few months of open existence following its organization in September, 1919, was driven underground by a terrific onslaught by the government at the beginning of 1920. In this attack some 6,000 members of the party were arrested and held for deportation and under indictments involving long prison sentences. Only recently Assistant Secretary of Labor, Post, under whose jurisdiction the deportations were carried out, admitted that the arrests of 1920 were largely illegal and that only a few hundred of the 6,000 arrested were actually deported.

In August of 1922 the convention of the underground party was discovered by the police. The convention officers, however, received warning of the impending raid and before the police arrived all but 17 out of the 75 delegates had left the premises. The 17 were arrested and charged with violation of the "criminal syndicalist" law of the State of Michigan. This law forbids the advocacy of sabotage, crime, violence or unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of achieving political or industrial reforms. Later five others who attended the convention were arrested. Among these was William Z. Foster, head of the Trade Union Educational League, the American branch of the Red International of Labor Unions. Because of his influence in the organized labor movement the prosecution decided to put Foster on trial first, each defendant being entitled to a separate trial.

The Communists are now fighting for the right to work in the open in the United States. At the last convention of the Workers' Party a clear-cut Communist program was adopted and fraternal affiliation with the Communist International was announced. The Workers' Party is now the Communist Party in everything but name, that change being referred to a later date. It was decided by the Central Executive Committee of the Workers' Party, to make the trial in the Michigan case part of the struggle for an open existence of the party, by a bold announcement of Communist principles during the trial, and the denial that those principles are criminal.

The trial of William Z. Foster opened at Saint Joseph on March 12th. Saint Joseph is a city of about 8,000 inhabitants, situated in a fruit-growing country on the banks of Lake Michigan. It is a sleepy country town, far removed from the atmosphere of the great cities and their highly industrialized population. Here, before an audience and jury of farmers, fruit growers, petty tradesmen and officials, Communist science, its analysis of capitalist society and its tactics in the class struggle must come up for trial.

The party made its initial move in the trial, by sending ten of its leaders, who had attended the convention but had escaped arrest, to give themselves up to the authorities a day before the trial commenced. At the same time a statement was issued that the Communists would fight for their right to an open advocacy of their principles, and the open existence of the party, and declaring the confidence of the party in the workers coming to its support in such masses that the government would no longer dare to put Communists in prison. This bold step took the government prosecutors off their feet and strengthened the party so much that not one of the ten who surrendered was imprisoned, but all were left free until bail for their appearance was given. This bail was fixed at \$1,000 each, whereas previously it was \$5,000 and in some cases \$10,000.

Under American law, the attorneys for the prosecution and the defense are permitted to question the prospective jurors as to their views on social and economic questions, in order to find out whether they have prejudices which would make them unfair as jurors. The questions asked by the prosecutors and the attorney for the defense indicate that the trial is not a prosecution for crime, but a clash between the Communist and capitalist view of society. The questions clearly show the class lines in the trial.

Some of the questions asked by the prosecutors were: Do you believe in the private ownership of property? Do you believe that the government should protect the accumulated surpluses of private property held by individuals? Are you in favor of a Soviet form of government? Do you believe that the government in this country should be overthrown by violence and a Dictatorship of the Proletariat established?

In contrast to these questions Frank T. Walsh, the noted American lawyer, who is conducting the defense for the Communists, read the following paragraph from the Declaration of Independence, adopted in 1776 when the Colonists rebelled against England:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

He then asked, "Do you believe in the fundamental right of revolution stated in this Declaration?"

Another question asked of the jurors read:

"Would you be prejudiced against the defendant if it appeared in the evidence that he believed that no great social changes have been achieved in past history without a resort to force, and that it was his belief that when a majority of the workers and farmers of the United States demand a change which will abolish the private ownership of the industries of the nation by the capitalists, even though they are in a majority, this change will not be achieved without resort to force, because the capitalists will not give up their privilege without a struggle, although the defendant does not advocate force or violence now?"

A question along the same line, asked by the attorney for the defense was:

"You know that in Hungary the Communists gained power without any violence, the Karoly government surrendering to the Soviets there in 1919, but later the aristocracy and the capitalists, with the help of the Roumanian army, made war on the Soviets and overthrew them, and in Finland the Socialists elected a clear majority to parliament, but their government was later overthrown by the capitalists by force of arms, and in this country the Socialists elected members to the New York legislature who were expelled by their political opponents. Knowing these things, would you be prejudiced against William Z. Foster if it appeared that he and the Communists generally said that the struggle of the workers and farmers against the capitalist system would not be won without force, although they did not advocate any acts of violence at this time, but merely made the historical forecast that force would be necessary?"

The prospective jurors were also questioned as to whether they knew what the Communist International was, how it was organized and the principles which it supported.

At the time this article is written the jury has been selected and the actual trial has begun. The jury consists of nine farmers, one small tradesman, one gate tender for a railroad and one woman, a housewife.

The trial itself will be described in a later article.