

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 3 No. 35 [17]

3rd May 1923

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

CONTENTS

- Karl Radek*: A History Lesson for the Archbishop of Canterbury
- Politics**
 International Capital and the condemnation of the Catholic Priests
 Leaders of the Mesopotamian People to the Communist International
Bertreint: The Comité des Forges, Poincaré, Loucheur, Dariac and Dorten . . .
P. Frölich: The Reparations Program of the 2nd International
A. Ker: France's Finances
- Economics**
E. Varga: Survey of the World Economic Situation in the 1st Quarter of 1923
- In Soviet Russia**
F. Rubiner: Public Education in Soviet Russia
Orchonikidze: Decay of Menshevism in Georgia
- Discussions and Polemics.**
L. Trotsky: A necessary discussion with our Syndicalist Comrades
- In the R.I.L.U.**
 Agenda of the C.C. session of R.I.L.U.
- In the International**
 Worker's Party—the Communist Party in the United States
- In the Colonies**
M. N. Roy: New Phase of the Indian National Movement

A History Lesson for the Archbishop of Canterbury — and a History Lesson on the Archbishops of Canterbury*)

By Karl Radek.

The clergy of England, headed by Randall T. Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, have issued a protest "against the religious persecution in Russia". As a proof of the existence of this persecution, the English clerical confraternity avails itself of the trial of the Catholic Archbishop Zepliak, the impending trial of the orthodox Archbishop Tichon, and—oh horror!—the arrest of the Rabbi of Gomel, about which we have heard nothing, but which is being trumpeted throughout the English press with the object of demonstrating that: If even the timid Jewish Rabbis are being persecuted, then there be can no doubt whatever that in Russia, Beelzebub is wrestling with the Archangels!

When the production of brandy was prohibited in America, the schnaps manufacturers inaugurated a campaign compared with which, even the action of the Archbishop of Canterbury is mere child's play. Hurt in their finest feelings and in their pockets, the schnaps manufacturers marched up with the great cannon of "liberty of the American citizen", which liberty they were convinced was being trampled underfoot by the prohibition of the manufacture of spiritous liquors. The manufacture of

religious spiritual drinks is no less profitable. And therefore we fully comprehend the class solidarity of the English parsons with the Russian. But despite our full sympathy for the reverend English manufacturers of spiritual schnaps, we shall none the less point out to them the many errors they have fallen into in asserting that there is religious persecution going on in Soviet Russia. In order to show what little cause there is for speaking of anything like religious persecution in Soviet Russia, we shall adduce a few examples from the history of England, especially from the history of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the hope that our English comrades will extend this lesson to a course of instruction, which will be highly useful, not so much for the Archbishop of Canterbury, as for the English workers themselves.

How the English kings induced the English church to submit to the state.

We communists are opponents of the liberal conception of the history of the church. The liberal bourgeoisie has flatly denied any merit whatever to the church. We are not such inexorable parson slayers. During the first period of the middle ages, the church was the source not only of spiritual, but also of technical culture. The church not only preserved the inheritance of the Roman Empire, but also that of the eastern. It taught the Teutonic barbarians, who had, for the most part, scarcely crept forth from their forest ravines, how to carry on agriculture and handicrafts. It established communications between the different countries of Europe. And it is not to be wondered at that the church demanded the position of supreme authority over the kingdoms of the middle ages, that it required the kings to regard themselves as its subjects. But scarcely had the feudal state become firmly established, when the struggle over the primacy broke out between the kings and the church.

*) The present Archbishop of Canterbury is the same prelate who, a few years ago, supported the introduction of Chinese Labor in the South African mines, pleading that it was "a regrettable necessity". The reason which impelled the Soviet Government to bring Archbishop Zepliak and other clerical dignitaries to trial was the necessity of preserving the first Workers' Republic from those who would withhold bread from its perishing population. The "regrettable necessity" which prompted His Grace to sanction the introduction of Chinese slaves working under slave conditions into the South African mines was that of filling the coffers of cosmopolitan financiers rolling the rand mines. (Ed)

The English king Henry II. resolved to put an end to the independence of the church. He demanded that the priests be punished like ordinary mortals for common crimes and crimes against the state. In order to realize this aim, he appointed one of the best educated clerics of that time, Thomas A'Beckett, as Archbishop of Canterbury. But Thomas A'Beckett, having ascended his archbishop's throne, wanted to shear his sheep without royal interference. He came into conflict with Henry II., out royal power, and adorned this struggle for clerical domination with the catchword: *liberty of religion*. Henry II., although a good Catholic, was naturally not able to look calmly on at these priestly machinations. Thomas A'Beckett had to fly to France, where he continued his machinations against his native country, aided by the enemies of England. The pope of Rome feared that Thomas A'Beckett's extraordinary zeal might injure the church, and therefore commanded him to make a compromise with the royal power. Thomas A'Beckett returned to England, but was murdered through royal instigation. The king of course publicly expressed his great regret at this sad event, but this regret could not recall Thomas A'Beckett to life.

But Thomas A'Beckett did not rest after his death, but began working miracles from his tomb in Canterbury, miracles not yet prohibited at that time. Thousands made pilgrimages to Beckett's tomb, and the monks of Canterbury earned huge profits. And as the church was thoroughly capable of making a business calculation, it resolved to increase its revenues from the martyrdom and the miracles of the resurrected saint. Thorold Rodgers, professor of economics at the Oxford university, a friend of Cobden and Bright, that is to say, a man not connected with communist cut-throats, but with exceedingly moderate liberal circles, described in his book "Six Centuries of Work and Wages", published 40 years ago, the victory of the archbishops of Canterbury in the following words:

"Beckett died in the winter (a season very unsuitable for travelling); therefore the monks begged the pope for permission to change the day of martyrdom and veneration of the saint to the summer. They bargained with one another long and energetically, as the pope demanded one half of the gross takings. But as the monks declared that they could not undertake the business on these terms, the pope contented himself with half of the clear profits."

Henry II. emerged as the formal victor, but in reality the church was stronger than he, and even John Lackland fell into a state of complete subjection to the pope of Rome. But circumstances changed when strife began within the church itself, enabling the regal power in England to resume supremacy. Henry VIII. had better luck than Henry II. Not only did he subordinate the whole church to himself by having himself proclaimed head of the church in the year 1531, but he began to fleece the church according to all the laws of a profitable business concern. The yearly revenues of the church were estimated at that time at 320,000 pounds, and of this sum the king laid claim to one half. He plundered the monasteries, deprived them of their treasures. He closed the small monasteries and drove out the monks. He was clever enough, however, not to interfere with the princes of the church, but rather to share his gains with them. In a 17th century pamphlet written at the time of the English revolution the "reformation" of Henry VIII. is described as follows:

"Henry VIII., having supplanted the pope by his royal authority, had no intention of alleviating the unhappy situation of the people. He merely replaced the foreign yoke (of the pope of Rome), by chains forged at home; he divided the profits between himself and his archbishops, for whom the Roman pope was entirely superfluous so long as they could retain their dignities and their possessions."

One of the first amongst those dignitaries of the church who, in this case, forgot to rail about the liberty of religion, but on the contrary prostrated themselves before the English despots, was the forerunner of our present defender of "religious liberty", the Archbishop of Canterbury, *Cranmer*. This holy man was so accommodating in the service of kings that he consented to divorce Henry VIII. from Catherine of Arragon, although this marriage had been blessed by the pope of Rome himself. The pretty girl Anna Boleyn had captivated the king, and the Archbishop of Canterbury decided that all the dogmas of the church and all the decisions of its head, the pope, could serve as a comfortable cushion for the epicurean king. And when Henry had tired of Anna Boleyn and decided to have her beheaded, in order to be free to take another wife, again the Archbishop of Canterbury raised no difficulty.

Since then there has been no struggle between the English kings and the church. On the contrary, the kings have been the actual protectors of the church. And when a movement

set in the democratic strata of the population, aiming, not at the extermination of religion—God forbid—but merely at the abolition of the unprecedented power enjoyed by the bishop over the souls of the flock, James I. in the year 1604, expressed himself as follows, to a deputation of Puritans:

"I, the king, will be lord in this country. The hierarchy of the church must be maintained. It is the best support of the throne. I shall teach these Puritans to submit to the church, and if they do not submit, I shall banish them from the country or do worse to them: I shall have them hanged and be done with them."

Thus, there is nothing surprising in the fact that since this time, the bishops and the English rulers have been the best of friends. "Protect us with the sword, and we shall protect you with the pen."—thus they declared in their proclamation of 1624.

Let us sum up this first chapter in our history lesson: At first the church attempted to establish its rule over the propertied classes, with the result that the Archbishop of Canterbury was beheaded. But when the feudal power, the kings and the landowners, frightened the church out of its wits by plundering the lesser clergy, and dividing the booty with the latter defenders of the faith showed themselves not only willing to pander to every kingly desire, to every landowner's whim, but they even allowed the kings to interfere in all matters of religion and the church, and to determine what religion is.

Another fact. A considerable portion of the property of the present English aristocracy originated in the church property robbed under Henry VIII., who divided it among the spiritual and secular oligarchs. When the descendants of these robbers of church property protest in the name of religion against our "robbery" of the treasures of the church, every thinking English workman must laugh in their faces.

But—thus the Archbishop of Canterbury—why do you republicans and revolutionists imitate the feudal kings?

But your Grace will allow me to say: In the first place you have never broken with this feudal past, in which the Archbishops of Canterbury played a very active part. And then you are of the opinion that your protest carries special weight precisely because you fill the office occupied by the oldest archbishops of England. But to come to the essential point, we must tell you: That which the Soviet power is now doing has nothing whatever in common with that which was done by the feudal kings to the church with that to which your church submitted when it saw that the royal arm was powerful. The Council of People's Commissaries has not proclaimed itself head of the church; it has no desire to appoint bishops, and makes no attempt to lay down 31 points for the church, as Henry VIII. did. The Soviet government permits every citizen to believe what he will, and to carry on religious propaganda, just as it permits unbelieving citizens to carry on anti-religious propaganda. It does not interfere with the internal affairs of the church, it only demands that the clergy, like all other citizens, respect the laws of the republic. Henry VIII. plundered the church in order to make presents to his toadies, archbishops, and courtiers, and the English church was mute when its princes received gifts from the king, derived from the property robbed from the church. But the Soviet power commanded the treasures of the church to be gathered in the safe the starving from death. The Zepliaks and Tichons, who prostrated themselves before Tsarism, resisted the measures taken by the Soviet government, measures aimed at saving millions of human beings from death by starvation. And the Archbishop of Canterbury who defends these priests is a worthy successor of that Archbishop of Canterbury Cranmer, who trod underfoot the commands of the pope of Rome in order to satisfy a monarch's lust. His Grace appeals for religious liberty. We will recall to his memory another chapter from the history of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

How the Archbishops of Canterbury defended religious liberty against the rebellious workers and peasants.

It was in the 14th century. At this time the English church was in a state of utter confusion. The monks, high and low, occupied themselves with debauchery; they robbed the population and sent a considerable portion of the proceeds to the pope, who was the tool of the French kings. A movement arose against this among the educated classes, under the leadership of Wyclif, an ecclesiastic and professor at the university of Oxford. Wyclif demanded that the English church should separate itself from the pope of Rome, and preached that the priests should live simply, as Jesus Christ lived. These sermons of Wyclif met with the approval of the textile workers, who at that time lived wretched lives, and were not pleased at being shorn by the priests. Wyclif also found many followers among the peasants,

who were being crushed by the priests and the landowners. The movement known as the Lollard movement began, and was joined even by a section of the poorer clergy, headed by John Ball. John Ball's agitation expressed the struggle against the exploitation by the priests and landowners. We take the following speech of this monk from a contemporary chronicle:

"Good people, things will never go well in England so long as goods be not in common, and so long as there be villains and gentleman. By what right are they whom we call lords greater folk than we? On what grounds have they deserved it? Why do they hold us in serfage? If we all came of the same father and mother, of Adam and Eve, how can they say or prove that they are better than we, if it be not that they make us gain for them by our toil what they spend in their pride? They are clothed in velvet, and warm in their furs and their ermines, while we are covered with rags. They have wine and spices and fair bread; and we oat-cake and straw, and water to drink. They have leisure and fine houses; we have pain and labor, the rain and wind in the fields. And yet it is of us and of our toil that these men hold their state."

This speech contains nothing against religion; on the contrary, John Ball appeals to the holy scriptures. But the Archbishop of Canterbury held this speech to be blasphemy, had John Ball imprisoned and excommunicated. John Ball got off pretty lightly, but thousands of Lollards were burnt, and in this persecution the leading role was played by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Arundell. Professor Thorold Rodgers, mentioned above, writes on this archbishop as follows:

"He is known as the author of the law for burning heretics at the stake, a law compelling the authorities of the county of Canterbury to carry out the death sentence. The princes of the church declared, with revolting hypocrisy, that they did not wish to kill, and induced the king to issue the regulation obliging the authorities to commit that which they would not do with their own hands."

Arundell is also the author of another law: On the pretext of combatting heresy, the lesser clergy were forbidden to preach without permission; this permission had to be paid for. The purpose of this measure was to ensure that the king should hear nothing of the dissatisfaction aroused by his regime."

The history of the archbishop of Canterbury shows us that: When the king proclaims himself head of the church, when he determines its doctrines, and even when he plunders it a trifle, all this is "freedom of religion" so long as he divides the spoil with the archbishop. But when the pious workers and peasants, basing their demands on the holy scriptures, ask that the priests renounce their luxury, their gormandizing and drinking, that they live with the people—then this is a blasphemy for which the Archbishop of Canterbury has thousands of working people executed.

It is now clear that the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, is fighting, in the so-called year of our Lord 1923, for the same aims as his predecessors fought in the 14th and 16th centuries. The priest John Ball, who preached the truths of communism in the crude phraseology of the 14. century, was as heartily hated by the then archbishop of Canterbury as the "agents of Moscow" are hated by the archbishop of Canterbury of the 20th century. Why should his Grace not step forward as the defender of Tichon, the champion of Tsarism, of the capitalists, and the landowners! But the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall T. Davidson, is not actuated merely by hate of the Lollard movement which has risen from the dead and is victorious in far Russia in this 20th century. He is not acting out of sympathy with the Russian landowners and Russian capitalists only. Our history lesson must conclude with a leaf from the present:

The incorruptible relics of Saint Urquhardt.

Once upon a time there lived a follower of the true faith, an Englishman by the name of Leslie Urquhardt. As in the days of old devout monks often took up their staffs and wandered into far off countries, where the savages knew nothing of trousers or shirts, and attempted to teach these wild beings that they had immortal souls and were the children of God, even though they had nothing wherewith to cover their nakedness,—so this monk of the church of capital, Urquhardt, made a pilgrimage into the savage land of the Russians, in order to there propagate the holy faith in the mighty god of capital. And like all high priests, Leslie Urquhardt managed to feed himself so well in our country that he can now only speak of it as a Paradise Lost. The Russian savages insulted this holy man. They offered resistance to the Tsar, to the landowners, and to the gods of capital, and even drove Urquhardt out of his factories.

It is not every saint who can be characterized by patience. Many of the saints in the days of old drew their swords and

behaved very much as if they were ordinary brawlers. The holy Urquhardt did not belong to the patient ones. He ran to Koltchak, and wanted to tear from us by force the people's treasures which had been taken from him. He placed himself at the head of the crusade against Soviet Russia. His spirit inspired all the knights of the pen in capitalist England, and many were the appeals which these published for the annihilation of this nest of robbery and blasphemy. But when Soviet Russia was victorious, then the holy Urquhardt decided that it was consistent with his holiness to pardon. He made up his mind to strike a bargain with us. He shared the gains with the devil, and promised to serve him faithfully and honorably. But the Soviet devil, when he read the contract, found that he was going to be cheated, and declined to do business. The holy man is now sitting in his cell on the Exchange and waiting for the Bolshevik miscreants to reform. An hundred times did he promise to wait in patience, but when the uproar began with the trial of Ziepliak and the shooting of Budkievich, he could contain himself no longer. He assembled the offended creditors of Russia, and proposed to them that they demand that relations with Soviet Russia be broken off, not only on account of the persecution of the church, but in consideration of the fact that—trade with Russia brings but little profit. He is not inclined to carry on business with the Bolshevik devil for such small gains.

As we have already said, Leslie Urquhardt is a holy man, and knows how to work miracles. When he feels sad, the leader of the Labor Party (Clynes) sends us telegrams and begs the Soviet government not to grieve the ambassador of the god of capital. When Urquhardt is of the opinion that pressure would be useful to expedite the concessions of the Soviet government, then the Archbishop of Canterbury weeps over the suppressed rights of the Catholic, Jewish, and orthodox churches.

A piece of advice to Saint Urquhardt.

Mr. Urquhardt, do not play with fire, or you will burn your fingers again. And you will have to change your religion again, as you had to after Koltchak's defeat. Can you not wait a while? We are not so very hard hearted, and everything comes to him who waits.

A piece of advice to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Most reverend Dr. Randall T. Davidson! I, a man incompetent in matters of the church, have given you this lesson in history. If you persist in lying, then the Comintern will send you two experts on the subject, who will compile for you such a history of the archbishopric of Canterbury as will make you sick. As it is not permissible to burn anybody at the stake in England today for such deeds, the good-for-nothing English communists will print this whole history, containing all your sins and the sins of your predecessors, and even the sins of their illegitimate children, and will have copies of this history distributed by the million. Why run this risk? It is much better that you sit quietly at home, eat your pudding, drink your porter, read English novels if that is not too tedious for you, and leave Soviet Russia alone!

POLITICS

International Capital and the Condemnation of the Catholic Priests

"We shall have peace upon this Earth when the last king is strung up by the guts of the last priest." (Diderot).

Something horrible has happened in that abode of barbarism—Soviet Russia. A Catholic archbishop, who had "saved" the treasures of the church, accumulated by Catholic priests during centuries by every species of base trickery, from being utilized for feeding the starving masses of the people, has been condemned to death by the revolutionary tribunal of the Soviet republic. Until the revolution, the courts of justice worked hand in hand with the priests, for the priest and the judge both invariably defended the exploiter. But in this terrible Soviet Russia, everything is turned upside down. The tribunal defends the cause of the working population, defends the starving, while the priests of the Catholic and orthodox creeds persist in remaining in their old positions, and continue to defend capital, to defend the land-owners. It is no wonder that the whole "civilized" world shrieks aloud at this betrayal by the tribunal of the "eternal laws of justice". It is not to

*) Editor of the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique* and ideologist of bourgeois revolutionary France.

be wondered at that the whole "civilized" world takes it upon itself to defend the Catholic archbishop, whose sacred duty it is to protect ill-gotten gains against the starving population. Roman Catholic Spain howls with the others, and how could this be otherwise? In this magnificent country the Catholic priests, for many centuries, burnt every opponent of feudal order, even if he had merely sinned in thought against the Catholic church.

And Mr. Herriot, the "friend" of Soviet Russia, the representative of the radical free-thinking French bourgeoisie, adds his shrieks to the rest. The bourgeoisie whom he represents acted differently at the time of its revolution; then it guillotined the Catholic priests, expropriated church property—and not merely to feed the starving, but to found a revolutionary army to fight against that feudal order which was supported by the priesthood. Such priests as ventured to act against the decisions of the Convention or of the Committee for Public Safety were rapidly despatched to that kingdom with which they had consorted the starving and suffering. But these priests did not even require to resist the decisions of the revolutionary powers in order to secure a ticket to heaven; it sufficed if they refused to swear complete submission, or when they hid themselves. But over a century has passed since that time. The French large and petty bourgeoisies are no longer in conflict with the landowners. They are themselves an exploiting and oppressing class. They have passed through the battle of 1848 and the massacre of French workers in 1871. And thus it is a matter of course that the radical French bourgeoisie, now being in conflict with the workers here upon earth, has felt itself obliged to conclude peace with heaven and its representatives,—with those deceivers of the people, the priests. The last lame attempt made by the French bourgeoisie at separation of church from state was carried out by that last of the Mohicans of the radical bourgeoisie, Combes; and the present French government is engaged in rubbing down the sharp edges of this attempt. No wonder that the free-thinking Mr. Herriot, the enemy of every church, who prays at Lyons fair to the god of profit, is also filled with horror at our verdicts.

The reformed Jewish Rabbis of New York are also protesting. They were persecuted for centuries by the Catholic church. The Jewish people were slaves among slaves; but the venerable rabbis have forgotten the old enemy; today Jewish bankers rule the world. Why should the rabbis not protest against the punishment of counter-revolutionists in monks' cowls? Today it is your turn, tomorrow mine. Soviet Russia will not be ashamed of hanging the spiritual representatives of the banking house of Rothschild Bros., should the revolution demand it.

The whole world bourgeoisie rises as one man to protect one of the instruments of its domination. The Catholic church is not the main weapon of capitalist rule—the latter is supported by other churches, by the press of all bourgeois parties, and even by free-thinking science. But world capital cries out—lay no finger on one of my servants! And when the protestant clergyman and the Jewish rabbi rise to protect capital, to protect its servant the Catholic church, when the corrupt press and no less corrupt science undertake the defence of capital, how can then the flunkies and simple Simons of capital, the opportunist party leaders, remain silent? The honorable veteran leaders of the opportunist workers of England, are also disquieted. As they have not the courage to break with the bourgeoisie, they have naturally not the courage to break with the spiritual servants of the bourgeoisie either. In the forties of the last century, the revolutionary workers collected their pence to publish the works of Feuerbach against all religion. The leaders of England's reformist workers go to church in Sunday clothes and silk hats, in order to be like other "respectable" people. That which is deception on the part of scoundrels is conviction in the case of the honest but stupid representatives of the English working class. The veteran Lansbury wants to forge a weapon out of the church and out of religion, for the emancipation of the working class, and the veteran Ben Turner sends us a telegram: "Human life is precious. Do not execute the archbishop." The English labor party would not expend a tenth part of the money for a protest telegram against the execution of striking workers in South Africa. But as soon as it is a question of parsons, then the labor party remembers that human life is sacred, and Lansbury appeals to our magnanimity. This is the best possible object lesson to the revolutionary worker, showing plainly that world capital relies not only on the bayonet, on priestly deceptions, and on the bourgeois press and science, but that its last and perhaps strongest support is the mental slavery of the reformist labor leaders.

The leading voice in this common choir of the world bourgeoisie and world counter-revolution is that of bourgeois Poland.

And Poland has a right to lead. Poland boasts even today, that she has been for centuries the stronghold of Christianity against the Tartars. Today, the Polish landowners and Polish-Jewish capitalists are no longer threatened by Tartars. They are threatened by the Musjik whom they plunder; they are threatened by the workers. And the Polish bourgeoisie can proudly maintain that it has no old traditions of a struggle against the church with which it has to break. During the best period of Polish liberalism, it fought against the Schlachta and its main support Catholic clericalism, but this fight consisted at most in the publication of two to three weekly periodicals. The so-called Polish positivism never went any further than the translation of a few anti-religious books. Therefore the leader of this party, Sventohovski, was able to end his career without any qualms of conscience in the most reactionary and clerical Polish party, the national democratic party. It was only to be expected that this confraternity would join in the chorus uniting "their" priests. But the impudence of Polish reaction exceeds all expectation. The Polish prime minister, General Sikorski, in an official communiqué and in an official Sejm speech, had the brazenness to interfere in the most insolent manner in the internal affairs of Soviet Russia, and to threaten the Soviet government with reprisals on account of this verdict. We should really be terribly afraid of Mr. Sikorski, were his arms not so short. In 1918 we were threatened by a somewhat stronger personality than this evanescent statesman of the Polish republic; the English minister for foreign affairs, Balfour, threatened to harrass us by land, water and air, if we would not renounce our "crimes". The Soviet government indignantly rejected the threats of the representative of the mightiest capitalist state of Europe. It continued to act as the interests of the Russian proletariat and of the Russian peasantry demanded, and Mr. Sikorski is not the man to frighten the Soviet government. We reply briefly to all Mr. Sikorski's threats, and to the threats of the Polish bourgeois press, with a curt "Hands off!"

The All Russian central executive committee confirmed the fact that the verdict is fully in accordance with the sense of justice of the revolutionary proletarian masses, that the revolutionary tribunal has acted rightly in sentencing to death those Catholic priests who resisted the relief action in aid of millions of starving people, and who conspired against the Soviet laws. But at the same time, the Central Executive committee has had to take into consideration the circumstance that the poorer Catholics had much to suffer under the yoke of Tsarism. In order that the Catholic masses should not regard the conviction of the archbishop Zieplak as a continuation of the Tsarist policy of persecution against the Catholic church, the C.E.C. remitted the death sentence into one of ten years imprisonment. But with regard to the priest Budkevitch, not even this extenuating circumstance could be pleaded. He was an agent of the Polish government, and carried on his counter-revolutionary activity not out of religious conviction, or of religious fanaticism, like Zieplak, but in the interests of a foreign bourgeois power. The monk's cowl is not to be used as a cloak for spying, or for counter-revolutionary activity in the interests of powers which are hostile to us; still less is it to be used to serve the interests of powers preparing to attack us.

International counter-revolution may shriek as much as it likes. Soviet Russia did not permit the imperialist powers to interfere in her interior affairs even when she was still weak. And today she will permit it still less!

The leaders of the Mesopotamian people to the Comintern

We append a letter from the representatives of the Mesopotamian people to the Comintern, and the reply of Comrade Zinoviev. The fact that representatives of a whole oppressed people appeal to the Comintern for aid is the best proof that the Communist International is the sole international institution which really and sincerely defends the interests of oppressed peoples. The writers of this letter (the supreme representatives of Mesopotamia) were expelled from the country last year by the English, and are at present in Persia. Ed.

Letter of the representatives of the Mesopotamian people to the Comintern.

Teheran, December 21, 1922.

To the President of the Communist International.

Dear Sir,

With reference to the agreement concluded on October 23, 1922, between the English government and Emir Feisal, we permit ourselves to draw your attention to the fact that the military occupation of Mesopotamia by English troops was originally

undertaken on the pretext of protecting the liberty and independence of this country.

This intention on the part of the English government was declared several times in official English publications in Mesopotamia and other countries.

After the occupation of Irak, the English did not hesitate to unveil their real aims: the annexation and the open subjugation of this Musselman country.

In reply to this attack the population of Mesopotamia, in the year 1919, succeeded by means of general risings in curbing the imperialist greed of Great Britain. Britain was finally forced to recognize the independence of Mesopotamia, and to form a constitutional government under Feisal, the son of king Gedsha. The people of Mesopotamia, having no faith in English cunning and intrigue, accepted the new government with reserve only, and adopted a waiting attitude with regard to the policy pursued by the government.

This government threw off its mask by unexpectedly (without the knowledge and approval of a national assembly or of any leading personalities of the country) signing the unhappy convention with England, backed up by the power of the English sword only. What fate this convention would have encountered, had it been submitted to a parliament or plebiscite, is only too obvious. There is universal agreement upon the fact that this convention is an attack on the sovereignty of the people and on the independence of the country; for this purpose the guarantees formulated by the English have been controverted by the facts. We appeal to you, as president of the Communist International, to your sense of humanity and that of your honored colleagues: Will you accord your attention to the situation into which our country is plunged by the violation of the principles of the League of Nations, and will you help us to emancipate ourselves from the tyrannical yoke of the English, whose presence in Mesopotamia may be regarded as a permanent threat against general peace.

Please accept the expression of our highest esteem. The supreme representatives of Mesopotamia.

Comrade Zinoviev's reply.

Honored friends,

I have read your letter with the greatest interest for your cause. The tragic history of the subjugation of Mesopotamia is the clearest possible expression of the hypocritical and treacherous policy pursued by the English government. And where has English imperialism ever acted otherwise? In India, Egypt, South Africa—everywhere we find the same policy of lies, treachery, and ruthless cruelty.

I have just gathered from newspaper reports that another extensive revolt has broken out in Mesopotamia, in consequence of the unceasing repressions on the part of the English. The Communist International will follow the course of this heroic struggle with the greatest attention. It is probable that the English executioners will attempt not only to drown the new movement in the blood of the Mesopotamian population, but also to split it up from within by some trick. There are already rumours that the English in Mesopotamia contemplate the proclamation of a general amnesty for the arrested and banished leaders of the freedom movement, and that they are even prepared to admit national ministers into the government of the traitor Emir Feisal.

I am confident that your past experience will induce you to reject these hypocritical concessions on the part of Sir Percy Cox. All that he is aiming at is favorable elections for the confirmation of the treaty between England and Irak—and for the security of his bloody rule in Mesopotamia.

In your letter you refer to the fact that the regime introduced by English imperialism into your native country is a violation of the principles of the League of Nations. Here there seems to be a grave misunderstanding. The League of Nations was called into existence after the war, by the imperialist victors: England, France, etc., in order that the vanquished might be the better robbed. It is precisely England who now heads this institution.

Thus the "principles" of the League of Nations differ in no way from those "high principles" now being put into practice in Mesopotamia by England, and realized by a bombardment of the defenceless population from aeroplanes. I beg in all friendship to draw your attention to this misunderstanding, and request that you enlighten all those who share your views on the matter, in order to avoid the serious errors rendered inevitable by an incorrect estimate of the true character of the so-called "League of Nations".

The emancipation of Mesopotamia will never be attained with the aid or support of this or that imperialist state or League of Nations, but by the organized struggle of the broad masses of the town and country population of Irak against the occupation. These masses are to be convinced that their material position

will be alleviated and improved when the English are driven out; all traitorous Mesopotamians, with Emir Feisal at their head, who are seeking for personal enrichment from the oppression of the people, are to be exposed to the contempt they deserve; the confidence of the neighbouring countries is to be won; and when all this is realized, then the victorious end of your heroic struggle against English imperialism is secured.

The Communist International, which unites the millions of revolutionary workers and peasants of England, France, Germany, Russia, etc., assures you of its sympathy and support in your fight for liberty.

Should you think it useful, honored friends, to journey to Moscow, I shall be most pleased to welcome you.

Should events keep you in Persia, I should like to ask you to collect documents, material, and photographs on the English regime in Mesopotamia.

Should you think it possible to write a pamphlet on the same subject, I consider that it would be useful to have this published in European and English languages.

With most cordial greetings,

G. Zinoviev.

President of the Communist International.

The Comité des Forges, Poincaré, Loucheur, Dariac and Dorten

By Bertraint (Paris).

Dr. Dorten, the champion of Rhenish separatism, granted to the *Matin* an interview which this newspaper published in its edition of April 11th.

We append a few of the "great ideas" of this chief of state, who is at the present time without office.

"If you demand from a man of the Rhine country that he assume a high position, that is, that he in a certain sense appoint himself, despite the frequently bloody reprisals of the German government, do you not think that he should then be given certain guarantees?"

"And yet you are of the opinion that these honest people, these peaceful and unassuming Rhine country patriots, of whom I possess a complete special list, can take over the positions of Prussian officials without your having given them the assurance that France is a strong country, and that they have nothing to fear from the return of Prussian policy of violence?"

"In spite of all this we, my friends and I, have experienced nothing but half measures, although the Ruhr occupation created a most favorable opportunity. The French authorities have never issued an absolutely inexorable command, which would have been able to impart confidence to the Rhenish patriots, and which would certainly have been obeyed..."

"In our Rhine country we are very susceptible to prestige and authority. Nothing whatever is to be attained by mere administrative reforms, for in this respect you cannot compete with the Prussians we are accustomed to great names and great historical figures. Caesar and Charles the Great made the Rhine country into a fraternally united land, allied to France. The Swedish conqueror Gustavus Adolphus wanted to raise Mayence to his capital city. Napoleon I. left ineradicable recollections behind him..."

We may now draw a parallel between Dr. Dorten's positions and the spirit displayed in the report of the French chamber deputy Dariac, commissioned by Poincaré to work out an *enquete*.

I append a few remarkable extracts from this report:

"By this (a prolonged occupation) France would at the same time protect the Rhenish population from a speedy return of the Prussian fist, and would allay its fears as to its fate..."

"The troops of Louis XIV, of Louis XV, and Napoleon, were there (in the Rhine country) in succession, and were alternately replaced by those of Frederick the Great and Blücher..."

There is thus complete rapport between the Dorten interview and the Dariac report.

Allusions to historical recollections, to hesitation on the part of the population to committing itself to separatist manoeuvres on account of alleged fear of the Prussian return after evacuation, to submission to the authority of prestige and violence; in short, the characterization of the inhabitants of the occupied provinces agrees in every point.

But at the same time some considerations intrude themselves. Who would not admire "so spontaneous" an inclination to separation which first requires the military protection of Foch before coming out in the open.

What can we say to this Rhenish patriotism, which bows its head to violence?

These Rhineland patriots are so numerous that Dr. Dorten can carry a complete list about with him in his pocket, or can

keep it in his writing table drawer! This alone suffices to show the whole extent, force, and sincerity of the "Rhenish freedom movement!"

Dr. Dorten and his small cabal, who pretend to represent the Rhine country, bow to the power of French imperialism, hesitate to commit themselves to anything without previous guarantees, and are afraid that the French occupation will cease.

But how much does this serial manufacture of artificial Rhenish patriots actually cost the French government? How high is the price of this dirty and yet precious raw material, which represents the political emasculation of Dr. Dorten and his clique?

A few historical reminiscences may shed some light on this.

The occupation general Mangin, this colonial butcher, who drove whole regiments to a terrible death in the German barbed wire in Champagne — it was this general who called the Dorten separatist gang into existence immediately after the war, obviously with the approval of the French government.

But as he attempted to force matters a little too clumsily, he evoked a violent protest from the United States, which feared competition from a France not only having the iron of Lorraine at its disposal, but also the coal of Westphalia.

On this, Mangin was recalled from his post by the French government, which was obliged by the international situation to place a mute on its Rhenish reparation violin.

But Mr. Poincaré stood on the battlements of the temple and watched.

In his capacity of prime minister, he cheerfully continued the policy which he had pursued during the war as president of the French republic.

For as early as May 1915 he concluded that notorious treaty with Tsarist Russia, according to which France undertook to help Russia to gain possession of Constantinople in return for a free hand in the Rhine country.

Tsarist Russia meanwhile collapsed, but Poincaré's plan, and his determination to realize this original aim of his, continue to exist.

Poincaré demands from England that he be left free to pursue his Rhine policy, in return for the support lent by France to England in the struggle for the Mossul petroleum.

But he is manoeuvring with the utmost caution, and in strict accordance with the instructions imparted him by his most devoted bosom friend Dariae.

Dariae points out, in the report mentioned above, that it will be impossible for Germany to pay the reparations imposed upon her by the Versailles peace treaty within the terms given.

"We cannot demand," says he, "that Germany pay these gigantic sums within 35 years."

On the other hand Mr. Dariae defends the right of the bailiff.

"As creditor, France has received the Rhine country as a guarantee. As payment is not forthcoming, she retains this pledge, makes it useful for her own purposes, and informs all concerned of this decision."

The one great idea dominating Poincaré's policy is to impose such impossible conditions on Germany that France is not obliged to withdraw from the Rhine country.

But all this is only a modest beginning. Let us hear what Dariae has to report further:

"The first action taken by this policy must be the organization of Rhine country finance, the creation of a customs barrier closed towards the East, that is, to Germany, and open towards the west, that is, to France, in order to prevent that economic strangulation of the country which would of necessity result from a double wall of customs.

The second act must be the displacement of all Prussian officials by Rhenish. (The Dorten clique is already lurking behind the door.)

The third action would be the extension of the authority of the Supreme Interallied Commission, and the convention of an elected (that is, elected under the protection of the French bayonets) legislative assembly."

All this may be designated as an ambitious plan, but if it is carried out with care and caution, and at the same speed at which Germany evades her obligations, it would be perfectly justified.

"The policy to be pursued here is a farsighted one, in which skilful diplomacy must pace one stone of carefully considered action on another, until the Rhine country liberated by this action separates from Germany under the military protection of France and Belgium."

As a matter of fact, since November 1922, when Dariae's report was written, Poincaré has added the heavy stone of the Ruhr occupation to the massive edifice, of French imperialism.

But this has only led to a sharper pursuance of his policy. And the new reparation program just published by the *Daily Telegraph*, prompted to this periodical by Loucheur, already provides for the creation of an autonomous Rhine state.

The *Comité des Forges*, Poincaré, Loucheur, Dariae, and Dorten, all speak exactly the same language.

The French imperialist firm has a well trained staff. And this is quite natural, for the employer, the business manager, the recently engaged commercial traveller, the employee, and the office boy, all express themselves in exactly the same language.

In the face of all this it is the duty of the international proletariat to raise a clear and determined voice, and to make thorough preparations for the struggle.

The reparations program of the Second International

By Paul Frölich.

The profoundest silence is being preserved on the subject of the reparations program drawn up by the Second International at its Conferences in Berlin and Paris. This silence is certainly not intended as a confession that this program will not bear the light of day. No, it is a diplomatic secret. This program, as we shall see, accomplishes the transition from profane class war — the gentlemen of the social democratic parties will pardon the hard word — to "higher politics".

We must be grateful to Mr. Jean Longuet, who is now introduced to us not only as the grandchild of Karl Marx, but also as the godchild of M. Clemenceau — we must be thankful to him that he at least permits us to read the initials of this epoch-making document. This he does in the *New York World* of March 31, where he writes as follows:

"The *World* cannot expect me to break my obligation to preserve silence on our negotiations, but I can make certain definite statements as to the results obtained.

Our plan, which has been worked out by the great German socialist Hilferding and the brilliant young French deputy Auriol, permits of the whole debt being completely paid off within three years. The loan required for this has to be raised by a financial consortium.

Such a plan would place France in a position to receive the 41 milliard francs of reparation payments which she has already expended, as well as the remaining 50 milliards which she requires, while 10 or 15 milliards would go to Belgium.

The plan is based on a reduction of the reparation obligations to the payments for the devastated districts, and abandons most of the foolish demands for the payment of war pensions, introduced by Lloyd George into his Versailles treaty.

At the same time the plan provides for the annulment of the various war debts and securities by a mutual *God's peace treaty*."

This is delightful! For four years the whole world has been racking its brains to find out how the economics of the world, thrown out of gear, are to be set working again by the aid of Germany's payment of debts. On this account we are undergoing the severest economic crises, the acutest international antagonisms, the war in the Ruhr, the danger of a new world war. And the Second International has a recipe for satisfying everybody within three years. And this recipe, the creation of the great Hilferding and the brilliant Auriol, is kept a secret! The Second International knows how to raise a loan which would enable Germany to pay more than 100 milliard francs to France and Belgium within three years. But how this devilish loan is to be raised, under what guarantees, etc. remains the secret of the Second International. Or does it let the secret leak a little? In the *Populaire* of April 11, the brilliant young deputy Vincent Auriol congratulates himself on the agreements made by Loucheur in London. He states that the *Matin*, in an apparently semi-official notice, declares that the French government is not against Loucheur's plan so long as France's share does not fall below 26 milliard gold marks.

Mr. Vincent Auriol further informs us that the Frankfort program (2. Intern. 1922) has formed the basis for the present specialized and detailed program. This agrees with Loucheur's loan guarantees. And what are these guarantees? In the *Daily Telegraph* we read:

4. After passing through a successful financial operation, Germany will receive loans guaranteed by railways, canals, duties, and "other methods of suitable security".

5. The Rhine country will become a demilitarized federal state within the confines of the Reich, under the supervision of an international police. The Saar area will be affiliated to it.

The program thought out by the great Hilferding and the brilliant Auriol thus agrees, in its guarantee paragraphs, with

a plan which would rob Germany of her most important financial sources and positions of economic power, and would dismember and colonize her.

Now we are quite willing to believe that Mr. Auriol's article, in which he states triumphantly that Poincaré's path leads from the Ruhr to Frankfort, that is, to the bosom of the beatific Second International, was merely born of a small demagogic need of the day. But with demagoguery he has betrayed, against his own will, the real essential character of his program.

Apart from the Utopian character of this piece of bungling, a character sufficiently apparent from the few facts mentioned, it is a program based on purely bourgeois mentality. It is the program of the victor, dictated to the vanquished. And it could not be otherwise, for it is the program of an International which is internally cleft asunder by national antagonisms, and is only held together by the need of maintaining its agitation and its mass deception; an International within whose own confines there are victors and vanquished. It is the program of an International which still regards the treaty of Versailles as something sacred, however much it may talk to the contrary, which still regards Germany as vanquished and thus guilty, condemned to pay even if it perishes in the attempt. An International upon which the idea never dawns that this same Germany, which it holds to be vanquished and guilty, the Germany which is to be made to pay with its last drop of blood, is none other than the Germany of the working and starving, the Germany of the proletariat.

No, such an International can never draw up a socialist program for saving the world out of its chaos. For such a socialist program has to be drawn up on the foundation of the joint and systematic work of the international proletariat, and the pre-requisite for this is the joint and self sacrificing struggle of the international proletariat against all exploitation, robbery, and oppression.

Mr. Jean Longuet, Clemenceau's godchild, informs us on the Paris conference: "The conference decided to inform president Harding of the plan."

The Second International keeps its program secret from the masses of its own party comrades. It submits the program to president Harding. The object is thus no proletarian action, but a diplomatic *demarché*! The Second International does not trust to the fighting will of the proletariat, but to the "good will" of greedy and imperialist America. It seeks to revive the old bigoted faith in the man at Washington, who during and after the world war deceived the working class, especially the German working class, lulled it into a feeling of security, and betrayed it into the frightful defeats of the revolution. And now the international proletariat is to be again deceived, rendered inactive, and led into defeats, by means of this program.

It is not the improved and specialized program formulated by the Second International at Frankfort, not the program of humbug, of great war victors, and of deception, which will lead the workers to victory and save the world from ruin, but the program made by the International Committee of Action at Frankfort, the program of International proletarian struggle.

France's Finances

By A. Ker (Paris).

The deficit in the French state finances possesses the strange peculiarity of evading any exact calculation. In the report given by Bokanovsky in the name of the financial commission, the deficit is stated to be at least 3,895 millions, assuming that the debts of the Entente states are annulled amongst themselves, that Germany fulfils her obligations, and that the rate of exchange of the mark does not fluctuate too much. A second project submitted to the senate decreases the deficit to 1,500 millions but without any expenditure having been limited or any fresh revenues granted. This remarkable discrepancy was brought about in the simplest manner in the world. It was calculated that the taxation of war profits would bring in another milliard, and that the railway companies would pay 500 millions for material sold them by the state. But this whole ingenious calculation was entirely useless, for the reporter of the senate commission for finance, Henri Beranger, was obliged to declare at the same time, that the first estimate had placed the revenue of the government 500 millions higher than it really is, and the expenditure one milliard too low. His calculation arrived at a result increasing the original deficit by 1,500 millions. This raises the deficit from 3,900 millions to 5,400 millions. The monetary requirements of the state, to be covered by loans, has

been estimated by the government at 24 milliards, but by the reporter at 33 milliards. Beranger expresses surprise that the minister of finance is not in a position to give exact figures of the expenditure and revenue of the country. Incredible though it may seem, there is no exact statement of the French national debt to be had, either in the ministry of finance or anywhere else. With respect to the loan requirements for 1923 there is an estimate of 18 milliards drawn up by Vincent Auriol, and one by Francois Marsal of 37 milliards. To all these contradictions we add our opinion that this year, the total deficit will amount to 35 milliards.

A government whose normal revenue amounts to between 17 to 19 milliards, but which expends 55-60 milliards; a method by which a faked budget of only 24 milliards is shown to the public, while the real deficit is concealed under a special budget of sums to be "reimbursed" by Germany; a national debt which increases by 30 milliards yearly; a ministry of finance which draws almost all the floating capital from the country; a bad debt with little prospect of successful collection; a state completely crushed beneath a load of debt, and yet ruining itself with military expenses and determined to play the part of gendarme in Europe; — this is the financial position of France in the year 1923. How long will these conditions last? How long will it be before the capitalist social order and economic system break down utterly? The financial difficulties which brought about the collapse of pre-revolutionary France were not to be compared with the present confusion. In 1787 the minister Calonne submitted to the assembly of notables a deficit of only 100 millions. The revolution broke out in the face of a budget deficit which a Turgot could have balanced by a somewhat bolder financial policy. Then as now, more than one half of the normal state revenues were swallowed up by the national debt. When a political system is no longer able to cover its expenditure by taxation, then it resorts to loan and inflation, and thus keeps up the appearance of stability though in reality the ultimate collapse is only accelerated by the delusion of apparently inexhaustible financial resources. Such a state falls beneath an unending pressure; inflation, high prices, depreciation of currency, and deficit co-operate with inexorable logic to bring about a development which nothing but revolutionary force can end. We are confronted by the crisis of the bourgeois state; even the tamest politicians confirm us in this opinion, when they demand reforms in republican institutions and abolition of bureaucratic evils. But the present system seeks in vain for bold and determined men really competent to find and apply effectual remedies. The sole solution lies in the suppression of all social parasites, and the setting up of the sovereignty of labor.

ECONOMICS

Survey of the World Economic Situation in the 1st quarter of 1923*)

By E. Varga.

I. General Section

General situation of world economics.

The World economic situation in the 1st quarter of 1923 presents a picture of even greater confusion than the year 1922. While a highly favorable state of the market has developed in the United States, the Ruhr occupation has formed a fresh centre of disturbance in western Europe; the production of Germany and of France has suffered severely. The surrounding countries — England, Czechoslovakia — on the other hand, have derived advantages from the reduced production of coal and iron in the Ruhr area and in France. The crisis which had lasted so long in Czechoslovakian heavy industry has been improved by orders from France and Germany, while the gradual improvement already observed in English heavy industry has developed into an actual revival; the English collieries benefited enormously by the forced purchases on the part of France and Germany; but the general state of the market has by no means improved to the extent hoped for at the beginning of the year. The advantages gained on the one side are outweighed by the apparent worsening of economic conditions in those European countries in which heavy industry plays an insignificant rôle — Italy, Poland, Hungary, the Balkans. In order to characterize the general economic situation, we shall first give some tables:

*) Beginning with this number we shall print, in sections, the quarterly economic report of comrade Varga.

Percentage of unemployed workers organized in trade unions.

Year	Engl.	% of all insured	Belgium	Holland	Denmark	Sweden	Norway	Canada	Germany
Oct. 1922	14	12	3.9	9.0	11.3	15	11.3	3.9	1.4
Nov. 1922	14.2	12.4	3.8	9.4	15.2	17.1	11.8	6.2	2.0
Dec. 1922	14	12.2	3.8	10.9	20.3	21.7	15.1	6.2	2.8
Jan. 1923	13.7	12.7	3.9	14.0	19.0	—	—	—	4.4
Feb. 1923	13.1	11.8	—	17.7	—	—	—	—	5.7

Absolute figures in thousands.

Year	Switz.	France	Italy	Czecho-Slovakia
1922 Oct.	48	—	321	—
Nov.	51	—	354	—
Dec.	53	3	382	1000 ¹⁾
1923 Jan.	56	—	—	250 ²⁾
Feb.	53	12	—	400 ³⁾

While in England the number of unemployed is decreasing slowly but steadily, in Germany their number is rapidly increasing, and had already, before the Ruhr occupation, reached a level corresponding to that of years of severest crisis. (The latest figures were still lacking at the conclusion of this report.) In judging of these figures, it must be taken into consideration that in most countries building and agricultural activity comes almost to a standstill in January and February.

In forming a judgment on the state of the market, the development of prices is important. This development of prices is naturally greatly influenced by the fluctuations in the rate of exchange, and can be taken as a sign of the state of the market in countries with a fairly stable currency only.

The development of wholesale trade figures for the last half year was as follows:

Year	U.S.A.	Swed.	Switz.	Japan	Engl.	Denm.	France	Italy	Germany
Oct. 1922	144	155	171	190	166	180	338	601	56600
Nov.	150	154	172	188	167	182	352	596	115101
Dec.	149	155	175	186	166	181	362	580	147500
1923 Jan.	149	156	175	183	169	192	387	575	278480
Feb.	151	158	181	—	172	199	422	582	548470
Mar.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	475000

The rising price levels in England and the United States are signs of a real improvement in the economic conditions, but in France and Germany the rising prices mirror the progressive depreciation of the currency; the stabilization of the mark in Germany tends to lower prices.

The course taken by the rate of exchange, best characterizes the economic situation. As the value of the English pound has scarcely altered during the last quarter, we shall here give the rates of exchange of European currencies in pounds sterling only:

	Par.	6. Oct. 22	6. Jan. 23	6. Apr. 23
France	25.22	58	67	71
Italy	25.22	103	92	94
Germany	20.43	9 550	39 500	98 000
Austria	24.02	315 000	320 000	330 000
Czecho-Slovakia	24.02	130	161	157
Hungary	24.02	10 500	11 500	20 000
Poland	20.43	40 000	83 000	200 000
Roumania	25.22	725	840	1 000
Bulgaria	25.22	750	665	600
Yugoslavia	25.22	275	425	455
Greece	25.22	155	390	400

These figures do not give a fair picture; during the period in question, the German mark sank to 240,000 per £, the French franc to 80 per £. And the curve displays a general tendency to drop further; with the exception of the Czech crown, almost all continental currencies are lower in value, as compared with the pound sterling, than they were three months ago. The rapid depreciation of Hungarian, Roumanian, and Polish currencies is especially characteristic.

To sum up, we may say: A world market of uniform tendency has not yet evolved. The following question seems to us to be of decisive importance for the development of the world's economics in the next 2 to 5 years:

Will the present economic boom in the United States bring general prosperity, will the sound portion of the capitalist world place the weak portion on its feet again, or will the reverse be the case: Will America's prosperity remain an isolated phenomenon, after the expiration of which the permanent crisis of world economics will again pass into an acute phase? It is obvious that this point is also of decisive importance for the development of the labor movement in the next few years.

¹⁾ Non-official estimate of the Economist.
²⁾ Unemployed receiving benefit.
³⁾ On March 15th.

There are certain purely external indications which lead us to believe that the latter issue is the more probable one. The first signs of a business revival already appeared in the middle of 1921. The improvement proceeded rapidly in 1922, but the long miners' and railwaymen's strike retarded it greatly. But since the strike was merely an external factor, we may already count the year 1922 to the present period of prosperity. Hence, we may assume that the highest point of this economic prosperity will have been reached by the middle of the present year. At the present time the industrial production of one of the best years in America's economic history (1917) must already have been exceeded, for the collective index of industrial production published by the Federal Reserve Bulletin for October 1922 is only 6% behind 1917. Whether the present boom will extend into 1924 is a question, and is above all dependent on the success of this year's crops. But to judge by the analogy offered by all prosperity cycles in the past, we may assume with certainty that America's present prosperity will come to an end in the year 1924. Should our assumption prove correct, then there is no likelihood of a general economic prosperity extending to all capitalist countries. For even if the Ruhr occupation is speedily settled, and the reparations question finally regulated—of which there is not the slightest possibility—certainly there can be no thought of a wave of economic prosperity in Europe this year. And should such a period set in in Europe in 1924, it is likely to coincide with the crisis in the United States, and thus come to an untimely end.

The American Boom

In my report on the second quarter of 1922 I wrote as follows:

"The essential question for American political economy is: Is it possible for a period of economic prosperity in America to last long, if the economic conditions of Europe remain in their present chaotic state?"

Today, nine months later, we must reply to this question in the affirmative, if we are not to deny plain facts. Even the year 1922, despite the mining and railway strikes, showed a great advance in production as compared with pre-war years.

Production in millions of units:

	Soft coal	Anthrac.	Petro-leum	Copper	Iron	Steel	Motor-cars
1910	372	75	248 (1913)	0.5	27.7	26.5	0.4
1920	556	80	443	1.67	36.9	42.1	2.2
1921	407	95	470	1.67	16.7	19.7	1.7
1922	411	52	551	1.55	27	33	2.5

How favorable the markets were in 1922 is shown by the tremendous accumulation. According to Professor Friday, the national income of the United States amounted in 1922, to over 60 milliard dollars.

More than 10 milliards of which have been accumulated. The sum accumulated is approximately half the amount of the whole national income of Germany or England. Of these freshly accumulated 10 milliards, one half consists of houses and factory buildings, railway buildings, etc., built in the course of the year; the other half of motor-cars, machinery, furniture, etc. The total amount of dividends and interest exceeds that of the year 1917 by more than a milliard dollars...

What are the roots of this new American economic prosperity?

This question is difficult to answer. But one thing is certain: the roots lie entirely in America itself; the foreign markets have contributed nothing to the flourishing conditions. This may be gathered with certainty from the figures of the foreign trade statistics. These are as follows, in millions of dollars:

	Total Import	Export	Price index
1919	3904	7920	4016
1920	5279	8228	2949
1921	2508	4485	1977
1922	3316	3832	716

We must further observe that the exports from the United States do not amount to more than 10% of the total production.

We thus see that most of the goods placed on the American market are absorbed by home consumption. But how comes it that the American market is in a position to absorb such increased quantities of goods, and how long will it be able to do so?

¹⁾ drop due to miners' strike.
²⁾ Provisional figures.

A few facts may be adduced in explanation. After the end of the war, the favorable economic conditions in America were also in part the result of speculation: The increase of production did not keep pace with the rise in prices. The gaps which had come about in the equipment of the railroads, in the building of dwelling houses, etc., were not filled up during the short period of prosperity following the war. The crisis broke in from the agricultural side: the purchasing power of the farmers for industrial products shrank to a minimum, for industry, almost completely monopolized, made the foolish attempt to maintain the high price level of industrial products by artificial means, while the prices for agricultural products sank rapidly. This disproportional price development between agricultural and industrial products was one of the causes of the great crisis in American economic life. (The March report of the "National City Bank" in New York points out that in pre-war times there was a similar disproportion in prices, but in favor of the farmers. While the collective index referring to the period 1890-1899, had risen from 100 to 134, the price level of farm products was 177.)

But when this disproportion had been almost equalized by rises in price of agricultural products and drops in price of industrial products, when the better prices attained by agricultural products enabled the farmers to purchase industrial products—then it was possible for a fresh period of economic prosperity to begin, independent of events in Europe. This period displays a great investment activity. (Building, locomotives, cars, etc.) The gaps caused by the war are being filled up. The farmers are again buying motor-cars, etc. The number of unemployed is going back to "normal", that is 1 to 1.5 millions.

But how long can such economic prosperity last, when thus confined solely to America? What will the future development of economics in the United States be?

In our answer to this question we must not forget that the economics of the United States—as of every capitalist country—show a tendency to pass from the export of foodstuffs and raw materials to the export of industrial articles, to capital export,—and to the import of foodstuffs and raw materials. This process of transformation is going on at full speed in the United States: the percentage of wheat and cotton exported decreases continually. Farsighted people like Prof. Tuliakov and comrade Krassin, have pointed out in the *Izvestia* that before long, the United States will be dependent on the import of Russian grain, for in America, where land is now so dear, corn so cheap, and cultivation so extensive, it is much less profitable to carry on agriculture than to produce industrial articles.

We dealt with these questions in our earlier reports: with the relatively unfavorable position of the farmers in our last report, with the question of providing the world with food—in the report before the last. We showed, basing our statements on American data, that the absence of Russian grain from the world market had been fully compensated by the extension of production in Canada, Argentina, India, and the United States; that the production of these countries could be greatly increased—were Europe in a position to purchase these foodstuffs at a profitable price. It is not the productive capacity of the producing areas that limits production, but the paying capacity of the consuming areas.

But the development of the United States to an exporter of industrial products and an importer of foodstuffs, is hampered by a great obstacle:

The leveling tendency in world economics

If we examine the economic development of the last decade, we observe a tendency to do away with the division of work hitherto prevailing in world economics; the traditional division: Western Europe as the "industrial workshop of the world", supplying the whole world with industrial products, and obtaining food and raw materials from everywhere, seems to be superseded by a more equal distribution of industrial production. Besides the United States, the new industrial world power, the industry of Eastern Europe is developing—protected by high duties—: Japan, China, India, South Africa. Neither the statistical data available nor the space at our disposal enables us to survey this development in figures¹⁾. We can only point out some of the most important symptoms:

1. *The world's trade diminishes, shrinks.* This is proved, not only by the statistics of foreign trade, which are not very reliable, but by the fact that despite America's economic pro-

¹⁾ We select one exceedingly characteristic example: According to the report issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Asia purchased from the United States machinery to the value of 178 million dollars in the course of the last 3 years,

sperty there is less freight space used at present for carrying goods in international trade than before the war.

According to Lloyds statements, the total tonnage at the present day is 14 million tons more than in 1914, but from this must be subtracted:

	Mill. tons
Ships more than 25 years old	6.55
Useless American ships	3.50
Oil tank steamers	3.58
	13.63

Thus the actual tonnage is not greater than before the war. The tonnage laid up—and a great part of the useless tonnage is probably included in this—is still over 9 million tons, despite improved economic conditions. However, an official American statement declares the conditions in sea transport to have improved, for the unused tonnage has been reduced by 2 millions in the course of the year. The ships laid up are to be classified (in 1000 tons) as follows:

	1. Jan. 1922	1. Jan. 1923
United States maritime office	4314	4411
United States tankers	214	214
United States private steamers	781	703
Great Britain	1961	1010
France	1085	730
Italy	585	772
Holland	327	330
Norway	207	53
Sweden	204	22
Greece	170	116
Japan	120	90
Belgium	275	275
Denmark	161	—
Spain	530	520
	10,934	9264

It must also be taken into consideration that many ships, though not actually laid up, wait for weeks in foreign ports for cargo, or sail with half a cargo or even with ballast; and it must be remembered that were international trade developing normally, it would require a considerably greater tonnage at its disposal than at present.

2. *England is emphatically the country of industrial export.* Now for over 2 years England has had a drag put upon her by a population of about 2 million unemployed and paupers. There is an ever increasing cry for emigration to the colonies, or for "back to the land". England has more or less abandoned the hope of finding places for all her unemployed in industrial undertakings, and of supporting her population by means of the sale of industrial products on the world market. Malthusianism is once more flourishing in England; even Keynes, the lauded hero of the pacifist wing of the bourgeoisie, knows no other means of escape²⁾.

3. England is merely the most striking example of the universal tendency to reduce the division of labor hitherto practised,—a tendency attendant on the present period of decay of capitalism, and becoming apparent in every economic sphere: the farmers are beginning to supply their own needs, the poorer classes of the city population cultivate their little plots in their spare time, etc.³⁾

All this shows that the assumption that the United States could neglect its agriculture, and develop into an industrial export country on the model of England, has no basis in reality. The decaying economics of Europe do not offer a good soil for such a development. It is only if American economics take precisely the opposite road; if agriculture is more intensely developed, so that it can absorb the products of industry and at the same time supply the cities with food and the industrial undertakings with raw materials, that the capitalist economics of America can continue to hold their own for some time yet, against the collapse of European economics and the general decay of world economics. Every future period of economic prosperity in America, like the present one, will have to be based, above all, on agriculture.

²⁾ See M. Guard. *Reconstruction* No. 12.

³⁾ " . . . In these times of political, economic, and financial uncertainty, the different states have been forced to take recourse to self-help, for covering their requirements, to an extent which we should have deemed impossible at one time. Consumption has been greatly diminished, and with it the demand; but in most countries there is a parallel tendency towards the reduction of every description of import, in order that the foreign trade balance may be more favorable." (From the report of the Controller of Currency, Crissinger, for 1922.)

American capital export

The supremacy of American economics in the world market will be felt less in the export of industrial articles in return for food and raw materials than in the export of capital. While the transformation of the United States into an industrial export country after the pattern of England is hindered by the general counter-tendency of levelling, the inclination towards the export of capital falls into line with this tendency, since all freshly industrialized countries are dependent on capital import. In this direction the United States has greatly outstripped England since the war.

The Guaranty Trust Company, in its monthly report for February, publishes the following interesting comparisons on the capital (in million dollars) exported since 1911, from London and from New York.

	England 1 £ = 5 doll.	USA.
1911	503	31
1912	465	71
1913	503	78
1920	40	464
1921	111	596
1922	276	652

Here it must be observed that England is doing everything to regain her lead as supplier of capital to the world, and that she is greatly assisted in this by its internationally arranged banking organization, which is much superior to the American. It is a fact that during the last few months American securities have again been bought on a large scale in England. During the past quarter, shares issued by an American firm have again been—for the first time since the war—put on for subscription in London as well as in New York. Despite the organizational superiority of the English capital market, we are none the less of the opinion that England will be obliged to let America take precedence in this direction, for England cannot keep pace with the United States in accumulation. The capital export of the United States is still (relatively) fairly small, if the above mentioned estimate made by Friday—10 milliards of freshly accumulated capital in the year 1922—is correct!

America and Europe

No change has taken place in the relations between the United States and Europe during the 1st quarter of 1923. The anti-European and the pro-European currents just balance each other, and everything goes on as before. The anti-European tendency has been encouraged by the realization that it is possible for America to develop a state of economic prosperity in spite of the chaos in Europe. Moreover, the effect of the new high protective tariff, has by no means been so disadvantageous to foreign trade as was predicted by American and European critics.

Foreign trade data since the introduction of the new protective tariff are as follows, compared with those of last year:

	Import in mill. doll.	
	1921	1922
Sept.	179.3	298.5
Oct.	188	345
Nov.	210.9	294
Dec.	237.5	297
		319
	Export in mill. doll.	
	1921	1922
Sept	324.9	313.2
Oct.	343.3	370.7
Nov.	294.1	383.0
Dec.	269.2	344.4
Jan.	—	278.8
Feb.	—	250.6
March	—	330.6

It seems that American foreign trade has not suffered by the new tariff. To be sure the tariff has been in force too short a time to allow of a final judgment. This is especially the case in the matter of imports. The high figures of Sept.—Nov. are probably to be ascribed to endeavors on the part of trades-people to import the largest possible quantities of goods before the new tariff came into force. The tariff bill being passed with unexpected promptness, these cargoes were unloaded under the new tariff. Besides, the valuation of imports has been subject to great fluctuations; the data have been frequently changed. But the fact remains that despite the tariff the import tends to increase. (Data for the present year are not yet published, but the large customs revenues show the further favorable course of imports; the customs revenue for the fiscal year July 1922—1923 are estimated at 480 million dollars.)

As to exports, two facts may be observed: 1. Rapid diminution of the export surplus; that of 1922 was lower than that of 1913.

2. Relative increase of Europe's participation in foreign trade. The distribution of exports among the different continents was as follows (in million dollars):

	1921 %	1922 %
Europe	2364 52.7	2083 54.4
North America	1130 25.1	916 23.9
South America	273 6.1	226 5.9
Asia	533 11.8	449 11.7
Australia	113 2.5	102 2.7
Africa	73 1.8	56 1.4
	4486 100	3832 100

It is not possible to ascertain at the present juncture whether the increased participation of Europe in American foreign trade is a passing phenomenon or not. Before the war (1910 to 1913) Europe absorbed 62.5% of American exports, with a decided tendency to diminish. The same tendency continued after the war, until 1922, while during the war Europe's participation in the export had risen to 71.2% (in 1915). It is therefore an open question whether the increase of exports to Europe is a temporary or a permanent phenomenon. We believe it to be temporary.

As to imports, the post-war tendency is definitely towards a rise:

	1918	1919	1920	1921
	14 %	19.2 %	23.3 %	30.5 %

To what extent the United States seeks connections with freshly developing states may be seen from the statistics of capital export (our authority is again the Guaranty Trust): "The distribution of American capital export over the various parts of the world, and the manner in which the loans raised in New York are applied, may be gathered from a survey of the past year (in millions dollars):

Destination	State or municipal loans	Joint stock capital	Total
Europe	132	79	211
Latin America	134	39	173
Canada and Newfoundland	106	50	156
Far East	111	1	112
	Total 483	169	652

Europe, with its 500 million inhabitants, received 1/3 less from the United States than Canada and South America with 100 million inhabitants.

The favorable state of the market, the absence of any detrimental effects of the new tariff, the growing exports and increasing capital export, the successful consolidation of the English war debt and the commencement of payment by England—all this weakens the pro-European tendencies of American political economy. And although American financiers expressed their readiness, at the international congress of Chambers of Commerce, to finance a reparation loan to Germany on certain conditions—to this we shall refer later on—we are none the less of the opinion that an intervention on the part of America, for the purpose of placing European economics on a sounder basis, is still a possibility of the distant future only, and one which would only come to pass under very hard conditions—the colonization of Germany, as pointed out in our last report.

The United States and England

Among the innumerable politico-economic antagonisms which divide the great imperial powers from one another, one at least has been successfully smoothed out during the period of this report: we mean the funding of the English debt in the United States.

The facts themselves are probably known to the reader. Before the London conference held on August 1, 1922, Balfour, at that time minister for foreign affairs in England, addressed his famous note to the allies, which announced that: England was only willing to cancel her demands on the allies to the amount which she would have to pay the United States; thus it depended on the United States as to how much the allies would have to pay to England. This policy, supported by that mighty organization of English industry, the Federation of British Industry, and combatted by the liberal circles of high finance, contributed much to the failure of the London conference, and was one of the causes that led to the increased severity of France's reparation policy, culminating in the Ruhr occupation. For there were wide circles of French taxpayers who said to themselves: If we have to pay our debts to England and America, we must insist on full payment from Germany.

The Balfour note evoked a storm of protest in the United

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Public Education in Soviet Russia.

(Letter from Soviet Russia.)
By Frida Rubiner (Moscow).

The social democratic press has lately hit upon a new object for anti-Bolshevist agitation—the Russian schools. As is well known, the school question is passing through a severe crisis in Russia, and Kautsky and his like are making use of this fact for the purpose of once more "proving" that not only is no help for Germany to be expected from Soviet Russia, but in addition, that the Bolsheviks are simply barbarians.

At no time have our Russian comrades attempted to conceal anything of the conditions in Soviet Russia. The contrary is rather the truth, for the Bolsheviks are inclined to paint a black picture as soon as danger threatens. This was the case at the commencement of the famine, and is so again in the question of the elementary school. At the last All Russian Soviet congress, held at the end of December 1922, the people's commissary Lunatcharsky raised alarm as to the desperate conditions obtaining in national education. The Soviet press immediately stepped in to emphasize more urgently the danger. It is a well known fact that the Bolsheviks, immediately after the seizure of power, exerted their utmost endeavors to make good what absolutism had for centuries neglected. This work was taken up with incomparable optimism, and great success was actually attained—though in the midst of civil war, and despite the blockade pressing upon the country—in the work of extending and developing the network of educational institutions. A few figures will best serve to give a clear idea of the work done by the Soviet government in the sphere of national education. In 1911 there were 47 people receiving education to every 1000 inhabitants; in 1922 there were 92. The costs of national education were:

1913	6.7% of the total state budget
1915	7.3% " " " "
1919	8 % " " " "
1920	11 % " " " "

The work of public education and care of children made great progress. Whilst in 1914 there were only 130 establishments for preparatory schooling, in 40 governments of Russia, Soviet Russia in 1921, counted almost 6,000 such establishments. For the abolition of illiteracy a wide network of so-called "liquidation points" were created: the work of the "Extraordinary Commission for the Liquidation of Illiteracy". By the summer of 1921 there were well over 50,000 of such "points" for the education of illiterates, reading circles, travelling libraries, clubs, lectures, etc., conveying knowledge into the remotest corners of the republic. Strangers visiting Russia in the years of "war communism" could not but admire the gigantic work accomplished by the Soviet power in the sphere of national education.

But the aims of the proletarian government in this sphere could naturally not be reached by the impoverished country, exhausted by the war. As late as December 1922 Lenin pointed out, in one of his last articles, written with all the "educational" acuteness peculiar to him, how very far Soviet Russia still is from the desired ideal in the matter of national education. Despite the utmost exertions, in 1920 there were still almost 400 in every 1000 inhabitants of the cities, and almost 650 in the country who could not read or write. It had only been possible to stamp out complete illiteracy in the Red Army. The intensive work done towards raising the standard of education of the masses encountered great obstacles, firstly through the lack of means, and secondly through the lack of human material. The situation became a complete disaster when the famine cast its shadow over the country in 1921, and the economic and financial crisis became acute. The first year of the "Nep" (new economic policy), 1922, signified a turning point in the school question. The enemies of the Soviet power take delight in announcing that in 1922, the schools were reduced by as much as 40% in some places, that the insufficiently paid teachers had to seek other occupations or even go begging, that the teachers in the famine districts on the Volga and in the Ukraine all died, that the schools had to be closed for lack of fuel, etc. Comrade Lunatcharsky himself did not withhold such alarming facts when he spoke at the Soviet congress of the need of the schools. At that time a step was taken which the education commissariat found very difficult to take—school fees for the elementary schools (schooling is free for workers' children, now as before). But conditions have greatly changed in the three months which have passed since the last Soviet congress. In the famine year 1922,

States, for it made the impression that England sought to throw doubt on the "moral" basis of America's claims by maintaining that these sums had been expended for the allies. However, this misunderstanding was smoothed out with great speed. At the beginning of this year the minister of finance, Baldwin, went to America. President Harding instructed the negotiation commission not to be bound by the decision of the Senate, according to which the war debts were not to be consolidated under 4 1/2 %. After brief and unusually friendly negotiations, an exceedingly advantageous agreement for England was arrived at: England pays 3% interest for 10 years, after that 3 1/2 %, and amortizes the whole debt in 62 years with an annual amortization rate of 1/2 %. The reduction of the rate of interest from 5 to 3% was accepted by the American Senate without any notable resistance. The whole transaction was carried amid repeated protestations of amity.

Although the Anglo-American friendship has thus made great progress of late, it would be foolish to assume that the economic antagonisms are settled by the arrangement of the debt question. Indeed, the greatest bone of contention, the petroleum question, has lately led to fairly acute antagonism between the two Anglo-Saxon powers. After England had rejected the protest made by the United States on account of the exclusion of Americans from the Mossul petroleum area, by referring to "acquired rights", America passed a federal law according to which the subjects of countries whose governments do not grant to Americans the same rights and privileges in oil concessions and property as their own subjects enjoy, cannot acquire any new American oil concessions, and cannot obtain any ascendancy in such concessions or properties. By force of this law the American ministry for home affairs had excluded, by the middle of March, the so-called Roxana Petroleum corporation, the English and Dutch Shell Company, the Asiatic Petroleum Company, and other oil companies in the United States controlled by foreigners, from all further participation in American oil properties.

England attempted to settle the difference on friendly terms, but without success. Before going into recess, Congress appointed a governmental commission—The Federal Trade Commission—to examine into the question.

The report of the commission was not published until Congress had gone into recess. The report states:

that not only the English, but the Dutch, French, and Roumanians, had placed the Americans at a great disadvantage in their oil undertakings, or had excluded them altogether. The report goes on to say that petroleum springs and other oil sources in America have been bought up by Englishmen and Dutchmen, so that the Anglo-Dutch Shell Corporation possesses no less than 240,950 acres of oil land in the United States, and thus controls 30% of the total output. "American oil interests" the report proceeds, "are badly treated in Australia, in the whole of the East Indies and all the Indian colonies of Holland and France, in British Guiana, British Honduras and Trinidad, and in all French colonies, including Morocco". In order that this report may not fail in effect, the American secretary of state Hughes has had copies sent to the governments of England, France, and Holland.

If we take into consideration the great rivalry for the Russian petroleum—Baku, where an American company has begun work; Sakhalin, where the English possess concessions obtained under Tsarism,—and the struggle for the South American and East Asiatic markets, etc., it seems absolutely illusory to hope for a final understanding. The rivalry of France, her tremendous armaments on land, water, and in the air, compel England at the present time to look for support to her racial brothers across the ocean. But there is still much to be arranged before the Anglo-American Entente can be regarded as an accomplished fact. Between the writing and printing of these lines the antagonisms between the United States, England and France have become more acute. The Turkish national assembly has officially confirmed the Chester concession, which placed in the hands of the United States the construction of railways in Asia Minor as far as Mossul, with the right to exploit all natural treasures within a radius of 10 miles on either side of the line. The French government has officially protested, in Constantinople through General Pelle, against the granting of the concession, because it is in contradiction to the concession granted to France in the spring of 1914. England is also disagreeably surprised at this advance of American capitalism in the near East, although the above named reasons have prevented her from taking any official steps up to the present. If American capitalism really starts seriously on exploiting this concession, then the harmony between the two Anglo-Saxon world powers is likely to be considerably disturbed.

the government was only able to devote 3% of the total budget to purposes of national education, but now it devotes 8% to this purpose. The decay of the system of schools, which had set in in consequence of the famine catastrophe, was arrested; even in the province of Samara, which suffered most severely from the famine, the schools are almost completely restored. As the state itself is not in a position to raise the necessary means, these are derived from local budgets. This is done by taxation of the propertied classes of the population, of the rich peasantry, of commerce, forestry, etc. In accordance with the customary system of "chiefs" in Soviet Russia, schools are placed under the guardianship of undertakings and factories, which have to provide for them. In the towns "co-operating committees" have been formed, which raise the means for the schools by voluntary contributions from the parents, etc. These are all, of course, only palliative measures; but until Soviet Russia is economically stronger, she is obliged to hold back the realization of her cultural strivings.

The education of the people is not only suffering from lack of means, but from lack of human material. Soviet Russia is striving for the uniform proletarian school, but for the attainment of this aim she requires teachers, permeated with the spirit of communism. At present many of the old teachers still have to be employed, many of them holding anti-Soviet views. Cases may be adduced, such as for instance at the beginning of the Cronstadt rising, when the children of a Petrograd school got up a celebration, and hanged the effigy of the communist school commissary. It is impossible to build up a proletarian school with bourgeois teachers, and it is therefore the endeavor of the Soviet power not only to impart elementary education, but to train a staff of teachers at the same time. At the present time, there are over 25,000 proletarian students studying in the workers' faculties of the colleges, and to this must be added the Party schools and the communist universities. In a few years, an army of teachers will leave these institutions, equipped with knowledge, and will place themselves at the service of the proletarian state. The economics of the country being then on a sounder basis, the splendidly planned work of public education will first be able to bear fruit. Here the people's schools of Russia differ from those of the bourgeois states: the Russian people's schools are proletarian, and serve the working class. And even though, owing to the economic crisis, the Russian schools are not at the moment, at their best, all they require are the necessary external conditions enabling them to develop their powers completely in the interests of the working class, while the schools of the bourgeois states are invariably solely instruments of the capitalist class.

The Decay of Menshevism in Georgia

By S. Orchonikidze (Tiflis).

During the last two months the disintegration of Georgian Menshevism has assumed mass proportions. This process of disintegration is the inevitable result of two years of creative work on the part of the Soviet power in Georgia. A correct national policy has brought the Georgian workers and peasants peace and tranquility. It has freed them from the unceasing wars with the Armenians, Ossetians, Abchasiens, Adschars, and Muselmann Achalzikes. Ever since the Soviet power was proclaimed, these wars have become a mere memory of the days of Menshevist rule. Never did national hate run so high in Georgia as under the Mensheviks. Bolshevism re-established national peace between the peoples of Georgia, and created fraternal relations between the workers and peasants of Georgia and those of the neighbouring republics (Armenia and Azerbaijan). Bolshevism at the same time created friendly relations between Persia and Turkey. National peace was the first great gain won by the Soviet power in Georgia and the whole of trans-Caucasia. It was the first decisive blow struck at Menshevism.

The broadly planned creative work done by the Soviet power in Georgia, in restoring agriculture and industry, has convinced the workers and peasants that it is only the Soviet power which can reconstruct their economics. The successful ameliorative work, the distribution of seed corn, and—that which the Georgian peasant has experienced under no other government—the aid for the starving, the construction of bridges, schools and roads, the restoration of the cast iron foundry in Tshatachsk after being idle for forty years, the building of electric generating stations in many provincial towns, etc., was the second blow at the Mensheviks, who attempted to frighten the Georgian population with the assertion that the Bolsheviki would devastate Georgia. The huge financial support lent to Georgia by the Soviet power showed the workers and peasants the difference

between the Entente, the allies of the Mensheviks, and Soviet Russia. This was the third blow.

The cultural work done by the Soviet power during the past two years—the schools, theatres, people's houses, textbooks, literature, in the Georgian language—has destroyed the Menshevist lie that the Georgian language and the Georgian national culture would be endangered by Soviet Russia.

The death blow to the landowning class was dealt by the land reform, which has lately been carried through by Soviet Russia at a revolutionary tempo, and has shown the Georgian peasants and workers who is their friend and who their enemy. What did the agrarian policy of the Mensheviks look like? At the beginning of 1918 there were risings in all districts under the slogan: We do not want to separate from Soviet Russia, we want the Soviet power. The essential import of this slogan was: The land possessed by the landowners to be given to the peasants! The Mensheviks suppressed the risings of the peasantry with the aid of German cannon and machine guns. The Jordania government granted a pseudo land reform. It consisted in substance of leaving the land in the hands of its original owners, with some few exceptions.

It must be observed that our comrades committed many mistakes when carrying out the land reform, but these errors were thoroughly rectified later. The Soviet power gave out the tried and tested slogan of: "All land for the peasantry!" The Georgian peasantry welcomed this land reform with unheard of enthusiasm, and in every district declared that now they first realized what the Soviet power really is. The Georgian peasant became the sole lord of the Georgian village.

All this could naturally not occur without leaving its traces among the working population of Georgia. The old Menshevist party, which has a record of 25 years in Georgia, began to fall to pieces. The first to fall away from the party were the railway workers, then the student youth, and then Menshevism began to degenerate into criminal officers' bands. The Central Committee of the Mensheviks approved, and lent financial support, to the preparations for a rising made by prince Tshelokayev, and thus showed the peasants in what manner they intended emancipating them from the "yoke of Bolshevism". The Mensheviks went abroad begging for help from the "defenders" of small nations, from Poincaré and Curzon, against the Bolshevist oppressors. In the face of this the Georgian workers and peasants declared, plainly and unequivocally, that they wanted to have nothing to do with the Menshevist traitors. This change of political feeling in the working masses of Georgia led to the final disintegration of the Menshevist party, which has become transformed into bands of robbers.

And now something occurred which was not expected by the outer world: the Central Committee of the Mensheviks broke up from within. Victor Tevsya, the spiritual leader of the Georgian Mensheviks, after living for two years as an illegal member of the Menshevist Central Committee, emerged from his illegality, and loudly declared that he is against intervention, against armed struggle,—is with us. He wrote to the editor of the newspaper *Communist* as follows:

"On the ground of my thoroughly well-considered decision I declare that I renounce all political activity. I hold it to be necessary to add that I have always been, and still am, an opponent of any armed struggle against the present power, and against any imperialist intervention in Georgia's affairs.

Victor Tevsya, 23rd February 1923."

Tevsya's declaration had a crushing effect on the Mensheviks. The sincere workers and peasants, who had been misled by the bankrupt leaders of Georgian Menshevism, left the ranks of the Menshevist party with every expression of abhorrence and aversion. The citadel of Georgian Menshevism, Guria, was among the first to react to Tevsya's declaration. Sixty-six workers and peasants, members of the Menshevist party, sent the following letter to the editor of the *Communist* on March 17, 1923:

"We, the undersigned, former members of the Menshevist party, declare that we are leaving this party today, for the reason that since 1914, and especially of late, it has allied itself openly with the bourgeoisie and with various anti-Soviet parties and bands, and threatens the proletarian revolution with armed risings. We express our contempt of the Menshevist party, and joining our forces to those of the Soviet power we swear to the working class that we shall fight alike against the inner and outer enemies of the workers and peasants power.

We appeal to all honest members of the party, those who still love the working class, to leave the ranks of this contemptible Menshevist bandit party, and to go hand in hand with that Soviet power which alone is capable of saving humanity from the clutches of capitalism, and of realizing liberty, fraternity, and solidarity among all workers." (The signatures of 66 former Mensheviks follow.)

On March 21 the editor of the *Communist* received another letter, also from Guria, signed by 116 workers and peasants; it reads:

"The undersigned members of the Menshevist party declare before the workers of all countries that the Menshevist party and the 2nd International have betrayed the interests of the workers; they have allied themselves with the world bourgeoisie, and are now working against the working class. The Mensheviks have used their rule for persecuting the defender of the interests of the workers and peasants—the Communist Party—and have acted in full agreement and alliance with the Tsarist generals.

When the Soviet power had become established in Georgia, the Menshevist party joined hands with the world bourgeoisie, and with the bandits of the Georgian district. (Here follow the names of some bandit leaders. Ed.) It intends to overthrow the defender of the workers' interests, the Soviet power.

For this reason we are today leaving the Menshevist party and condemn its disastrous policy. We proclaim this to the whole Georgian people and to the working class." (116 signatures follow.)

On March 23 another letter followed, with 50 signatures: "Kindly publish, in the next number of your newspaper, the following declaration to the workers and peasants of the Soviet republic:

We, the undersigned members of the Menshevist party of Georgia, who have been active in this party up to the present day, have arrived at the conviction that the Menshevist party, while calling itself a "labor" party, is forsaking the interests of the working class more and more every day, and is becoming an open defender of the capitalists and landowners.

In Europe it has smoothed the path of the hereditary enemies of the working class, and incited the Entente and its socialist flunkeys against the Soviet power.

Here in Georgia the party has proceeded so far in its chauvinism and betrayal that it supports, morally and materially, the bandits and the former officer and land-owner Cholokashvili, kashvili.

It now appears perfectly obvious to us that the social democratic party of Georgia is the party of the irreconcilable enemies of the working class and peasantry, the party of the national and of the world bourgeoisie.

We should consider it a disgrace to remain any longer in this party, and publicly announce our withdrawal from its ranks.

We are convinced that the Soviet power is a genuine workers' power, and that it should receive the support of every sincere worker and peasant.

Long live the Soviet power!" (50 signatures. Ed.)

Yet another letter from 54 workers at the arsenal, dated March 24:

"The undersigned arsenal workers, members of the Menshevist party, declare before the whole world that we were forced to enter this treacherous party, though its whole character is essentially foreign to us. During the rule of the Mensheviks, failure to enter the ranks of their party implied death by starvation, imprisonment, or penal servitude.

The Menshevist party is a party of bandits and betrayers, of inciters to nationalist agitation. We refuse to have anything to do with the policy of the Menshevist flunkeys of the bourgeoisie, and join forces with the Soviet power. We declare this to the working masses of Georgia, and to those who are still so misled as to remain in the ranks of the despicable Mensheviks.

All who desire the emancipation of the workers and peasants, all who do not want to live on other people's labor or bear the debts of others on their shoulders, who want our economics to prosper, our workers and peasants to enjoy material security, who desire to enjoy the fruits of socialism and to build up the state of liberty—all these should follow our example and turn their backs on those flunkeys of the bourgeoisie, the Mensheviks and their friends.

Hand in hand with the workers' and peasants' government, and with its supporter, the Communist Party, we march forward towards socialism." (54 signatures. Ed.)

On March 28 a letter from 25 workers of the city of Poti was published, declaring their secession from the Menshevist party.

On March 28 a members' meeting was held by the members of the Menshevist party occupied in the chief workshop of the trans-Caucasian railway; the resolution passed by this meeting condemned the Menshevist party, and announced the secession of the participants; these comprised 75 workers, all old underground revolutionists, members of the party since 1898/1900.

On the 29th of March, a meeting took place among the Menshevist workers of the wagon park and depot. A further 70 workers left the Menshevist party. The seceding Mensheviks from the chief workshop and the depot presented our Party nuclei

there with a red flag on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the C.P. of Russia. The last two secessions caused great excitement among the Mensheviks still remaining in the party. Groups of Mensheviks stormed our district committee daily, requesting permission to hold meetings for the discussion of the question of seceding.

Not only have whole groups left the Menshevist party, but our newspapers daily publish several declarations from individual members of the Menshevist party. And this is not all. The indignation felt by the Guria peasantry against the Mensheviks is best expressed by the fact that the peasants themselves search for the political bandits who are in hiding, and deliver them up to the Soviet power.

This is the inglorious end of the Menshevist party.

(After this article was finished, the *Rosta* reported the secession of a further 88 Mensheviks. S.O.)

POLEMICS AND DISCUSSIONS

A Necessary Discussion with our Syndicalist Comrades

By Leon Trotzky.

This article was written as a reply to the expositions of comrade Louzon, immediately after the IV world congress of the Communist International. But at that time, more attention was being devoted to the struggle against the socialist Right, against the dissidents, Verfeuil, Frossard, etc. In this struggle our efforts were united with those of the syndicalists, and I preferred to postpone the publication of this article. We are firmly convinced that our excellent understanding with the syndicalists will not cease to exist. The entry of our old friend *Mohatte* into the Communist Party was as source of great joy to us. The revolution needs men of this kind. But it would be wrong to pay for a rapprochement with a confusion of ideas. In the course of recent months the Communist Party of France has been purified and firmly established; hence we can enter into a tranquil and friendly discussion with our syndicalist comrades, along with whom we have still many joint struggles to go through.

Comrade Louzon, in a series of articles and personal explanations, represented views with regard to the fundamental question of the relations between party and trade union, which differ radically from the opinions of the Communist International and from Marxism. French Comrades, whose opinion I am accustomed to respect, speak with great respect of comrade Louzon and his devotion to the proletariat. It is all the more necessary therefore, to correct the errors made by him in such an important question. Comrade Louzon defends the complete and unqualified independence of the trade unions. Against what? Obviously against certain attacks. Whose? Against attacks ascribed to the Party. Trade union autonomy, an indisputable necessity, is endowed with a certain almost mystical significance by Louzon. And our comrade here appeals, quite wrongly, to Marx. The trade unions, says Louzon, represent the "working class as a whole". The Party, however, is only a Party. The working class as a whole cannot be subordinate to the Party. There is not even room for equality between them. The working class has its object in itself, the Party however, can either serve the working class or itself. The Party cannot annex the working class. The Moscow congresses, and the mutual representation of the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions signified, according to Louzon, the actual equalization of Party and class. This mutual representation has now been done away with. The Party thereby resumes its role of servant again. Comrade Louzon approves of this. According to him, this was also the standpoint of Marx. The end of the mutual representation of the political and the trade union internationals in each other is, to Louzon, the rejection of the errors of Lassalle (!) and of the social democrats (!), and the return to the principles of Marxism.

This is the essence of an article published in the *Vie Ouvrière* of December 15. The most astonishing thing in this and other similar articles is, that the writer is obviously, consciously and determinedly shutting his eyes to what is actually going on in France. One might think that the article had been written on Sirius. How else is it possible to understand the assertion that the trade unions represent the working class as a whole? Of what country is Louzon talking? If he means France, the trade unions there, so far as we are informed, do not, unfortunately, include even half of the working class. The criminal manoeuvre of the reformist trade unionists, supported

on the Left by some few anarchists, has split the French trade union organization. Neither of the two trade union federations comprises more than 300,000 workers. Neither singly nor together, are they entitled to identify themselves with the whole of that French proletariat of which they form only a modest part. Moreover, each trade union organization pursues a different policy. The reformist trade union federation works in co-operation with the bourgeoisie; the Unitarian Trade Union Federation, (C.G.T.U.) is fortunately revolutionary. In the latter organization, Louzon represents but one tendency. What does he then mean by the assertion that the working class, which he obviously regards as synonymous with the trade union organization, bears its own object in itself? With whose help, and how, does the French working class express this object? With the help of the C.G.T.U.? The C.G.T.U. has rendered excellent service. But unfortunately it is not the whole working class. The C.G.T.U. was originally under the leadership of the anarcho-syndicalists of the "pact". At the present time its leaders are syndicalist communists. During which of these two periods has the C.G.T.U. best represented the interests of the working class? Who shall judge of this? If we now attempt, with the aid of the international experience of our Party, to reply to this question, then, in Louzon's opinion, we place ourselves in a dangerous dilemma, for we then demand that the Party judge what policy is most beneficial to the working class. That is, we place the Party above the working class. But if we appeal to the *working class as a whole*, we should unhappily find it scattered, impotent, and mute. The various trade union federations, their separate trade unions, and the separate groups within the trade unions, would give us varying replies. But the overwhelming majority of the proletariat, standing outside of both trade union federations, would, at the present time, give us no reply at all.

There is no country in which the trade union organization includes the whole working class. But in some countries it at least comprises a wide section of the workers. This is, however, not the case in France. If, as Louzon opines, the Party must not "annex" the working class (but what is the term actually intended to mean?), for what reason does comrade Louzon accord this right to syndicalism? He may reply: "Our trade union organization is still weak. But we do not doubt its future and its final victory". To this we should reply: "Certainly; we share this conviction as well. But we have as little doubt but that the Party will gain the unqualified confidence of the great majority of the working class." Neither for the Party nor the trade unions is it a question of "annexing" the proletariat—Louzon does wrong in employing an expression used by our opponents who are fighting the revolution—it is a question of winning the confidence of the proletariat. And it is only possible to do this with the aid of correct tactics, based on the test of experience. Where and by whom are these tactics consciously, carefully, and critically prepared? Who suggests them to the working class? Certainly they do not fall from the sky. And the working class as a whole, as "a thing in itself", does not teach us these tactics either. It seems as if comrade Louzon has not faced this question. "The proletariat has its object within itself". If we strip this sentence of its mystic wrappings, its obvious meaning is, that the historical tasks of the proletariat are determined by the social position of the class, and by its rôle in production, in society, and in the state. This is beyond dispute. But this truth does not help us to answer the question with which we are concerned. Namely: how is the proletariat to arrive at subjective insight regarding the historical task set it by its objective position? Were the proletariat as a whole capable of grasping its historic rôle, it would stand in need of neither Party nor trade union. Revolution would be born simultaneously with the proletariat. But in actuality the process required to impart to the proletariat an insight into its historic mission is very long and painful, and full of inner contradictions.

It is only in the course of long struggles, severe trials, many vacillations, and wide experience, that insight as to the right ways and methods, dawns upon the minds of the best elements of the working class, the vanguard of the masses. This applies equally to Party and trade union. The trade union also begins as a small group of active workers, and grows gradually as its experience enables it to gain the confidence of the masses. But while the revolutionary organizations are struggling to gain influence in the working class, the bourgeois ideologists oppose them, and set up the "working class as a whole" against the Party and the trade unions, accusing these of wanting to "annex" the working class. The *Temps* writes this whenever there is a strike. In other words, the bourgeois ideologists oppose the *working class as object* to the *working class as conscious subject*. For it is only through its class-conscious minority that the working class gradually becomes a factor in history. We thus see that the criticism brought by comrade Louzon against the "un-

warranted claims" of the Party, applies equally well to the "unwarranted claims" of the trade unions. Above all in France; for French syndicalism—we must repeat this—was and is, in its organization and theory, a party. It is for this reason that it arrived, during its classic period, 1905–1907, at the theory of the *active minority*, and not at the theory of the "collective proletariat". For what is an active minority, held together by unity of outlook, if it is not a party? And on the other hand: would not a trade unionist mass organization, not containing a class-conscious minority, be a purely formal and meaningless organization?

The fact that French syndicalism was a party was fully confirmed by the schism which took place as soon as deviations in political viewpoints appeared in its ranks. But the party of revolutionary syndicalism fears the aversion felt by the French working masses for parties as such. Therefore it has not assumed the name of party, and has remained incomplete as regards organization. The party attempted to have its membership coincide with that of the trade unions, or at least to find cover in the trade unions. The actual subordination of the trade unions to certain tendencies, fractions, and even cliques of syndicalism, is thus explained. This is the explanation of the "pact" with its caricature of free-masonry, intended to hold a party organization together within the fold of trade union organization. And vice versa: The Communist International has most determinedly combatted the split in the trade union movement in France, that is its actual transformation into a syndicalist party. The main consideration of the Communist International has been the historical task of the working class as a whole, and the enormous independent significance of the trade union organization for solving the tasks of the proletariat. In this respect the Communist International has defended, as long as it has been in existence, the real and living independence of the trade unions, in the spirit of Marxism.

Revolutionary syndicalism, which was in France in many respects the forerunner of the communism of today, has acknowledged the theory of the active minority, that is, of the party, but without openly becoming a party. It has thereby prevented the trade unions from becoming, if not an organization of the whole working class (which is not possible in a capitalist system), at least of its broad masses. The communists are not afraid of the word "party", for their party has nothing in common, and will have nothing in common, with the other parties. Their party is not one of the political parties of the bourgeois system, it is the active, class-conscious minority of the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard. Hence the communists have no reason to hide themselves behind the trade unions, who for their part are at liberty to accept or reject do not misuse the trade unions for changing the scenery. They do not split the trade unions if they are in the minority in them. They do not in any way disturb the independent development of the trade unions, and support their action in every respect. But at the same time the Communist Party reserves the right of expressing its opinion on all questions in the labor movement, including the trade union question, to criticize trade union tactics, and to make definite propositions to the trade unions, which for their part are at liberty to accept or reject the propositions. The party strives to win the confidence of the working class, above all, of that section organized in the trade unions.

What is the meaning of the quotations from Marx adduced by comrade Louzon? It is a fact that Marx wrote, in 1868, that the labor party would originate in the trade union. When writing this he was thinking mainly of England, at that time the sole developed capitalist country already possessing extensive labor organizations. Half a century has passed since that time. Historical experience has in general confirmed Marx's prophecies in so far as England is concerned. The English Labor Party has actually been built up on the foundation of the trade union. But does comrade Louzon really think that the English Labor Party as it is today, led by Henderson and Clynes, can be looked upon as representative of the interests of the proletariat as a whole? Most decidedly not. The English Labor Party betrays the cause of the proletariat just as the trade union bureaucracy betrays it, although in England the trade unions approach nearer to comprising the working class as a whole than in any other country. On the other hand we cannot doubt but that our communist influence will grow in this English Labor Party which has grown out of the trade unions, and that this will contribute to render more acute the struggle of masses and leaders within the trade unions, until the treacherous bureaucrats will ultimately be driven forth, and the party will be completely re-formed and renewed. And we, like comrade Louzon, belong to an International which includes the little communist party of England, but which combats the Second

International supported by the English Labor Party which emerged out of the trade unions.

In Russia—and in the law of capitalist development Russia is precisely the antipole of England—the Communist Party, the former social democratic party, is older than the trade unions, and has created the trade unions. Today the trade unions and the workers' state in Russia are completely under the influence of the Communist Party, which by no means has its origin in the trade unions, but on the contrary created and trained these. Will comrade Louzon maintain that Russia has evolved in contradiction to Marxism? Is it not simpler to say that Marx's judgment on the origin of the party in the trade union has been proved by experience to have been correct, if not 100% correct, at any rate in the case of England? But that Marx never had the least intention of laying down what he himself once scornfully designated as "a super-historical law?" All the other countries of Europe, including France, stand between England and Russia in this question. In some countries the trade unions are older than the party, in others the contrary has been the case; but nowhere, except in England and partially in Belgium, has the party of the proletariat taken its origin in the trade unions. But are we to deduce from this, that the Communist International has originated wrongly?

When the English trade unions alternately supported the Conservatives and the Liberals and represented a mere labor appendage to these parties, when the political organization of the German workers was nothing more than a left wing of the democratic party, when the followers of Lassalle and Eisenach were quarrelling among themselves,—Marx demanded the independence of the trade unions from all parties. This formula was dictated by the wish to oppose the labor organizations to all bourgeois parties, and to prevent their being too closely bound up with socialist sects. But comrade Louzon may perhaps remember that it was Marx who founded the First International as well, the object of which was to guide the labor movement in all countries in every respect, and to render it fruitful. This was in 1864, and the *International created by Marx was a party*. Marx refused to wait until the international party of the working class formed itself in some way out of the trade unions. He did his utmost to strengthen the influence of scientific socialism in the trade unions—scientific socialism as first laid down in 1847 in the manifesto issued by the Communist Party. When Marx demanded for the trade unions complete independence from the parties and sects of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, he did this in order to make it easier for scientific socialism to gain dominance in the trade unions. Marx never saw in the party of scientific socialism one of the ordinary parliamentary democratic political parties. For Marx the International was the class-conscious working class, represented at that time by a truly very small vanguard.

If comrade Louzon would be consistent in his trade union metaphysics and in his interpretation of Marx, he would say: "Let us renounce the Communist Party, and wait till this party arises out of the trade unions? But such consistency would be equally fatal to party and trade union. For the present French trade unions can only regain their unity, and win decisive influence over the masses, if their best elements are combined in the class-conscious revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, that is, in a communist Party. Marx gave no final answer to the question of the relations between party and trade unions, and indeed he could not do so. For these relations are dependent on the varying circumstances in each separate case. Whether the party and the trade union federation are mutually represented on their central committees, or whether they form joint committees of action in case of need, is not a question of prime importance. The forms of organization may alter, but the decisive rôle played by the party is unalterable. The party, if it be worthy of the name, includes the whole vanguard of the working class, and uses its ideological influence for rendering every branch of the labor movement fruitful, especially the trade union movement. But if the trade unions are worthy of their name, they include an ever growing mass of workers, many backward elements among them. But they can only fulfil their task when consciously guided on firmly established principles. And they can only have this leadership when their best elements are united in the party of proletarian revolution.

The purification of the Communist Party of France, which rid it on the one hand of whining petty bourgeois, of drawing-room heroes, of political Hamlets, and sickly career hunters, and on the other hand actuated the rapprochement of communists and revolutionary syndicalists, implies a great stride towards the creation of suitable relations between trade union organizations and the political organization; which in turn means a great advance for the revolution.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

Agenda of the C. C. of the RILU

(to be held on June 1st, in Moscow.)

The agenda of the Central Council session of the RILU, convened for the 1st of June in Moscow, is as follows:

1. Report of the Executive Bureau. By comrades *Lozovsky* and *Kalnin*.
 2. Our next tasks. Speaker: comrade *Lozovsky*.
 3. The international craft unions: Speaker comrade *Kalnin*.
 4. The emigration of labor. Speaker: comrade *Tresso*.
 5. The struggle of the trade unions against Fascism. Speaker: comrade *Nin*.
 6. The tasks of the RILU. followers in England. Speaker: comrade *Borodin*.
 7. The situation in Czecho-Slovakia. Speaker: comrade *Enderle*.
 8. Miscellaneous (Organization questions, etc.)
- Propositions for the agenda are to be forwarded, accompanied by reports, not later than May 20th.

Executive Bureau of the RILU.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Workers Party — the Communist Party in United States

The National Office of the Workers Party has received the following communication from the Communist Party of America. New York City, April 11, 1923.

Comrades: The Communist Party of America at its Third National Convention, held in New York City on April 7th, at which were present delegates from all parts of the country, after thorough debate, went on record unanimously as recognizing the fact that the Workers Party of America, of which the members of the Communist Party of America were a component part, has developed into a Communist Party.

The Convention, therefore, decided by unanimous vote to dissolve the Communist Party of America, leaving the Workers Party of America, which is already fraternally affiliated with the Communist International, as the only organization carrying on the struggle for Communist principles in the United States. The Workers Party of America is authorized, when it deems it desirable, to adopt the name "Communist Party of America". Communist Party of America.

THE COLONIES

A New Phase of the Indian National Movement

By M. N. Roy.

The close of the 37th annual session of the Indian National Congress witnessed the orthodox Non-Cooperators, followers of Mr. Gandhi, in the majority and the full confirmation of the "Constructive Program" adopted at Bardoli in the spring of 1922. The triple boycott of law-courts, government schools and of foreign cloth was to be prosecuted with vigor, the boycott of the Reform Councils was to be maintained, and before the end of April, the Congress leaders pledged themselves and the country to collect 2½ lakhs of rupees for the National Fund and to enroll 50,000 volunteers in the army of Passive Resisters to governmental authority. It was likewise decided by the majority vote, to organize peasant and labor unions under the Congress auspices, and to embark upon individual Civil Disobedience, (as distinguished from Mass Civil Disobedience), should the country at the end of this given period be considered fit for embarking upon this step, in the eyes of the Congress leaders. An 11th hour resolution, repudiating all debts henceforth contracted by the government or the Reform Councils, was carried by an enthusiastic majority, and the Congress adjourned without having committed itself to any new step, or repudiating any of the old tactics that had landed it in its present bankruptcy.

The decisions of the Congress signaled the temporary defeat of the strong Opposition faction within its ranks, headed by Mr. C.R. Das, the well-beloved and brilliant lawyer-politician and patriot from Bengal, who as President of the Congress, had issued just before its convening, an alternative program

embodying many changes in the tactics hitherto pursued by the Non-Cooperators. The most important among these was the abandonment of the boycott of the Reform Councils, and the contesting of the 1924 elections by the Congress Party with the object of "entering the Councils to end them or to mend them". The whole struggle of the Congress turned upon this issue, which was supported, not only by Mr. Das and his immediate followers, but by the strong right-wing faction of rational "Pro-Change" politicians who had long been agitating within the Congress for the abandonment of the boycott of the Reform Councils. Thus Mr. Das, leader of the left-wing Extremists, found himself temporarily allied with the "Responsive Cooperators" of the right-wing faction of the Congress. The complete defeat of Mr. Das' program led to the resignation of the latter at the close of the Congress as President of that body, and to the formation within the Congress of a separate party, headed by Mr. Das and including the right-wing elements, known as the "Swaraj Party", whose avowed object was to work within the Congress with the object of obtaining the majority in that organization and to work independently with its own program, for the attainment of Swaraj by non-violent means.

The new party thus included within its ranks incongruous elements of the left and of the right, whose bond of union consisted in the disgust of both factions with the orthodox Non-Cooperators and their moribund tactics, and in the tactics of contesting the elections to the Reform Councils, with the object of entering them to practice obstruction and so force the government either to dissolve the Councils or to concede further reforms. There were however, many revolutionary elements who drew back from allegiance to the new party on account of their dislike of anything even remotely resembling cooperation with the government, as entrance into the Reform Councils seemed to imply, even though qualified as obstructionist tactics. Such elements were represented by the faction within the Congress which, for two years past, has presented a resolution calling for the definition of Swaraj as "complete independence outside the British Empire, to be attained by all possible and proper means". Such a definition stands in direct opposition to the rather vague Congress slogan of "Swaraj", which has only very recently been defined by various accredited leaders as meaning Home Rule or Dominion Status within the British Empire. To this latter definition, the Swaraj Party of Mr. Das and his adherents subscribe, and in their recently published program, drawn up in February of this year, it is clearly announced that the objective is "complete dominion status". Thus, there is still room for a republican party standing for the freedom of India from all foreign rule, and such a party has been formed within the past two months by those extremist elements inside the Congress whose resolution calling for complete independence has been twice rejected. This third party is known as the "Independence Party", which has issued a manifesto and announced its intention of working within the Congress until it obtains a majority. Its following, however, is much less than that of the Swaraj Party, which claims to control the votes of one-third of the Congress delegates present in this session just past.

The Swaraj Party contains within its ranks all the leaders of the Non-Cooperation movement possessing any personality and influence on the country as a whole, and it embodies the principles of bourgeois democracy, as opposed to the reactionary and metaphysical politics of the orthodox Gandhites. As such, it is bound to command a majority in the 1923 session of the National Congress, and has already commenced an intensive campaign of organization and propaganda throughout the length and breadth of India. So widespread was the response, and so enthusiastic the popular reception given to the leaders of the Swaraj Party, that the faithful followers of sacrosanct Gandhism became alarmed, and overtures for negotiation and compromise were made by the latter to the leaders of the new and more vigorous faction. These overtures bore fruit in several conferences, and at last resulted in a temporary understanding, whereby the Swaraj Party agreed to postpone all independent propaganda for its own program until after April 30th, the date on which the Congress had pledged itself to collect its fund and enlist 50 thousand volunteers. This temporary truce was to hold good until, at the end of this period, it was seen whether the country was ripe for the declaration of Civil Disobedience, and each side agreed to work in unison until the Congress Committee should announce its decision on this point.

The agreement to compromise means several things. It means, first of all, that the orthodox Gandhites realize that their day is over, and that in order to prevent the new party winning control of the entire Congress organization, it was necessary to temporize and eventually to concede the main points at issue in order to preserve the unity of the Non-Cooperation forces. This is a tacit confession that the victory of Gandhism at Gaya was an illusive one, and that the real strength of the movement

has shifted from the petty-bourgeois sentimentalists and transcendentalists, to the rationalist politicians of the school of "Responsive Cooperation" advocated by the late Lokmanya Tilak, whose death prevented him from organizing an effective resistance to the spiritual politics of Mr. Gandhi and his disciples.

The compromise means also, that the New Party is unwilling to go to the length of a definite split from the Congress ranks, if it can drag the unwilling followers of Gandhi in its wake. The game of "Responsive Cooperation" is a dangerously opportunistic one, which the present Moderates who accepted the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms as a "stepping-stone" to complete Self-Government, can on occasion play with the government in a very spectacular manner. The decision of the Swaraj Party to contest the elections to the Reform Councils alarmed the Moderates and put them on their mettle to prove that they, after all, had been right all along in their decision to accept the Reform Scheme for what it was worth, and to utilize it for what it was worth, in order to extract more concessions. On several occasions during the past two years, they have practised obstruction within the Councils with some degree of success, and since the beginning of the present year, they have three times rejected measures proposed by the Government, necessitating the "certification" by the Viceroy that such steps were necessary for the welfare of the country, and so passing them over the heads of the Legislative Assembly. Thus, the demands for increased railway expenditure and for the expenses of a Royal Commission to investigate the question of the Indianization of the Government Services were refused by the Assembly and passed by order of the Viceroy, while the Bill to protect the Indian Native States against Disaffection, by curbing the freedom of the press was rejected by the Assembly and certified by the Viceroy, whence it was afterwards laid before the British Parliament and approved by that body, and so became a law. Even more sensational was the very recent rejection by the Assembly of the official proposal to double the Salt Tax as a means to raise revenue to cover the huge Budget Deficit, now totalling some £100,000,000. This increased burden on the poor people was recommended by the Inchaape Committee, which let the staggering military expenditure off very lightly. The enhanced Salt Tax was twice rejected by the Legislative Assembly, and was thereupon certified by the Viceroy and will go before the British Parliament to become a law in the next months.

Thus, the struggle within the Councils is already taking place, and the prospect of new elections looming up early in the coming year will do much to enhance this opposition of the enthroned Moderates, who are very loth to lose their seats in the Legislative and Provincial Assemblies, to the faction of the Non-Cooperators who have declared for contesting the elections. There is little doubt that the Non-Cooperators lie closer to the heart of the very limited electorate than do the ultra-loyal Moderates, and that candidates from the Congress or Swaraj Party would stand a much better chance of election than those from the Liberal League. But that the "Responsive Cooperators" will be able to accomplish more within the Reform Councils by obstructionist tactics than the Moderate Liberals have, remains extremely unlikely. The character of the Reform Councils has not altered, and the government can manipulate those bodies, as well as the elections, to suit its own purposes. It is certain that the Non-Cooperators will not obtain a majority of the seats in the coming elections, so well controlled is the official representation and so complex is the system of communal and special class voting.

However, a break away from the blind alley of spiritual politics has been made, and the Non-cooperation movement is struggling for a new program and new tactics to guide the national struggle. The elaborate Programme and Constitution of the Das-Swaraj Party has been drawn up and laid before the country for criticism, suggestions and approval. It suffices to say that one of its main clauses calls for the "growth and protection of private property" to understand the highly-bourgeois nature of the new party, and its intense class-consciousness. The fact that its program also calls for the organization of peasant and labor unions to help in the national struggle only makes the signs more ominous. It means that the Indian working-class will be consciously exploited by the national movement for its own ends, instead of unconsciously, blindly and sentimentally, as heretofore.

April 18, 1923.

Correction:

A most poignant error has crept into last week's *Inprekorr.* It is only too obvious that the last article on the last page should have come under the heading: "Youth Movement".

Printed by Friedrichstadt-Druckerei G. m. b. H., Berlin SW 46

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 36 [18]

9th May 1923

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

CONTENTS

Politics

Karl Radek: Empty Threats . . .
G. H. Martin: Oil and the British-American Rivalry
Fight of the C.P.F. against Poincaré
W. Stoeker: French and Communists on the Ruhr
P. Böttcher: The Saxon Proletariat

Economics

E. Varga: II. World Economic Situation in the 1st quarter of 1923

In Soviet Russia

Leon Trotzky: Relations between Proletariat and Peasantry in Soviet Russia
Pierre Pascal: Soviet Russia: March 15.—April 15.

The Labor Movement

J. T. Murphy: England: Yellow Leadership
French and German Railwaymen

In the International

John Pepper: The Workers' Party of America — Its Problem
W. Martarty: The C.P. of Canada

In the Colonies

E. Roy: Where are the Indian Masses?

Discussions and Polemics.

R. Albert: War: a conversation with a Pacifist
Our Problems.
E. Hörnl: The Proletarian Film

Empty Threats . . .

By Karl Radek.

When the English Parliament began to play a conservative comedy in place of the liberal, Mr. Ronald McNeill became specialist for foreign politics. He began to brandish a paper ~~sabre cut out~~ of the leading articles of the arch-reactionary *Morning Post*, and to proclaim in terrifying bass voice the firmness of English foreign politics as pursued by the conservative cabinet. Mr. McNeill is under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, and speaks for his department in the House of Commons; for his chief, Lord Curzon, adorns with his worthy person the Upper House, that honorable assembly of speculators, who contribute money for the election campaigns of the governing party.

We were much ashamed of our ignorance when we first came across the name of this new shining light of the English Parliament and of English diplomacy in the newspapers. We had no idea who he was, and were obliged to look up reference books to obtain information concerning this gentleman who has so suddenly emerged from obscurity. But alas! The reference books gave us nothing to go by, for all we could learn about this ill-disposed individual, who cherishes such unfriendly feelings towards Soviet Russia, is that he is 63 years of age, that he has been assistant to an editor issuing the 11th edition of the *British Encyclopedia*, and that he has written a work on the harmfulness of socialism and the utility of the exploitation of Ireland. But how this young man with the tremendous past has become the bard of English imperialist hopes, was a mystery to us until a few days ago, when we read the solution in the Fabian organ, *The New Statesman*. Mr. Ronald McNeill belongs to the most stupid-headed wing of the English conservatives, and has blazoned his name eternally in the book of history by a heroic deed. During the struggle carried on between the conservatives and liberals over the Irish question, he threw a book at Winston Churchill's head. For this he has now been rewarded by the position of under-secretary of state in the foreign office, and the reader is thus obliged to study his biography.

This gentleman declared only a few days ago in Parliament, that there could be no thought of recognizing Soviet Russia until it acknowledges the debts and gives the English capitalists their factories back again. But even should Soviet Russia do all this, the severe Mr. McNeill is only going to "see" . . .

Mr. McNeill is making a mistake. He will not get the chance of "seeing". For Byron's words, when he spoke of the heroes who come and go every month, and have incense burnt before them in succession by the newspapers, apply still more to the England of today than to the England of a century ago.

The honorable Lord Balfour, in 1918, threatened the Soviet government that he would make it personally responsible for the crime of the Red Terror. His lordship is now engaged in curing his piles and reading medieval mystics because he has plenty of time for such things, being no longer in the government. And then the prime minister himself, Ulysses Lloyd George the versatile, took an oath that he would never sit at the same table with the Moscow robbers. But still he did so, and even made himself very agreeable. Although we are convinced that the haughty English government will find itself obliged, sooner or later, to enter into negotiations with regard to the recognition of Soviet Russia, still there is little likelihood of our having anything to do with Mr. McNeill, for Mrs. Britannia has become very fickle in her old age, and changes the heroes of her heart with astonishing rapidity.

The hero of a month, Mr. McNeill, has been endeavoring to frighten us. He has sent us a semi-official threat per radio, relating to the execution of that spy in Catholic cowl, the prelate Butkiewitz, and informs us that the English government is about to examine into the advisability of withdrawing the English representative in Moscow, Mr. Hodgson, since the Soviet government does not grant immunity to Entente spies. This intimation can do no more than call forth a smile at the clumsy agitative methods of the personified incapability at present representing the English government. It goes without saying that the Soviet government has been guilty of unheard of inhumanity in having spies shot. But that the English government will break with us on account of a Polish spy is something which nobody is likely to believe; for that we have too much respect for the understanding of the English government, however low its level may be at present.

The Bolsheviks are very bad people. But still they are good enough to trade with, and at the present time this trade is likely to be considerably increased, now that the fresh crops will permit the export of grain. But even were we to preserve silence on these material motives, none but a blockhead would think