

# The Workers' Council

Vol. I.

New York, April 1, 1921.

No. 1.

**The Commune: Half a Century of Struggle: 1871-1921**

=====  
**Russia's Triumph**

=====  
**A Home for the Politically Homeless**

=====  
**Accepting the Third International**

=====  
**A Place in the Sun**

=====  
**The Workers' Council**

=====  
**TEN CENTS A COPY**

**\$2.50 A YEAR**

=====  
THE WORKERS' COUNCIL, an organ for the Third International, published by the International Educational Association,  
320 Broadway, Room 620, New York.

# The Workers' Council

Vol. I.

New York, April 1, 1921.

No. 1.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
The Workers' Council .....	2
A Place in the Sun .....	2
A Bitter Lesson .....	4
Russia's Triumph .....	5
Gompers and Hillquit .....	6
England and America in Struggle for World Domination .....	8
A Home for the Politically Homeless.....	9
Accepting the Third (A Telegram) .....	10
Press Review .....	11
Communist Russia .....	12
The Commune: Half a Century of Struggle .....	13
Unity .....	15
Manager's Column .....	16

Published by the International Educational Association.  
BENJAMIN GLASSBERG, Sec'y Editorial Board  
WALTER M. COOK, SEC'Y INTERN. EDUC. ASSN.

## The Workers' Council

AN ORGAN FOR THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The working class of the United States, today, is as much exploited economically and as much suppressed politically as any other in the world, and it has the weakest labor movement on the political as well as on the economic field. Still the American masses are by no means inherently reactionary or conservative. They have shown a keen response to the appeal of the Russian proletarian revolution, and their attitude towards Soviet Russia has been so unmistakably sympathetic that though unorganized it has prevented the government from active military hostilities during the last two years.

Moreover there is a growing sentiment that stands behind the Third International and its principles. All that is needed is a force that will cement this unorganized sympathy and understanding and loose allegiance into a compact body.

The Socialist Party vacillating between the Second and the Third International, standing upon a platform of ineffectual reforms and parliamentarism of the kind that have, since the war, been discarded by every European socialist party outside of the Second International, is not today the instrument of revolutionary working-class education and action.

The American working-class undoubtedly offers a field for fruitful action. But this action can be undertaken only after all those who are today working as individuals and in groups for its culmination, have been gathered behind a great driv-

ing force functioning on the political as well as on the economic fields, reaching the working-class in the shops and in meetings, in the labor organizations and through the press, in political campaigns and in political organizations.

"The Workers' Council," a bi-weekly organ for education and propaganda which is about to make its first appearance, intends to become the medium through which this force will find expression. In launching the new undertaking we are fully conscious of the task we are facing. But it must be undertaken and can be met successfully if every one of us does his duty.

"The Workers' Council" will stand uncompromisingly and unreservedly for the Third (Communist) International and its principles. It will attempt to carry such agitation into working-class circles that have never been reached before.

It will endeavor to become the expression of revolutionary Socialism, as it was conceived by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the Communist Manifesto of 1847, and as it has been interpreted, in the light of modern conditions, by the Russian Revolution, culminating in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The Workers' Council" will stand by these principles and endeavor to make them a conscious force in the American labor movement. It calls upon the class-conscious elements of the workers to rally to its support.

## A Place in the Sun

Whatever our opinion may be of the gentleman who now occupies the White House, it must be admitted that he, unlike his weakly vacillating predecessor, leaves no one in doubt as to his position. He is the servant of the imperialist interest of America, and he does not care who knows it. He is determined upon an aggressive foreign policy that will establish the American capitalist class firmly as a factor in the world market. He realizes that imperialism abroad can be achieved and maintained only at the expense of democratic institutions at home, that only a complete centralization of power in the hands of a small group of autocrats can assure the success of his ambitious plan. And Mr. Harding is willing to pay the price. He has no patience with the weakly sentimentality that pretends to preserve constitutional rights that are obviously not in accord with the new role that America is to play. He makes no attempt to hide his real purpose behind a smoke-screen of beautiful phrases. He does not propose to be handicapped in the serious business of capturing the world for the money powers of the United States by a too close consideration of the opinions and feelings of its people.

The first week of the new administration has indicated beyond a doubt the policy that is to be

pursued. In the inaugural address, hidden in the mass of florid verbiage that is used on such occasions to conceal the speaker's true opinions, we find a short paragraph, so short that it almost escaped public attention, that serves notice upon the American people, that the era of international warfare has only just begun.

"Our supreme task," says Mr. Harding, "is the resumption of our onward normal way. Reconstruction, readjustment, restoration — all these must follow. I would like to have them. If it will lighten the spirit and add to the resolution with which we take up the task let me repeat, for our nation, we shall give no people just cause to make war upon us. We hold no national prejudices, we entertain no spirit of revenge, we do not hate, we do not covet, we dream of no conquest nor boast of armed prowess.

"If, despite this attitude, war is again forced upon us I earnestly hope a way may be found which will unify our individual and collective strength and consecrate all America, materially and spiritually, body and soul, to national defense. I can vision the ideal republic, where every man and woman is called under the flag for assignment to duty for whatever service, military or civic the individual is best fitted, where we may call to universal service every plant, agency or facility, all in the sublime sacrifice for country, and not one penny or war profit shall inure to the benefit of private individual, corporation or combination, but all above the normal shall flow into the defense chest of the nation.

"Out of such universal service will come a new unity of spirit and purpose, a new confidence and consecration, which would make our defense impregnable, our triumph assured. Then we should have little or no disorganization of our economic, industrial and commercial systems at home, no staggering war debts, no swollen fortunes to flout the sacrifices of our soldiers, no excuse for sedition, no pitiable slackerism, no outrages of treason."

To make certainly doubtfully sure, the Secretary of the Navy, a few days later, announced the program of the new administration, and demanded that the United States must have a navy, as large or larger than that of any other nation in the world.

Nor is all this to be accepted simply as idle "big talk," or as a warning issued to the world in general that the United States intends to protect itself to the utmost from foreign attack. On the contrary, the administration has already launched upon a very positive program of imperialist aggression, a program so palpably unfriendly to both Japan and England, the two chief competitors against American capital in the world market, that difficulties are bound to ensue. The sending of General Wood to the Philippines will certainly be regarded in Japan as a threat. The proposed concentration of the entire fleet in the Pacific can serve only to deepen this impression. In fact Washington, according to the statements given out to the correspondents of the press, makes no secret of its intentions. The fleet will go to the Pacific, not because the country is in danger of invasion, but for the purpose of emphasizing the new foreign policy upon which the United States is about to embark. The American govern-

ment is determined to play a more important part in the Pacific and in the Orient than hitherto. Nothing that transpires in there shall escape its notice, nothing of international moment shall be done there without its consent. According to these statements, America has had to submit to indignity after indignity in the past in its foreign relations. Recent years have changed this. The war has made the United States a military as well as an economic factor, and the new administration is not prepared to relinquish the position it has already gained. In line with this change of foreign policy, it has been intimated that the new administration will disregard the Lansing-Ishi treaty, since it practically recognizes and establishes the dominance of Japan in the Orient. In other words, our neighbors on the other side of the Pacific have been thus unofficially notified that the present administration does not propose to stand by the foreign policies of the Wilson Administration.

American capital is emerging from a long period of extremely profitable exploitation at home. But the industrial development of the nation has been carried to the point of satisfaction. Investment within the borders of the United States no longer promise anything more than moderate return. Large investors, their lust for enormous profits inflamed by the extraordinary inflation that accompanied the war, are reaching out to Asia for more profitable fields. China, hitherto regarded by Japanese capital as its own private field of exploitation, must be made immediately accessible to American capital. Mexico South and Central America must come so completely under the domination of their great neighbor on the North as to practically nullify the possibility of Japanese influence there. They must, moreover, be made more tractable to the will and dictatorship of American investors, must be forced to lend them the same sympathetic support and interest that they have been accustomed to receive at the hands of their public servants at home.

Meanwhile England is ill at ease over this metamorphosis that is turning a friendly and more or less desultory competitor into an active menace. English capital has already found a firm foothold in China. London reports the organization of a huge business enterprise that will undertake to unlock China's industrial resources. This concern has already secured important concessions from Peking. Up to this time it has been impossible for foreign capital to own real property outside the open ports. These limitations have been removed in the interests of the new undertaking. Thus the United States, by reaching out into territory now under the domination of either Japanese or English capital, is storing up trouble for the future, a fact that our administration recognized, and for which it intends to be prepared.

In short, the United States, in a single week, has openly broken with its traditional position of aloofness in international affairs. The administration has steered the ship of state into a course that can have but one ultimate outcome, new international difficulties and new wars, without pretending to consult Congress, the recognized expression of the will of the people. Its transactions are clothed in a deep shroud of mystery becoming public only when all possibil-

ity of an expression of public opinion has passed. It has been possible, in this great democracy of ours, for a few men to place the entire nation in a position where war is inevitable, to adopt a course that can be maintained only by the abnegation of every free principle of government, under a regime of unqualified autocratic reaction. Under the Constitution Congress alone has the right to make war. But Mr. Harding and his Cabinet without consulting Congress have adopted a policy which will lead inexorably to new hostilities, with Mexico, with Japan, with England. The time will come when conflict heaped upon conflict, when injury added to injury, will flare up into a new world war. Then the rulers of these nations will once more come before their peoples, to show how ruthless they have been attacked, how their most sacred rights have been trampled upon. Mr. Harding and his cabinet will call upon Congress to declare war upon the enemy who has dared to invade the shrine of our liberties. They will call upon the people to vote upon the question of war or peace when it is too late to recede, when they, by their imperialistic machinations, have piled up a conflagration that will threaten to consume the world. Congress will vote for war, because there is no other alternative. And the men of the nation will once more give their lives that American imperialism may live.

## The Bitter Lesson

While the pre-war dollar still hovers about the 50-cent level, the masters of industry are busily reducing wages to the pre-war point. Wholesale reductions of 10, 20, and 30 per cent are being announced throughout the country. In the less organized industries cuts of as high as 60 per cent are being quietly put through. As usual, the lowest paid workers suffer from the largest comparative cuts. The packers not only announce a wage cut of 12½ per cent, affecting 200,000 workers, but also the replacing of the basic eight-hour day by one of ten hours. This in spite of their agreement with the workers to maintain the status quo until a year after a treaty of peace was signed with Germany. From coast to coast the railroads are vigorously setting about the task of lowering the standard of living of millions of men. Here also the lowest paid workers must stand the brunt of the attack. Hundreds of thousands of railroad laborers are being reduced from \$4 to \$3 a day.

This is a "return to normalcy" with a vengeance! It is the real inaugural message to the American workers, though of course there was no hint of anything of the sort in the pious platitudes emitted by Mr. Harding in front of the Capitol.

These wage-reductions are natural and inevitable in circumstances like the present under a system like our own. The object of our economic system is to maintain profits. In our society the purpose of a field of wheat is not to provide bread but to build up profits. The purpose of a clothing industry is not to provide clothes but to create dividends. The purpose of a railroad is not to transport people and commodities, but to transport gold into the pockets of the insiders. To a sane and impartial

planetary observer such a system of production would seem quite mad. It is the system we have, however, and there is certainly no political intelligence at large in high places that holds out any hope of a better one.

The recent industrial slump has threatened the holy profits. The domestic consumer has grown wary and a good proportion of our foreign markets have vanished while the European statesmen have been completing the ruin of Europe. Industrial stagnation has brought on a labor surplus here and the masters of industry have been quick to take advantage of it. Wages are being reduced in order that the great god Profit may be maintained in the style to which he is accustomed.

The maintenance of profit is not as simple as it was before Mr. Wilson led us forth in the grand but expensive crusade to usher in a new world order. Taxes are sky high. The war must be paid for. It must be paid for out of production, for there is no other way. Either profits must be sacrificed or the workers must be sacrificed. Since the profit mongers are the lords of industry, the worker must pay.

In the present situation the worker is in the position of being the most easily replaceable part of the industrial machine. This condition is common except in times of labor famine. It will continue to recur as long as the workers tolerate a leadership which accepts the economic creed of capitalism. It will continue as long as the workers are willing to serve capitalism as cannon fodder in war and factory-fodder in peace.

Only by class-conscious organization can those who produce from their toil and sweat, out of their suffering and starvation, all the wealth of the world, be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor and build a new world of happiness and freedom. Only by class-conscious organization can they cast from their shoulders the overwhelming dead-weight of profit. Only by class-conscious organization and international solidarity can they escape the old captivity, strike off the old chains. The present is a time of bitter education, but its lesson is plain. Can the workers fail to profit by it?

## COMMUNIST RUSSIA

(Continued from Page 12)

intrigues and blockades. It may take ten years, perhaps a generation. What of it! Russia is past the most difficult period of transition from the capitalist state to a communist state, while other capitalist countries must still face the period of revolution. Therefore let Russia lead the way. Let the American workers realize that Russia's fight is their fight, that Soviet Russia's success is the success of the laboring people the world over! Hail Soviet Russia, the first Communist Republic, the land of, by and for the common people. We greet you, workers and peasants of Russia, who by your untold sacrifices, by your determination and devotion, are transforming the Russia of black reaction, of the domination of a few, into a land of glorious promise for all. Comrades in America, watch the bright dawn in the East; you have but your chains to lose, and a world to gain!

## Russia's Triumph

With the signing of the Russo-British trade pact, to be followed by a peace treaty with Poland, the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic enters upon a new stage of progress. After three and a half years of isolation it has now won its right to recognition as a Sovereign State. After three and a half years of battle against a hostile world in arms eager to maintain the old order of greed and grab, Soviet Russia unaided has beaten off her enemies and forced them to come to terms with her. Against Soviet Russia invasions failed, and starvation blockades failed, and lying propaganda failed, and internal plotters and hired assassins failed. At times it seemed that only by a miracle could free Russia survive, for czarism and the ineffective transition governments had left nothing but chaos and starvation. The survival is indeed a miracle of heroism. The triumph of the Russian workers and peasants is the most notable event of modern times.

Not altruism certainly, but hard reality, led the Imperial British Government to sign a trade treaty with Soviet Russia on equal terms, to pledge itself to the lifting of the blockade and to co-operate with Russian trade processes. It is the primary business of the British Government, in its foreign policy, to look after British trade. For many months Germany has been diligently cultivating the Russian market. Seven great orders for locomotives and locomotive parts alone have been placed in Germany by the Russian Commissariat of Ways and Communications. German manufacturers, starved for markets, have rushed ahead on these orders. In the matter of locomotive parts they are three months ahead on deliveries. Their locomotives began to arrive in Russia some weeks ago. If British statesmen permitted this most promising market to slip away from them, the realistic British traders would liquidate the power of Lloyd George & Co. in short order. Thus it has happened that the Russian emigrés in London and the little band of former Russian diplomats without a country have of late been finding Downing Street not at home when they called. Britain's idle factories and Britain's army of unemployed were the first consideration in British politics. The Russian market was a necessity if Britain was to pull itself out of a nasty economic hole. The attraction of Moscow proved irresistible, let the old-fashioned Tories and imperialists rail as they would.

In concluding the pact, the Lloyd George Government scored doubly. It scored over its chief imperialist rival, France, and its chief economic rival, the United States.

The entente with France has for some time been showing signs of wear and tear. The recent occupation of the Rhine Valley was obviously not altogether to the liking of the British Government, and has caused a further strain on Anglo-French relations. England has no particular reason at present to welcome a greater France that may grow into an uncomfortable neighbor. England wants above all things peace and quiet and trade, and France's present policy of intrigue and bluff has been keeping all Europe and part of Asia in a turmoil. More-

over the French chauvinist press has been vigorously attacking England and lauding the United States. The Russo-British trade pact marks the first serious break in the entente.

Incidentally it leaves the United States in a humiliating position. Here too we have a critical unemployment problem. The capitalists have found bankrupt Europe a dead market for our goods. The continental chauvinist governments are willing to buy, but they want to borrow money with which to pay, and their assets are not easily discernible to the naked eye. Russia, the greatest market in the world today, has been offering us preferential treatment for her trade since there first appeared a possibility that the Russian blockade would be opened. But the Wilson administration chose to spurn the offers and deport the Russian trade representatives. From any point of view the policy was imbecilic. It was cleverly fostered by anti-Russian propaganda emanating from London, which our provincial politicians and our narrow-minded capitalists swallowed, lock, stock and barrel. While British statesmen were perfecting their agreements with Krassin and British traders were eagerly making their arrangements in Moscow itself through their accredited agents, British diplomats were cleverly disseminating for American consumption propaganda that no self-respecting nation could have any dealings with Russia. It was a slick game, and it worked. Britain has handsomely won from Uncle Sam the first round in the struggle for markets.

The signing of the trade pact follows a month of the wildest sort of anti-Russian propaganda, emanating mostly from French sources. As soon as Krassin's final negotiations began in London, the French propaganda factory at Helsingfors began to announce the imminent overthrow of the Soviet Government. French and Finnish intrigues managed to give color to the propaganda by stirring up a little counter-revolutionary tempest at Kronstadt, which was announced as in progress, in the reactionist press in Paris, some days before it actually occurred. Anti-Soviet uprisings were reported all over Russia, and in the so-called "news" the streets of Moscow and Petrograd ran with blood, while Lenin was packing his trunks to flee. It is now plain that all these wildcat reports were sheer inventions. The trouble was confined to Kronstadt, and is being gradually liquidated, the delay being caused by the desire of the Soviet authorities to avoid bloodshed, even the blood of the poor dupes of French imperialism. It is interesting to note in connection with the Kronstadt affair the persistent reports that food has been furnished to the rioters by a counter-revolutionary propagandist organization calling itself the American Red Cross. That is good news for the British traders!

Thus Soviet Russia enters a new era. The blockade is ended. The imperialist thieves are divided in counsels. A more normal life can be assumed and a great era of construction looms ahead. The Russian workers can now set about their task of building up a civilization that will be a model for the whole world, a model in human happiness, in human right, in human freedom. The dreams of the little man in the Kremlin can move towards splendid realization.

## Gompers and Hillquit

On February 8th, 1921, the Hillquit report urging the severance of all international Socialist relations was adopted by the Central Committee of Local New York.

On March the 8th, 1921, Gompers cabled to the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam announcing the severance of relations between the A. F. of L. and the international labor movement.

At a time when the imperialists of the world are more and more solidifying their ranks; at a time when the need for working-class unity was never greater than at present, American Labor and American Socialism are urged to eschew entangling alliances with Internationalism. American workers are called upon to sever affiliation with their European comrades who would lead the American movements to destruction.

The Russian comrades, the Hungarian comrades and the Italian comrades may be face to face with the power of Entente Imperialism and reaction, but Hillquit bids the Socialist Party turn its back on their struggles and "devote all of its strength and resources to build up on American soil a powerful organization of class-conscious revolutionary Socialism."

Gompers and Hillquit are both united on a policy of isolation; both believe it necessary and possible to erect a barrier separating America from the onward sweep of the social and economic forces let loose by the World War and the post-war period.

Gompers is faced with two internationals, the Yellow at Amsterdam and the Red at Moscow. He has never made any pretense at friendliness with the Soviet "savages". He has never flirted with Bolshevism. Neither will he swallow the Amsterdam International. Its militant pronouncements against the brutal murderers posing as the Hungarian Government, which has been engaged in a systematic campaign for the complete destruction of the working-class movement of Hungary, although signed by his friend Appleton, were too much for Gompers. He has "withdrawn" American Labor from such contaminating influences.

Hillquit is faced with three Internationals. The Second, the Third and the "would-be" or "two and a half." He will have none of the Second. A reading of the platform and principles he drew up for the May 1920 Convention of the Socialist Party would clearly indicate that that is where he really belongs. No European party still talks of bringing about Socialism after "political power has been achieved through the securing of a majority in Congress and in every State Legislature, and the winning of the principal executive and judicial offices." Only in the Second International can such phrases still be found. Hillquit even had a good word to say about the leaders of the Second International, long since repudiated by every Socialist. In describing the growth of Socialism in Europe, he pointed with pride to the fact that "in Sweden and in Czecho-Slovakia; in Germany and in Austria,

Socialists were largely in control of their governments."

At the same convention, Hillquit thundered against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Soviet System. Two months later at the Geneva Congress of the Second International, J. H. Thomas, Vandervelde, Scheidemann and Huysmanns likewise thundered against "any form of Dictatorship." But the rank and file of the Socialist Party have long since buried the Second International, and so Hillquit will have none of it.

For a time the "would be" International at Vienna offered an avenue of escape. The N. E. C. at first indicated its intention of sending a delegate to the initial conference held at Berne in December 1920, but it refused in the end to be officially represented at the February conference at Vienna. It may be that the manifesto adopted by the Centrist parties meeting at Berne, influenced the decision of the N. E. C. In its manifesto we find the following declaration on the dictatorship:

"The dictatorship, i. e., the application of all the means of state power of the Proletariat when it has become the ruling class, to counter the resistance which the bourgeoisie may offer to the realization of Socialism, is a transitional phase in the evolution from the capitalist class state to the Socialist Commonwealth. . . . If however during the period of the decisive struggle for power, democracy is destroyed by the intensity of the class antagonism, then the workers must assume dictatorship through proletarian class organization."

This definite approval of the necessity of a dictatorship in addition to the opposition within the party, perhaps influenced the party officials to stay away from Vienna.

In Hillquit's report to the Central Committee repudiating all affiliation with any International and especially the Third, a number of reasons for this decision are given which we will attempt to analyze:

1. "The Socialist Party has repeatedly and constantly declared its readiness to affiliate with the Communist International, with only such reservations as were imperatively imposed by existing conditions," it declares. The report failed to mention that these reservations include every principle upon which the Communist International is based, but to Hillquit this means "repeatedly and constantly declaring readiness to affiliate."

2. Affiliation with the Communist International would mean changing the name of the party to "Communist Party," which we are led to infer is something very dangerous or terrible, thereby giving implied sanction to the treatment by the government of members of the existing Communist Parties. The report fails to point out that even the Government has not gone so far as to consider the name "Communist" as in itself illegal, but that the clause in the Communist Party program calling for armed insurrection was the excuse given by the government for its policy of terrorism,—an excuse which was repudiated in the decision of Federal Judge Anderson.

3. "It would have to subscribe publicly to a program committing it to illegal activity." This is

probably based upon Point III. of the 21 points which declares:

"The Class Struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus, which at the decisive moment should do its duty by the party, and in every way possible assist the revolution. In every country where, in consequence of material law or of other exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, a combination of lawful and unlawful work is absolutely necessary."

We are to assume from this objection that Hillquit would not have us continue our propaganda if the carrying on of Socialist propaganda was made illegal or was forbidden by the law. Should the law forbid Socialist propaganda, we should evidently, according to Hillquit, then and there cease all efforts at spreading the message of Socialism. Point III. requires that where, because of martial law or of other exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, then a combination of lawful and unlawful work is necessary. That, according to Hillquit, means subscribing to a policy of illegal activity. This is one of the half truths that are worse than untruths. Surely, Comrade Hillquit would not be in favor of ceasing all Socialist propaganda merely because the ruling class forbade it. No party ever did and no Socialist Party worthy of the name ever will. The capitalist class carries on its struggle against the workers by legal and illegal means at all times, not hesitating even at suspending the Constitution when necessary. Comrade Hillquit however, would have the worker entertain so great a respect for the laws of property, that he would forbid them from waging any sort of struggle which was not strictly legal.

The Spanish Socialist Party recently addressed a number of questions to the Executive Committee of the Third International relating to the question of illegal organizations within the party. The answer of the Executive Committee published in *Le Populaire*, January 25th, 1921, is worth while quoting at this point.

"The reason for the existence of the illegal organization consists in the necessity of giving to the party at all times and under all conditions the possibility of remaining in existence, independent of the policies of the government and of the whim of the government officials, and to have ready at hand the means for giving a systematic revolutionary direction to all of its activities.

"The illegal organization is a sort of liason organization. It is subordinate, as all other activities of the party are, to the Central Committee of the Party. The numerical proportion between legal and illegal organizations depends upon political conditions. If there is no interference with political liberty, the illegal organization will be reduced in importance, but if reaction rules, the Central Committee itself will doubtless be forced to undertake secret activities. In any case, that part of the party which works illegally, will not constitute an independent organization."

4. The report opposes the 21 points because it calls for systematic propaganda in the Army, and it leaves it to be inferred that to engage in propaganda in the army would help to bring about the destruction of the Socialist Movement. The report does not oppose propaganda in the Army as such. It does not take the position that propaganda in the Army is wrong, but it does assume that to declare ourselves in favor of propaganda in the army would be fatal.

It is interesting at this point to recall that at the 1904 convention of the Socialist Party, a motion was introduced by a delegate named Reynolds of India urging that we authorize and direct the N. E. C. to take action for the "concentrating of specialized, determined propaganda for Socialism among the privates of the army and the militia over the entire country and its Colonies." The motion however was not adopted. (Proceedings of National Convention 1904, p. 277.)

The same resolution came up again at the 1908 Convention, and Spargo reporting for the Resolution Committee said that the 1904 resolution on the Army and Navy was brought up again, and he presented the following resolution:

"The Convention recommends that the N. E. C. consider the question of instituting a special propaganda among the privates of army, navy, and the state militia."

This resolution was carried. (From proceedings of National Convention 1908, p. 178).

In other words, the need of carrying on systematic propaganda in the Army is by no means new. Neither has the notion emanated from the brain of Zinoviev. All parties have at all times realized the necessity for carrying on such propaganda. In 1917, during the mayoralty campaign special efforts were made in New York City to bring the message of Socialism to the newly drafted soliders at Camp Upton. Hillquit himself attempted to go out and talk to the "boys" although the military authorities interfered.

It is true that the American standing army is not a conscript army as are all European armies. None of us have any illusions as to the character of the make-up of the American army, but nevertheless, efforts should be made to reach them, as well as all other Americans.

5. Hillquit objects to submitting every platform and declaration of principles for approval to the Communist International and to submit to its decisions on all questions of party policy and party tactics. He fails to point out that Point 15 clearly advises that a program should be drawn up in conformity with the special conditions of every country, as well as in accordance with the resolutions of the International: that Point 16 states that in the adoption of binding resolutions, the International is bound to consider the variety of conditions under which the different parties have to work and struggle. Hillquit's idea of an International is still the Second International, an International which contents itself with talk and passing compromise resolutions and then leaves each party to do as it pleases. That is the kind of International Hillquit advises the Socialist movement to wait for. The workers

of the world are urged to organize "loosely" with "autonomy," etc. In this way, presumably, they will be best fitted to meet the solid ranks of the Imperialist nations ready at any moment to clamp an air-tight blockade against any Socialist revolution. The miserable failure of the lamented Second International has evidently taught the Hillquits nothing. If he can have his way there will be no centralized form of organization in the international field nor within the party.

Not a word is said in this report about the Dictatorship of the Proletariat or the Soviet form of government. Is it possible that since the May convention, the Dictatorship has been embraced as something acceptable to "American psychology"? Perhaps in another year, the party leaders will be willing to accept the twenty-one points.

The party leaders have to their record a series

of blunders piled upon blunders. Bankruptcy is written large over the entire movement. Only one thing can help to give it new life, and that is open and unreserved affiliation with the Third International. This one thing the party officials refuse to do, in spite of the expressed wishes of the membership. They will not even allow a delegation which they themselves chose, to go to Russia, evidently for fear of its being affected with Bolshevism.

We may quote in conclusion from the Russian Press Review, No. 9, "Comrades, make it plain to every worker, that it is not a matter of one, two, five, or twenty-one conditions, but that there is only one real condition, namely: that those parties which desire to affiliate to the Communist International, must be real Communist revolutionary proletarian parties, in which there is no room for reformists, social pacifists and waverers."

## England and America in Struggle for World's Domination

By M. P. PAVLOVICH

While the French press is full of attacks and bitter reproaches towards England and is already bringing up the question of the end of the Entente, the same press is full of praise for the United States and is emphasizing the rapid growth of the war, marine and economic might of the United States.

France is a country with a small population, weakened by the war, having in the East an enemy in Germany, which if not today will tomorrow show its teeth again and the only reliable Ally of the Continent is Belgium, not counting Poland of the "Schlachta" (Landlords)—France would never have dared to begrudge England if she would not feel behind her a support of some considerable force. Lately the French press is full of articles regarding the English-American rivalry. This rivalry is first of all manifested in the struggle for the domination of the seas. The items which the French press has recently printed (Temps of Aug. 8th) show indeed the tremendous success of the United States in the struggle for the domination of the oceans.

In the year 1914, just before the war started, the United States was in her merchant marine (steamers) behind Germany, France, Japan and Italy. The tonnage of the American fleet was almost ten times less than the tonnage of the marine of the Queen of the seas—England. But after the period of 1914 to 1920 the tonnage of the American steam fleet grew six times and now the United States in its merchant marine is far ahead of Germany, France, Italy and Japan and is now occupying the second place after England.

In the year 1914 the English fleet was equal to 18,000,000 tons, the American 2,000,000 tons. In the year 1920 the English marine had 18,100,000, the American 12,400,000 tons. The English fleet decreased, owing to the submarine war, by 800,000 tons. The American, however, increased to 10,380,000 tons, e. i., 500%. The United States has taken up seriously the question of becoming the dominator

of the seas and putting England second. The efforts of the United States to overtake England in *war marine* armaments are even of a more intense character. The English Government has announced more than once that the English fleet under all circumstances must always be equal to the combined fleets of two of the strongest *maritime* governments in the world.

This position is considered the axiom of the English war marine policy and has been sanctioned more than once in the House of Commons and the House of the Lords. But the United States decided not to consider the predictions of the Dominator of the seas. In the last report of the American Naval Department we find the following lines:

"The Naval Department has established a policy according to which the fleet of the United States must become equal in its force to the strongest navy which any country in the world may have; therefore we shall increase our fleet yearly in accordance with our resources. This we must attain by all means not later than 1925."

The French Temps remarks that the only fleet to which the American Secretary of the Navy has alluded is the English fleet which is of course the strongest in the world. Now England is menaced by a danger.

The items which the French press brings up show that America has a chance of overtaking England in the tonnage of the war marine in the year 1923, which is two years before the expected time, if England will not put forth its utmost efforts. The official organ of the French government concludes with a remark:

"With deep emotion and apprehension we are tracing the movement of the fleets of both countries. The struggle for the domination of the seas has begun."

The French press tries to hide its joy over the open fight which has begun between the United States and England for domination of the seas,

but it cannot hide the joy, and indeed this struggle will have important consequences. We note why and how the conflict between Germany and England has begun. England demanded that Germany stop naval armaments, having nothing against the armaments of Russia, Belgium or France. The endeavor of Imperialistic Germany to create by all means the strongest navy, the building of the greatest number of high type warships, the works over the Canal of Kiel, etc., all this was the most important factor which excited all England and which made the dominating classes of Great Britain join Russia and France with whom however, England had serious controversy in America and in Asia. Now in place of Germany there appears a much more dangerous competitor for England in the shape of the United States.

The French bourgeoisie hopes to profit by the English-American conflict the same as they did in the German-English conflict. This is the explanation of the courage and daring with which the French press is attacking England. It is interesting to note that the French press is trying to brush aside the role played by the English and especially Russian army at the beginning of the war and which practically saved France from being utterly demolished. But instead of it the French press praises the merits of the "remarkable, heroic" American army, which chased away the barbarous Germans. When we read the articles in some French

papers about America's army and navy it reminds us of the same articles which were written before the war in regard to the Russian army and the might of Czarist Russia. These articles seem to say to every citizen:

"Do not be afraid of our conflicts with England. We play one hundred per cent sure. America will carry us through. By the time Great Britain will have made up her mind to attack us the American fleet will be the first in the world."

In the growing English-American conflict French diplomacy sees the best means to raise the "world" significance of France as a country whose friendship or hostility is of importance to everyone of the rival countries which are about to begin in the near future a bloody war. Bourgeois France begins to feel itself the master of the situation, but the International proletariat will crush these hopes together with the whole capitalistic building and under the ruins of the latter the remnants of the French, English and American bourgeoisie will be buried. If not we shall soon be witnesses of another world war, where millions of proletarians of all countries of the world will perish again for the sake of the French exchange and for the sake of raising the dividends of dynamite and gun kings. The English-American struggle for the world domination is first of all a struggle for the domination of the Pacific Ocean, in other words the yellow continent.

## A Home for the Politically Homeless

By KARL RADEK

The 2½ International is an organization without independent political ideas. It is an organization that is unwilling to carry out in practice the ideas it has borrowed from the Communist International and diluted to its own taste. It is not an international organization of the proletariat at all but aims consciously to be an international loosely joined federation of the various national centrist parties. How little faith it places in its own power to fight and survive it proves by its desperate cleaving to the yellow Trades Union International of Amsterdam. Nevertheless it would be a mistake to assume that it is unable to exist. If the revolutionary movement in the western European countries does not at once take more rapid strides, if the process of the radicalization of the masses of Labor does not make immediate progress, the 2½ International will be able to prevent the vacillating elements among the revolutionary laboring masses from attaching themselves to the Third International. It will become the home for the politically homeless who are unable to decide for this side or that. To be sure its existence will be but a shadowy one. Incapable of action, incapable of becoming the living, revolutionary advance-guard of the world proletariat, it will form the mere illusion of the rear of the proletarian army, unless events somehow force it to the fighting front of the world revolution.

How large these hesitating masses are appears most clearly in the most recent happenings within

the Italian Socialist Party. The Italian Socialist Party used to be regarded as one of the largest and most important parties of the Communist International. The thousands upon thousands of workers who stood behind that party gave proof of their steadfastness in the earlier skirmishes of the Italian Revolution. Their sympathies for Soviet Russia they expressed in terms of action at the time when she was threatened with the gravest dangers. They declared themselves openly for the dictatorship of the proletariat. They assimilated the idea of the workers' councils and they even tried, in connection with one of their revolutionary engagements, to put into practice the control of production by shop councils. Nevertheless they were as a matter of fact connected with the reformistic past by bonds the significance of which they themselves do not understand, although these bonds threaten to strangle the Italian Revolution. Because the reformists within the Italian labor movement split just before the war, because the openly imperialistic elements among them left the party even before the war, the majority of the Italian revolutionary workers fail to see the danger which consists in the fact that their leadership contains democratic and pacifistic elements which are opposed to the Socialist revolution, opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat. And this mass of workers which considered itself an advance guard of the Communist International when it had to decide between the reformist leaders

and the Third International, decided at least in part in favor of the reformist leaders and against the Communist International. The fact that the workers who stand behind Serrati are firmly convinced that they have nevertheless remained true to the Communist International, is a proof of the gravity of the centrist danger in the international labor movement.

The poison of the centrist idea has eaten deeply into the body of the working-class. Only the future development of the world revolution can be the means of driving out this poison. It cannot be overcome by means of theory and propaganda. It can be overcome only by the struggle that shall fill the masses with the determination and the conviction that hesitation at the decisive moment means death. But the realization that the centrist spirit can be overcome only with and by the world revolution does not mean that the Communist International must adopt this spirit so that the revolution may proceed to overcome it. It is self-evident that wherever within its organism the centrist poison has found a place the diseased members must be removed, so that they may not be the cause of infecting the entire body.

The Communist International is *the revolutionary advance guard of the proletariat*. And the more conscious it is of the fact that it must maintain the closest contact with the mass of the workers while that mass is slowly developing, the more careful must it be to maintain in its ranks, in the ranks of this advance guard a calm sure consciousness of aim and direction. Certainly, whoever desires to lead the masses into a revolutionary struggle must be in close contact with them. He must not desire to determine the direction of their spontaneous movement. This the Communist International has never done. It adopts its aims on the basis of its understanding of the tendencies in the development of the world revolution. To adhere to the aims of the Communist International does not mean to advance one's own aims in a doctrinaire fashion to the working class; it means rather thinking in the present day of the working class in terms of its tomorrow, it means looking out beyond the meanderings of the road and keeping the goal in sight. It means forming a firm, solid advance guard in the movement of the revolutionary masses who are still uncertain of step, still fearing the consequences involved in their struggle, still going through a period of development, and with the aid of this advance guard urging the masses ever onward and leading them to victory. This situation implies the necessity not only of maintaining connections with the still hesitating masses, but also the duty of carrying on a merciless struggle against all their illusions, all their hesitation, and above all against the ideologies of the Center, its leaders and its organizations. The relation of the Communist International to the 2½ International must therefore be above all a relation of open hostility.

The more relentlessly, the more thoroughly we combat the lying the stalling, the hesitation and the vacillation of the 2½ International, the more firmly shall we close our ranks and the more strongly shall we make our influence felt among the masses that stand back of the 2½ International. With

these masses we shall cooperate wherever they appear in the great struggle. With their readers we shall fight relentlessly wherever and whenever they are misleading the masses, wherever and whenever they fail the masses in the fight.

The history of the Right International of Germany after the split in Halle has shown how much and how rapidly they swing still further toward the right, when once they have lost the ballast of the revolutionary workers. This self-revelation of the centrist elements will hasten the victory of the Communist International. The 2½ International is a product of the revolutionary process through which the entire world is passing. But it is not a product in which the creative spirit of the world revolution expresses itself. It is a decoctus historiae, a waste product of the world revolution. Hence the 2½ International is destined to be washed away by the stream of the world revolution as soon as that mighty current gains greater impetus. Until that time we must combat it as a burdensome tradition which retards the awakening of the workers to the consciousness of the revolutionary struggle.

### ACCEPTING THE THIRD

Committee on the Third International,  
of the Socialist Party of America.

Right now the advanced section of the world's workers are being called upon everywhere to decide whether they are for or against the revolution, whether they favor the change from capitalism to Socialism not only in theory but in practice. This condition applies to the United States as well as other countries. The answer determines whether you are with the Third International of world labor or against it, for the revolution or against it, for the dawn of Socialism or against it. Stripped of all verbiage, that is the situation as it appears to us and it is because the Third International points the way, the only way to the Socialist era that we are for it, that we feel the Socialist Party ought to affiliate with it. It is in this spirit also that a group of comrades have organized into the Committee of the Third International within the party, their opinion being that the actual processes of disintegration that our party is going through can only be arrested by the party's adopting as guidance for its action the principles enunciated by the Third International.

We favor affiliation without reservations with the Third International. The announced twenty-one articles of affiliation are not in our opinion a hindrance toward affiliation. All discussions as to the applicability in the United States at the present time of certain principles or tactics proposed by the Third International should be carried on within the International not from without. The party should and must if it would survive as a revolutionary working-class organization give its wholehearted support to the Third International and must arrange its organization and propaganda accordingly. Let party members interested in the work of the Committee communicate with the Secretary, fourteen hundred North Kedzie Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

J. LOUIS ENGBAHL, Chicago, Ill.  
STEVEN BIRCHER, Newark, N. J.

## Press Review

The two liberal weeklies, the Nation and the New Republic, express scornful amazement at the respectful manner with which President Harding's inaugural taradiddle was treated at home and abroad. After citing the rapturous encomiums of Republican Senators the Nations says: "Our metropolitan press, too, long accustomed to meaningless words, treats the inaugural with greatest respect—even the World doubting politely—each one interpreting Mr. Harding's phrases about world affairs to its own tastes and desires. At the risk of our lives we set down our pious wish that no one will laugh, for if any man should begin to laugh aloud the country would rock." We wonder what our liberal friends expected the capitalist senators and the capitalist press to say about the inaugural of the political head of the capitalist state? If Mr. Harding had stood up in front of the Capitol and merely remarked "Eeny, meeny, miny mo," (omitting the next line in deference to his southern constituents), the capitalist senators could have done no less than cried "Magnificent!" and the capitalist press would be bound to extol his wisdom. But we think the liberal brethren have not been exactly fair to Mr. Harding. It is true that he probably is not accustomed to think very deeply, or even very much. It is true that he uses our language with the awkwardness of a Zulu chieftain trying to eat with a fork. But these are not substantial matters. Were President Harding a Machiavelli for wisdom and the subtlest of stylists, in his present position he could not be substantially different from the transformed small town editor from Ohio. The forces that placed him in office would be the same, and he could represent nothing else. Merely he might be more successfully hypocritical. Eight years ago his predecessor, representing substantially the same forces, was inducted into office and spoke his stage piece. Then as now the groundlings gaped their approval. No sane person today would maintain that Mr. Wilson's refined phrases, his alluring generalities, had any relation to reality. Yet the Nation was almost hysterical in its praise of his inaugural, its "transparent sincerity," its "clear and sagacious intelligence," its promise of a new day. Had the New Republic been born at that time it would doubtless have vied with the Nation in laudation. But the difference between a Wilson and a Harding is only a matter of phraseology. As we read the Nation's adoration of the Wilson rhetoric we registered our pious wish that no one would laugh.

"It is perfectly obvious," says the London New Statesman, "that without the consent of American finance (rather than American diplomacy), no indemnity agreement can be made to work. American finance holds the whip hand over all Europe—witness only the applications, foreshadowed or actual, for loans in the current year from more than half peasant proprietary which forms the bulk of the Russian nation is unconverted. This is true; but if Socialism is to wait until farmers become class-conscious Marxists, it will wait forever. The bourgeoisie did not wait for the approval of the farmers

the states of Europe. Not the Capitol but Wall Street can wreck the treaty and the League if it wishes to." This parallels the recent utterance of Signor Ricci, the new Italian ambassador, said to be something of a corporation lawyer in his own country. Having looked over the ground, after his arrival, he remarked with refreshing frankness: "I see already that for some years at least the relations that representatives of European powers will have with American bankers and manufacturers and exporters will be of far greater importance than those with officials of the government." It is interesting that well informed Europeans know where the power lies here, even though the mass of the American people, and particularly the so-called leaders of organized labor, are ignorant of it. To control the industry of a nation is to control the life of its people. The political state is merely an adjunct of that control. How do the master minds of the A. F. of L. think the workers can have anything to say about the conduct of the country or the conduct of their own lives as long as a little group of bankers are permitted to be the czars of industry?

In the New Republic, Sidney Howard has been running a series of illuminating articles entitled "The Labor Spy." The editors in an introduction to the series explained that in gathering his material Mr. Howard talked with certain A. F. of L. officers who "denied that industrial espionage exists." Samuel Gompers thereupon wrote a letter to the publication denying the deniers. He declared it inconceivable that any officer of his organization had made such a statement to Mr. Howard, and he doubted if Mr. Howard could mention the name of one. To this the New Republic has come back editorially as follows: "We can furnish Mr. Gompers with an affidavit showing that on several occasions, local and national the A. F. of L. officials denied all knowledge of espionage to Mr. Howard. We are also prepared to supply him with information showing with reasonable certainty that, in one large industrial city, a visit paid by Mr. Howard and Mr. Dunn to the Federation was reported to a detective agency by one of the union officials with whom they talked." It would now seem up to Mr. Gompers to demand the affidavits forthwith and make public the names of these precious "representatives of labor." If the head of the A. F. of L. does not give them short shrift, he will simply be demonstrating anew his tenderness towards the labor fakers in his organization.

George Bernard Shaw, one of the few British writers who preserved their sanity throughout the war, in an article in the London Nation, neatly strips the rags of respectability from H. M. Hyndman, leader of the British social patriots. It is Hyndman's attitude towards Russia that Shaw goes after, and he marvels that since Russia has brought to reality what Hyndman has been preaching for many years, Hyndman can so vigorously attack the Soviet Government. "If, as Mr. Hyndman contends, Bolshevism is not real Marxism, but a murderous imposture, what does he think the real thing will be like?" asks Shaw. He then continues: "If one may infer his answer from his indictment of Bolshevism, he relies on the fact that the colossal

before they consummated the Capitalist transformation. . . We should still be in the Stone Age if Hodge always had his way. . . Mr. Hyndman, steadily intellectual as a historian at long range, is (being human) prejudiced as a current politician. During the war he was what he still is, a vehemently patriotic 'Majority Socialist.' But he denounces the German Majority Socialists fiercely for voting the German war credits and not coming out as pro-Britons and Pacifists. Yet he has no words scathing enough for Lenin because he refused to vote the war credits, and for . . . the Bolsheviks for surrendering at Brest Litovsk when they were hopelessly beaten, instead of bleeding to death as England's auxiliaries. This is neither Socialism nor the philosophy of history; it is naive John Bullism. . . There are moments when he seems to be revolted by the institution of compulsory labor by the Soviet Government. . . For my part I cannot understand why anyone who has the most elementary comprehension of Socialism can doubt that compulsory labor and the treatment of parasitic idleness as the sin against the Holy Ghost must be fundamental in Socialist law and religion. If Lenin has abolished idleness in Russia, whilst we, up to our eyes in debt, are not only tolerating it, but heaping luxury upon luxury upon it in the midst of starvation, then I am much more inclined to cry 'Bravo, Lenin!' and 'More fools we!' than to share Mr. Hyndman's apparent horror." We commend the foregoing to Samuel Gompers when next he tries to divert attention from the horrors of compulsory unemployment here by crying out against compulsory employment in Russia.

"President Wilson was singularly ill-served by his agents in Russia," says an editorial in the N. Y. American. "They thought and he thought that the Czar's overthrow meant simply a new government by aristocrats, lawyers, financiers and ex-Czarist officers. The Root Commission entirely misgauged the purpose of the Russian people. Ambassador Francis was hopelessly at sea. Every one of Wilson's chosen advisers adopted a purely capitalistic view of Russia, failing entirely to see the economic significance of the revolution." In the great metropolis of New York the American is the only capitalist daily guilty of occasional lapses into editorial sanity. The above quotation is taken from an editorial describing the amazing lavishness of the Wilson Administration in paying out \$60,000,000 of the American people's money to the bogus "Russian Ambassador," Bakhmetieff, over a period of three years after his "government" had been cast into the ashcan. Long after this prodigality had become an international scandal, and was provoking derisive comments in the press in other countries, our own capitalist papers breathed not a whisper about it. Bakhmetieff and his wastrel crew squandered most of the money on high living here, but some of it went to the House of Morgan to pay the interest on Miliukov's Russian bonds, most of which had remained in the banker's hands. Hence the silence. The editorial writer in the American evidently anticipates a saner policy from Tweedledee Harding than from Tweedledum Wilson. Why so, we wonder? The Morgan firm still holds the bonds.

## Communist Russia

Communist Russia, the Russia of the common people, marks a new epoch in the world's history. It marks a basic change in the structure of human society. Up to this time society lived under the rule of the few, under the rule of the class which possessed the wealth of the country. The methods were different at different periods in the world's history, but the results were the same: riches and power for the few, a bare existence and endless toil for the many. The slaves, the serfs, or the wage workers of today, who compose the masses of the people, have ever been the hewers of wood and the carriers of water, the beasts of burden on whose backs sported and fattened kings and nobles, landlords and capitalists. They who possessed wealth had the power. And they passed laws to protect that power, to make the possession of wealth a social institution. Private property was enthroned and every striving of mankind was subjected to the rule of property. Thence grew the exploitation of man by man for private profit, and all abuses resulting therefrom; fear of loss of property, care of possession, dread of the future, fear of loss of employment, envy and greed. Human society was ruled by property grabbers; masters, kings, capitalists, providing toil, disease, war for the masses of mankind. That is the rule of capitalism, and cannot be otherwise.

But under communism, profit is abolished, and with it the exploitation of man by man; private property is no longer a factor in the life of man; property becomes universal, all natural and created wealth belong to society, to every member of the community, as secure a birth right as air and sunlight. Everybody's measured work provides a common fund of things to satisfy material needs, today, tomorrow and in years to come. There can be no fear of losing one's job, of seeing one's children starve, of the poorhouse in old age. As sure as the sun will rise on the morrow, man is secure of his bread, his shelter and clothing. Man is freed from animal cares, free to develop his human qualities, his intelligence, his brain and heart.

Russia points the way. Russia is now one huge corporation, every man, woman and child an equal shareholder. The state is administered as a business; the benefit of the stockholders being the object of the corporation. The individual contributes his labor, whatever it may be: manual, mental, artistic. This labor is applied to available materials: the soil of the farm, the natural resources, the mines, and mills and factories. The finished product is distributed through the agencies of the corporation, in the shape of food and clothes and shelter, of education and amusement, of protection to life and limb, of literature and art, of inventions and improvements; to every member of the corporation, which means every man, woman and child of the nation.

To be sure this ideal of a human brotherhood is not yet realized in Russia. No sane person would expect so tremendous a change to be consummated in three years, in the face of universal aggression,

(Continued on Page 4)

## The Commune: Half a Century of Struggle: 1871-1921

Half a century has passed since the days of the Paris Commune, one of the most stupendous tragedies in the struggle of labor to attain the heights of existence. That first uprising of the modern proletariat has since been followed by the great victorious revolution of one of the greatest peoples of our planet. But while the uprising of March 1871 was a desperate attempt on the part of the working-class of a single city to establish its dictatorship over a nation of peasants, today we are confronted by the united efforts of all the toilers of city and country alike to bring about the realization of socialism, after they had seized the organs of power and authority from the bourgeois state. The present upheaval is of such incomparably greater dimensions, its aims are so immeasurably wider, and the stakes are so enormous, that in view of these struggles we are witnessing it is almost difficult to appreciate sufficiently the heroes of the Commune and their desperate fight and to view their struggles in the proper perspective.

And yet the defenders of the Commune too had their important post in the battle of human progress. They too contributed to the building of the new future, in fact it was they who first opened the doors through which the social revolution of our day must pass if it is to attain its goal. Hence the Commune should appear to us as a teacher and counsellor, as a prophet and mentor, for although the Commune pointed out new roads, it committed old errors. The Commune appears to us as a pioneer, and yet it sometimes slipped into the pitfalls and errors of antiquated methods and forgotten times. The Commune was, in the words of its historian, Lissagaray, a barricade which was not given time to turn into a government. Karl Marx in his little book "Civil War in France" erected a monument to the Communards, a monument as enduring as the memory of the heroes of that great proletarian revolt. In his brief and simple review of the historical facts the founder of scientific socialism created an analysis of unparalleled depth and sureness, which at the present time more than ever should become the common possession of all those who understand the importance of learning from the struggles of the past the things that should guide us in the work of the future.

To Marx at that time the Franco-German war and the revolt of the Commune appeared as events of the first magnitude in determining the political developments of the immediate future. The establishment of a united Germany in the center of Europe necessarily made itself felt throughout the entire world. Just what its effects would be and what reactions it would call forth depended on the fundamental and permanent acts which would accompany the entry of this new state into the political system of the world. The Peace of Frankfurt in the year 1871 formed the turning-point, for it disregarded the principle of the formation of states according to nationality as no treaty had disregarded it in the last hundred years. It ended the period of national unification in Central Europe by

mutilating the national unity and dissecting the national territorial unit of the conquered French. But German militarism, in calling forth and feeding the French spirit of "Revanche", in striving continually to surpass the armaments of the neighboring countries, in making itself the pivot of the militarism of the Great Powers of Europe and hence of the militarism of the world, became at the same time the greatest hindrance to the national movement of Eastern Europe, which could liberate itself from this suppressing force only through a violent explosion. Thus the collapse of France brought forth the downfall of Germany, and now the prophecy of Marx's "Civil War" is fulfilled: "History will mete out its revenge not according to the territory in so many square miles wrested from France but in accordance with the greatness of the crime of reviving the old policy of conquest in the latter half of the 19th Century."

The Paris Commune stands out in contrast to the coincident founding of the German Empire. This German war of expansion coming at the close of the period of mediaeval unification shook to the very foundations the oldest and most strongly joined national state of the continent. The shock temporarily loosened the cornerstones of those foundations and amid the turmoil of such a tremendous impact the working-class succeeded by a daring charge in seizing the reins of government for the first time in history. But the rule of the workers was destined to be of short duration. It was choked in the blood of a massacre unequalled in the annals of civil war. Those of the socialist workers of the French capital who survived were imprisoned and deported. To destroy socialism in the heart of the empire, to exterminate it root and branch, to prevent a recurrence of socialistic activity in any part of the land, after the fall of the Commune, this was the object of the policy of the counter-revolution. While the German Empire, resplendent in its armaments, seemed built to outlast the ages, the Commune was looked upon by its contemporaries as a miserable little insignificant episode, as a caprice of history, worthy only of ridicule and scorn. And yet, how differently has it turned out! Unlike the episode of the German Empire and Bismark's policy of blood and iron, that bore in its core the canker of its own destruction, the Commune carried within itself the living seeds of the future. "This is the lesson of History," says Marx's "Civil War." "With nations it is as with individuals. To take from them the power of aggression it is necessary to deprive them of all means of defense. They must not only be seized by the gullet, they must be actually killed."

The Commune, in tearing apart for the first time the scaffolding of the national state from within, attacked its foundation, its very existence. It tore down in order to create a new type of state, a new social order. It disarmed and destroyed the original state,—the form of the bourgeois nation so that the people, liberated, may find room to live and that Humanity may be enthroned among the free peoples of the world.

Within the ranks of the French workers during the sixties, three opposing groups struggled for supremacy. There were the adherents of Blanqui, the adherents of Proudhon, and the adherents of the International Association of Workers, the First International. While the theories of Blanqui and Proudhon originated in the soil of France, the ideas of the International, which consciously and as a matter of principle transcended national limits, forced their way in from the outside. Naturally therefore, the influence of the ideas of Blanqui and Proudhon increased rapidly from the beginning of the sixties down to the time of the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, when the adherents of these currents far exceeded in number those of the International, which had as a matter of fact taken root only in Paris.

For Blanqui the consummation of the revolutionary struggle consisted in the seizure of the power of government by means of armed revolt, a view which is based on the significance of the possession of the state machine in the struggle of the classes in society. It was not essential, according to this view, for an entire class, much less the majority of the people to back up the revolt. The success of the uprising depends rather on the compact and secret organization of a sufficient number of determined men, ready at the given moment to rise up in force to overthrow the government, establish the new regime, and defend it against the partisans of the old order by the same force that brought it into being. The great mass of the people was to be considered only insofar as the support of certain radical elements might be counted on which by chance were not included in the organization. When the decisive moment was happily past it was assumed that the mass of the people would of itself rally to the conspirators, since the entire revolt had been undertaken in the interests of the people, solely for the good of the masses. Blanquism repeats the principles of Jacobinism, of the Jaqueries and the Montagne (the mountain) who in the previous century had ruled France by means of the dictatorship of a firmly organized minority, in order to organize the defense against the attack of feudal Europe and to ward off the armies of the feudal world that stood ready to break into France. Blanqui approaches the Jacobins still more closely in that his opinions on economic questions were those of a petty-bourgeois and his political ideal was the "social contract" of Rousseau.

Proudhon's theory bears a very different stamp, proceeding as it does from the basis of economic conditions. To this day production in France has a petty-bourgeois character. The dominant figure is still the tradesman or merchant, who employs independent mechanics and artisans and places the products of their manual labor on the market. To a far greater extent this was the case in the times of Proudhon, when the development of industry was only in its infancy. Exploitation on the part of the merchant-capitalist tends to force the crafts to a lower and lower level, in many cases pauperizing the master workman without entirely wresting the instruments of labor from his hands as does the capitalistic factory. In view of this type of exploitation Proudhon's theory appears inseparably bound

up with circumstances similar to those which dominated the beginnings of the German labor movement and explains in part the peculiar form of the Lassalle organization. Proudhon combats the most consistent representatives of the working-class, the Communists, with extreme intensity, because, stopping short as it were half-way between capital and labor, he is unable to formulate any theory of the working class. He rejects the trade-union federations because they are monopolistic and suppress individual freedom. He advocates co-operatives of production wherever the labor process demands co-operative effort extending beyond the confines of the family or a small group of persons. The idea is to organize exchange, to create an exchange bank which, working without interest and offering free credit, would mediate the exchange of products on the basis of their established labor value.

These views were opposed by those of the International, which assimilated those elements of both theories that, properly formulated, possessed permanent value for the working-class, and surpassed these theories with giant strides. That the emancipation of the working-class can be accomplished only by the working-class itself and only by the final abolition of classes, that economic dependence on the monopolists of the means of production forms the basis of all slavery and all political dependence, that the political movement of the working-class has for its object and its purpose the economic liberation of that class, that to realize this object the unity and solidarity of the workers of all lands is essential, that the emancipation of Labor is not a local or national but a social problem embracing all lands where modern methods of production exist, a problem depending for its solution upon the practical and theoretical co-operation of all the progressive countries of the world—these were the great principles upon which the International founded its existence.

\* \* \*

What was the origin of the Commune?

During the critical period prior to the outbreak of the war of 1871 the adherents of Blanqui attempted to rouse the proletarian quarters of Paris to oppose this mass murder. On July 15th, at the very hour in which Ollivier, standing on the rostrum of the Parliament gaily conjured up war, the Socialists marched across the boulevards crying, "Long live Peace!" and singing the song of peace:

"The nations all are our brothers,

Our only foe is tyranny."

"From Chateau d'Eau to the Boulevard Saint Denis," writes Lissagaray, "they were hailed with applause, but on the Boulevards Bonne Nouvelle and Montmartre they were hissed and attacked by the war-crazy mobs. The following day they gathered again at the Bastille and began their march, Ravvier, a porcelain-painter, leading with the flag. But when they reached the Faubourg Montmartre they were attacked by the city gendarmes with naked swords. Being unable to accomplish anything with the bourgeoisie, they appealed to the workers of Germany, as they had done once before in the year 1869: 'Brothers, we are protesting against the war, we want peace, freedom! Brothers, pay no heed to the voices hired to deceive you as to the true

spirit of France!' And this great-hearted appeal of theirs was rewarded by a fitting response. While in 1869 the Berlin students had replied to the peace memorial of the French students with an insult, in 1870 the workers of Berlin replied to their brothers in France: 'We too desire peace, work, and freedom. We know that brothers dwell on both sides of the Rhine.'

The war came, the Empire collapsed. On September 4th the workers of Paris proclaimed the republic. But the government was placed not in their hands but in the hands of the Chamber of Deputies, the representatives of the bourgeoisie and of the old powers. "The workers permitted this state of affairs on the express assumption that the new government would make use of the power entrusted to it for the organization and the determined carrying out of the national defense—which meant above all the defense of Paris. But this necessarily presupposed the arming of the workers. But Paris in arms meant the Revolution in arms. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressors meant a victory of the French workers over the French capitalists." ("Civil War in France"). Just as we have observed in most recent times in Russia and in Germany, so here too the French bourgeoisie decided this conflict between class interests and national duty unhesitatingly in favor of bourgeois class interests and national treason.

"Under the pressure of the French reverses"—we are here following an account by Karl Kautsky—"the legislative body sitting in Paris adopted a law proposed by Jules Favres transforming the citizens' guard into a general people's guard. To the sixty old battalions of the national guard at Paris taken from the possessing classes, there were now added 200 new battalions recruited from the poorer classes, with power even to appoint their own officers. Thus the national guard at Paris became a real organization of the proletariat. The law ordaining this extension of the national guard was altogether the outcome of sudden panic and not of mature deliberation. The child at once became a source of terror to its fathers; so they decided to do everything possible to keep it from growing strong. It had been impossible to prevent the arming of the Paris proletariat, but the military authorities under Prochut's command could simply leave undone what was absolutely essential to make the national guard into an efficient fighting force. This was treason to their country, but they were more afraid of the workers of Paris than they were of the soldiers of Wilhelm.

"Paris contained at the opening of the siege 100,000 regulars and in addition 100,000 mobilized troops. Assuming that of the more than 300,000 troops of the national guard 200,000 were suited for active service, there was in all an army of 400,000 men, while the Germans besieging Paris never had more than half that number at their disposal, and these were scattered over a wide area. There was sufficient time—from the month of August on—to train the national guard.

"The Commander-in-Chief of Paris therefore had a force at his disposal which was far superior to that of the Germans. If he succeeded in breaking at a single point the iron ring embracing Paris,

the German army would have very slight prospects of winning the war. But all this presupposed getting to work immediately to train the national guard. But that was the thing the rulers were most afraid of. They preferred to lose the war and hand over Elsass-Lorraine to the enemy. This the Parisians felt very clearly, hence their rage against the ruling powers, who had betrayed France. When Paris had surrendered, when the national assembly had been elected and had shown in the most provocative manner its hatred of the republic and particularly of the capital, the Parisians realized that they were facing a bitter struggle."

The surrender of Paris was the signal for the outbreak of the civil war. The city was still in arms. The forts had been handed over, the regulars and the mobilized guard had given up their weapons, but the victors were forced to leave the national guard its arms and its artillery. The Revolution, which had overthrown the empire and proclaimed the republic would enter only upon an armistice with the conquerer. But Bismark began open hostilities against Paris and its proletariat through the medium of the French government. He very readily agreed to the release of the captured French soldiers, so that the September government might be enabled to crush Paris, and he even added to the terms of surrender a provision commanding the holding of a new election for the national assembly within eight days. Naturally such short notice was to the advantage of the forces of reaction, as there thus remained no time for an educational campaign.

This Bismarckian assembly resulting from the elections of February 8th was well aware of its mission. It took up at once the fight against the republic, against Paris. Paris was to be deprived of its character as a capital city; all notes and rents due within the last six months were to be collected at once. And when the national guard responded to this provocation by the decision to federate, to form a solid union of the units of the national guard and to elect a common central committee, the government gave orders to carry off the guns of the national guard. The attempt, which was made during the night of March 18th, turned out a failure. The attacking party sent out by the government had forgotten to provide horses to remove the cannon. Thus there was sufficient time to alarm the guardists. The members of the government at that time in Paris were forced to flee. The Commune was proclaimed. (To be continued)

## Unity

(Letter of F. Engels, June 20, 1873)

When one finds himself as we do in a position, so to speak, of a competitor with the General Union of German Workers, one is inclined too easily to take account of this competitor and to accustom oneself to think before everything, about his rival. But for the moment the General Union of German Workers and the Workers' Social Democratic Party taken together do not as yet constitute but a small minority of the German working class. According to us—and this opinion is confirmed by long ex-



perience—good tactics in the matter of propoganda does not consist in turning away from your adversary a few persons or some of his members, but to act upon the great masses which are still indifferent. One single new force which is brought forth from nothing is worth more than ten followers of Lassalle who always bring into the party the misery of their false tendencies.

The thing would still go if one could have the masses without their local leaders, but it is always necessary to accept a whole band of these leaders who are bound by their former public declarations if not by their opinions that they professed hitherto, and who must now prove that they have not repudiated their principles; but on the contrary it is the Workers' Social Democratic Party which preaches the true doctrine of Lassalle. This is the mischief done at Eisenach, which was not easy to escape at the moment; but these elements have certainly *hurt* the party and I don't know if the party would not be today as strong without them. If these elements were to receive support I should certainly consider this a calamity.

We must not let ourselves be influenced by all this noise for unity. The greatest artisans of discord are those who have this word most often on their lips, as at this moment the Bakounistes of the Jurassien Switzerland, the artisans of all the splits, that do not stop to clamor for unity. These fanatics of Unity are either narrow spirits who would mix all and make of it a shapeless dough, which, when no longer stirred will bring out still more sharply the differences that now find themselves in the same pot. (In Germany we have a very fine example of these people who preach the reconciliation of the workers with the small middle class); or they are the people who unconsciously or consciously want to deviate from this movement. That is why the greatest sectarians, the greatest braggers and fakirs demand at certain moments with greatest violence, Unity. In our existence nobody has done us greater harm, nobody has shown us greater falseness than these braggers of Unity.

Naturally every party wants to be in a position to record successes, which is as it should be. But there are moments when it is necessary to have the courage of sacrificing a momentary success to more important things. Especially in a party like ours, where the final success is so absolutely certain, and which has developed in our days and under our eyes, in a manner so formidable, one does not always need a momentary success. At all events, I believe that the capable elements among the followers of Lassalle, will later come to you of their own accord and thus it would not be wise to gather the fruits before it is ripe, as the partisans of Unity would like to do. Old Hegel already said: 'A party behaves like a victorious party by dividing itself and by being able to stand the division.' The movement of the proletariat passes necessarily thru different degrees of development: at each stage a number of people stop and do not continue the journey; that alone explains why the solidarity of the proletariat is being realized everywhere in groupings of different parties who engage in a life and death struggle, like the Christian sects in the Roman Empire, during the worst persecution.

## Manager's Column

The Manager's task is usually a difficult one; it is the task of making both ends meet. It is prosaic, and concerned with common things, payments, money and other such uninteresting details. Even in the bringing out of a Revolutionary Socialist paper, these details are ever present. So the Manager was thinking of making an appeal to you, his audience, to come and help him in his difficulties.

Our appeal is to the Young. Not necessarily to the blond-haired and black-haired as against the gray-haired, but to the Young in Spirit, in Resolution, in Daring. Our appeal is to the people who are setting out on a great enterprise, who see before them a great New World, who are inspired by what is to come, and not by what has come. We appeal to the great masses who labor and toil, and long for a way out.

But we should not call this "our" appeal. It is not "we" that ask "you" to do something for "us." There are neither "you" nor "us" in this undertaking. It is only the great Movement of the workers, who are striving to create for themselves a new state. Translated into terms of action it means effort, devotion, sacrifice. It means for you and me and everybody to get together and give freely of our best to the Movement.

And in this Spirit I want to tell you about "The Workers' Council." The publication of it is a task which has been assumed by the International Educational Association, in the conviction that there are a great many Comrades, attached or not attached to existing organizations, who feel and think the way we do. We want these to join with us in the undertaking, to help us carry the Workers' Council along.

The Workers' Council is sold to the Reader at ten cents a copy. But from the Dealer we get about half that; besides the many free and unsold copies. The actual cost of the paper is more than we get for it. Add to this cost of make up, general expenses, etc. In order therefore to bring this publication to the Reader and to spread its circulation, it is necessary for a large group of people to divide the cost among themselves. Every dollar contributed will pay for ten copies of The Workers' Council. Five dollars a month from one hundred comrades will secure The Workers' Council for a month in its present shape. One hundred dollars will give us the opportunity to plan work ahead, to create agencies and supporters in every part of the country.

Let the Business Manager hear from you.

Address:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASS'N,  
320 Broadway, Room 620, New York.

# The Workers' Council

Vol. I.

New York, April 15, 1921.

No. 2.



"Sic him, Fido!"

## Russian Trade and the Economic Crisis in America

### The Resurrected Second International

### The Fight of the American Farmer

### O, The Wicked Marx!

TEN CENTS A COPY

TWO DOLLARS FIFTY CENTS A YEAR

THE WORKERS' COUNCIL, an organ for the Third International, published by the International Educational Association,  
80 East 11th Street, New York.