

THE Communist

An Organ of the Third (Communist) International

(PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN)

No. 122

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2nd, 1922.

[Registered at the G.P.O.
as a Newspaper]

TWOPENCE



"The ameliorative measures prepared by My late Government are being examined afresh and you will be asked to make provision for their continuance and extension"—King's Speech

CAPITALISM'S NEMESIS

WHILE the votes were being cast in the General Election, the Unemployed Marchers were converging upon London. As the new Members, flushed with triumph, were gathering at Westminster, ready for the opening of Parliament, so too there gathered weather beaten and travel-stained, the chosen representatives of one and a half million unemployed and their five million dependents.

The Members had come in due course to do as had been done on like occasions for many a century. The unemployed had come to do their best to prevent that which had been the rule and custom to prevail any longer. They were resolved to see the Prime Minister: to extract from him a public promise; and to excite in the breasts of their fellow victims of capitalism a grim determination to see, first that the promise should be given, and second, that once given, it should be carried out—or they would know the reason why.

Processions and demonstrations of the unemployed have been of frequent occurrence. Since in the late "eighties" John Burns forced himself into prominence as the "Man with the Red Flag"—one who was "an outlaw against society because society had outlawed him"—every few years had seen the appearance of the phenomenon.

At first they were a portent—a threat of reprisals by the hungry upon those who were better fed than they. Thus considered it was a matter of temperament whether their gathering was resented as an impudent attempt at blackmail or pitied as a parade of helpless failure—subconsciously, highly gratifying to those who had managed to succeed.

In the one mood the unemployed were bludgeoned—in the other they were given odd coppers; in either they were treated as evidence, not of the failure of capitalism as a social system, but of the failure of the unemployed man to adapt himself to the needs of his time.

The newspapers, in pre-war days, swift to do their masters' bidding, discriminated largely and profoundly between the "genuine" unemployed and the "unemployable," and set out to prove that the demonstrators all fell into the latter category.

Occasionally, there was a riot, like that in 1886, when the unemployed, goaded by insults, smashed windows from Pall Mall to Regent's Park. Generally they marched to the tune of rattling cigar-boxes, in which were gathered pence sufficient for a day or two to tide over the sharpest necessities of hunger. After a few weeks the newness wore off, the collections fell away, the processions dwindled until they ceased and the unemployed were forgotten until a fresh crisis brought them again upon the scene.

Such were the unemployed demonstrations of pre-war days: such are *not* the demonstrations with which the Capitalist State is confronted to-day.

(Continued on Page 4)

Emancipate the Dukes!

London Labour Party's Great Concern

WHEN the Annual Conference of the London Labour Party assembled last Saturday, delegates were given a paper containing the text of the Chairman's address and headed "Inspiring Address." We can honestly say that never in all our experience of Conferences have we heard a less inspiring address, nor attended a Conference more out of touch with realities.

Only twice during the Chairman's address did the delegates cheer. First on the reference to George Lansbury's election and then to our Comrade Saklatvala's.

After that the Conference became a funeral-like procession. In vain did a few live spirits endeavour to wake it up.

Dr. Salter, the newly elected member for Bermondsey, made a successful defence of the reduction of wages of municipal employees. On the plea that not 500 of his constituents got more than £3 a week he justified the dragging down to the verge of destitution those workers employed by Labour Councils.

Comrade Vaughan, speaking for the Bethnal Green Councillors, vigorously opposed this policy. His speech was a vivid exposure of the Whitley Councils and the Joint Industrial Board—but the Conference votes, mainly in the hands of Trade Union representatives, went for the reduction policy.

The next sign of life came on a proposition to extend membership of the Party to all working class organisations accepting the Labour Party Constitution.

Great concern was expressed by Mr. James Myles (I.L.P.) that the movement should not move to the Right. This resolution would admit Tory Working Men Associations.

Comrade Bishop rightly pointed out that the Labour Party were more concerned with what the *Morning Post* or the *Pall Mall* would say than with uniting all the working class elements. This resolution was meant to apply to such bodies as the Communist Party. Why were they not admitted? They were not opposing Labour. The Chairman, T. E. Naylor had written his thanks to the Communists, 37 Communists ran as Labour candidates in the Guardians elections, six ran as Labour candidates in the L.C.C., and 27 in the recent Borough Council elections.

On a show of hands the resolution was carried overwhelmingly, but on a card vote the "block-heads" won.

Woolwich Trades Council wanted the aims of the Party altered so that its object should be the emancipation of the working class. Their delegate vigorously opposed the concern for other sections.

Herbert Morrison, the secretary, showed a pitiful concern for the capitalist class. They, poor fellows, were as much victims of circumstances as the workers—we would emancipate them. "Labour admits into its ranks all who stand for its objective," he said. This in spite of the vote given against the admission of Communists.

Comrade Wall denounced this in scathing terms. "Did Morrison think the Duke of Northumberland wanted emancipating?" Once again reaction prevailed and the status quo was endorsed.

It was not until the end of the agenda had been reached that any decision of import was made. Then for once the heart of the Conference evidenced itself. The following resolution was passed:—

"That this Conference of the London Labour Party is convinced that the workers should present a United Front, both political and industrial, to the onslaughts of Capitalism, therefore we call upon the Executive Committee to immediately initiate a campaign for the purpose of attaining, the United Front of the Workers."

Despite efforts to confine it to the political field, and an amendment which would take the initiating onus off the Executive, the resolution was carried. We wonder if the Executive will obey its instructions?

There were no cheers at the conclusion of the Conference. There was nothing to cheer about.

The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party announces that Mrs. L. Collings, 41, Swinton Street, Gray's Inn Road, W.C. (formerly a member of the South West Islington branch) is no longer a member of the Party.

British Capital and Indian Revolt

Speech by S. SAKLATVALA in the House of Commons, 23/11/22

ONE of our speakers said that the continent of Europe had been impoverished because capital had gone abroad. Who took it abroad?

Is it a sign of disservice to the country for enterprising men to take their capital abroad? If that is so, what can be said of private enterprise in Britain itself, and those British citizens who are taking abroad British capital produced by British working men, day after day and year after year?

Over 74 jute mills have been erected in Bengal by British millers and capitalists, with the result that to-day we have shut up shop in Dundee and our workers in Bengal are working at from 14s. to 38s. a month—producing for the owners dividends of from 150 per cent to 400 per cent.

Out of the 124 coal companies in my country, India, 102 have been opened out by British capitalists.

If these are the results of private enterprise, may we ask our friends not to sit down and wait until the great calamity overtakes this country altogether, but to learn lessons from what has happened on the Continent, and remove the causes which brought about the conditions which all of us agree are not worthy an intelligent and civilised race?

One of my colleagues referred to the position of trade with India, especially the textile trade, and I understood the Seconder of the Motion to refer to how it had become impracticable for the Austrians to buy Indian hides and the Germans to buy Indian cotton, and so forth.

I want the House to note carefully that the loss of trade with India is due to two separate reasons.

One has been the desire of the Government of this country (who have always prided themselves as a constitutional nation and Government) to try in the outside world most unconstitutional methods of dictating Government from outside.

No Britisher would for a moment tolerate a constitution for Great Britain if it were written outside of Great Britain by people who are not British.

In a similar way the constitutions for Ireland and India and Egypt and Mesopotamia should be constitutions written by the men of those countries, without interference from outside.

But there is another great cause, and I wish the House to understand it clearly. It is the rivalry due to the spirit of private enterprise which is responsible now, and will be responsible in the future, for one country depriving the workers of another country of their legitimate livelihood.

It is the growth of this private enterprise, of these large corporations and trusts, these huge industrial concerns in India, which is beginning to tell its tale upon the workers of this country.

I wish to make no secret of it. The cotton industry of this country is bound to suffer from this two-fold evil, namely, the political, sulking of the people of India and the spread of private enterprise and of the privileges of the private enterprisers.

The Indian private enterprisers have learned to ask for protective duties, for high dividends, for low wages, long hours, and all kinds of privileges which private enterprise in this country has claimed for 150 years.

It is this combination which is working the ruin of the workers of this land.

In reference to Ireland, I am well disciplined and trained in the general principle of the Labour movement, namely, that the happiness of the world depends on international peace, and that international peace is only possible when the self-determined will of the people prevails in each country.

I deplore greatly, therefore, those elements in the Irish Treaty that are not compatible with that great and wholesome principle.

Everyone knows that the Treaty has, unfortunately, gone forth as the only alternative to a new invasion of Ireland by British troops. As long as that element exists the people of Ireland have a right to say that the very narrow majority which in Ireland accepted the Treaty at the time, accepted it also on this understanding—that if they did not accept it the alternative was an invasion by the Blank-and-Tans of this country.

If it were possible in some way to allow the people of Ireland to understand that their country's constitution is to be framed by them as a majority may decide, and that the alternative would not be an invasion from this country, but that this country would shake hands with Ireland as a neighbour, whatever shape or form that Government took, it would be quite a different story.

Otherwise, whatever we may do, however many treaties we may pass, however unanimous the British may be in their behaviour towards Ireland, Ireland will not be made a peaceful country.

As in 1801 England gave them a forced Union, so in 1922 England is giving them a forced freedom.

When I say so, I put forward not my personal views, but the views of 90 per cent of those Irishmen who are my electors. They have pointed out to me that, whereas under the threat of renewed invasion the Dail only passed the Treaty by a majority of barely half a dozen votes, Irishmen who are not under that threat—Irishmen who are now living in Great Britain—have, by a tremendous majority, voted against it. As long as those factors continue to exist, the Irish Treaty is not going to be what we—in a sort of silent conspiracy—have decided to name it. The reality will not be there. The reality is not there.

Before I conclude I wish to refer to one point which is conspicuous by its absence from the King's Speech.

If in the Empire, this House and this Government is going to take the glory of the good, they will also have to take the ignominy of anything disgraceful which happens outside this country. This Government and this House will have to satisfy this country as well as outside countries, why the policy of the South African Government, in hanging and shooting workers, was permitted and was kept quiet.

We are still calling Ireland a part of this Empire, and it is only last week that four young working-class lads, without an open trial and without even fair notice to their families, were shot. These acts might be described as the acts of independent governments. Either these governments are independent or they are part of this Empire. If they are part of this Empire, then the Government must see to it that a policy of this kind does not go without challenge and protest from this House.

Clara Zetkin Greets the Russian Proletariat

GREETINGS.

Greetings a thousand times to the Russian Proletariat, the alert self-sacrificing, faithful advance guard of the world revolution.

The Russian working class was the first to learn the lesson of the imperialistic world war, that robber war in which the bourgeoisie broke all the laws—written or unwritten—of their own culture, and trampled upon every worthy achievement struggling humanity had won.

And the Russian proletariat learned more than that; they learned the lesson of eight months of bourgeois revolution and democracy, of eight months of the betrayal of the interests and rights of the toiling classes.

They pronounced the historical verdict on the class domination of the bourgeoisie. Their finding was that capitalist class rule implies the economic exploitation of the masses to the utmost limits of endurance, their political enslavement, their educational drugging, and a deprivation of science and art which reduces them to the level of barbarism.

The Russian proletariat confirmed the historical verdict on the class rule of the bourgeoisie. By the establishment of the Soviet rule, they seized the state power with their own strong hands. The Soviet power is the tool with which will be forged

the Communist Commonwealth in which all will be free.

In the last five years the Russian proletariat has fought internal and external counter-revolution with unexampled heroism. As freemen, who are resolved never to return to the old slavery, they have shown that they know how to use their power. They are now allotted the final and most difficult task, that of transforming the present social order into the Communist society, despite all opposition.

After five years of struggle and sacrifice, such as the world has never before witnessed, the Russian proletariat has proved conclusively its endurance, its courage and inspiration, and its fraternal solidarity with the exploited and enslaved of all classes. The joy of spending even only ten minutes among these workers, of feeling their heart beat and sensing the glow and power of their will, rewards one for the labour of a life-time in the revolutionary struggle. This proletariat, full of glorious promise for the future—the chosen people which, instead of waiting longingly the coming of some saviour, seek to create their heaven now upon the earth—with them shall we march, shoulder to shoulder, so that the oppressed of all lands may carry the red banner, with hammer and sickle, to final victory.

INTERVIEW WITH LENIN

THE special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, Mr. Arthur Ransome, has been the means of obtaining by a series of questions put directly to our Comrade Lenin, an authoritative indication of the lines of development that may be expected in Soviet Russia.

Communists cannot fail to be profoundly interested in Lenin's simple and final disposal of the myth that "Russia has abandoned Communism."

Ransome's questions betray the orthodox bourgeois misconceptions in all their purity. Lenin's replies are themselves an introduction to the study of the philosophy and methods of Communism.

THE PROBLEM OF THE NEPMAN.

Question I.: "I find (in Moscow) immense economic activity, everybody buying and selling, and a new trading class obviously in existence. I ask, How is it that the Nepman is not, and shows no signs of wishing to be, a political force?"

Lenin's Answer: "Your first question reminded me of a talk in London long, long, ago. It was a Saturday evening, about twenty years back. I was walking with a friend. The streets were extraordinarily animated. Everywhere along the streets the traders were lighting up their goods with small metal flare-lamps burning naphtha or something like it. The lights were very beautiful. The movement in the streets was really extraordinary. Everybody was buying or selling.

"In Russia there was at that time a movement which we called 'The Economists.' By this name we knew a childish simplification of the views of the historical materialism of Marx. My friend was an 'Economist,' and busied himself at once in expounding his wisdom. 'Behold,' said he, 'on this extraordinary economic activity must follow a striving towards political power.' I laughed at such an understanding of Marx. A multitude of small traders, and their very lively activity, does not in the very slightest bear witness to the great economic strength of a class, from which conclusions could and should be drawn concerning a striving to 'political power.'

"I fear that your question why this Nepman (i.e., street trader? small trader?) does not 'show signs of striving to become a political force' brings a smile to our faces, and we shall reply to it: 'For the very same reason why the crowd in the London streets which was all buying and selling in the streets on Saturdays did not show in England signs of a striving after political power.'"

THE QUESTION OF PRODUCTION.

Question II.: "I get the impression that in Russia to-day sale and exchange is highly profitable, whereas production is not profitable except in the rarest cases. Sale and exchange is in the hands of the Nepmen. Profitable production is mostly small scale and in the hands of private persons. Unprofitable production is in the hands of the State. I ask: Does this mean the steady economic strengthening of the Nepmen and the steady weakening of the State?"

Lenin's Answer: "I am afraid that your second question is also stated from a point of view almost 'Economist,' in the sense of the word mentioned above. Bastiat, it seems, was almost seriously of the opinion that the ancient Greeks and Romans lived by robbery. He did not trouble much with the economic question as to what was the origin of the stuff that was stolen by these people who lived by robbery.

"You have the impression that in Russia at the present time buying, selling, and exchange are highly profitable 'while production is possible only in the rarest cases.' (Lenin misread my question, which does not use the word "possible" but "profitable.")—A. R.).

"I was much surprised to read of such a deduction from observation of the Moscow streets. But what, thought I, of the millions and millions of Russian peasants? The case of their sowing the ground, that is obviously not a rare case, certainly not one of the rarest, but is a case in the majority in Russia. A case even more numerous than the buying or selling of anything by a Nepman.

(Since Lenin cannot hit back again, it is perhaps unfair for me to point out that the Russian peasants are actually Nepmen, seeing that after paying their taxes they are allowed to sell their produce freely, and that they owe this freedom to the New Economic Policy.—A. R.).

"And probably peasant production in Russia is not only 'possible' but also highly 'profitable.' Otherwise, whence would come those hundreds of millions of poods of corn tax which our peasants have brought to the State so extraordinarily easily and quickly? Whence that general rise of building activity, both in the villages of boundless Russia and in the towns, which is observable by everyone and all?"

"Is not he who puts such a question taking for 'highly profitable sale and exchange' the petty trade when a small trader gets sometimes millions and millions of profit in the falling Russian *valuta*, when the million on the open market is worth less than a rouble was formerly?"

"Such a mistake is hardly possible, for our State is now crossing out—for some months already it has been crossing out—the useless noughts on the paper money. Yesterday a trillion, but now four noughts are crossed out, and the result is ten million. The State does not grow rich from this, but it would be strange to suppose that it should grow weaker, for a step forward towards the improvement of money is here obvious. The Nepman begins to see how the stabilisation of the rouble is beginning; this, for example was obvious last summer. The Nepman begins to understand that the crossing out of noughts will go yet further, and I scarcely think it is likely to be arrested by his 'stifling after political power.'

"I return to production. With us land is in the hands of the State. The small peasants who possess it pay the tax excellently. Industrial production, so far as it concerns so-called light industry, is visibly reviving, and it is often either the property of the State, under the direction of its officials, or in the possession of lessees.

"Therefore there is no ground for fearing 'the steady weakening of the State.'

"One must draw a distinction not between production and trade but between production in light industry and production in heavy industry. This latter is actually unprofitable—hence, indeed, the difficult position of our State. Of this later."

Question III.: "It is suggested that an attempt will be made (by taxation) to make the Nepman subsidise production. I ask, Will not the effect merely be to raise prices, raise Nepman profits, indirectly compel a rise in wages, and so a return to the same position?"

Lenin's Answer: "There are hundreds of millions of poods of corn in the hands of the State. In such conditions to expect that taxes will 'merely' raise prices is impossible. Taxes will also give us a revenue from the Nepmen and from the producers for the help of industry, particularly for the help of heavy industry."

FORWARD OR BACKWARD?

Question IV.: "Judging by ordinary capitalist standards, the economic situation should be worse. Judging from Communist standards also, the situation should be worse (decline of heavy industry). Yet every individual I meet admits that for him things are better than a year ago. It would seem that something is happening which is not allowed for by either capitalist or Communist ideology. Now both these assume progress. But what if, instead of progressing, we are retrogressing? I ask, Is it possible that we are not advancing towards a new state of well-being but returning towards an old one? Is it not possible that Russia is moving backwards towards a period of agricultural production about equal to her demands and of busy internal trade only slightly affected by foreign imports? Would it not be possible to conceive of such a period under a proletarian dictatorship, as formerly under a feudal dictatorship?"

Lenin's Answer: "Let us begin by considering things according to 'ordinary capitalist standards.' All the summer our rouble was stabilised. That is an obvious beginning

of improvement. Then the undoubted revival of peasant production and of light industry. Also improvement. Finally, our Gosbank (State Bank) has received a clear revenue of not less than twenty million roubles in gold (that is a minimum estimate; in actual fact, more). Not much, but undoubtedly an improvement. Not much, but undoubtedly the beginning of the growth of a fund for heavy industry.

"Further, let us turn to consider things according to Communist standards. All the three circumstances already enumerated are pluses from the Communist point of view also, for, with us, the State authority is in the hands of the workers. The step towards the stabilisation of the rouble, the revival of production by the peasants and in light industry, and the beginning of profit for the State Bank (that is, for the State)—all these are *plus* from the Communist point of view also.

"How can it be that, while capitalism and Communism are opposite things, yet various circumstances count as *plus* from both opposite points of view? That is possible, for the transition of Communism is possible also through State capitalism if power in the State is in the hands of the working class. And that precisely is 'our present case.'

"The decline of heavy industry—that is our *minus*. But the beginning of revenue from the State Bank and from the Department of Foreign Trade is preparation for an improvement of the state of affairs in this branch also. The difficulties here are great, but the matter is by no means hopeless.

"Let us proceed. Can it not be that we are going backwards towards something or other in the way of a 'feudal dictatorship'? Nothing of the kind is possible, for slowly, with intervals, with steps backwards from time to time, we are lifting ourselves along the line of State capitalism. And this is a line leading us forward to Socialism and to Communism (as the highest grade of Socialism) and not by any manner of means backward to feudalism.

"Foreign trade is growing; the stabilisation of the rouble is growing stronger, though with intervals; the obvious revival of industry in Peter (Petrograd) and Moscow; the small, the very small beginning of the preparation of State means for the assistance of heavy industry, and so forth. All this shows that Russia is going forward and not backward, although, I repeat, very slowly and with intervals."

Question V.: "Or have we merely the sad spectacle of a squandering of capital that ought to be used in production?"

Lenin's Answer: "To this question a reply has already been given by the preceding exposition."

A RUMOUR CONTRADICTED.

Question VI.: "Apart from these questions, I think the *Manchester Guardian* would be interested to have from your lips a contradiction of the rumours now busily circulating in Moscow to the effect that the card system is to be re-introduced this winter, together with wholesale requisition of the Nepmen's stores."

Lenin's Answer: "I willingly confirm the complete lack of foundation for rumours to the effect that we are thinking of going back to the card system or to 'a wholesale requisition of the Nepmen's stores.'

"Pure fairy-tales! We are not dreaming of anything of the sort.

"Nor is it possible to imagine anything of the sort in contemporary Russia. These are rumours put about by malicious folk, who are very angry with us, but not very clever."

Question VII.: "Lastly, am I right in assuming that the Urquhart Agreement is not finally rejected but merely pigeon-holed pending the establishment of normal friendly relations with the British Government?"

Lenin's Answer: "You are absolutely right with regard to Urquhart. We have not finally rejected the Urquhart concession. We rejected it only for the political reason pointed out by us in the press. We have begun in our press an open discussion of all the pros and all the contras. And we hope that after this discussion we shall form our final opinion both on political and economic lines."

THE DUPES OF HOPE

MANY a time have the poets let their fancy roam about the hope that "springs eternal in the human breast." Besides being one of the three cardinal virtues, herein lies that which helps the Britisher out of work to be "the admiration of the world." Beyond doubt the primary cause of working-class inactivity in response to the challenge of King Capital, and the reason why both employed and unemployed are suffering the terrible consequences of the present world crisis with such "calm fortitude" and "power of endurance," is a hope of a revival in trade and industry, less unemployment, more wages, a fall in the cost of living—in short, "better times."

In the majority of cases the wish is father to the thought, whilst those who profess to support contention by argument, merely rely upon past experience of the regular cycle of alternate trade prosperity and depression.

It is a belief inspired by the paid "experts" of capital, carefully nurtured by a prostitute press, and one which must be uprooted from the minds of the workers before the thoughts can be turned into more useful channels.

In the first place, despite the glaring headlines which leap out at newspaper readers, nowhere do we find in the whole range of economic and political activity any signs of a revival in trade or recuperation in industry. Even according to authorities like the "Manchester Guardian Commercial," "The Times Trade Supplement," "The New York Times," "The Frankfurter Zeitung," the decline in the world volume of trade and production has not yet been arrested. Secondly, where economic conditions favour reconstruction on a large scale, political barriers stand in the way. Examples are Russia (at once the fear and hope of European capitalism), China, the coming Helldorado, and Germany, the scene of the next proletarian revolution.

A third factor not appreciated by our optimistic friends is that the present world crisis differs from its predecessors not merely in extent but also in nature. Trotsky and Varga show quite clearly in their brilliant monograph "The World Crisis" (Published by the C.P.G.B.) that capitalist economy is threatened with destruction because of under production. This is a fact of tremendous importance as it nullifies the application of the usual old fashioned remedies to a solution of the problems of trade depression.

Last, but not least, modern capitalism is a very delicate and highly sensitive social organism. At the best of times it is always tending to lose its equilibrium (to constantly restore which is the function of the state) but the most serious of the many legacies left by the war is a permanent dislocation of the various parts constituting capitalist economy.

The foregoing general survey tells us very little unless the picture is filled in with a more or less detailed examination. The causes at work group themselves conveniently into two categories: (1) National; (2) International. In regard to home affairs few indeed are the workers who attempt to study the "form" of the money market. Yet it is here we find our cue. Jubilant articles are being daily printed in such papers as the "Financial News," "The Financier," "The Financial Mail," etc., rejoicing in the fact that the boom in "Gilt-edge Stock" which began a year ago, has not yet reached its height. Emphasis is also laid upon the low bank rate, i.e., the ease with which money can be borrowed. This means that there is a superabundance of money floating round somewhere. These two facts taken together (remembering that gilt-edge stock mainly consists of Government loans) indicate that the people who are investing their money in these long term loans have little or no hope of a revival of trade within the next five years at least!

Simple-minded men and women may be inclined to ask, whence all this money in face of so much poverty? and why such feverish activity on the money market at a time of stagnation in industry?

Sufficient that since 1914 there has been a great pyramid of new nominal capital created, both in industry and national

finances. The National Debt increased from seven hundred million pounds in 1914 to eight thousand million pounds as it stands to-day. Instead of the State paying from 5 to 10 per cent. in 1914, it now pays 50 per cent. of its national revenue to State bondholders. The F.B.I. had approximately 365 members in the last House of Commons. They would naturally use their power so that the £400,000,000 required to pay the interest on the National Debt every year would exactly coincide with the £400,000,000 annual decrease in wages suffered by the workers from 1920-22.

Time was when an expansion in capital invariably involved increased production and more employment. During and since the war the former took place without the latter. The illusory gains of the capitalist class (viewed as a whole) 1914 to 1920, were reconverted into "capital" by the "bonus" share system. From 1914-19 we learn that the new nominal capital created by this and other means amounted to more than four thousand million pounds. All of which requires the average rate of interest.

This process still proceeds apace. In 1921, a year of unparalleled unemployment, issues of new capital amounted to 182½ million pounds. From January to October (inclusive) in the same year, 1,325 limited liability companies increased their total nominal capital by 80½ million pounds. Not merely will His Majesty be there when His Majesty's Imperial Labour Party get "power," but all this capital of His Majesty's subjects also.

The present cost of living figures are largely artificial. The vast sums of money above-mentioned represent latent purchasing power. If the expectations of our trade revivalist friends were realised tomorrow, this immense fund of stagnant purchasing power would cause a big increase in demand for commodities. The consequent rise in the cost of living would be great.

Turning to the international sphere, our Micawbian brethren have not one single plea. Even the two most favoured and the richest countries in the world, England and America, can boast of nothing more than a passive balance in their foreign trading relations. In countries like Italy, Austria, Hungary, capitalist economy is so bankrupt that, had it not been for the British Navy, Russia could not proudly boast to-day of being the one solitary proletarian state in the world. Economic pressure is compelling Japan to make drastic use of the "Geddes Axe," whilst political events in China bid fair to prove that "the best laid schemes of mice and men often gang a-gley."

The predatory role of France in European politics rests upon the simple economic truth that the claims of her home and foreign bondholders cannot be met from within. France is placing absolute reliance on the regularity of reparation payments from Germany to meet the growing deficit in the national budget. In the background looms Soviet Russia, where the imperative need is means of production on a large scale, i.e., machinery of every description. Commodities which require a long time to produce and a still longer time to affect a turnover of capital.

But Western capitalism cannot afford to wait. It wants immediate payment. This involves concessions from Revolutionary Russia, who in turn demands credits and assurance as to the social status of Russian workers employed by European and other capitalists.

Germany has been steadily devouring her own vitals trying to satisfy the claims of the Allies with constantly depleting economic resources. The increasingly rapid deterioration of her currency is the barometer of the coming welter and chaos. The world bourgeoisie are paying a heavy price for the knowledge that economic laws cannot be ignored without paying the penalty. Before the war a division of Labour existed not only within each nation but also between nations. The result was a sort of rough harmony between international productive and consuming capacity. The war, and its consequences of peace treaties, political pacts and revolutions, fresh antagonistic interests, blockades, creation of new states and tariffs, struggles for national independence, all of these and a thousand and one more effects of post-war imperialism have destroyed that rough harmony, without which capitalist society cannot recuperate. These events are accurately reflected in the acrobatic foreign exchanges, demoralised currencies, and national finances, the state of which in every country indicates how much "backward progress" has been made towards national bankruptcy. It is indeed a fitting example of the products controlling the producers.

The one paramount important thing which capitalism needs, but cannot have, is increased production. We have no desire to be pessimistic or exaggerate the situation, but all the causes here mentioned at home and abroad point unmistakably to a general aggravation of the crisis in world economy.

A section of the Y.C.L., Liverpool district, protests against the murdering and imprisoning of our fellow workers in South Africa, and urges the Y.C.L., along with the adult party, to hold a national demonstration to show our African comrades that the children of the British working class are helping them in their struggle for the workers' rights.

Here and There

March, if you must, Unemployed,
You have oft marched for them, over there.
March, and you'll make them annoyed
And the Gold-Thugs stammer and stare.
For bread, what will Bonar give?
Bullets, I think, if you dare
Have the impudence to want to live
In the land for which you fought, over there!

If Bonar had been over there
He might have pitied you over here
Had he crouched in a Very light glare
He might have grown a heart, and an ear.
But you know very well, Unemployed,
This fear-stricken fool in his lair
Would give all he's got and be over-joyed
To see you all damn well back—over there!

RUSSIA UNDER THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

For Official Information as to its progress and development read—

RUSSIAN INFORMATION AND REVIEW

(Published by the Information Department of the Russian Trade Delegation.) Instructive Articles, Statistical Tables, and vivid Pen Pictures of Life in Soviet Russia.

Weekly, Price 3d. Post Free, 4d.

Terms for Quantities.

Obtainable at the COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP, 16, King Street, near Covent Garden.

READY NEXT WEEK

"THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL"

(British Edition)

The Magazine of International Communism

SPECIAL CONGRESS NUMBER

Articles by N. Lenin, G. Zinovieff, Karl Radek, E. Varga, Th. Rothstein, Ch. Rappaport, J. T. Walton Newbold, R. Connolly, D. Ivon Jones, &c.

80 PAGES

ONE SHILLING

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP, 16, King St., Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

The Fourth Conference of The Communist International

Soviet Republic and the Third International

By U. STEKLOV

THE coincidence of the dates of the fifth anniversary of the October Revolution with the opening of the Fourth Congress of the Communist International is neither accidental nor arbitrary. This coincidence is of profound significance and emanates from the organic connection between the two historic events.

The Soviet Republic celebrates to-day its fifth anniversary and the Comintern convenes its Fourth Congress. Thus the Comintern appears to be the younger of the two brothers. Indeed, it was organised during the second year of the existence of the Soviet Republic and officially its chief sponsor was the Russian Communist Party. The majority of the Communist parties which joined the Comintern were organised at a later date than the Russian Party. This gave rise to the assertion of our enemies that the entire Comintern as such is the "creature" of "Moscow." This is not the case at all.

Paradoxical as it might at first sight appear, we maintain that both the October Revolution and the Russian Communist Party, which was instrumental in bringing it about "from a broad historic viewpoint" were the product and creation of the Communist International.

It is true that as a definite and official organisation the Comintern came into being later, but as a moral force it preceded them. Before its formal inauguration the Communist International lived in the consciousness of all revolutionary Marxists. Its fundamental elements evolved at the Zimmerwald and Kiental Conferences and in the inter-party debates during the entire period of imperialist war; as the categorical, imperative and the moving spirit; it acted a long time before the Inaugural Congress of the Third International. The Russian Bolsheviks particularly, as far back as 1914-1915, considered themselves part of the future Third International, acted in conformity with its principles and, impelled by them, carried out the October Revolution.

But no matter how we regard the chronological sequence of events and their historic continuity, the closest organic and spiritual relation undoubtedly exists between the Soviet Republic, the product of the October Revolution, and the Communist International. Even if this relation had not been repeatedly announced from both sides, it would be equally clear to all.

In his speech at the closing of the last session of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, Comrade Kalinin observed that the force of the Soviet Federation is a very "important element in the general strength of the Third Communist International," and that the workers and peasants of the Soviet Republics constitute one of the strongest of the parts comprising the Comintern.

This is a profound truth. The counter-revolutionary press makes fun of the assertion that the Russian peasants are interested in the Third International, but they do not dispute the fact that the Russian workers are interested in it. Kalinin's assertion, however, is true as regards the peasants. Perhaps the average Russian peasant has a rather vague idea of the Communist International and is still less familiar with its programme. He is fully aware of its existence, however, and feels himself attached to it. Forced during four years to fight, to repel the onslaught of world capitalism, the Russian toiling masses became intimately cognisant of the significance of the international solidarity of Labour. The worker and peasant masses of the Soviet Republic, still boycotted and blockaded by the capitalist imperialist

powers, are fully aware of the fact that their most vital interests are closely bound up with the success of the international revolutionary movement. In this sense Russia is at present a country in which the broad masses feel and think internationally.

Considered from this point of view, the existence of the closest contact between the Soviet Republic and the Communist International cannot be questioned. This contact is a fact not only of a moral, but of a material and tangible character. On the other hand, the Comintern is equally bound spiritually and materially with Soviet Russia. We do not refer here to any material support about which the bourgeois press raises such a clamour and which is only largely legendary. At all events, the material support rendered by the workers of all countries to the Soviet Republic during the last year's famine was not less than the aid which the Russian Communist Party could ever extend to its sister parties abroad.

Of course, in case of need, both sides will extend to each other the utmost assistance, but at the present time we emphasise only



THE MEMBER FOR MOTHERWELL ARRIVES

FIRST PLUTE—It's a good thing Motherwell's an insignificant part of our Empire.

SECOND PLUTE—Insignificant? It's bigger than Nazareth...!

the contact which exists between them in the spiritual and political sense of the word.

The Comintern rests on Soviet Russia. The mere fact of the existence of the Socialist Republic which during five years repelled the attacks of all its enemies, increased the revolutionary sentiment of the world proletariat, encouraged it in the most trying moments and inspired it to carry on the struggle indefatigably.

The world proletariat possesses in the Soviet Republic an impregnable fortress where the world Communist programme and tactics are shaped and the systematic accumulation of proletarian constructive experience and the building of the Proletarian State is achieved. Here all the fighters for the Socialist Revolution find a secure refuge where they are protected from the fierce vengeance of the bourgeoisie and where they are able to study the process of creating Communist Society.

The mutual solidarity of the Soviet Republics and of the Communist International is a fact of everyday reality. To the extent to which the existence and the growing strength of Soviet Russia is important for the Third International to the same extent the development and the strength of the

Comintern is important for Soviet Russia. The International has already helped Russia to repel the onslaught of world capitalism. In the future its aid will be still more effective. The success of the Communist International will strengthen the economic and political power of Soviet Russia and vice versa. The ideological, moral and material contact between them is based on the complete identity of their interests.

Hence the thought of opening the Fourth Congress of the Communist International on the day of the celebration of the anniversary of the October Revolution was a most happy one. It is a symbol with the profoundest meaning and speaking equally convincingly to both enemies and friends.

The Preliminary Session in Petrograd

A CONTINUOUS stream of automobiles moves along to the Narodny Dom. The splendid auditorium of the Opera Theatre is packed from floor to ceiling. At a modest estimate 8,000 people must have assembled for the opening of the Congress. All round one hears conversation in different tongues. At the press table there are no less than 50 representatives of Russian and foreign press, and even the boxes nearest the stage are filled with journalists.

At 8.45 p.m. Clara Zetkin appeared upon the platform. All present rise like one man to greet this aged leader of the international proletariat with a grand ovation.

Speaking in German, Comrade Zetkin declared the Fourth Congress of the Communist International open.

On the proposal of the E.C. of the Comintern, Comrade Zinoviev was unanimously elected President of the Fourth Congress.

On taking his place in the presidential chair, Comrade Zinoviev proposed the election of a Presidium composed of the representatives of the following countries: Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Switzerland, France, America, England, the Scandinavian countries, Italy and Germany. Comrades Lenin and Trotsky were elected to the Presidium as representing Russia.

In his opening speech, Comrade Zinoviev paid respect to the memory of the fallen warriors in the struggle for the emancipation of labour in all countries. "The present Congress," said Zinoviev, "is opening under the cross-fire of the enemies of the working class. It is attended by the representatives of labour from 52 different countries." The conclusion of Comrade Zinoviev's speech was followed by a storm of applause and the playing of "The International" by the orchestra.

A number of telegrams of greeting to the Congress was read, including messages from Comrades Lenin and Trotsky expressing regret that, owing to pressure of business in Moscow, they were unable to be present. "However," added Zinoviev, "Comrade Ilyitch has promised to be with us in the near future." This announcement was greeted with loud cheers for Lenin and Trotsky.

Comrade Clara Zetkin again spoke and was again given an ovation. In her speech she dwelt on the position of political prisoners languishing in the prisons of all countries. She illustrated her points with figures and facts of innumerable cases of persecution to which Communists are subjected in bourgeois countries.

Arising out of Comrade Zetkin's report, Comrade Felix Kon proposed a resolution of greeting and approbation to all political prisoners pining in the jails of Europe and America. The resolution was carried unanimously.

The Sovietization of the Far East

By V. VILENSKI

THE occupation of Vladivostok by the Red troops brings to a close the first stage in the struggle of Soviet Russia against Japanese intervention. The struggle lasted for nearly five years and cost the Russian workers and peasants great sacrifices.

Taking advantage of the exhaustion of Russia during the period of the imperialist war, Japan decided to drive her from the coasts of the Pacific and the Japanese imperialists stubbornly and undeviatingly strove to fortify their domination in the Russian Far East on the pretext of safeguarding the Japanese islands from Bolshevik contagion.

Japanese intervention gave rise in the Far East to a buffer state organised in the principles of democracy in the form of the Far Eastern Democratic Republic, and which in its constitution recognised private property, and based its entire government apparatus upon all democratic principles embodied in the so-called democratic bourgeois countries.

This democracy existed in the Far East for two and a half years, and it seemed that here indeed was an ideal spot for a "democratic paradise," but soon it became apparent that these principles were of no use to anybody. The Japanese imperialists manifested little inclination to respect the democratic Far Eastern Republic, and during the entire period of their occupation they not only refused to recognise it, but conducted open warfare against it by organising the Russian counter revolutionaries who were centred at Vladivostok, and at the behest of the Japanese militarists, directed from there their piratical raids against the Far Eastern Republic.

Still less did the democratic principles satisfy the workers and peasants of the Far East. Having drunk the cup of bitterness of Japanese intervention to the full, they with clenched teeth tolerated the democratic makeshift until Japan finally withdrew her troops from Russian territory, and now emphatically declare that they will no longer endure their unnatural separation from Soviet Russia and its form of government.

This demand of the workers and the peasants of the Far East is quite comprehensible, considering the social-economic condition prevailing there. Owing to its enormous natural wealth, it is an attractive morsel for foreign capital. On the other hand, the population is too small—numbering only two million people, scattered over an immense territory—to maintain an independent economic life. Without the aid of Soviet Russia the people could not defend the Pacific coast from encroachments by foreign capitalism which will never abandon its attempts to make itself dominant in the Far East.

The destiny of the Far East is closely and indissolubly bound up with the destiny of Soviet Russia, and the Far Eastern workers and peasants refuse to allow foreign capitalism to fasten its yoke upon them. This they can achieve only in fraternal union with the Russian workers and peasants. Hence arises the necessity to Sovietise the Far East and to include it in the All-Russian Soviet Federation.

In its turn Soviet Russia cannot remain indifferent to the future destiny of the Far East and its people. The Far East is the corridor to the Pacific wherein enormous masses of oppressed peoples are commencing their struggle for liberation from the yoke of imperialism. Soviet Russia is the first country to raise the banner of the world revolution: she stands as the shining example for all the oppressed peoples of the Eastern Hemisphere. Hence the emergence of Soviet Russia on the coast of the Pacific is the lighting of a Socialist beacon to the oppressed people of the Far East.

The workers and peasants of Far Eastern Russia will plant the Red banner of the Russian Soviet Republic which will serve as the symbol of world revolution and which will emancipate the oppressed peoples of the Eastern Republic.



"The state of trade and unemployment continues to cause Me deep concern."—KING'S SPEECH

ADVERTISEMENT RATES

PROPAGANDA ADVERTISEMENTS. (C.P. branches and kindred organisations):—Displayed, 5s. per inch, single column or pro rata. Classified (run on) 6d. per line (6 words) or part thereof.

COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENTS:—Displayed, 7s. 6d. per inch, single column or pro rata. Classified (run on), 9d. per line (6 words) or part thereof.

No advertisement will be inserted unless copy is received, together with cash in prepayment, by second post Monday for insertion in current week's issue.

All communications to Advertisement Department, "The Communist," 16, King Street, W.C. 2.

MEETINGS

Communist Party Branches

BIRMINGHAM. Special Lecture, Floodgate Street School, Sunday, 7 p.m. Prominent Speakers. Bull Ring, Sunday, 11.30 a.m. and 7 p.m. Intending members apply T. Lowe, 27, Heath Mill Lane, Deritend.

CENTRAL LONDON. Minerva Cafe, Sunday, December 3rd, 6 p.m., Social Tea. All welcome. 8 p.m., Lecture (Comrade Field), "The Dawn of Socialism in Turkey."

CENTRAL JOINT COUNCIL. Minerva Cafe, Monday, December 4th, 8 p.m., Comrade Dickinson on "The Communist Manifesto." All welcome.

ISLINGTON. S. Saklatvala speaks at West Islington Library, Lofting Road, Caledonian Road, on Sunday, December 3rd, 7.45 p.m., on "Where is Labour's Salvation?"

WOOLWICH. Sunday, December 3rd, at 7.30, Reading Room, Co-op. Hall, Lakedale Road, Plumstead. Lecturer: T. Irving.

WORKINGTON. A Meeting will be held in the Trades' Hall, Oxford Street, on Saturday, December 2nd, at 7.30 p.m., with a view to forming a Branch of the Communist Party. Speakers: Comrades Mowatt and Yeomans, of Barrow.

YOUNG COMMUNIST COUPLE require Two Unfurnished Rooms and Kitchen, London.—Write A. T., 24, Hermitage Lane, N.W.2.

THE COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP

16, King Street, near Covent Garden,
Aims at supplying **ALL** your Literature. We stock every Book worth considering on

SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

We can Supply ANYTHING to Order

Party Publications always on Sale
CHAS. H. KERR'S Publications a Speciality

LENIN'S IMPERIALISM

A Study in Finance Capital

64 Pages

1s. 6d. post free

KERR'S BOOK AGENCY,
Vernon House,
Friars Place Lane, East Acton