

# The COMMUNIST REVIEW

EDITOR :: WM. PAUL

---

---

Volume 3

July, 1922

Number 3

---

---

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SINGLE COPIES		BUNDLE ORDERS	
SIX MONTHS - -	3/9 POST FREE	13 COPIES FOR 5/3	POST PAID
TWELVE " - -	7/- " "	SALE OR RETURN	

---

---

## Review of the Month

### THE REAL CONSPIRACY AGAINST LABOUR

**I**N all moderate sections of the British Labour movement one hears nothing but puerile lamentations regarding the great capitalist conspiracy to crush the organised industrial workers. This is the cry that is now uttered by Messrs. Henderson, Clynes, Thomas, and the other "privies" of modern Labourism. We do not deny that the capitalist class has organised its forces to try and smash the trade union movement; indeed, we have never heard of a time, in the history of propertied society, when the aim of the property owners was not to try and subjugate the toiling masses. But it is not only necessary that the workers' attention should be directed to the determined attack which the master class is making upon them, of even greater importance is it for them to know about the hideous conspiracy of the trade union leaders who have wrought more havoc among the organised masses than all the combined onslaughts of the propertied interests could ever have done. For, after all, a capitalist offensive upon the trade union masses automatically reacts upon them and instinctively creates resentment, which in its turn produces defensive and aggressive tactics. No one can deny this. The rank and file miners wanted to fight when Smillie diverted the struggle into the Sankey Commission truce of defeat. Last year the industrial mass struggle was sabotaged by Black Friday. This year 47 unions, led by A. Henderson, went down in a defeat unparalleled even in the history of British trade union betrayals. The conspiracy against the working-class, in this country, is not that it is being attacked by the capitalist class; that is the normal condition of the class struggle. The *real* conspiracy against the trade unions lies in the damnable treachery of the trade union leaders themselves who, since the armistice, have systematically and successfully undermined every instinctive attempt of the rank and file to put up a fighting resistance against the employing class. The dauntless fighting spirit of the masses was such that easily it could have surmounted the inherent weakness of the trade unions. But

what it could not surmount was the bureaucratic power of leaders determined to avoid a struggle even at the expense of betraying their own members.

Only the Communist Party, and its press, has had the courage to point out this true explanation of the recent defeats of the working-class. Our mild contemporary, the *Labour Leader*, which has, with characteristic I.L.P. cowardice, failed to point out the real lessons of Labours' debacle contents itself by saying:—

The engineers have been beaten by the superior economic staying power of the Employers' Federation. They have not admitted the moral right of the masters to "do what they like with their own," which formed the basis of the memorandum which led to the dispute. What has been demonstrated is simply the now familiar lesson that, aligned on its present front, and operating with its present machinery and methods, Trade Unionism cannot hope to triumph in its struggle with amalgamated capitalism.

Neither the superior economic power of the employers nor the machinery of trade unionism can be utilised to cover up the treacheries of the labour leaders, many of whom learnt the gospel of class timidity from the I.L.P.

### **The Trade Union Parliamentarian**

**W**HEN we remember the above facts we can easily understand why the masses are leaving the trade unions in hundreds of thousands. No rank and file soldier feels safe in an army led by cowards and traitors. Desertions are bound to take place and the number of deserters determine the revulsion of the soldiers against their so-called leaders.

It is necessary, at the present juncture, to enquire into the reasons why the trade union leaders have so basely capitulated, all along the industrial front, to the employing class. We do not for one moment suggest, despite well-founded rumours, that the leaders are in the pay of the Federation of British Industries. Many of them are so desperately egoistic and politically ambitious that mere money could not satisfy them; besides, capitalist governments can tickle the vanity of such men by political baubles and distinctions which are much more valued than lucre—there are such things as being made privy councillors; and there are many well paid sinecures, carrying with them social prestige, which are among the gifts that the propertied class can bestow among its deserving vassals. There are other leaders whose timidity in the class struggle is based upon good intentions which form, it is said, the paving stones of hell.

Many of the most prominent trade union leaders look upon the industrial movement as the jumping board for a political career. Their interests are not the same as their dues paying members. If at any moment the intensity of the class struggle demands a vigorous onslaught upon capitalism the politically minded leader will readily sacrifice the well-being of the industrial masses upon the altar of his parliamentary ambitions. The growing intensity of the class struggle is revealing the Communist truism that success in the industrial conflict can only be won by virile mass action directed against capitalism and all its institutions. To lead in a fight of this character is not the sort of job the modern trade union leader desires, it would mean that the capitalist press would dub him as one who neither understood "statesmanship" nor the gentler

methods of solving social grievances. Anyone who knows the traits of the capitalist class knew that the miners were foredoomed to failure, last year, from the moment that the "kept" press hailed Frank Hodges as a brilliant young man who would leave his mark on the political history of his time. The trade union leader with parliamentary ambitions would very much like to dispense with the annoying tasks allotted to him as an official in an industrial organisation. He cannot leave the union because it is his financial support before and after he enters Parliament. His official position in a big union increases his political importance; it gives him a better organised *power* to flaunt in the face of opponents than that which he derives from the constituents who elect him to the House of Commons. Thus the ideal of the average Labour leader is to settle down to a nice parliamentary career and to be sustained therein, both politically and financially, by a big trade union membership which neither believes in strikes nor aggressive industrial action, but which feels that it is sweeping from victory to victory in the same measure that its leader earns the praise of the capitalist press and is ultimately rewarded by being elected to the "privy." This explains why the large salaried trade union leaders in parliament frankly admit that a strike should be the last weapon to be used by their dues paying members. Therefore, the task of these gentlemen is to so arrange matters that the members pay, but do not strike, while the leaders declaim in parliament regarding the virtues of a Labour party which is not a *class* organisation but which exists, as Mr. J. R. MacDonald would say, to perform its tasks in a spirit of social co-operation.

### The Ten Years' Truce

**B**UT how can our trade union parliamentarians retain their official contact with the unions, and all that that involves, and yet prevent the masses from upsetting matters by such drastic things as strikes? Mr. Arthur Henderson has propounded the solution. He suggests nothing more or less than a ten years' industrial truce! Right here we wish to say that Mr. A. Henderson is the best poised Labour Party politician in this country. As wily strategists Mr. J. H. Thomas and J. R. MacDonald are mere Lilliputians in comparison; the former being as stupidly bombastic as the latter is arrogantly vane. Mr. Henderson would never have made himself so petty as to prosecute his critics in a capitalist court, and he would never have taken up the hypocritical war attitude adopted by Mr. J. R. MacDonald who attempted to run with the timid hares of pacifism, to bark with the blood-hounds of war, and finally to land in the ditch of war indemnities. For good or evil Mr. Henderson takes up his stand and sticks to it. He has always been a sincere advocate of a sacred union between Capital and Labour. It is said that his hand helped to draft the Munitions Act which was an industrial truce imposed upon the trade unions during the war. In the cause of industrial peace he faced, in company with Mr. Lloyd George, the Glasgow rebels organised by the Clyde Workers' Committee during the war; that visit, it may be remembered, ended in the suppression of his comrade Johnson's Labour weekly, *The Forward*. Within the last few weeks Mr. Henderson achieved an

industrial truce by leading the retreat of the 47 unions. His new agitation for a ten years' industrial truce may well be the crowning achievement of his career. This policy would be akin to the Munitions Act and even Mr. Smillie—haunted by the devastating results of his Sankey truce—has denounced it.

A ten years' industrial truce in practice would mean that the trade unions would become the financial milch cow of the leaders, who, being relieved from such irritating tasks as strikes and lock-outs, would be able to devote their best energies to developing their parliamentary careers. It is an open secret that many of the parliamentary trade union leaders rejoice in the disasters that have recently overtaken the masses on the industrial sphere. These leaders imagine that once Labour has been thrashed industrially it may transfer its energies from the economic field to that of pure and simple parliamentary action. Thus the masses, during a ten years' industrial truce, would not only supply the financial needs of the trade union parliamentarians, they would also be treated as mere voting cattle by the leaders.

### A United Front with Capital

**R**EGARDING the suggested ten years' industrial truce there is an important point that has not been overlooked by Mr. Arthur Henderson and the leaders of the Second International. They know better than most people that the fighting spirit of the masses passes through a series of cycles. The fighting spirit of the British workers, as elsewhere, was at its highest point when the army was demobilised; it was during this period that the workers flocked into the unions. They had been keyed up by the Russian revolution, by the overthrow of the Kaiser and by the forward surge of the European masses. The leaders of the Second International were able to check the inherent revolutionary impulses of the workers in every country except Russia. The glowing enthusiasm of the proletariat was not harnessed, and it was not meant to be. Instead of the revolutionary fervour being exploited to lead the workers against Capitalism, the leaders of the Second International retreated at every point. When an army which feels it can be victorious, if led against the enemy, is given the order to retreat in face of a terrified foe, and if retreat after retreat is ordered it results in destroying the fighting quality and moral fibre of the troops. This is precisely what the Second International did, with the result that the suddenly emboldened capitalist battalions have inflicted defeat after defeat upon Labour's army. These defeats have been so humiliating, and the treacheries perpetrated have been so numerous that the fighting spirit of the masses is now at its lowest point. But the reaction is bound to set in. Human flesh and blood will refuse to endure the hideous degradation that the capitalists are now enforcing upon the workers. And when the masses are goaded, by sheer desperation, to turn upon their task-masters they will use the industrial organisation as the chief weapon of attack. It is here that the real genius of Mr. A. Henderson reveals itself. *His projected ten years' industrial truce is intended to spike the industrial gun so that it will be useless as a weapon of attack.* The ten years' industrial truce is the Second International's latest attempt to save Capi-

talism by arranging with the propertied interests that the industrial organisation shall be impotent during the next decade.

There is another point that must be emphasised. The leaders know that a virile industrial policy breeds a fighting spirit in the rank and file. They also know that the waging of the class struggle leads the masses into close contact with the Red International Labour Unions. It is this fear of the class struggle and where it leads to, that has compelled the leaders of the Second International to renounce a United Front with the Communists. To keep the workers away from Communism it is necessary to make industrial struggles impossible and it is therefore imperative to inaugurate a ten years' truce. Mr. Henderson who wishes such a truce is in reality, in conjunction with the Second International, *seeking to form a united front with the employers against the vital needs of the masses and the policy of the Communists.* And the leaders who are making such overtures to the capitalist class are the very same people who are so enthusiastic in their wholesale condemnation of Soviet Russia!

When the war broke out in 1914 it was Mr. Henderson who led the wavering Labour leaders in Britain to the support of imperialism; in doing this he proved himself an able exponent of the tactics of the Second International. When the war ended it was the Second International that saved European Capitalism from the wrath of the masses. And now on the dawn of a new revolutionary crisis the Second International, in anticipation of the coming fury of the workers, proposes to act as the bulwark of Capitalism by advocating a ten years' truce. But it will fail. Such a truce may bind the leaders, as they were bound by the Munition Acts during the war, but it will let loose a new rank and file and Workers' Committee Movement which will harness every element of industrial revolt to break down the bureaucratic power of the Hendersons, to sweep away the inefficiency of the unions, and to prepare the proletariat for a mass attack upon the capitalist system.

Since the Second International has refused to form a united Labour front to fight Capitalism, it is the duty of all Communists in denouncing the ten years' industrial truce to rally the workers for a new offensive. The Communists have failed to unite the Labour forces despite their overtures to the leaders of the Second International; it remains now for the appeal to be made over the head of these leaders to the masses themselves.

### **Pacifism or Anti-Militarism**

**A**T the present moment there is a great deal of worthy interest being manifested in a crusade against war. Many of the active participants in the campaign are leaders who were loud voiced imperialists during the last great war. The tendency of many of the advocates of no more war is to emphasise the dangers of *French* imperialism. Very few of the Labour parliamentarians seem to realise that the present strength of French imperialism is due to the Versailles policy which the Labour Party did not repudiate when it was first foisted upon Germany. To hear indemnity mongers, like Mr. J. R. MacDonald, denouncing war while spurning the best opportunity ever offered to seriously combat it—the offer of the Communist International—is to listen to the meanest hypocrisy.

The pacifists of British Labourism have always been very tame people of the I.L.P. brand. They can be very bold when attacking every imperialism except the one that matters to us in this country—British imperialism. Side by side with the growth of the conflict between French and British financiers, over foreign plunder, there is developing a healthy hatred between French and British statesmen. The duty of anti-militarists in this country is not to attack the imperialism of France—that is one of the special tasks of the French working-class. The French Communists are doing their duty by publishing a series of books based upon the contents of the Czarist government archives at Moscow and Petrograd. René Marchand, the well-known French journalist and Communist, is busily at work on this job. By attacking French imperialism at the present moment we are only playing the game of the British financiers who are clever enough to use such propaganda against their French enemies; our duty in this country is to attack British imperialism.

During the war Karl Liebknecht very cleverly pointed out that for German Socialists to attack British imperialism or for British Socialists to attack German imperialism was nothing less than a betrayal of internationalism. When British Socialists and Labourists attack the French government they are laying the basis for a *national war*; when they direct their attention to British imperialism they are helping to carry on the *class war*. Let the reader study the manifestoes issued by the Japanese Communists against their government (published in our *International Review* in this month's issue) and it will be seen that the real struggle against imperialism must mean the prosecution of the class war; let the reader observe how that splendid old Japanese agitator, Sen Katayama, calls upon the soldiers of Japan, situated in Siberia, to revolt against their government. His call is not that of an I.L.P. pacifist, it is the clarion note of one who understands that the fight against imperialism means struggle, struggle, struggle. Likewise, Clara Zetkin also tells us that communist anti-militarism is opposed to sentimental pacifism. To prepare and organise the masses to attack Capitalism is the only sane method of combating imperialism.

## Pen Pictures of Russia

By JOHN S. CLARKE

*One of the Most Popular Books about Soviet Russia.*

*Now in its second edition*

PRICE

4/6

Communist Party, 16, King Street, London, W.C.2

# A Day in Moscow

By A. ROSMER, Editor of The Class Struggle

(TRANSLATED BY H.C.S.C.)

**T**HE snow had blocked our train, and it had now become certain that we should not reach the Windau station before three or four o'clock in the morning. This was altogether unexpected, for we had already arranged quite a programme as to what we were going to do; nevertheless, we made the best of it, and passed one more night in the train, instead of in bed, lying on the seats.

The train stopped. One is semi-conscious even when half asleep, and we became aware of the sound of voices talking, curiously noticeable in the stillness after the continuous rumble of the journey. What was it all about? But already our carriage is besieged by a lively group of Russian comrades accompanied by Boris Souvarine. Our representative and our friends had even wished to meet the train to receive us, and it was a pleasant surprise to us, and increased the happiness we felt in being once again in Moscow, the "Holy City," so to speak, to revolutionaries of every country. Our luggage is quickly collected together, and we start off at once for the International Headquarters.

It was impossible to separate immediately, there was so much to talk about, so many questions to put on so many subjects, the famine, the new political moves. And the friends we had left, where were they now? Still at Moscow, or dispersed all over the great country?

Nevertheless, one has to get some time for a bit of sleep—not much! As soon as the breakfast bell strikes we are up and ready, for we know that round the long table we shall meet all our friends. Here is Nin, whom I saw a few months ago in Germany, already mixed up in Berlin affairs, and sent over here by Ebert's police after already having been some time in quod. Here is Andreytchin, happy, exuberant, as he always is, unless he is ill. Then, this is Haywood, the big giant, now become quite a Russian, and in high spirits over the installation very shortly of a strong contingent of American workmen in the Kousnetz Basin, in Siberia, where they will work the mines and factories. Later on we shall find the little French colony.

But at 12 o'clock there was a meeting of the International Communist Bureau, to which we had been summoned. Our comrades are a little uneasy here as to the position of the French Party. The incidents which passed at the Marseilles Congress show that the Party is passing through a crisis a solution to which must quickly be found.

The Communist International has changed its quarters; it has left the swagger mansion—but ugly enough!—of the old German Embassy, which was far away and badly accommodated, and has installed itself just by the entrance to the Kremlin.

Zinoviev was, of course, there, with all the members of the Bureau. Trotsky had also come. The discussion was a long one,

for the clearest fact about the state of the French Party is that things are not at all clear! Confusion always reigns, even in the Managing Committee. One generally blames the four who resigned at Marseilles, their action is disapproved of, but the political reason which caused it is, of course, quite understood, and the desire to make a public demonstration of slipping over to the Right and show the danger to all.

At five o'clock we had an hour for dinner, but we had to return to the Kremlin, where the Central Executive Committee of Pan-Russia Soviets was holding a very important meeting on the subject of the Genoa Conference, arranging as to whom should form the delegation.

When we arrived at the Sverdlof Hall, where the meeting was to take place, it was already packed. The Committee consists of four hundred members, and there certainly were not many absentees. The public occupied the upper gallery, and on the platform, which was the ordinary stage, were the officials; in the centre Kalinin, the President, whose shrewd and intelligent face of a working-farmer is familiar to us.

Tchitcherine made his report. He explained the whole affair, its origin, the difficulties in the way, the efforts at sabotage directed by Poincaré, who has mobilised the faithful Bénés and the Little Entente. What is one to expect from Genoa? Not much, certainly, not too much. Soviet Russia has been summoned. It will go, not as though conquered, but conscious of the strength it represents; it will discuss the propositions put before it, but will give away nothing it considers intangible.

There was perfect silence, as is always the case here in the big assemblies, and there was great attention, and so even the voice of Tchitcherine, which is very weak for this hall, could be distinctly heard everywhere.

Then the discussion began. Sosnovsky, editor of *Pravda*, did not seem to feel very reassured. He spoke his fears; the great capitalist powers seeking to re-establish their economic conditions with the object of pillaging Russia: while they were talking Peace, their mercenaries were preparing war; the delegation ought to have very strict instructions.

An old farmer (*paysan*) followed him; his son had been killed in the struggle against Denikin; and now they had got to repay the money the French capitalists had lent the Tsar to crush the Revolution of 1905, and then these same capitalists who backed up all the attempts of the counter-revolutionists are directly responsible for all the devastations. The thing is not possible!

Then a working man of Petrograd calls attention to the point voted in many factories asking instantly that Lenin should not take part in the delegation, but remain in Russia. Italy is over-run by the Fascisti, who pillage, kill, and burn, backed indirectly by the bourgeoisie and the Government. Why wasn't the conference held in Moscow, where the security of everyone would be guaranteed, and where there was no ministerial crisis, since the bourgeoisie in Italy is unable to form a ministry? And he also asked that there should be a representative of the Red Army in the delegation.

Kamenef, the Generalissimo, a pleasant-faced man with a mous-

tache, asked permission to speak to make a declaration. It was not necessary, he said, that any special representative of the Red Army should go to Genoa. The Red Army used the same organs as the proletarian State. The comrades who would be selected to form the delegation would represent the whole of Soviet Russia.

Tchitcherine replied. Then the delegation was formed. Lenin was to lead it. Tchitcherine would hold full powers in the absence of Lenin, and would be assisted by Litvinoff, Krassin, Joffé, Rakovsky. It would be a formidable set. They should be well able to defend Soviet Russia before the agents of world imperialism.

In the evening Lozovsky had called together the syndicalist section of the congress of the peoples of the Far East who have been stopping here for the last two weeks. The congress had brought together about 150 delegates, the syndicalists consisting of about 50, including Chinese, Koreans, Japanese, and also a delegation from Java.

Lozovsky gave a summary of the general situation of the international workers' movement, and indicated what he considered to be the best methods of working; the members of the different delegations would speak in turn on the questions that were of especial interest to them. Then the questions would be grouped and debated upon.

There was the difficulty of languages. But it is not so formidable as it appears. English is the common language of all these peoples. In each delegation at least one comrade speaks English, and can translate.

First of all, it was the Chinese turn. A railwayman spoke first, then a metal-worker, a printer, a member of the Union of General Workers of Honan. Then came the Koreans and the Japanese.

The question which came up most often was that of organisation. In all these countries the syndicates are still, in general—there are exceptions—in a primitive state. Delegates asked that they should be pointed out the practical means of consolidating their organisations. A lot of questions were asked also concerning tactics; how to defend wages, how to assure the protection of women and children employed in the factories. The committees from the factories spoke; they were asked what they were and what they did.

During these discussions one learnt an interesting fact. In Korea the syndicates include Korean workers as well as the Japanese workers. The national claim of independence, which is very acute there, thus passes to a secondary consideration.

On the whole, the questions which interest the workers of the Far East are the same as those which interest us. The only difference is that their movement is still in the early stages of formation as regards organisation, but it is already able of putting forward its demands and defending them energetically with the strike.

This finished the day's work. Each problem raised would be dealt with in the meetings to follow.

Our first day had been very full. Was that anything exceptional? Certainly not. Each day brings with it its crowd of questions, studies, information and particulars of all descriptions, some connected with Soviet Russia, others with the East, or with regard

to the international situation. Everything is becoming clearer and finding its exact place, and the outlook is widening.

What one sees does not resemble descriptions of Utopian cities. It is something larger and more definite; it is the creative effort working hard in full swing. One feels the revolution "in the making," forging ahead; over numerous and enormous difficulties a new world is forming; it has not sprung up, nor will it spring up all in a moment; it is being built bit by bit, at the price of the highest sacrifices. Everyone dimly feels all this, even the old bourgeoisie. But one does not quite understand that the first condition is to fully and unreservedly devote oneself to the Revolution.

## The Struggle Against New Imperialistic Wars

By CLARA ZETKIN

**W**HEN the last war broke out, when the Powers were flying at each other's throats, they all came to the conclusion that that must be the last war. The battle cry was that it was the war to end wars, to make it absolutely the last war. Two years have passed since peace was declared, and what do we see? We are now as near to war as we have ever been before. Preparations for war are visible the world over. Conditions are more dangerous than they were in 1914. The war danger still exists. The conditions that led to the great slaughter are still in existence. The balance of power has been shifted, but the war has not solved the original problem that led up to it. On the contrary, alongside of the antagonisms which led up to the war, new antagonisms have developed and sharpened. Colonial opposition to the mother countries grows. Russia was excluded from the world economic and political systems. Now the powers are considering what specific stand they must take towards Russia, and are fighting each other about it. Smaller states have developed. The former Austrian empire has brought forth a number of smaller states, such as Czecho-Slovakia and Jugo-Slavia. Border states, like Latvia, Esthonia, etc., have risen. The original cause of the war was not due to the antagonisms between France and Germany, but was a clash between England and Germany. The struggle was for world power, but German Imperialism is destroyed, its militarism is defeated, and still the antagonisms between England and Germany exist. France tries to save itself from bankruptcy by squeezing Germany like a lemon. Germany is impoverished. It can save France from bankruptcy. England won the war, but England has been a country manufacturing finished products in great quantities and Germany was one of its greatest markets. Now England finds German markets closed to it, because Germany is pauperised. On the other hand, in order to pay the indemnities required of it, Germany must export its products extensively, and must consequently compete with English products. The present condition in

Germany, through the sinking of the mark, has made Germany the bargain counter of the world. Germany is trying to sell everything, machinery as well as finished products. The German capitalists would sell the moon and stars if they could get at them. They are selling their land to foreign capitalists. After all, the German bargain sales mean nothing but dirty competition, that is, unfair competition with the products of other countries, because the German worker is the most exploited worker in the world. The products thrown on the market by Germany are produced by absolute exploitation. The German working class is under paid as no other working class is underpaid. The German worker is at a lower stage of payment than the coolie of Japan. He gets eight times less than the English workers, and it is impossible for other countries, despite their tariffs, to prevent German goods from coming in and still selling at a tremendous profit. England did not gain anything by its victory, but French militarism has been strengthened. Before the war France was a nation of bankers. Now, after the war, industrial capital has developed in France. It is no longer a place where luxuries are produced; it is also producing iron and steel wares. Through the war it got hold of the great iron deposits of Lorraine, and got the German coal basins near to its doors. Germany, through the coal indemnity it has to pay, has influenced the development of industrial production in France. This is also a reason why France wants to get hold of the Ruhr district for the sake of the coal on the other side of the Rhine. England, of course, is against that; it knows that if the deposits of ore that France possesses were reinforced by the possession of such additional coal deposits, France would become a very dangerous industrial competitor. France has extended its political influence. It has created a new form of vassals in Jugo-Slavia, Poland and the Little Entente, etc. Through this influence it has also got connections with the coal and oil resources of Roumania and the Balkan States. It can also block England's way from Europe to Asia Minor and to the lower Balkan states. France is also in a stronger position than England in another respect. Its colonies are so close that they are of great importance and benefit to the militaristic designs of the French capitalists. The Angora Treaty that France signed with the Young Turks has strengthened France in Asia Minor just where England is weakest. The German Government has always speculated *upon the antagonism* between England and France. When the Upper Silesian question was under discussion, Germany thought that England would prevent the division of Upper Silesia. It thought that the antagonism would prevent Poland from getting these deposits. But the German Government did not see the real factors. Germany, after all, is only an object in any dispute that exists between England and France. The real question with England lies in the route to India, in the control of the direct route that England must have to India. At the present moment the control of Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, Egypt, and independent Arabia—nominally independent, but in reality under the supervision of England—still guarantees such a route. And it is over this that the real conflict may come.

Another product of the war was the fact that England, which had been capitalistically and politically in the forefront of world-power, has been pushed back by America. America exploited the war to its greatest advantage. Its industries have intensified and extended. It has organised production on a very large scale, and it is significant that much of this organisational work was done by German engineers, etc., which proves that capitalism knows no country. Formerly America was known as an exporter of raw products, steel and food products. Now it is extensively exporting finished products. During the war it conquered the home and South American markets. It has now extended its raw products to Europe. Even the coal market was conquered by America, although it was England's coal that won for her her great position. Lately England has got back her coal supremacy. The President of America had to ask the United States railway companies to reduce the rates for coal transport, to enable the American mine-owners to compete against English coal. Another source of antagonism between America and England is oil. Oil is superior to coal as fuel. It is easier to transport, and gives quicker results. It has become important, especially for war vessels and for ships generally. America controls about 70 per cent. of the oil production. England wants to get the Baku and the Mesopotamian oil wells. A steady stream of gold has found its way to America since the war, and even more so at the present moment than before.

Another source of antagonism between England and France is China. China has about one-third of the population of the world. Her peoples have been trained for centuries to be subservient and willing workers. These workers can give unlimited profits to capitalists. The United States is trying to conquer China by so-called peaceful penetration, but still in this effort it comes into conflict with England and Japan. Japanese capitalism developed more during the war than even American capitalism. Japanese capitalism has developed the militaristic side of capitalism more than any other country. The apparent parliamentarianism that exists in Japan is still ruled by cliques and castes. They have built such a military system in Japan that it is just to say that Japan is the Prussia of the Far East. It combines the features of the highest developed capitalist State with the highest developed military features of an Imperial State. Japan wants to get certain strongholds in the Pacific Ocean. It might appear that the attempt to get these would be a course of war, but that is not so. The cause of war in the Far East is in China itself. Japan was successful in taking hold of a large part of China during the war. It got the province of Shantung, and also that part that was controlled by Germany, Kiao-Chow. England did not oppose the Japanese occupation of these places, because she was entrenched in the South of China. She controls there the production, which has developed, to a certain degree, in a European manner. England looked at the Japanese occupation with no tearful eye. A conflict will sooner or later break out between Japan and England. Antagonism will increase between Japan and America, and any such antagonism will benefit England.

England is somewhat hampered by its over-sea dominions.

These, at the last Imperial Conference, demanded their say on the foreign policy of England. As far as the Dominions are concerned, they are not at all completely in agreement with English foreign policy. South-Africa has very little interest in shedding its blood in a conflict that England may be embroiled in over America and Japan. Australia has many more points of connection, politically and economically, with America than it has with England, especially regarding Japan. Australia would not want to go to war against America if she attacks Japan. The chances are that all these oppositions that arise, even between the Dominions and England, will lead sooner or later to a complete separation of these dominions from the mother country. England is also hampered by the rebellion that is taking place in all its colonies. For instance, the revolt in Ireland was very much supported by America, *by official America*, as well as by the Irish in America. The position of Ireland as a friend of America would greatly improve the chances of America in a war with England.

The Egyptian revolution is of exceptional importance to England. With the penetration of Asia-Minor by France, England is more and more compelled to look upon the Suez Canal as its most important connection with India. If it loses its hold on Egypt, the fate of the Suez Canal would become problematical. India has been for forty years in a state of ferment. England has tried both to crush this rebellion and to bribe it. It has used both the whip and sugar in dealing with it. But still it has not succeeded in crushing it. It is a revolution of the Mohammedan world, as well as a national revolution, and these elements are reinforced with a growing class-struggle. In Madras and Bombay, in all the States of India where there are industries, great strikes are constantly taking place, and the class struggle becomes more intense every day. The rebellions that have appeared in all the colonial countries have been greatly influenced by the world war. It is true that the world war has decreased the influence of the white races, or the respect that the coloured races have had for them. But the rebellion has been even more influenced by the Russian revolution which has inspired the colonial peoples with the rebellious spirit.

All these antagonisms among the capitalist countries are tending towards a conflict, but all these countries, despite their opposition to each other, find a point of contact in a struggle against Soviet Russia. Russia has inspired the Eastern peoples against Europe. Soviet Russia is obnoxious to the capitalist world. It is a perpetual reminder to the capitalists that their days are numbered. Russia has proved to them that the day will come when they will disappear from the earth. The capitalists are afraid, and for this reason they are everywhere trying their best to crush Russia. France has spent a billion francs to bring this about. It is using its influence with the Little Entente and with Poland for the purpose of using these powers in an eventual attack on Russia. Even the neutrality of Germany in such a struggle is only a myth. At best its neutrality would be only a preparation for

war against Russia. It is quite certain that it would turn against Russia despite any treaty entered into between the two countries.

The neutrality of Germany is no safeguard for Russia. Its only safeguard would be the revolutionary integrity of the German proletariat, which would prevent Germany from taking part in any war against Russia, and would prevent France from using Germany against Russia.

The world is still in arms. In 1914 there were 7,000,000 in the armies. In 1922 there are 11,000,000 under arms. If one considers that the German army has been completely disbanded, with the exception of about 100,000 reichswehr, and the Austrian army is practically eliminated, still there is an increase of 4,000,000 in the armies of imperialism. France has nearly 1,000,000 men in the army. It is costing five billion francs per annum. The social institutions of France, the laws for social insurance, etc., are only given one and a-half billions. France was a creditor to the amount of 50 billion francs. Now there is a deficit of 35 billion francs against her. France owes this sum to other nations.

England spends a large percentage of her income on the fleet. The Geddes Commission was formed for the purpose of finding ways and means of economising the national household. There is a conflict now because that commission submitted a report which demanded a reduction of the army to the number of 75,000 and a reduction of the naval forces to the number of 50,000, and the unification of the ministries of the air and the army and other measures.

The world war did not solve the antagonisms and the problems which brought it about. It did not end with the Peace of Versailles. It can only end with the proletarian revolution. The proletariat is exploited more than ever before. In England six and one-third millions of wage earners have had their wages decreased since the peace was declared, while only 130,000 have gained increases. The only right of existence that capitalism ever had was that it developed the forces of production. But capitalism itself now limits the further development of industry. It is slackening the forces of production, and therefore it has no more right to exist; its historic mission has ended. This impossibility of capitalism to develop its own productive forces further is increasing, and will intensify the existing antagonisms which are increasing the danger of the conflict.

The danger of war is increasing rather than decreasing. But even among the bourgeoisie there is opposition to war. Commercial capital cannot find its markets in other countries without first sending armies to these countries, but financial capital can exploit its forces only through the political dominance in the countries in which it invests its money, and this can only be got by military conquests, and therefore the policy of the governments is for war all the time. War shows the crisis of capitalism. As war becomes a permanent institution, it exposes the critical character of the position in which capitalism finds itself, and this proves the necessity for the abolition of the present ruling powers and the creation of a new society. The Washington Conference for England, America, and Japan only resulted in a weak treaty which

says that if a conflict arises, all these powers will come together to discuss it. The Conference resulted in nothing. They want to scrap some battleships and not build any more for the next ten years. This is the only result of the Washington Conference. Big battleships are worth nothing in view of the development of new instruments of murder. England would recognise Russia, but France is refusing to do this. Russia, of course, does not need to be recognised. Its very existence is proof enough that it does not need a paper recognition. It is forced, no doubt, to make certain concessions through its position. The capitalists are using this position to try to make Russia a dependency, but the Red Army will see that capital is only an instrument for the development of Soviet Russia.

Pacifism, too, must be fought by our comrades. We must not permit the idea of pacifism to be used against the Red Army. The working class must get all the means of life into its hands, and this must be preceded by getting the means of death out of the hands of the capitalist class. This is only to be got by struggle. The class struggle alone can be a struggle against war. Pacifism is not a struggle against war. In France pacifism grows because the country has lost about 2,000,000 of its population since 1914. Even counting the new population gained by the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine, the population of France is 500,000 less than it was in 1911. The peasantry which adheres to the two children system, is against war because it sees its sons used for militarist purposes. So pacifism is growing in France. We may be glad to note that pacifism exists among certain sections of the capitalist class, *but we must not allow pacifism to exist in our own ranks in a struggle against war.* We must agitate among the soldiers, so that when they are called to war they shall know what to do. The whole policy of the Communist International must be to mobilise the working class against war. The Genoa Conference ought to have had a brother conference for a mobilisation of the working class. Genoa had only one object—the reconstruction of capitalism at the expense of the working class. We must reconstruct the working class state at the expense of capitalism. Capitalism is doomed. Our struggle and our tactics must be directed towards the great goal, to organise the powers of the workers; to inspire them for the struggle and to develop it, so that when capitalism calls again for war the working class of the world can answer with a call for world revolution.

WE WANT AGENTS FOR THE  
**Communist Review**

Send your name to Circulation Manager  
16, KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN,  
LONDON, W.C.2.

# Current Phases of the Class Struggle in the United States

By WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD

**T**HE Convention of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, the title of which suggests its membership, was recently held at Washington, D.C. The proceedings of this Conference were of more immediate interest to the working class of the United States than the Peace Conference held in the same city. The fighting slogan of the M. & M.A. at the present time is the "Open Shop." With this tocsin they have called their forces together to wage war against organised labour. This battle is supposed to be waged against the old-time trade unions, which for years have vegetated in a sense of security by their unwarranted application and enforcement of the so-called "Closed Shop." It might be well here to say that the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labour, are not so much interested in the "Closed Shop" as they are in the opportunity that it has given them to maintain a closed union.

It is not necessary to explain that the "Closed Shop" is not in itself a working-class weapon; most of those who advocate and fight for it are themselves unconscious of the class struggle, and are using the "Closed Shop" as a meagre effort to protect their own selfish interests.

The injuries imposed upon the working class generally by the "Closed Shop" of the old-time trade unions are many, but they will not be discussed in this article. Mention here is made of them only because the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association has so generally adopted the "Open Shop" slogan, which primarily means to the members of the M. & M.A. not "Open Shop," but "Non-Union Shop," as is evidenced by the fact that the merchants and manufacturers fight the I.W.W. (Industrial Workers of the World) more bitterly than they do the old-time trade unions, though the question of the "Open and Closed Shop" has never been a controversial matter with the I.W.W. This organisation takes the position that the entire working class has a right to labour; they, too, appreciate that the only practical way of having what the A.F. of L. claims to contend for the "Closed Shop" is by having a wide-open union without restriction to membership, either as to sex, creed, race, or colour. Low initiation fees, low dues, no apprenticeship, but, on the other hand, every inducement for every man, woman, boy, or girl employed in the industry to join the union.

Though the capitalist class may be politically ignorant and economically dense, they realise that this form of organisation would be a big step in the direction of their elimination, so, while fighting under the slogan of the "Open Shop," their real purpose is to entirely wipe out organised labour.

## **Unemployment**

The campaign of the M. & M.A., united as it is with the commercial clubs, and employers of all kinds in the United States, has much to do with the ever-increasing army of the unemployed. They are the masters of the situation, owning and controlling the resources of the country, the machinery and the tools of production, and with the elements of force, soldiers, the militia, police, detectives, and the Press, always ready to respond to their masters' call. Between seven and eight million men and women have been forced out of the mills and factories, shops and mines, and denied access to the means of life by the exploiters of labour, who will allow the workers access to these things only when they make a profit from their toil.

## **Threatened Railroad Strike**

The many brotherhoods of railroad workers, some sixteen in number, threatened a strike against a reduction of wages. Threatened is used advisedly. I leave it to the reader to imagine if it is possible for leaders like Stone, Morressey Lee, and Hanrahan to more than feebly threaten a strike against the railroad companies, which takes such special care for their comfort. When these leaders have occasion to travel, they, each of them, are provided with a sumptuously-furnished palace car at the cost of the company. Thousands of the rank and file were in deadly earnest when they registered their determination for a general strike against the reduction of wages. But the Government had provided the railroad companies with a club, in the shape of a law passed in 1920, which practically prevents strikes on inter-state carriers. The men, nearly a million strong, had passed by a referendum a law of their own, and were determined to enforce it, even though a strike were necessary. But their soft-cushioned leaders regarded the edict of the politicians of Washington of greater importance, and the threatened strike was declared off.

## **Chicago Building Trades Strike**

Men employed in the building industry in Chicago and vicinity suffered a reduction in wages amounting to one dollar a day through a judicial decision rendered by the notorious Judge Kenesaw, Mountain Landis. It was he who fined the Standard Oil Company 29 million dollars, which fine was never paid. The same judge sentenced members of the I.W.W. to terms ranging as high as twenty years in prison—not for any crime that they had committed, but because of honest opinions and convictions that they held. It seemed as though there would be a general strike of the building trades against this infernal decision, but the carpenters' union decided, amid cheers of its members, to withdraw their support to the call for a general strike, and submit without protest to the reduction of wages imposed upon them by this judge, who enjoys a life tenure of office, and who also holds the position of Baseball Commissioner, for which he receives a salary of 45,000 dollars a year, making a total of 51,000 dollars a year, while the white-headed old rascal cuts wages a dollar a day.

### **Coal-Miners' Strike In Kansas**

A State-wide strike against the findings of the Industrial Court, which has been set up in the Sunflower State, is now on. This court of industrial relations was supposedly established for the prevention of strikes, but since it has been in existence hundreds of strikes have taken place in the State of Kansas; for most of them Alexander Howett, President District 14, United Mine Workers of America, stands openly sponsor. The fight that he has made, backed up by the miners, is worthy of the cause. Howett is now in prison, likewise the secretary of District 14, for violation of the decrees of this servile court. Howett was compelled to fight this issue out in the Convention of the U.M.W.A., from which convention he was finally expelled for having violated the order of President John L. Lewis. After this has occurred Howett was re-elected President of District 14 by an overwhelming vote. He is in prison, while upon the shoulders of Lewis falls the responsibility of assisting the mine-owners to break the strike in the State of Kansas. This is not the only weak-kneed action of the said John L. Lewis. It was he who crawled before the injunction issued by Judge Anderson at Indianapolis. If ability and a willingness to fight merits reward, Alec. Howett will step from the Pittsburg jail to the President's chair in Indianapolis.

### **Strike of the Meat Packers**

The world of labour was startled by the so-called riots precipitated in Chicago through police interference, when the workers of the great packing plants of that city walked out. They were almost immediately attacked by mounted police. Nine of their number were shot down in cold blood. The only offence of the workers was an effort to maintain the wages they had been receiving. The strike has grown in proportion until it has almost completely tied up the plants of the beef Trusts. Minneapolis, Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, Fort Worth, and eastern plants have become involved in the controversy. Out of this strike may grow an industrial union with which the workers who prepare food for some of the world may be able to do something to improve their own living conditions, which are, at best, miserable in the extreme. Arbitration courts cannot prevent strikes.

### **Marine Transport Workers' Strike**

A strike of sailors and other marine transport workers of American ports developed into international importance. Andrew Fururseth, Secretary of the Seamen's Union, was all fuss and feathers because of the actions of the members of the Seamen's Union in their refusal to accept his advice against the strike. Poor old Andy, who fought for forty-five years to get a law placed on the statute books of the United States, which he finally accomplished, but the poor fragile thing is not worth quoting; it could not stand the stress of the first little storm. Andy's bark was nearly swamped. The membership declined from 65,000 to 20,000. This would be a serious blow to organised labour were it not for the fact that the members who gave up the sinking ship found berths in the

marine transport workers of the I.W.W., through which organisation they have been able to make a remarkably good fight for better conditions, for men of seafaring lives.

### **Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Lock-Out**

For months the clothing workers of the manufacturers of New York and vicinity were locked out. A vicious conspiracy of the capitalists, large and small, of this important industry, determined to weaken the strength, to clean out entirely, if possible, the members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. A lock-out was declared; shops and factories were closed throughout the city and State.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers, organised on industrial lines, independent of old-time trade union affiliations, took up the conflict, collected a strike fund among their own members of more than a million dollars. They maintained that serious point, mass picket lines. They established distributing agencies for food and relief. They opened co-operative clothing factories, providing work for victimised members; they conducted educational courses, lectures and propaganda meetings.

The officials of the A.C.W. were hailed into court. The preamble drafted after the draft of the I.W.W., of which it is almost a counter-part, was presented by the prosecution as a seditious document. The A.C.W. fought valiantly for the principles set forth in their preamble. They were exonerated. They won against the lock-out, coming out of the struggle stronger morally and financially, stronger as an organisation. During their hours of stress they were planning for the relief of Russia, and since their victory have done much for the famine-stricken, as well as assisting in the reconstruction of the clothing industry of Russia.

### **Ladies' Garment Workers' Strike**

New York and vicinity was the centre of another struggle of clothing workers. The organisation they belong to is known as the Ladies' Garment Workers which declared a strike against the manufacturers of ladies gowns, cloaks, etc., when an attempt was made to reduce their wages. During the progress of the strike they adopted the unique method of suing out an injunction against the bosses. This injunction, which was granted, prohibited the employers from discriminating against members of the organisation, the Ladies' Garment Workers. Some damages were granted and the manufacturers, in this instance, were taught a wholesome lesson. Courts are seldom appealed to in the United States. The writer recalls one other instance where an injunction was granted, during the strikes of Cripple Creek, Leadville, and other mining sections of Colorado, when the late Judge Owers granted an injunction on behalf of the Western Federation of Miners, prohibiting the mineowners of Leadville from discriminating against members of the W.F.M. It is good to have friends at court. But working men seldom find them there.

### **Coal-Miners' Strike in West Virginia**

Black is the record of the authorities of the State of West Virginia, where the coal-miners have had one strike after another during

the last twenty years. This State has seventy million tons of measured coal recognised as the property mainly held by the Steel Trust. This coal means an immense amount of wealth to the stockholders, who have little regard for the men who delve into the depths to produce it.

Since May, 1921, the miners of West Virginia have been on strike, chiefly against the imposition imposed upon them by the private army of the Baldwyn-Feltz detectives. The system of espionage that prevails became unbearable. When the miners went on strike they were evicted from the homes in which they had been living, company-owned houses, and were compelled to take up their abode in tents pitched on the sides of the hills and mountains opposite the mines. The thugs of the company armed with rapid-firing guns, fired volley after volley into the miners' homes, who, when attacked, armed themselves, and for many months maintained a fifty-mile front. A march of miners was organised, in which six thousand men took part. The Governor fearing the strength and publicity which the miners were attaining, appealed to the President of the United States for troops. Martial law was declared; aeroplanes flew over the assembled miners, dropping chlorine bombs. A friendly sheriff, Sid Heightfelt, who had killed five Baldwin-Feltz detectives, was, with a friend, assassinated on the steps of the court-house. A form of civil war has prevailed in Mingo and adjacent counties of West Virginia, though less than 150 miles from the nation's capital.

Though the miners complied with President Harding's orders at the time of their march, since then three-hundred of them have been indicted, nineteen charged with treason, and the war is still on.

### **Eugene V. Debs and Amnesty**

Debs, since being released from prison, has come out with the signed statement pledging himself to the support of the members of the I.W.W., hundreds of whom are yet in prison. Debs says, "No one of them is any more guilty of crime than I was." He is lending his energies to the movement for general amnesty for all political and industrial prisoners, including I.W.W.'s., most of whom were convicted of *intent to conspire* against the Government during the war, and Communists who were convicted for the opinions they held. Jim Larkin, Gitlow, Ruthenburg, Ferguson, and others are among the many still in prison. Workers everywhere can assist in securing the release of our imprisoned comrades and fellow workers in the United States. Help those who are the last held by any country for activities during the war, by sending your protest and demands for their release to the President and Congress of the United States.

# The Asiatic Revolutionary Movement & Imperialism

By KINSIC KIM

WE often speak of the necessity of a "united front" and "co-operative action" in connection with the revolutionary undertakings of the Far East. Recently we have come to realise this more than ever, since we have seen how the capitalistic powers of Western Europe and America have combined themselves to jointly exploit the whole of Eastern Asia. Even the great republic of America, which has made so much ado about its "altruistic" pretences and its world-wide "democratic" principles, threw off its mask at the Washington Conference when it formed the hideous quadruple agreement with the three notorious bloodsucker nations—England, France, and Japan. The First Congress of the Communist and Revolutionary Parties of the Far East, recently held at Moscow, judging from its proceedings as well as the resolutions and manifesto passed, gave expression in clear-cut language to the need of a "get-together" on the part of the peoples of Eastern Asia against the combined imperialistic aggression and continually intensifying capitalist oppression and exploitation.

However, the question is such that a "united front" must not only be discussed in theory, but should be made an *actual* fact, and that in the quickest possible way, and with the best available means. Therefore, it is now most urgent for us to take up concretely and definitely the different phases of our respective revolutionary movements in the Far East—whether it be in China, Japan, Korea, or Mongolia. Our fate is so closely interwoven, and as we have been thrown open alike to the combined attacks of capitalistic exploitation and imperialistic aggression, we can no longer stand at distances apart from each other and simply watch, with abstract negations, the complete enslavement, destruction, or final annihilation of our members.

That insidious instrument called the League of Nations was formed by the association of the so-called free and independent states of this avaricious capitalist world, simply and solely to pledge one another's support in keeping the *status quo* at the time of the formation of this most heinous pact (see Articles X., XI., XV., XVII. of the League Covenant). It even clamped the lid down on any *prospect* of a "revolt" on the part of the oppressed peoples and weaker nations that had previously become victims of the Great Powers in their highway robbery and land-grabbing. But when the plunderers themselves could not come to a clear understanding regarding their own hideous programme regarding the permanent strangulation of their respective victims, when the senate of the very American nation that originated the scheme refused to ratify the agreement, and when they found themselves in dispute over so much of their spoils, they finally decided to "come together" and have definitely agreed among themselves even to discard, temporarily, all their differences in their combined intrigue for the complete

enslavement of the exploited peoples for their own enrichment. Now we see the quadruple agreement—more vicious and decidedly of greater consequences than the Anglo-Japanese Alliance ever dreamt of being, and much more comprehensive and far-reachingly effective for their pillaging purposes than the League of Nations ever could be made to be.

In face of all this, what are *we* doing? What are we going to do? Are we really “getting together”? What are we doing to really effect this “getting together”? Let us just take a quick bird's-eye view of the present situation in the Far East and the revolutionary movement in the different countries.

The Far Eastern republic is still unable to get rid of the stranglehold that Japan has on her eastern frontiers, and there is also the combined and continued attacks of the white bandits that are being directed by the Japanese military command and aided by the co-operation of France and the other Powers. The other peoples of the Far East are, however, too weak and too much occupied with their own troubles to be able to take any active part in extending, even triflingly, a helping hand in the struggle against the combined imperialistic aggression on the Asiatic mainland. Aside from a few hundreds of individual Koreans fighting in the ranks of the partisan units and as separate detachments there is no co-operation of the peoples of Korea and China, even though they realise that their present slavery and oppression will be continued so long as Japan does not withdraw her military forces from Siberia. Japan still repeatedly promises to evacuate Siberia—as at the Washington and Genoa Conferences—because of a certain amount of pressure from the other Powers, and more so since the recent setbacks of the “whites,” yet she still says that she will evacuate only when the life and property of her 8,000 subjects there are safe!

It is true that Mongolia, through the timely assistance of the Red Army of the Russian Far East, has been saved only recently from the clutches of Japan's imperialistic hegemony—by deliverance from the plunder and murder of Unghern and his paid maniacs and by repulsing the Chinese militarists. But the Chinese and the Korean people themselves were unable to render any assistance whatever, even in the way of necessary man-power and otherwise. Rather, the geographical remoteness and difficulty of communication made the whole question appear as a problem quite foreign to their regular line of thought, instead of a matter of vital importance to them all.

China is at present a seething cauldron of civil strifes, groaning under the iron heels of Japanese imperialistic aggression and European and American capitalistic exploitation. She is unable to manage her own affairs according to the will of her own people. Not only do the people of Korea and Mongolia simply watch with passive concern this struggle on the part of the Chinese people to establish a *real government of their own* in place of the hired and camouflaged machinery used by Japan and the other Powers, but even the Chinese people themselves are unable to act in unison of their own free will because of the nefarious intrigues and insidious underhand work of the Japanese, British, French, and American capitalists and financial groups and combines which prolong the

internal factional fights and strife for the personal aims of the Chinese traitors, so that they, the foreign capitalists, may expediate and facilitate their plunder.

So we can readily understand why Korea has been struggling in a lone battle to regain her national freedom ever since she came under Japan's control. The other peoples of the Far East only took it as a matter of course when they heard that Korea had become a Japanese protectorate in 1905, and when she was finally annexed to Japan in 1910. In the same way they looked upon the March uprising of 1919 in Korea as a natural sequel in the case of a subject people trying to regain their freedom. Of course, before 1911 China herself was in the throes of suffering under the tyranny of her own Manchu despots, who were hastening the destruction of the entire nation and people; and yet the Chinese people, with the exception of a few far-sighted revolutionaries, hardly make an effort to even understand the real situation in Korea. How many of the other Far Eastern peoples realise that Korea, by her geographical position and political relations, is the Balkan Peninsula of the Far East? How many Chinese and other peoples of the Far East know that, from the strategical and historical standpoint, Korea is to China and Russia—as against Japan's imperialistic programme of absolute domination of the Asiatic mainland and mastery of the Pacific—what Belgium was to France and England's "safety" against a "Deutschland uber Alles." It is true that occasionally a few Chinese Liberal papers remark, "The teeth become cold when the lips are destroyed." But what have the Chinese people or nation really done in the way of any material or even moral support to keep the lips from being destroyed? The Mongolians understand so little about the international game of robbery that only a few—very few—of them realised that they should profit from the experiences of the Korean people.

It is needless to mention here that the non-revolutionary proletariat in Japan look upon the working masses in China and Korea not as fellow-labourers victimised by the capitalistic oppressors of their own country, but simply as creatures for them to exploit in turn as they themselves are being exploited. This is also the sad truth with regard to many Japanese artisans who are in Korea and Manchuria. The Japanese toilers (peasants and labourers) in Korea and Manchuria take advantage of the fact that they are given preferential rights in everything by the authorities and of the strong discrimination that exists in every way imaginable—work assigned, wages, hours, and treatment. This explains why the Korean people, no matter whether it be the intelligentsia or the labouring class, have an undying hatred for the reactionary Japanese elements, because of the treatment they get from the latter; and such hatred will grow more and more intensive so long as Korea is not freed from Japanese tyrannical imperialism and unrelentingly exploiting capitalism.

### **Will Japan Face War ?**

The questions that naturally follow are, What should be done? and What can be done? Much should be done, and all can be done. But before these queries are answered definitely, it will be

well to meditate for a moment as to what will be the outcome of all this, or if one does not care to look too far ahead into the eventualities of this troubled world, what is going to happen in the *immediate* future. Then we shall be able to decide how we should go about it in the most effective and the quickest possible way. Of course, no one can definitely foretell the future, but, judging from the past and watching the events that have led up to the present world situation, both in the West and the East, we can postulate:—(1) *From the standpoint of the European and American capitalistic Powers the Far Eastern questions cannot be solved before Japan has had an armed clash*; (2) *and from the world proletariat view when such a clash comes it will be necessary to take advantage of the situation at that time to effect the overthrow of the Japanese imperialistic capitalism in the Far East, and thus check the further advance of the Occidental exploitation of the Orient and emancipate the toiling masses of Asia and elsewhere.*

Much has been said about the probability of a war between America and Japan in the near future. During the Far Eastern Congress in Moscow, Comrade Zinoviev remarked that this clash may take place, at the latest, in about five years' time. Both the American and the Japanese public have entertained no little anxiety over such a possibility, and America's concentration of naval forces on the Pacific waters, as well as Japan's overt actions in Siberia and the Pacific islands, have only helped to confirm such fears. Many students of world politics now think that this conflict has been postponed by the "good results" attained at the Washington Conference, viz., the Quadruple Agreement. However, one only needs to consider the facts in the case, and not the spasmodic outburst of national indignation or international dissatisfaction over differences on minor issues; and one can clearly see, whether they have an agreement or not, conference or no conference, that there must be larger issues at stake before either America or Japan plunges into another war that will mean great consequences to the whole Far East and the entire world. One might briefly review the questions that rose during recent years, which seem likely to bring about such a conflict.

The questions that United States of America wanted to settle with Japan were, and are still to a certain extent, the Yap Cable, the Siberia Evacuation, the Shantung Release, Equal Trade Opportunities, and the Maintenance of the Open Door Policy in China (including Manchuria and Mongolia), and the Mexican Grudge. Japan's greatest complaint against America is the latter's immigration policy and the racial antagonism in California and the other States of the Pacific Coast. Then there is America's seemingly patronising attitude towards China and her Shantung loss. Japan also fears that America is gradually getting an immense economic hold on China by lavishly investing her surplus capital at every turn and opportunity in the development of that country's trade and industries, even to such an extent that Japan may have to fall back behind the line and make room for American capitalists when she herself was just about to eclipse England's long-standing lead in China's foreign trade. Moreover, Japan feels that America is quite capable of doing this because of her gigantic industrial develop-

ment and the unlimited amount of cash at her command. However, are these real and sufficient causes to make it advisable for either America or Japan to launch into an armed struggle?

The question of the Yap Cable has been settled; but *how* has it been settled? America has control of an empty shadow of the cable line by controlling the connections between Yap, Guam, and the Philippines. Japan controls the line between Yap and Shanghai. In other words, the nominal control of the lines east and west of Yap, with no connection with the Asiatic mainland, can be of no earthly use to America whenever she has a war with Japan or when she wants to support Russia or China in case of an armed conflict between Japan and either of the two latter nations. Some Americans have boastfully said that it matters not because the United States will have so many radio stations in China to operate, besides having the cable connections between Manila and Hong Kong. But neither of these arguments will hold as far as America's interests are concerned in case of a war in the Far East, because radiograms can so easily be intercepted, as was done by the German Naval Command with the British Admiral Beatty's messages to Admiral Lord Jellicoe at the time of the Jutland battle. Besides, agreement seemed to have been reached to give up all foreign control of all radio stations in China, as a result of the Washington Conference. The cable messages can often be interrupted for weeks at a time, as for instance during the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, just when the Shantung question was being discussed and decided, the cable lines between Guam and Manila were interrupted three times, so that no communication could be made with the Far East by this channel for nearly five weeks. There were stories and rumours that a branch line had been found attached to the Guam-Manila leading straight to Nagasaki. Nevertheless, America does not care enough about entangling herself too much in the international problems of the Far East, and therefore, whether advantageous or not, or whether she has only the empty shell in the control of the Yap cable or not, she is not going to take up arms for the "trifling" affair of a cable connection with an island of only a few square miles in area, and just a mere speck somewhere in the far-away Pacific.

Of course, Korea was practically conceded to Japan by England and America in 1905, first by the revision of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese Treaty of Peace in August and September, respectively, of the same year, and then by the purposely silent acquiescence of Japan's forcible protectorate on Korea in November. This question was not to be thought of even, much less to be mentioned or considered, no matter how many delegates and representatives the Korean people sent to Paris, Washington, or elsewhere. Therefore, there is no danger of the United States ever going to war with Japan on account of Korea as China and Russia have done in the past.

Likewise, although a few of the United States senators, like Borah, Johnson, Reed, Norris, Thomas and others refused to ratify the Versailles Peace Treaty, because of the "Shantung Rope," even these very legislators would not dream of voting for any war budget for America to enter into a combat with Japan for any

such matter. Besides, Japan has now found it necessary to save her face by agreeing to make a nominal withdrawal (from the Ising-tao-Isman Railway zone, though not from Kiao-Chow), while pulling the wires from behind the screen.

Siberia is a thorn in the eye for America to endure, but it is too much of a Bolshevik country for the American bourgeois democrats and reactionary republicans to fight Japan for it. America would like to "get in" on Siberian trade and natural resources by quietly asking Japan not to exercise a monopoly, but she would never go to war for this alone.

The only possible thing that might draw America into a war with Japan would be the blocking of equal trade opportunities and the closing of the "open door" of China and Japan. But even this is seemingly too materialistic and rather vague a question for the "altruistic" America to take up arms. Like France and the other experienced plunderer nations of the world, America would rather go to war to "defend justice, liberty, and human right," or to "make this earth safe for democracy," etc., and for illusioning her own as well as other peoples. In this way Japan grabbed Korea, occupied Manchuria and other parts of China, and is now staying on with a firm foothold in Eastern Siberia, "*only to maintain peace in the Far East,*" and "*to make these regions safe for life and property against 'bandit' attacks.*" *The real fact is that America cannot go to war with any nation, in any part of the world for any cause, unless her Wall Street magnates think that it would be profitable in the final reckoning of dollars and cents to pitch into an armed struggle.* Up till the time of the Washington Conference and with the question of the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance hanging overhead, it did look as if America was chafing, because of the many difficulties her financial groups found in connection with some of their projects for investment of capital or for large financial and industrial undertakings in China. After her mills and factories had been increased and enlarged for production on such an enormous scale, during and after the European war, and now finding that her over-production cannot be dumped on Russia because of the blockade policy, nor into Western Europe for the reason that the latter wish to rehabilitate their own industrial means, America must have control of the Chinese market and raw material. But here she finds a snag in the fact that Japan, with her cheap products and easy transportation, as well as by her cunning methods of manipulating the Peking Government authorities and Provincial Tuchuns, is able to keep out of China nearly all foreign manufacture, and particularly American goods. America would be willing, perhaps, to play a secondary rôle in Far Eastern politics, as heretofore, if she were not hampered in some of her financial undertakings and industrial projects. But every time she tries to obtain a mining or railway concession, or a permit to invest in and operate an industrial plant, or even to establish a radio station or two, she finds that Japan has a *priority* right or raises objection on some political ground or otherwise. In other words, it seems as if it is not possible for America or other Powers to have equal opportunities in trade and industry, and that the "open door" in China is *only open to Japanese capitalists.* In these

circumstances it would not take much additional provocation to draw America to a fight with Japan, especially when we also consider the "Mexican grudge" that America has against Japan. However, since the Washington Conference, this conflict has been postponed for the present. Besides, America would think twice before actually going to war with any nation, and she would try much harder to avoid a conflict with Japan, because there is England still on the side of Japan—ever since the understanding reached by these two States about mutual assistance and reciprocal recognition of colonial and economic expansion in their respective spheres, Japan's undertakings in Korea, Manchuria, and other parts of the Far East, and England's interests on her Indian frontiers and in Central and Western Asia. Despite the hideous instrument called the Anglo-Japanese Alliance (*which has played such havoc by absolutely enslaving all the peoples of the entire Continent of Asia to Japan, England, and America*), it would not be at all surprising to see the new Quadruple Agreement prolong its existence for ten years as stipulated by the Agreement itself (see Article III. of the said Four-Power Agreement).

In addition to the above-mentioned provocations, Japan is furious with America because of the "indignation" she claims to be suffering from the latter on the Californian or immigration question, and this is the only real issue for which she may take the initiative, as the other questions only concern her own provocative actions in the eyes of American and other nations. But, although Japan feels that she is even better prepared than America for a short and quick engagement (as was shown by statements made by Senator Reed, of Missouri, on speaking of the new Naval Treaty agreed upon by the Powers as a result of the Washington Conference, from information furnished by the United States naval experts), she knows that if there should be prolonged warfare, the latter's financial resources and reserve strength far excel those of her own, and that once the conflict is started, it is likely to be a long struggle. Moreover, she realises that just as soon as she enters into a combat with America or any other nation, Korea, China, and other nations and peoples of the Far East, and possibly some of her own working class, may keep her hands full. It will not be so easy, therefore, for Japan to precipitously plunge into a war with America, although she would like to have the first chance of giving America a slap in the face.

Japan may enter into a struggle with the Far Eastern republic of Siberia, and, through it, with Soviet Russia. However, this depends altogether on what attitude Japan takes from now on. If she continues to succeed in hoodwinking the world about her "eventual evacuation" of Siberia, and if she keeps on with her policy of abetting the white bandits and the black brigands in guerilla warfare, against the Russian Far East for the purpose of extending her imperialistic aggression on Russian territory, workers, and national resources, then naturally the Russian Far East will be compelled to enter into a real and intensive armed strife with Japan in self-defence to preserve its free existence. Of course, Japan already realises that the Siberian expedition has been more costly than was expected, and has been, so far, a failure. Yet, so long as Japan has her present form of imperialistic government

controlled by militarists, who are in turn controlled by the capitalist magnates like Mitsui, Okura, Mitsubishi and others, she will never relinquish her hold on Siberia—not any more than she will give up Korea, Manchuria, or any other of her present colonial acquisitions. If the Japanese statesmen were far-sighted enough, they would change their policy of immediate territorial expansion, and enter upon a programme of slow economic absorption. But Japan's public men and leaders are so greedy and short-sighted that they cannot see for themselves that, on account of their blind intoxication and passion for greater national grandeur and Pan-Asiatic hegemony, day by day and year by year they are precipitating the nation and the people to an ultimate pitfall.\* Once

(1) The following is an extract from the editorial comment of the London *Times*, dated April 6th, 1922, on "Japan's Naval Policy," with the sub-heading, "Anti-Washington Influences in Tokio," referring at the same time to a statement made by an influential Japanese denying the fact that Japan is ruled by her militarists:

"One of the misconceptions most prevailing in the United States, and in a lesser degree in Britain, is that Japan is controlled, both as regards policy and administration, by a bureaucratic junta, overriding alike the Cabinet, the Diet, and the purely political parties. . . . To suggest, therefore, that bureaucratic militarism rules the country, and that the Diet is a negligible factor, shows not only ignorance of Japan's history during the last half century, but a disregard of the factors which govern Japan's national existence to-day."

"These statements appeared in the December issue of the *Round Table* in an article written by a Japanese, who was presumably in a position which entitled him to express that opinion. Yet he must have known that his denials of military and bureaucratic interference of the workings of constitutional governments are flatly contradicted by the editorial articles constantly appearing in the leading Japanese newspapers.

"The conclusion of the Pacific Pact in Washington was not the signal for general rejoicing in Japan. The tone of many editorial comments was decidedly unenthusiastic—that of some was frankly hostile. Japan has been humiliated, cheated, while Britain and the United States had secured substantial advantages at Japan's expense. . . . Advocates of naval expansion were horror-stricken at the idea that any alteration of the program laid down in 1906, which had been approved by the late Emperor Meiji, should be made by the present Government, and their indignation was only temporarily nullified by an assurance that any changes arising out of the Washington Conference could be put into effect only with the approval of the Emperor.

"In view of all this, it does not appear probable that the 'misinterpretation' of the news from Tokyo is the result of active interference similar to that which has prevented the withdrawal of Japanese troops from Siberia. It has been repeatedly asserted in the Japanese Press that the Government's decision to withdraw from Russian territory in the East has been prevented owing to the interference of militarists outside of the Cabinet. If similar influences have been at work to bring about what appears to be a repudiation of the whole spirit of the Washington Agreement, the Japanese Press must lose no time in protesting against an act which will bring discredit upon the nation and give rise to further suspicion of Japanese policy in the Far East, which may be quite unaccounted."

"(Our Tokyo correspondent in a message published on Tuesday, stated that the *Asahi* learnt that 'the military authorities had decided to withdraw the Japanese troops from Siberia. It was added that this decision would probably be submitted to the Diplomatic Advisory Council at its meeting yesterday)."

It seems strange that we still get news in Moscow that fighting is at present going on between the Japanese contingencies and the People's Revolutionary Army of the Far Eastern Republic.

Japan is engaged in warfare with Russia, the people of China and Korea will put all their strength and man-power to help to drive away the Japanese aggressors from the Asiatic mainland. This struggle may, after all come about before we expect it, and before the possible conflict between America and Japan. However, just at present, war-worn and famine-stricken Russia, with her lack of funds and need of economic rehabilitation, is not anxious for a life-and-death struggle with a power like Japan; while Japan herself, after having seen the resourcefulness of the Russian people during all these years of external and internal wars, in spite of all the blockades, Second International intrigues, attacks, and pressure on the part of the capitalistic powers, does not feel too sure of coming out unscathed from a real struggle with a government like the Russian Soviet Republic.

But the ultimate struggle will be between China and Japan, and this will be the *real struggle*. China, with her present unstable government, and weakened with internal strife, and foreign pressure—particularly Japanese—will not be able to declare war on Japan before she has a unified and powerful government properly constituted by the will of the Chinese people. Such a government may seem to be far off since the recent temporary defeat of the revolutionary Sun Yat Sen, but with the untiring efforts of other Chinese revolutionary leaders, together with the general tendency of the Chinese intelligenzia and students, it may not be long before the Peking Government totters down completely, as it has begun to do. The Peking Government has only been able to postpone its hour of expiration by the occasional injection of stimulants—usually of Japanese or some other capitalist source, intermingled with the manœuvres and intrigues on the part of some powerful Tuchun or mammon politician like Hsu Su Cheng (known as Little Hsu), Liang Shih Yih, Chang Tso Lin, and others. But, after all, the Chinese merchants and students have a powerful sway over China's economic and political situation, as has been shown time and time again by a sudden outburst of public sentiment expressing itself in a national campaign and general movement in the way of boycotts, strikes, etc., etc., as during the time of the Twenty-one Demands by Japan (1915), Yuen Shih K'ai's (1916), the Paris Peace Conference and the Shantung Rope, and the recent Pacific Conference in Washington. So, in spite of all the underhand work and the power and influence wielded by Japan and the other capitalistic Powers of the world to keep China in a continually backward state and factional turmoil, she cannot be prevented from ultimately setting her house to order with a unified government of her own before very long. Besides, it is to the interest of Europe and America, in the long run, to deal with a stable and responsible Chinese government, in order to feel safe with regard to some of their investments, and while the imperialistic plunderers are trying to balance their power and come to an understanding in their respective exploitations. China can, in spite of them, make certain progress because of her undeveloped wealth resources, as well as by her intelligent student and working masses that are rapidly awakening to the needs of the present situation. Japan, however, will not relinquish the hold she already has on

China, nor relax in her programme of aggression for some time to come, no matter what happens in China or in the outside world, unless a revolution takes place and her own imperialistic government is overthrown, and this is not likely to happen very soon. So Japan will continue to provoke China until the latter will be forced to take up arms. Moreover, when America finds that she must put a check to Japan's further advances into China and the Far East she may induce China to declare war on Japan. America would give China financial assistance and supply her with arms and ammunition and diplomatic propaganda.

In whichever case, it seems that China, sooner or later, will have to bear the brunt of a war with Japan, whether it be with America's assistance, Russia's co-operation, or by her own people with Korea's help. Japan is bound to face, before many years are past, a situation similar to that of the last days of Germany under the Kaisers and Russia under the Tsars. Although it may be only a question of time, yet the clash is inevitable one way or the other. Korea cannot expect to achieve her independence without outside aid and co-operation and without some such change in the international situation. For this reason the Koreans are endeavouring to prepare themselves for the eventual armed struggle and to seize the opportunity, whenever it comes, whether it be Japan's clash with America, Russia, or China; or when Japan is faced with a revolutionary uprising of her own working masses. In the same way, the Japanese revolutionary element, being so insignificant as yet, cannot attain its ultimate aim—whatever that be, either a political revolution and the establishment of a democratic republic or a real social revolution—before Japan herself is face to face with some outside combatant. Thus the success of the Korean revolutionary movement has a direct connection with any Japanese social upheaval and with the struggles of China and the Russian Far East against Japan. The political history of the world repeats itself wherever similar forces are at work. A political, much less a social, revolution in Japan cannot come about, without affecting Korea. Without going back to the remote past, one only needs to be reminded of the far-reaching changes that have taken place in Europe—particularly mid-Europe—during recent years, and follow up the history and development of the Russian revolution.

### **Korea the Key to the Far East**

Whether the possible changes mentioned above should come about one way or another, and whether the results be for the better or the worse, there is no getting over the fact that the *Korean question is the crucial point in the Far Eastern situation*. As already shown, Korea, with her geographical position, historical relations, and strategical advantages, has always been not only the pivot on which the Far Eastern problem revolves, but also the fuse that ignites the fire of international arms. We only need to recall to our memory the many wars that have been waged in the past between China and Japan on account of Korea—the Hideyoshi Invasions being the most notorious in the past, while the war of 1894-5 is the outstanding incident in the annals of recent decades, not to speak of the many intermediate and minor conflicts. As already

mentioned, the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5 was mainly caused by the Korean question. These facts go to show that *Korea is the key to the Far Eastern problems*, and therefore unless the question of Korea is properly settled, the whole Far Eastern situation will be in a turmoil regardless of whether it concerns Russia, China, or Japan.

This importance should not only be considered from the physical (that is, the geographical or strategical besides the historical) and economic view-point, but also from the moral side. In the same way as the Chinese revolution had its moral influence on the Korean independence movement, so the March Movement of 1919 in Korea produced a marked effect not only on the agitation and the awakening of China and Japan, but it even had a bearing on the Indian movement to a certain extent. The Korean people have been forced to become revolutionary, *radically revolutionary*, because they have no other course. They are bound to revolt, because they know that they will be exterminated altogether if they continue to submit to Japanese oppression, while if they strike they will have nothing to lose—not any more than if they did not strike.

One need not argue at length to show that the revolutionary movement in the Far East cannot be quickly and properly achieved without making use of the very spark that causes the ignition—that is, the Korean revolutionary element.

The above brief review only goes to show that the fate of Korea is closely interwoven with the destiny of the other peoples of the Far East. The reciprocal bearing the one has on the other is of such a nature that the whole Far Eastern question cannot be dealt with, either separately or by considering the whole while ignoring any of the most vital parts. China's efforts must be assisted by Soviet Russia and co-operated in by the revolutionary masses of Korea and Japan. The Russian Far East must be defended against the encroachments of the Japanese imperialists and intrigues of the European capitalists, not by the Russians and Siberia alone, but also by the Koreans, Chinese, and Mongolians. The Korean Independence Movement must be achieved as the first step toward the final adjustment of the status of the whole Far East, not by Koreans alone, but with the assistance of Russia, China, and even with the co-operation of the Japanese working masses. The Japanese working masses must be assisted, now secretly, and later openly, by all the toiling masses of Russia, China, and Korea. We all have a common enemy, and are striving for the same goal. Therefore, it stands to reason that we should not only say that we *will* co-operate when the time and opportunity comes, but *we should co-operate NOW in preparing ourselves with plans for the future.*

# Implications of The Transition Period

By T. BELL

THE characteristic difference between the Communist International and the Second and the Two and a-half Internationals is not only a question of the former being more active in pursuing the fundamental aims of the proletariat than the latter. It is, besides, a question of the *direction* of activity. The Third International, despite the fears and sneers of its opponents, who have not the courage to take their rightful place in one or other of the camps of the yellow internationals, has but one single aim. That aim is the extension and promotion of the world revolution. The Third International, for example, has never concealed its object in working within the labour organisations, industrial or political. And as Comrade Radek rapped home to Vandervelde and Macdonald at the Berlin Conference, there is nothing new in the creation of the Communist nuclei in the trade unions, political labour parties, or any other proletarian organisation. The Second International uses similar methods. But what the leaders of the Second International really object to is not the principle of the nuclei, but their aim. The yellow leaders want conciliation, progressive constitutional action, negotiation, and compromise. They want industrial harmony and social peace in a world torn by class conflict and struggle around economic interests. The Third International, understanding the class struggle, rejects none of the foregoing methods. On the contrary, while using them, it would subordinate them or make them auxiliary to the fundamental objective of the world revolution. It is this *direction* of communist activity the yellow leaders object to, and not merely its mechanics. Failure to keep this in mind is responsible for the tendency, even in some Communists, to hesitate and feel uncertain whenever it is proposed at any time to alter the tactics of our movement.

It is not to be denied that the tactics of the new economic policy in Russia, with its concessions to capitalists, and even preparedness of the Soviet Government to acknowledge the pre-war debts, has been disquieting for many loyal Communists. So have the tactics of the United Front by the Communist International. Indeed, but for that loyalty in many cases, e.g., in France and Italy, there would have been active opposition and disruption in the Communist ranks. But as the congresses of the Third International have revealed from time to time, there need be no occasion for hesitation, lest the Communist International becomes an opportunist outfit, i.e., opportunist in the sense of the Second International. The relentless criticism without regard to national frontiers of the parties affiliated is a sufficient safeguard. Those who imagine the "voice of Russia is the voice of God" overlook the fact that the experience of the Russian Revolution is the treasured property of the world's proletariat, and not to be trifled with. Only a proper understanding of the implications of the Transition Period in

Soviet Russia and what that means can strengthen the loyalty and confidence of the Communists as well as the masses of the working-class in the stability of the first workers' republic and its capacity to win through.

The transition period shows us that the revolution is not moving in a straight line. The zig-zag lines which the revolution is being forced to take is nothing more or less than the process or dynamics of the revolution itself.

The dethronement of a Czarism or the overturning of a bourgeois régime of political domination is seen not to be the end in itself. It is but the preliminary to fresh struggles. Each succeeding stage in the revolution gives rise to new problems which are not to be overcome by chanting "pure" doctrinaire principles or formulas. They can only be overcome by practical work and intelligent control. And this latter is what is happening to-day in Russia.

The power of the Czaristic bureaucracy has been crushed for all time. In the débâcle of the autocracy the economic and transport life of the community was seriously impaired and in many respects ruined. At first the task of the revolution was to consolidate the gain of political control by the workers and peasants. The fierce hatred of the world imperialists expressed in naked military force had to be met. It was met, and in the very process and necessity for fighting, the Red Army was organised. This task has been so successfully completed that the "ragged armed mob" of 1917 and 1918 has now compelled the imperialists who jeered and sneered at them then to respect them now as a force to be reckoned with.

Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the very existence of this now well-trained and equipped proletarian Red Army is an important factor in the desire of the imperialists for disarmament. It is certainly as potent a factor as the economic and commercial bankruptcy of the Allied bourgeoisie.

The military front being secured, the next task of the Workers' and Peasants' Government is to get to work. Not only does this mean the organising of the industrial workers for productive output in machinery, manufactures, etc. It also means the organising of even the lethargic and reactionary elements that tend to hang on to the republic as an incubus on its economic recovery.

There has never been any attempt to disguise the chaotic state of the economic life of Soviet Russia. Indeed, the open and fearless acknowledgement and criticism of the shortcomings of the republic in general, and the Communists in particular, has puzzled the politicians of the bourgeois States who are accustomed to all the arts of secret diplomacy and obscuring the truth.

But, as is now well known, considerable sabotaging, *ca' canny*, and slacking was persisted in, especially by the petty bourgeois and intellectual elements, who were compelled to take to industry for their bread, during the period of the mobilisation of labour. It should not be forgotten that the organising of this opposition is an important part of the New Economic Policy which has brought into the limelight the new petty bourgeoisie and all the paraphernalia of capitalism.

When, therefore, the new economic policy is introduced, and

the petty bourgeoisie begin to lift its head, naturally the bourgeoisie in Europe thinks Communism has failed, and Russia is returning to capitalism. Had the appearance of this new phenomena been a spontaneous growth in the teeth of government opposition, there might have been some grounds for bourgeois rejoicing. But since this policy is the deliberate and conscious effort of the proletarian government itself to overcome the problem of dislocated industry, it makes all the difference in the world. The bourgeoisie can extract all the comfort they can out of the new situation. The Soviet Government is under no illusion.

By giving the incentive to trade and profit, not only is the government relieved from the burden of sabotage and slacking, but the very efforts and activity of these profiteering elements in a measure helps in the process of economic reconstruction. Just as in capitalist countries the workers are organised by the bourgeoisie in the interests of capitalism, so the organisation of the petty bourgeois and anti-Communist elements are now being organised in the interests of the workers' republic.

Are there any dangers in these methods? Of course there are!

The economic wealth in the hands of the petty industrialists will certainly increase, but the accumulated power and strength of the State industry and the general economic power of the workers' government can never be overtaken.

In the industries there are and will be wage disputes, strikes and lock-outs.

But whereas in England or America the government opposes the labour unions as inimical to the interests of capitalism, in the workers' republic the unions will have the support of the Soviet government, and labour organisation actively encouraged. Shop committees inspired by the tireless Communists will defeat the private capitalists. And as the State industries grow, and the economic wealth of the State increases, the labour conditions in these State institutions, largely determined by the labour unions, will always be a pattern for the workers in the petty industry to model their conditions upon.

On the other hand, since the Communists form the backbone of the whole State apparatus in the workers' and peasants' government, the organisation of the workers' committees under the influence of the Communists will be directed against the greed of private enterprise. In this way the power of the petty industry to acquire unrestricted exploitation of the working-class will be controlled.

One thing is now beyond dispute, as was established at Genoa—there is no question of handing back the factories, workshops, or industries generally to the former capitalist owners. Nor is there any question of extending to them the political franchise. But even if the latter should take place, what chance has any anti-government group or party against the political machinery of the State apparatus and accumulated experience of the last few years of organised State propaganda?

As with labour organisations and petty bourgeois property, so with the Press. In England or America the capitalist government tolerate the weak Press of the labour movement. They counteract labour agitation by means of their subsidised newspapers and

business organs. In Soviet Russia the situation is reversed. The enormous resources of the workers' government, will always be superior to the efforts of private enterprise, and will be turned against any attempts of the petty bourgeoisie to poison the minds of the working class.

Thus, just as Communism in capitalist countries has to face the whole weight and power of the capitalist government, so the dangers from the petty bourgeois side will be met in Soviet Russia by the entire power of the proletarian State.

In conjunction with all this, it must never be forgotten that as the economic and productive resources of the government recovers and progressively increases, so the whole psychology of the workers' outlook will be shaped and fashioned in accordance with the aims of the proletarian State. But above all and most important of all, we have to reckon with the Communist Party.

In the transition period the Communist Party is bound to be the most active section in the State, forming, in fact, the backbone of the State apparatus. Accordingly, there is attracted to its ranks all the petty bourgeois grafters and professional elements, who think, because of the close identification of the party with the State apparatus, that the party card will be a stepping stone towards a place in the administrative machine. This is a danger that undoubtedly had to be faced if the achievements of the revolution were not to be lost. It was seen that if things were allowed to drift, not only would there take place a change in the personnel of the party but an entirely different psychology that might become favourable to the bourgeoisie would arise.

Without any auditing or stocktaking it is conceivable for the party to get overloaded with such elements. This was shown to be actually the case at the last "cleaning out" that took place. Nearly 100,000 such elements were effectively combed out and now the balance is safely on the side of the workers and poorer peasants. This cleaning out process has come to stay. By stipulating conditions of probationary membership that render it difficult for the petty bourgeois elements to enter the party, while at the same time making it easy for the workers who are increasingly attracted to it, any tendency to weaken the revolutionary aims of the party are put in check.

After demonstrating its capacity to defeat the militarist opposition of the imperialists, and as shown at Genoa its ability to turn the weapons of the capitalist diplomacy against themselves and withstand the attacks of the allied imperialists, the proletarian Government has earned the confidence of the masses. At the same time keeping in mind the tremendous energy that is presently absorbed in the defence of the military front and in grappling with the problem of the Famine, we have but to imagine these resources set free to be devoted to the work of economic re-building of the industries and the problem of fighting the petty bourgeoisie and the concessionaires fades into thin air.

The implications of the transition period therefore calls for more than a mere superficial reading of the appearance of certain forms of capitalism and dilletante attempts to explain their historical content. To fully grasp the significance of the transition period

we must bring to our aid the dialectics of Marxism which does not seek refuge from difficulties behind niceties or high-sounding phrases, but takes the material to hand and fashions it to the wants of the proletarian masses. The outer-breastworks of capitalism have been broken through by the Russian proletariat. The transition period is a period of giving and taking, retreating and advancing that is bound to go on until the world proletariat is finally safe from the grip of the bourgeoisie.

The Communist revolutionary seeks no cut and dried Utopia. He seeks no end short of removing the bugbear of capitalist exploitation from the economic life of the masses.

Above all he recognises that supplementary to our understanding, the Transition Period is a test on the loyalty and faith of the communist revolutionary, not only in the Third International but in Soviet Russia as the vanguard of the proletarian revolution.

# High Finance and Foreign Politics

## PUTTING THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE INTO PAWN

By J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD

*[By no means the least important part of Communist agitation in this country is to expose how ruthlessly British imperialism has plundered the peoples of the East. In the following article, which is the first of a series, Comrade Newbold unmasks how certain financiers used "democratically" elected Governments to further their economic interests abroad. In order to show British foreign policy in action the author has been compelled to go back a little into history and trace out the various roots which now nourish the most cunningly devised imperialism the world has ever known. As the coming struggle between France and Britain will be over the East, and as the conflict of America, Japan and Britain will take place in the Far East, it is highly important for all sections of the Labour movement to thoroughly grasp the economic character of the coming world-war. To provide such information is the aim of these articles.—ED. OF COMMUNIST REVIEW.]*

**W**HETHER we understand the diplomacy of the British Government now or at any time within the epoch of capitalist development, that is to say within the last century to a century and a half, must have regard to the fact that it always centres upon the maintenance of control over and continuous communication and contact with the great dependency known as the Indian Empire. Whatever were the factors originally determining the very influential sections of the English bourgeoisie who founded the East India Company or its rival, the New East India Company, with which it subsequently amalgamated, to invest such considerable sums of money and to establish themselves so firmly in the peninsular of Hindustan does not concern us in a study of this character. The fact is indisputable that the interests involved were extremely powerful and that the inducement to secure possession of the Indian trade was sufficient to make it worth while for the most influential mer-

chants of the United Netherlands to ally themselves, both financially and politically, with the dominant sea power that controlled the avenues of Asiatic trade. Three hundred years have elapsed since the merchants composing the original East India Company began to establish themselves in the East. Two hundred years have gone by since English, Scottish and Dutch interests began, under the patronage of a Crown completely in their pockets, to exploit India and the East in effective co-operation. During that time, there have grown up successive series of official and trading interests who have, firm rooted in the governance and tribute of India, become the impervious core of the British aristocracy and of our mercantile and banking community.

In the service of the Honourable East India Company, many Scottish gentlemen of birth and breeding found a congenial outlet for their martial qualities when, after the Rebellion of the "45," a complete change was effected in the social and economic organisation of the Highlands. Thither, also, after the Union in 1707 but much more rapidly after the middle of the eighteenth century, the younger sons of the Lowland gentry, then entering into trade, made their way. We remark on this because the British East swarms with the merchants of three races, Scots, Jews and Greeks. Nearly every merchant house that fell heir to the monopoly of the East India Company has a name that denotes it as belonging to one or other of these three categories.

In the earliest period of European contact with the East, a very considerable part of the trade was in the hands of the Portuguese, from whom, of course, England obtained, as a marriage portion, Bombay. Hard on the heels of the Portuguese came the Dutch and, also, the French. Then, appeared the English. With the first of these and with each subsequent arrival came the inevitable cosmopolitan trader in bullion, expert in exchanges and specialist accomplished in handling all the new instruments of commerce, the Jew of the Marano or Portuguese connexion. His drift across the centuries and the European Continent was from Portugal to Holland and, sometimes, to France, and from Holland to the London Stock Exchange. Stray members made their way to Italy, to Turkey and to Mesopotamia. Some of them rose high in the service of the Ottoman Government, becoming pachas and viziers. One family, in particular, made its home in Baghdad, where it conducted treasury operations for the Turkish Governor. *That was the family of the Sassoons.*

But whilst Baghdad was a place of consequence standing, as it did, on one of the main caravan routes between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, it was not of such importance in the early nineteenth century that the Sassoons could remain there and prosper exceedingly. That being so, in 1822 David Sassoon left his father's mercantile and banking house in that city and made his way to Bombay, there to found the famous firm of *David Sassoon & Co.*

### **The Bullion Brokers**

Meanwhile, however, we must have regard to the fact that the East India Company was as yet supreme, that its ships went ever (like the Flying Dutchman) round the Cape of Good Hope, and that England's eyes were, therefore, set in the ends of Africa.

There, also, was set in a happy moment, England's flag. There, of course, it continues to fly.

The East India Company did business with a great firm of bullion brokers, *viz.*, *Mocatta and Goldsmid*. This house had most extensive financial operations connecting it with Portugal, Brazil and Turkey. The Goldsmids were closely associated with Pitt on the one hand—as brokers for his war loans—and with Ricardo, the economist, on the other. Isaac Lyon Goldsmid “secured the powerful aid of Lord Holland, the Marquess of Lansdowne, the Duke of Sussex and other prominent members of the Liberal Party” for the cause of Jewish Emancipation (*i.e.*, enfranchisement). The Mocattas were inter-married with the Montefiores and they with the Rothschilds. All four families were in 1829 very big holders of stock in the East India Company.

The *Montefiores*, as agents of the *Rothschilds*, were the pioneer financiers to interest themselves in what was then a penal colony, and is now the Commonwealth of Australia.

Australia, in its development, has been to a very great extent an appendage of India so far as land mortgage investment, banking and shipping enterprise were concerned.

This interest of the great Jewish bullion brokers in the finances and trade of India during the first half of the nineteenth century was all important. These brokers were Liberals. They were seldom Radicals. They maintained a continuity of interest and of ideology binding the City of London and, for that matter, Manchester and Liverpool commercial circles to India at a time when the dominant interests of the cotton capitalists were not pre-disposing them to maintain or, at any rate, to extend the British Empire. Railway construction had not yet made India a great market, and not until the American Civil War and the resulting Cotton Famine did Lancashire and Glasgow textile capitalists concern themselves with developing the raw material resources of the great dependency.

India, at that time, was the concern rather of the Tory Party. It was a preserve of the Army and of the officialdom of the East India Company, one of those privileged corporations so little in favour with the Manchester school of economic thought. Palmerston, whose father had been a stock-holder in the East India Company, and whose diplomatic assertiveness conformed to the interests of the Whig oligarchy in “the City,” directed his policy in the Near East to the end of stabilising the Ottoman Government and of checking French penetration into Syria and Egypt. “We want,” he said, “to trade with Egypt and to travel through Egypt, but we do not want the burden of governing Egypt. . . . Let us try to improve those countries by the general influence of our commerce, but let us abstain from a crusade of conquest.”

Palmerston was concerned to keep “free” the land-route to India.

This route, or rather, these routes, were becoming much more important than hitherto. French trade and finance, which had revived under the First Empire and which flourished more and more vigorously under the Monarchist Restoration, were aspiring to penetrate and to possess those two southern provinces of the Ottoman Empire, Syria and Egypt. British and Portuguese merchants and

shipping magnates were heavily involved in the Eastern Mediterranean. London and Liverpool had very great connexions with the ports of the Turkish Empire. There was a very considerable import trade in cotton from these parts. The French were concerned rather with the silk trade.

### **The Cotton Brokers**

Extensive mercantile interests were at stake. All through the early nineteenth century we can see behind that mysterious emanation of idealism, Greek Liberalism, the characteristic lay-out of a cotton-merchant's warehouse.

Manchester has been clamorous in its enthusiasm for the Greeks and its sympathy for the Armenians. Have not the merchants of these races been the best hucksters of its wares, and the best buyers of its raw materials?

Asia Minor and Egypt—it was thence that for two centuries most of the raw cotton was imported into Western Europe. That trade was, mainly, in the hands of Greeks. They flourished under the rule of the Moslem Turks much as the Jews had flourished some centuries before under that of the Christian Latins. Ubiquitous in the East, they frequented every sea-way, every caravan-route, and every bazaar. Their religious attachment to the Orthodox Church, moreover, gave them a decided advantage in Russia whose borders began in the eighteenth century to march with those of Turkey on the Black Sea.

In the ports of Southern Russia—in the grain ports—they were more welcome than the Jews. It is quite obvious that they profited enormously by the opening up of backward Russia and negotiated a very large proportion of the trade between that awakening agrarian empire and the capitalist countries of the West.

It was no accident that Greek nationalism and Greek liberalism began to manifest themselves in the early nineteenth century. Having gained economic power and realised the strategic advantage of their position in the grain, cotton, dried fruits, silk and other produce markets on the road to India, the Greek merchants set out to achieve political power in addition. They enlisted the sympathy of their co-religionists (and clients) at the Court of the Czar. They appealed to the easily excited sentiments of the manufacturers and merchants with whom they did business in Manchester and Liverpool. They discovered, in the period when the capitalists of Cottonopolis were jealously challenging the economic and social monopoly of the privileged companies trading in the East, that they could cash the credit of the classic isles at the humanitarian bank-counter of aspiring Liberalism. The Greek and Armenian communities of Manchester and Liverpool were the not disinterested go-betweens of Gladstonism (Liverpool) and Cobdenism (Manchester) on the one hand and the Russians on the others.

The Governing class—and the victorious Reformers and Free Traders of 1832 did not conquer executive power for nearly if not quite a generation—favoured the Ottoman Government, preferring to keep it as a barrier across the land-route to India what time they held the command of the sea-route.

When, with the introduction of steamships into the Mediterranean and the Red Seas and the building of a railway between

Alexandria and Suez, traffic to India began to go through Egypt rather than round the Cape, Greek merchants in the former city began to reap a rich harvest. When, in the "sixties" Lancashire commenced to seek in Egypt and in India the cotton she could no longer obtain from the Confederate States, the Greeks in Alexandria saw unroll before their eyes new vistas of profit. When, in 1869, the Suez Canal opened up a route, a water-way, that struck a mortal blow at the transshipment monopoly of Alexandria they had, perforce, to seek new centres of activity and to follow the cotton-bale and the dry-goods package to India.

### Enter the Rallis

As early as 1864, we find associated with the Sassoons in the *Bank of Hindustan, China & Japan, Ltd.*, the already influential Greek merchants, the *Rodocanachis* and the *Rallis*.

The former established themselves in London in 1830. The latter in 1820.

In 1872, the *Rodocanachis* were trading as merchants in London, Marseilles, Alexandria and Odessa. The *Rallis* were to the fore as cotton brokers and merchants in Liverpool and Alexandria, as merchants in Marseilles and as bankers in Constantinople. They were, also, in London.

Together with the *Mavrogordatos*—bankers at Constantinople and merchants in London—and the *Agelastos*—bankers at Marseilles and merchants in London and New Orleans, the *Rallis* and the *Rodocanachis* were big and influential holders in the *Bank of Alexandria*, founded in 1872.

It is quite apparent that this concern had influence with the Khedive Ismail and that it was heavily involved in loans to that unhappy prince.

In the "sixties" the *Rallis* were to be found in association in banking circles with the all-powerful financial house of *Bischofheim, Goldsmidt & Co.*, of Paris. They were, also, in the same camp as the *Sterns*.

These facts are of importance because the former house was in antagonism to the *Crédit Mobilier Français* and the older French banking houses that in 1863 promoted and secured control of the *Imperial Ottoman Bank*.

The *Sterns*, the *Bischofheims*, the *Goschens* are all to be found bunched together in banking promotions in the "sixties." They were, of course, Liberals. They were, also, the houses issuing loans to the Khedive Ismail of Egypt. Egypt was at that period in an anomalous position. It was nominally a part of the Ottoman Empire. It had been the policy of the British Government to keep the latter intact and, in consequence, to maintain the suzerainty of the Sultan over the Khedive. It had been the policy of the French Government to encourage the Khedive in his pretensions of independence.

Until about the middle of the nineteenth century, Britain, under the direction of Palmerston, had regarded France as a more immediate menace to the Indian outworks than Russia. After 1850, British policy oriented towards France and away from Russia and, in consequence, the Crimean War occurred which, whilst it saved

Turkey politically, definitely inaugurated the era of her economic subjugation.

### The Ottoman Debt

M. Poulgy, in "*Les Emprunts de l'Etat Ottoman*," says that between 1854 and 1864 Constantinople became a new El Dorado, by reason of the tremendous outlay of the Sultans. "In ten years from 1854 to 1864, the Ottoman Budget rose to 100,000,000 francs for loans out of a total expenditure of 343,000,000 francs."

In 1862, when the American Civil War closed the American market to British and French investment, the Turkish Government issued a loan of £8,000,000 and £35,000,000 was almost instantly subscribed.

The *Economist* (29/3/62) was much disturbed and commented as follows:—

"People fancy that in some form or other the sanction of the British Government is given to the matter. . . . These indefinite sanctions to foreign loans are, in our judgment, very misleading now, and may easily be very dangerous hereafter. . . . England should not lead people to believe she will see them paid unless she intends to see them paid. . . . If the British Government gives the least aid to the borrower, assuredly in the case of default it will have either to give its aid to the lender at the cost of a possible war, or refuse that aid with the certainty of imputed ill-faith."

It stated that Lord John Russell had sent out two gentlemen to Constantinople "to assist in the due application of the proceeds of the loan to . . . the funding of the floating debt." There was the authentic hand of Liberalism in politics aiding Liberalism in finance just as Liberalism in politics had, by the Cobden Treaty of Commerce with France, just previously, prepared a basis for Franco-British co-operation in money-lending.

### The Ottoman Bank

In the following December, the *Crédit Mobilier Français* promoted the Imperial Ottoman Bank as a state bank of the Ottoman Empire to handle the whole business of the loans, past, present and future. A group of English capitalists co-operated in the scheme but, as an older bank claiming an infringement of its privileges protested to the Committee of the Stock Exchange, the shares of the Imperial Ottoman Bank could not be dealt with thereon and, in consequence, *the French interests, at the outset of its career, secured that majority influence and interest in the Imperial Ottoman Bank which they have to this very day.*

From that time onwards the conflict of interests between "British" capitalism—very cosmopolitan in complexion—and French capitalism has been chronic in the Ottoman Empire.

That same victory for French capital at Constantinople promoted a change in "British" capitalism's attitude towards Egypt.

Ten years, during the major part of which the Liberalism of Rothschild and Goschen was in the ascendant, saw a great amount of British money pass into Egypt and, for that matter, into Turkey.

### Egypt's Ruin

In 1873, the Khedive secured from the Sultan, as Rothstein says in "*Egypt's Ruin*," "with the connivance, if not under the encouragement of the British Government," his financial autonomy,

in other words, he gained the liberty to mortgage his province to the financiers to the uttermost.

In 1875, the Ottoman Government defaulted. Its borrowings were somewhere in the region of 1,000,000,000 francs—not that it had received anything like that amount but that was about the sum with which it was debited. In the same year, the Khedive Ismail, who was indebted to the sum of nearly £70,000,000, sold his shares in the *Suez Canal Company* to Rothschilds, who acted therein on behalf of the British Foreign Office, for £4,000,000.

The comment of the *Times* was instructive:—

“It is impossible to separate in our thoughts the purchase of the Suez Canal Shares from the question of England’s future relations with Egypt, or the destinies of Egypt from the shadows that threaten the Turkish Empire. . . . Should insurrection, or aggression from without or corruption within bring a political as well as financial collapse of the Turkish Empire, it might become necessary to take measures for the security of that part of the Sultan’s dominions, with which we are most nearly connected.”  
(26/11/75.)

Next month, the British Government sent out a financial mission to Egypt which was unsuccessful but which, probably, had acted on its instructions:—

“To obtain incidentally much information of the greatest value both to Egypt and to this country.”

Into the squabbles of the French and the British bondholders in Egypt we do not propose to enquire. The negotiations were prolonged. War with the revolting Egyptians supervened. Finally, the British Government installed Evelyn Baring, one of the great banking family of Baring Brothers, as Her Majesty’s Agent and Consul-General of Egypt.

Evelyn Baring, subsequently Earl of Cromer, the great “pro-consul,” had been private secretary to his relative, Lord Northbrook, when that representative of the Baring dynasty was Viceroy of India. In 1880, he had returned to India to be a financial member of the Viceroy’s Council.

Meanwhile, Turkey had become embroiled in war with Russia and in her embarrassment, when nowhere else could she obtain money, she had turned to the “native” bankers of the Galatz suburb of Constantinople.

They drove a hard bargain. Amongst them were the Zarifis, now powerful in the *Bank of Athens*, the Mavrogordatos, since involved in Russian banking and the *Vlastos*, now associated with Ralli Brothers.

Three years later, in 1881, the French holders of Turkish bonds, the proprietors and associates of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, took the initiative and, after preliminary meetings of creditors in different countries, the whole of the bondholders sent a Commission to Constantinople with the result that in December of that year there was set up the *Council for the Administration of the Ottoman Debt*.

### **Goschen and D’Abernon**

In the “seventies,” Czardom adopted a policy towards the northern provinces of the Ottoman Empire, viz:—Bulgaria, and the semi-independent Wallachia and Moldavia, that had the result of making the Greeks seek closer association with Britain. In 1881, the Gladstonian administration obtained for them the cession of

Southern Thessaly from Turkey and it is noticeable that the British delegate concerned with this adjustment was Goschen. It had been Goschen whom the Conservative Government had sent out to Egypt, with every appearance of it being a private enquiry, to investigate into the finances of the Khedive in 1876. If the Liberals were in office, George Joachim Goschen went on his travels officially. If the Liberals were in opposition, he went semi-officially, as the representative of *Frühling and Göschen*. In the "eighties" he was to do the logical thing, and to be one of those to bridge the gulf and become a Liberal-Unionist.

It was in Egypt and in Turkey that the Liberals celebrated the economic pass-over that resulted inevitably in the political pass-over to Imperialism. Whilst Goschen was acting the diplomat of high finance on behalf of Frühling and Goschen, and Northbrook and Evelyn Baring were entering Egypt to give administrative effect to the economic decrees of Baring Brothers, representatives of Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co., were appearing in the *Bank of Egypt, Ltd.*, of the Grenfells in the *Bank of Roumania* and the *Imperial Ottoman Bank* where, also, were the Sterns. Later, the Goschens put in an appearance on the boards of the last two concerns.

The British merchant bankers were staking out their claims in the provinces of Turkey as they became detached from the rule of the Sultans and were laying systematic tribute upon their customs revenue, upon their tithes and skinning the unhappy peasantry of everything they could extort. What they were doing was being done, with even greater success, by the French under the auspices of the Imperial Ottoman Bank or of the *Crédit Foncier Egyptien*.

With the establishment of the Council of the Administration of the Ottoman Debt and the permanent residence at Constantinople of the accredited representatives of the bondholders, a new era of financial penetration and of diplomatic intrigue commenced. There appeared upon the scene a young gentleman of the name of Edgar Vincent. He had been private secretary to the Commissioner for Eastern Roumelia in 1880. He had been assistant to Her Majesty's Commissioner for territory ceded to Greece in 1881. In March, 1882, this henchman of George Joachim Goschen, this government official, was elected by the British, Belgian and Dutch bondholders as *their* representative on the Council of the Ottoman Debt. Next year, he was promoted to be the President.

But the career of Edgar Vincent, subsequently Lord d'Abernon, His Majesty's Ambassador to Berlin since 1920, and a director of a Vickers' subsidiary; of his brother, the arch-jingo Member for Central Sheffield; of Sir Vincent Caillard, Sir Ernest Cassel and Sir Basil Zaharoff are, like the inner workings of Greek merchant capital in the entire British East, another story.

# Book Reviews

## AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK

*Social Struggles in Antiquity*, by M. Beer. Cloth covers. 222 pp. 6s. L. Parsons, Ltd.

It is a very great pleasure, on our part, to recommend this brief but valuable historical study by a celebrated Marxist scholar. Max Beer in *Social Struggles in Antiquity* presents us with the first volume of a history of the class struggle. We cannot imagine a better subject, nor a more important one. Judging by some statements which appeared in the columns of our distinguished contemporary, *The Labour Monthly*, it would seem that an historical sketch of the class struggle is not of much assistance to those who are actively participating in the modern class conflict. While yielding to none in recognising the value of specialist studies that examine the problems immediately confronting society, we contend that it is an essential part of the task of the revolutionary movement to show the historic mission of the working class. But to drive this lesson home needs an historical background.

The Marxist method is historic. This is such a commonplace amongst Marxians that some of our more academic comrades, of University extraction, are apt to be impatient of any efforts devoted to it. Those of us who have received our theoretical training in the working class educational movement and under the guidance of proletarian teachers, can never forget how we were thrilled and enthused when we first heard of the titanic class conflict that has been waged throughout the centuries. The fact that our struggle to-day is but a continuation of the heroic efforts of those who have gone before, inspired us with a new hope and gave an added strength to our courage when battling against terrific odds. Some of us have spent a considerable amount of time tutoring workers at Marxian educational classes. This work brings one into close contact with the mentality of the most serious minded proletarian elements in the Labour movement; for good or evil these are the ones who are destined to play an important part in the rank and file of the revolutionary movement. We believe no teacher of such a class will deny that

the subject which creates the greatest interest in the mind of the students is the history of the class struggle.

The greatest Marxian teachers, in dealing with any social institution, have always treated their subject from the historical standpoint. One of the great ambitions of Marx, one which, alas, had to remain unfulfilled, was to write up a study of gentile society based upon Lewis Morgan's famous work on that subject. So important was this task to the mind of Frederick Engels that he, utilising some of the data prepared by Marx on the subject, felt compelled to write that brilliant little classic, *The Origin of the Family*. This book was the starting point for Lenin in his essay on *State and Revolution*. So keenly do Marxist propagandists feel the need for emphasising the historic nature of the class struggle, and of tracing it from the downfall of gentile society up to the present day, that the great American socialist, Daniel De Leon, translated, into English, the twenty-one volumes of Eugene Sue's famous narrative of *The History of a Proletarian Family Across the Ages*. This was done by a revolutionary fighter who was busily engrossed in the everyday struggle of the masses and who was the editor of a daily and a weekly paper; he had, therefore, neither energy nor leisure to fritter away on fruitless tasks. De Leon knew that nothing so encouraged the workers in their present-day struggles as a knowledge of the great fights put up by the oppressed classes in the past. It was only natural to expect that when a splendid Marxist, like our friend Max Beer, wrote on the class struggle that he would place it in an historical setting, as he has done in *Social Struggles in Antiquity*.

On several occasions we have reviewed books, in these pages, dealing with the economic conditions of ancient Greece and Rome, and have drawn attention to the attempt of well-known historians to suppress the communistic nature (albeit it was of a crude agrarian character) of the mass struggles in those cities. The importance of *Social Struggles in Antiquity* is that it deals, very briefly, with this very point. It is an indispensable little volume for

those who are anxious to study the underlying causes of the class conflict up to the fall of the Roman empire. The value of the data in this book is that it cannot easily be found in the works of our celebrated "impartial" historians. And this is an additional reason why Marxians should make it part of their work to see that those who are active in the modern revolutionary struggle should know as much as possible about the nature of the class conflict down the ages. To supply such information is the reason why *Social Struggles in Antiquity* was written and why we recommend it to our readers.

W.P.

### Prince of Pamphleteers

*Between Red and White*, by L. Trotsky. 104 pp. Limp covers. Communist Party, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2. Post free, 2s. 3d.

A FEW months ago Geo. B. Shaw, writing in the *Nation*, described Trotsky as the Prince of Pamphleteers; others have declared he is the greatest controversialist ever produced by a political movement. And when we remember that in this book he is dealing with such people as J. Ramsay Macdonald, Mrs. Snowden, etc., one can imagine how easily Trotsky castigates these puny ones; it is like a whale among the minnows.

It is a curious thing that since the imperialist states have given up their open armed offensive against Soviet Russia that the Second International should have redoubled its campaign against the struggling peasants' and workers' Republic. A few months ago the Macdonalds and Snowdens did their utmost to incite the masses of this country against Russia by spreading, as is their manner, the most malicious lies about "Red" imperialism in general and the violation of poor little Georgia in particular. To the eternal credit of the rank and file proletarians in the I.L.P. they showed the utmost contempt for this anti-Soviet campaign of their leaders. Since the stunt regarding Georgia has been successful only in such reactionary papers as the *Morning Post*, the Macdonalds and Snowdens have had to find another muck heap in order to use it to bespatter Russia; at present, therefore, they are revelling in a new orgy of vituperation regarding the social revolutionary prisoners who are now being tried in Moscow.

The theme of Trotsky's latest book is the Communist reply to the Second International regarding Georgia. By a series of quotations, from the official documents of the Second International statesmen who recently were the wooden-head figureheads in Georgia, Trotsky is able to scarify the critics of Soviet Russia. He shows that the Georgian mensheviks were mere tools, at once venal and willing, in the hands of imperialist states anxious to destroy the power of the Soviets in Russia. But the most important thing in Trotsky's book is not his proof of the treachery of the Second International, it is his wonderful exposition of the fundamental principles of revolutionary tactics. *Between Red and White* has already been sold in great numbers, and those who have not yet read it should order a copy without delay.

T.L.

*More Production and More Poverty*, by J. P. M. Millar. 12 pp. Art covers. Illustrated. Price 2d. National Council of London Colleges, 11, Penywern Road, London, S.W.5.

OUR comrade Millar has produced an excellent little pamphlet which mercilessly flays the "increased production" demand of the capitalist class, which was also supported by the famous "Gateway to More" placard showing the faces of well-known Privy Councillors in the Labour movement. The author adopts what is the most forceful method of Marxian argument—that of quoting capitalist authorities to sustain Labour's contentions. The most powerful evidence one can quote against the defence of capitalism is that supplied by the defenders themselves. Our author does this with such skill that the result is highly disconcerting for the master class. The pamphlet is a powerful plea for the extension of the movement for independent working class education.

W.P.

### The Stuff to Give 'Em

*Communist Cartoons*, by Espoir and others. 2s. Communist Party, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2.

WHAT a joy it is to handle this volume of biting and brilliant cartoons! Never in the history of any political movement in this country has there been published such a series of scathing drawings. If some of the personages portrayed

in this volume are known to posterity it will be due to the fact that Espoir caricatured them. A history of 1921 could be written to depict the important events of that year, but it could not show the true inner essence of the period in anything like the manner that Espoir and his colleagues have done in this book of cartoons. Ireland, the Russian famine, the Anglo-Japanese alliance, the Miners'

strike and Black Friday—all are graphically dealt with, and convey a knowledge and meaning of those things that no written word could possibly achieve. Everyone interested in the Labour movement should possess this remarkable book and treasure it as one of the few triumphs of the working class during 1921.

W.P.

## COMMUNIST BOOKS ON THE WAR

*Les Responsables de la Guerre*, by Alfred Pevet, Paris. Librairie de l'Humanité.—1922.

*Un Livre Noir*. Diplomatie d'avant guerre d'après les documents des Archives Russes. Tome Premier. 1910-1912.—Paris, Librairie du Travail.—1922.

THESE two valuable books are big and ever growing French literature on the question of the origin of the world war. I hope other books on the same subject will follow, because we can never pay too much attention to this problem, which gives excellent opportunities for communist propaganda and enlightenment amongst the working masses.

A. Pevet is quite right in remarking in the first lines of his book, that "to-day as well as yesterday we are still speaking of the foreign policy of our governments and of their diplomatic machinery in the manner as the cave-inhabitants of Plato spoke of the external world." The workers are not made yet interested enough in "high" diplomacy. The war and the subsequent revolutions have opened the archives of the foreign offices of Brussels, Belgrade, Petrograd, Berlin, and Vienna, but the workers do not know much about the secret documents found in these places. These documents, published in various books, periodicals, etc., form the basis of A. Pevet's book. He does not deal with the economic problems underlying the complicated diplomatic game, his aim is to give a true picture of the diplomatic preparations for war prior to 1914, and of the feverish efforts of the July and August days of 1914, when the big European groups mobilised the greatest possible forces for the coming fight. He mercilessly destroys the "destructive legend" of the sole responsibility of Berlin, and very logically follows the course of events in the critical days, when unequivocal diplomatic obligations—

following the aspirations of capitalist-imperialist interests—drew one country after the other into the vortex of the world war.

When we had finished the 520 pages, wherein A. Pevet enumerates the names and crimes of those diplomatically responsible for the war, we are fortunate enough also to be able to read the correspondence of one of the chief war-criminals, that of Isvolsky, printed in the first volume of the *Livre Noir* (Black Book).

This volume prints the correspondence of Isvolsky during the second crisis of Morocco (1911), the war in Tripoli (1911-1912), and the beginning of the first Balkan war (1912). All these were important international crises, which might have created a general conflagration. At the same time there were internal troubles in Persia and in China, and these gave splendid opportunities to financiers to speculate in troubles, crises, and wars which always mean more money and more profit to them. The statements of Isvolsky on these questions are very remarkable, but I shall only mention two of them. He repeatedly records how, during these crises in 1911 and 1912, Poincaré and other responsible French statesmen often declared to him that "if Russia enters the war, France will fulfil her obligations, and she will enter the war too." Regarding the war preparations of Great Britain, Isvolsky writes on the 1st December, 1912:—"At this moment, the Anglo-French military convention has a character as accomplished and complete as the Franco-Russian one." (p. 362.) We know that this latter was a most perfect military convention.

Isvolsky asserts that most of the papers only hear "golden" arguments; is this the reason why our bourgeois Press is so silent on these—and on several other—important communist revelations?

A. J.



# Japan

## TO THE SOLDIERS OF THE JAPANESE ARMY IN SIBERIA

By SEN KATAYAMA

**Y**OU have been in Siberia for the past four long years. Many of you, moreover, sacrificed happiness and comfort; nay more, many of your brother soldiers have been killed on the Siberian battlefields, and yet you are still engaged in the bloody fight with the Russian army. Why all these sacrifices and deaths? Have you ever thought of yourselves in this murderer's business? No! You are simply obeying the Army Command, and what is more, you are doing the brutal work of the militarist class of Japan. If you had thought of this you would not now be where you are!

Soldiers! You are committing the gravest mistake by blindly obeying the orders of the army leaders. Don't you know that you are fighting against the Russian Red soldiers who are defending the only Workers' and Peasants' Government, the Soviet Republic? You are sons of the Japanese workers and peasants just as the Russian Red soldiers. But by your present conduct you are fighting for the capitalist government and the capitalist interests of Japan. The government and the capitalist of Japan have been oppressing and exploiting you at home for their own self-interest. Don't you know that the Russian Red Soldiers are defending *their* government and their own country? The Russian workers and peasants have destroyed the capitalist government and done away with the capitalist class!

In your blind obedience to Japanese militarism you have been at-

tempting for nearly four years to destroy the Soviet Republic of the workers and peasants who have done away with the oppressive Czar and his capitalist government.

Why have you been all these long years in Siberia? In order to strengthen the government and the capitalists of Japan who are oppressing you and will oppress you as long as you are willing to fight and sacrifice yourselves for them! Don't think for a moment that you are serving your country's best interests by staying in Siberia, which is not your country but belongs to the Russian workers and peasants! On the contrary, you are damaging the cause and interests of your own country, Japan. The Russians are not your enemies. Japan never declared war against Russia. The Russian workers are your friends, if only you could understand and follow the example of the Russian workers and peasants! Morally, you are committing the most outrageous crime against the Russians and against humanity! Are you not ashamed of yourselves now? Quit like men, lay down your arms and go home! That will serve the best interests of Japan.

Soldiers! The Russian Red soldiers are fighting not only for their own revolution but for the World Social Revolution. They are serving the cause of the workers and peasants, they are trying to reconstruct their national economy in spite of famine and the countless difficulties that confront them owing to the long foreign and civil wars. Soldiers of Japan! You should admire the

heroic struggle of the Russian workers and peasants and should help them in every way instead of attacking them in the most trying and critical moment of their new national life!

Soldiers! You are being misled and are ruining your lives and happiness in an unjust foreign invasion. You are fighting a most disgraceful and inhuman war. Yours is the robbers' fight to steal another's country. Your death is a dog's death. No one will be benefited thereby; but Japan will be disgraced, her future will be rendered difficult and the establishment of friendly relations with your neighbours, the Russian workers and peasants, is being impeded. Lay down your arms, pack up your belongings, go back to your country and improve conditions back home! That is the best policy for you and your country. It will help you as well as the Russian workers and peasants. If your officers hinder you, disarm them and do as the Russian soldiers did four years ago! This is the message of a man who loves Japan and the Japanese proletariat, who was raised as a peasant boy, who farmed, burnt charcoal, carried burdens for a living and has been a labour leader, Socialist agitator and Communist organiser for the past fifty years. Support the Russian Workers' and Peasants' Republic by quitting Siberia at once! This is the best thing you can now do!

No doubt the officers and corporals will be against you and will try to fight against you by their sole weapon, military discipline and military rule. But remember the fact that officers and corporals are but a very very small minority when compared with your numbers. You can easily suppress them and use them under your strictest control as the Russian Red soldiers have done in the past. Some timid soldiers among your colleagues may be afraid of the army authorities at home and may do the dirty work of betraying you to the officers. Kill such men as the worst traitors to the interests of the common soldiers and workers and peasants at home.

By your wise and determined conduct and action in the organisation and management of the Japanese Soldiers' Soviet in Siberia the soldiers at home will rise up en masse, will declare themselves free and will organise themselves into Soviets of Soldiers following your noble example. Thus you will best serve the

country. Don't be afraid of the army authorities. They are only strong as long as you are obedient, sacrifice yourselves in their interest and fight for them! They cannot fight a battle even in a small way without you. You are the masters of the entire situation.

When you organise the Soviet of the Japanese Soldiers in Siberia, you need not be afraid of the military rules or discipline of the Japanese army which now oppress you and compel you to obey and sacrifice yourselves and your all. The Red soldiers of the Soviet Russian Bolshevik Republic of the workers and peasants with one hundred and fifty million population will gladly come to your aid and help you to succeed in Siberia and in Japan. Down with the world imperialists! Down with the Japanese militarists! Down with world capitalism! Long live the world brotherhood of labour!

## **Japanese Militarism and the Genoa Conference**

### **JAPANESE SOLDIERS IN SIBERIA!**

**D**O you know why the Genoa Conference happened to be held? The Genoa Conference was called to discuss the economic reconstruction of Europe and the world. After the armistice, the capitalist allies thought they could reconstruct what they lost during the bloody war without Soviet Russia's help. Not only that; they thought that they would be able to reconstruct war-stricken European countries by shutting out and blockading Soviet Russia. But the capitalists and their governments of Europe and Japan found out that they cannot reconstruct their respective countries without Russia and Russia's rich resources. They knew these facts long ago, but at first they thought that they could make use of Russian labour and Russia's abundant resources by crushing the Soviet Republic of the workers and the peasants of Russia, and re-establishing a capitalist Russia by helping the reactionary generals of the Czarist regime and actually invading Russia. They did help Koltchak, Denikin, Yudenitch, Wrangel and Semenov, and they themselves have invaded Russia from all sides. But they failed utterly as you know very well. Being unable to seize Russian wealth and Russian cheap labour by

arms and reactionary war, because the Red soldiers were everywhere stronger than the reactionary generals of the Allies, the Allied capitalist governments called the Genoa Conference and respectfully invited the Bolshevik Russian Government to take part in this Conference. You know that the Japanese government sent representatives there to sit together with the Russian Bolshevik representatives and to consult with them upon world economic reconstruction. This means the Allied defeat on the battlefields against the Bolshevik Red Army and moral submission to the Soviet Russian Republic!

Have you heard of the fact that the Russian Delegation at the very beginning of the Conference proposed the disarmament of the countries represented at the Conference. Disarmament is the best means to stabilise national finance in every nation as armament is the heaviest burden on the people, especially on the workers and peasants. Do you know who opposed this most reasonable and wise proposal of the Russian Delegation. Japan was the chief nation that opposed the Russian proposal and the others followed! Don't you see now yourselves that the Japanese government which is controlled by the militarist clique of Saasiu and Chosiu, supported by the capitalists of the country, is making Japan the most reactionary nation on earth, thus making our dear Japan hated, despised and called the Prussia of the Far East by the entire world?

Have you ever thought of who profits by the army and your fighting as you are now for the army? Do you even now think that you, the workers and peasants, are profiting by your killing Russians and yourselves being killed by the Red soldiers? You ought to know better! By keeping up the big army and compelling you to fight in Siberia, the capitalists of Japan are the only persons who are profiting. You gain nothing but death and a crippled life, poverty and suffering! Besides, you are injuring the best interests of Japan by your staying in Siberia and fighting against the Russian Red Army.

Now what are you going to do in your present situation? You must do something that will really help Japan and at the same time will help you and your fellow workers and peasants. You must transform the Japanese army so that it will serve

the real cause of Japan and the Japanese workers and the peasants. We will tell you the best way to accomplish this. In order to free yourselves and your brothers and sisters at home we advise you to organise the Soldiers' Soviet!

You may ask how to organise the Japanese Soldiers' Soviet? It is not difficult. First, you should elect a captain among yourselves, whether it be in a company, battalion or even a regiment, under the strictest control of the soldiers and go on to organise the Soviet of your own and conduct the military affairs in Siberia in the interests of the country and yourselves. It may be better at first for you to organise the Soldiers' Soviet and conduct affairs secretly. When you are able to command the majority of the soldiers not only of your own company but in other companies and eventually in all the regiments of the present Japanese Siberian army then declare yourselves openly and assert yourselves as the sole masters of the Japanese army in Siberia. And then turn the army into a Red Army, join the Red Army of Siberia and fight with them for the best interests of Japan against anyone who obstructs your Soviets.

## An Appeal to the Proletariat of the World

TO THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF THE WORLD!

(Issued by the E.C. of the Communist Party of Japan.)

**C**OMRADES! Against the will and wishes of the workers and the peasants of Japan the Japanese government has sent a large army to Siberia to fight against the Red Army and to devastate the workers and peasants' country. We, the revolutionary proletarians in Japan, are yet too weak and powerless against the aggressive and oppressive militarist government to stop this most inhuman and bloody slaughter by the Japanese imperialist army in Siberia. The Japanese army has been losing the people's confidence ever since the fall of German militarism and the unjust Siberian invasion that has been undertaken by the militarist clique. The people have realised that such an invasion into a neighbouring country without any cause or reason is a great detriment to Japan. This confidence in the army which they once had in the past has been almost destroyed in the Japanese masses by the world-wide

anti-Japanese movement against the Japanese, when the masses of Japanese people realised that the increasing unpopularity and ever spreading anti-Japanese movement has been solely caused by the Japanese imperialist army, and its bloody and inhuman deeds in Siberia, China and Korea. The Japanese workers and peasants came out in opposition to Japan's Siberian intervention. When Japan was sending the first Siberian invading army commanded by General Otami, who was to be the sole commander of all the Allied intervention armies in Siberia the Japanese workers and peasants showed—although in a vague manner—their unwillingness to support the foreign war by the now historic food riots, the greatest uprisings in Japan, covering two-thirds of the entire area of the country, centred in 142 cities and towns. These great uprisings started in a fishing village of Northern Japan on August 3rd, 1918, lasted 45 days and spread like wildfire all over the country in a few weeks. It is estimated that the numbers involved in the food riots were over ten million, and that ninety per cent. of them were proletarians. This event with others prevented the governments from sending an army of one million soldiers to Siberia. None the less, they sent seventy thousand instead of the seven thousand agreed upon among the robber capitalist Allies.

The Government has been deceiving the workers and peasants through the period of four long years. First it said, "To aid the Czecho-Slovaks." The Japanese army has been constantly disturbing peace and order, but in order to obtain an apparent reason for retaining the army they invented a pretext, "In order to protect the lives and properties of the Japanese citizens in Siberia." But there are hardly any Japanese who are not connected with the invading army such as merchants who conduct parasitic business with the army and soldiers. Then the army plotted a black scheme, a Serajevo on a most gigantic scale at Nikolaievsk. It succeeded in the scheme, and now the Japanese Government is demanding a big indemnity for the framed-up so-called Nikolaievsk massacre in order to get some concessions to satisfy its greedy imperialistic ambitions and designs in Siberia. Now by circumstantial force and pressure from outside and from the people at home it has started peace negotiations with

the Far Eastern Republic at Dalny, but in order to keep the army in Siberia the most outrageous, audacious and impossible proposals have been laid on the table by the Japanese government.

As the result of the Genoa Conference the Allies agreed not to attack each other until the Hague Conference shall report on the economic situation. To this every Allied country but Japan agreed. The reason given by the Japanese representative Ishii reveals the most outspoken imperialistic designs of Japan in Siberia. Ambassador Ishii is the most bigoted, ultra-bureaucratic and militaristic spokesman of Japanese imperialism. He only represents the militarists and big moneyed powers of Japan. The vast majority of the people and the entire proletariat of Japan are opposed to the position assumed by Ishii. But the militarists and the big moneyed class rule the country.

The present attack on the Siberian Red Army is the last desperate act of the Japanese imperialist army to kill the determined opposition of the people and an attempt to regain the last confidence which the army once had in the past. It is a well-known Napoleonic policy of the army authorities of Japan to turn the attention of the nation from dissatisfied conditions at home to the foreign field, which is least known to the people at large. The imperialist government and its army wish to smokescreen the imperialist designs in Siberia, are executing wilful murderous attacks upon the Red Army in Siberia and are devastating the already impoverished country of the workers and peasants for framed-up reasons that are reported to the public through the prostituted press of the country.

Proletarians of the world! This most outrageous invasion of the Japanese imperialists in Siberia can only be stopped by your concerted action at this critical moment. We, the Communist Party members and the revolutionary workers and peasants, are powerless before this powerful imperialist oppression although we are fighting against the imperialists at every possible step. We ask you to make the most determined propaganda against the Japanese Government's conduct in Siberia. It is only the proletariat of the world that can stop the murderous war of the robber imperialists of Japan. As you know, the capitalist nations of

the world have established their united front against the workers and peasants of the world, especially in the Far East—the united front of the joint exploitation of Allied capitalism, particularly in China. For this Japanese imperialism, surrendering its special position in China, obtained a free hand in Korea, Manchuria and Siberia at the Washington Conference. And now Japanese imperialists are seizing what they got at the Washington Conference. What Japan reluctantly agreed to at Genoa as to the non-attack clause under the pressure of public opinion and the severe criticism of the Russian Delegation will hardly stop the fighting against Siberians unless the proletariat of the world compels Japan to do so by extraordinary means of action and propaganda. Under such extraordinary and exceptional circumstances and considering the critical situation in Russia, we, the advance guards of the Communist Party of Japan and the revolutionary workers, heartily approve and endorse the resolution adopted by six million workers of Great Britain—**TO BOYCOTT THINGS JAPANESE AS LONG AS JAPAN KEEPS HER ARMY IN SIBERIA.** We sincerely desire this shall be made an immediate aim of world-wide propaganda and immediate action among the workers and peasants of England, France and America, where Japanese export trade has vital interests together with the Chinese and Indian proletariat. We know full well that by this boycott the Japanese proletariat will suffer much, but we will suffer for the Japanese proletariat because this will hit a hard blow at the Japanese imperialism while it will strengthen immensely the international position of the Japanese proletariat. By weakening, as the result of the boycott, Japanese imperialism, the Japanese proletariat will learn and experience the most valuable lesson on the united front of the workers of the world and will more readily combat against imperialism and militarism!

Proletarians of the world! we want you to act at once for the most vigorous propaganda against the Japanese attack on the Russian workers and peasants in Siberia. No doubt European and American imperialism

and capitalism wish to weaken the Soviet position in Siberia and let Soviet Russia desperately pay sole attention to the Far East in order to tame her stiff-necked diplomacy and possibly to get a chance to let the Russian border countries attack the Soviet Republic! To this world-wide imperialist united front against Workers and Peasants' Russia, the Second and Two and a Half Internationals are giving their support. Now the traitorous two Internationals openly come out to sabotage the World Labour Congress to establish the united front of the workers of the world against the capitalist offensive against the proletariat of Russia and other countries.

Proletarians of the world! Thus you see the present aggressive and brutal attacks on the Russian proletariat in Siberia are a part and parcel of the capitalist offensive against Soviet Russia and will injure the interests not only of the Russian proletariat but also of the proletariat of the world! The class-conscious Japanese workers and peasants are fighting against this most powerful imperialism by strikes, sabotage, riots and determined revolutionary demonstrations, are demanding the recognition of the Soviet Russian Government and the dictatorship of the proletariat of Japan for the Japanese as these were the conspicuous slogans of May First this year.

Comrades of the world! It is the most urgent situation that we all are placed now. Once more we ask you to help us in this momentous fight against the imperialism of Japan and also of the Allied Powers and to help the Soviet Russian Workers and Peasants' Republic. We want your immediate co-operation and action against Japanese imperialism that is now attacking the helpless worn out poor Siberians in the Far East!

Down with Japanese imperialism and world imperialism!

Long live the Soviet Russian Workers and Peasants' Republic!

Long live the Red Army of Soviet Russia!

Long live the Communist Party of Japan and the Communist International!

*(Signed by the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Japan)*

# THE RED CALENDAR

- May 11. Russia sends Reply to Allies' Memorandum at Genoa.  
12. Grandhi's Son Arrested and Sentenced to 18 Month's Imprisonment.  
14-21. Communists Successes at Cantonal Elections in France.  
17. Non-Aggression Pact Signed by Russia and the other Powers at Genoa.  
17. The Communist Federation of Tunis Dissolved  
18. Business Suspended in India in Commemoration of the Amritsar Massacre.  
19. Genoa Conference Closes.  
19. General Strike in Prague in sympathy with Striking Metal Workers.  
19. Latvian Court Martial Sentences Five Communist to Death, others to Hard Labour for Many Years.  
21. Cologne Meeting of Second International against the United Front.  
23. Commission of Nine Meets in Berlin and is Dissolved owing to Sabotage of the Second International.  
24. Grave Incidents in Rome caused by Fascisti.  
26. Vanderveelde, Theodore Liebknecht and Rosenfeld arrive in Moscow.  
26. Metal-Workers' Strike Ends in South Germany.  
27. Reval (Esthonia). Heavy Sentences of Communists, 51 Sentenced; 16 of them to Hard Labour of from 4 to 10 years.
- June 1. Kuntze, Noted Czecho-Slovak Communist and Strike Leader Arrested.  
1. Offices of the *Hamburger Volkszeitung*, Hamburg Set on Fire by Reactionaries  
2-4. Congress of the C.P. of Switzerland.  
3. Four French Communists Sentenced to Prison.  
4-7. Congress of the C.P. of Bulgaria.  
6. Economic Treaty concluded between Czecho-Slovakia and Russia.  
8. Trial of Social-Revolutionaries Opens at Moscow.

## VOLUME ONE OF THE Communist Review

Bound in Strong Cloth Covers is NOW READY

PRICE **5/6** Including Postage

16, KING ST., COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W.C.2