

# The COMMUNIST REVIEW

EDITOR :: WM. PAUL

---

Volume 3

October, 1922

Number 6

---

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

### SINGLE COPIES

SIX MONTHS - - 3/9 POST FREE  
TWELVE ,, - - 7/- ,, ,,

### BUNDLE ORDERS

13 COPIES FOR 5/3 POST PAID  
SALE OR RETURN

---

## Review of the Month

### THE LABOUR PARTY

**A**CCORDING to the Press we may expect a General Election very soon. When it does come the next electoral contest will be an historic one, inasmuch as Labour, even though under the leadership of Henderson and Webb, will, for the first time in the history of this country, come forward seriously to challenge the parliamentary supremacy of the propertied ruling class. At first sight it would seem a masterpiece of stupidity, on the part of Henderson and Webb, that they had not formulated an *official* programme for the Labour Party. No one knows what the Labour Party intends to do if it succeeds in returning to Westminster with sufficient votes behind it to enable it to form a government.

It is not difficult to comprehend the reasons why the Labour Party has not issued an official programme, to place before the country, which it intends to put into operation when it assumes parliamentary control. Henderson and Webb are depending upon winning at the next election, not upon what *they* intend to accomplish, but upon what the Lloyd George régime has failed to do. They are hoping to get votes not because of their virtues, but because of the vices of the present government. Above all, they are slow to formulate a definite policy because they are afraid of splitting the party and of exposing the impotency of a parliamentary government as an organ of real social reconstruction. The Labour Party can be held together so long as its policy is vague and nebulous; the moment it comes down to any definite and concrete line of action, particularly upon any important problem, differences arise. Witness, for example, its lack of a definite policy of action in dealing with the government over the recent crisis in the Near East. It is not, therefore, anxious to elaborate a detailed plan of operating any great industrial reform because recent disastrous experiences in Germany, Australia, etc., furnish disconcerting lessons and warnings regarding the lamentable incapacity of parliamentary governments in dealing with such problems.

## MR. TREVELYAN'S PROGRAMME

**N**EVERTHELESS, there are one or two honest and enthusiastic souls in the Labour Party who are more interested about getting something done than they are in their own careers. They are most anxious that the Labour Party should, at once, formulate a definite policy instead of drifting about helplessly as it is doing at the present moment. Quite recently one of the Labour candidates for Newcastle, Mr. Trevelyan, outlined a practical minimum programme for a Labour government. Not only has he expounded this in an article in one of the Labour monthly *Reviews*, but he dealt with the urgency of the problem, at greater length, in two important lectures delivered at the Summer School held last month by the Labour Research Department.

The first point, on the international situation, which Mr. Trevelyan advances in his programme, is the immediate and unqualified recognition of Soviet Russia. He, unlike the professional leaders of the I.L.P., sees in Russia the first great and determined effort to break away from Capitalism and to found a new social system. In his opinion, the real test of the Bolsheviki is not to be found in their errors, but in the task they set before themselves and in the actual things they have accomplished. We have here a perfectly honest desire, on the part of a non-Communist, to appreciate the great work of the Russian revolution. We place it on record in order that it may be contrasted with the malignant hysteria which overwhelms Mr. J. R. MacDonald when Bolshevism is mentioned. It is one of the ironic things of the modern I.L.P. that its most courageous expounders of real internationalism are the sincere middle-class politicians who recently left the Liberal Party. One has only to compare Mrs. Snowden's volume of ignorant malice against the Soviet Government with Mr. C. Roden Buxton's clever study of a Russian village, in order to understand how low the professional I.L.P. type has fallen.

Mr. Trevelyan is equally definite regarding the Treaty of Versailles. He would scrap it. He advances two other points regarding international affairs which he considers necessary for the Labour Party to take its stand upon in seeking the votes of the workers at the next General Election. No one in the Communist Party will violently quarrel with the four points advanced by Mr. Trevelyan in the minimum international programme which he urges should be immediately put into operation when the Labour Party assumes parliamentary power. Had the Labour Party taken such a stand three years ago it would have been a real power in the land to-day. Courageous people, like Mr. Trevelyan, would willingly have proclaimed such a policy then, but it would have wrecked the Labour Party. Indemnity advocates like Mr. Thomas and Mr. MacDonald would have refused to have endorsed such a modest international programme; indeed, at the present moment, both of these gentlemen are a long way behind certain members of the Liberal Party so far as international politics are concerned. The moderate and mild character of Mr. Trevelyan's minimum programme was, no doubt, deliberately made so in order to win the adhesion of such backward persons, on international affairs, as Mr. Thomas and Mr. MacDonald.

## THE CRUX

**O**N home affairs, the first two points in Mr. Trevelyan's programme deal with the nationalisation of the mines and railways. While the progress of events and experiences of the past few months has been forcing, and must in the near future compel, even capitalist States to recognise Soviet Russia and to scrap the Versailles Treaty, it may be possible for a Labour government to carry out these international measures without much opposition from its political opponents. The Labour Party, however, will certainly be opposed, most vehemently, if it *seriously* attempts to nationalise the mines and railways in such a manner that social service displaces profit and dividends. If it merely rushes a Bill through Parliament nominally nationalising these industries nothing sensational may happen. But if it calls upon the miners' and railwaymen's unions to set up *new administrative organs* by which alone these industries can be successfully operated in a socialised manner, the propertied interests will use every weapon, both constitutional and unconstitutional, to smash such a Labour government. In these new organs of social administration the reactionaries will see, quite correctly, the embryonic form of a new society destined to replace the parliamentary system of government with a new basis rooted in the industrial organisations of the masses. Very speedily the Labour government will find turned against it, not only its own timid renegades who will desert it, but the whole organised might of the capitalist class operating through every channel where it wields power. Such a situation will demonstrate that *real* nationalisation is not a question of ballot box majorities but is one, fundamentally, of *class power*.

If the Labour Party is in earnest it will be compelled to take up a determined stand against the capitalist class. In such a struggle it will have the loyal assistance and co-operation of the Communist Party using its influence to stimulate the masses against the capitalist reactionaries. But if the Labour Party is not in earnest; if it seeks only to replace one parliamentary Premier by another one, to swap a Lloyd George for a Henderson, then it will fail and become a thing of scorn in the eyes of the workers.

Much as we admire Mr. Trevelyan's honest attempt to outline a practical programme for a Labour government, we think he entirely fails to comprehend the nature of capitalism and the relentless character of the propertied interests. The political and administrative machinery of capitalism cannot function in such a way as to operate socialised industries in the interests of all "who labour by hand and brain." This was admitted by even such a notorious Fabian as G. B. Shaw when he truthfully declared, in one of his serious moments, that the parliamentary machine could no more produce Socialism than a sewing machine could produce sausages.

Labour Party reformers, like our friend Trevelyan, view the rise of the new social system as a continuation, in a higher form, of the present methods of industrial and political organisation. They tend to view society as a conglomeration of citizens whose main function is, at certain periods of their life, to put an X on a ballot paper. And yet Mr. Trevelyan was attracted to the Labour movement because he felt that there was something seriously wrong in society. He had the moral courage to renounce an exalted position in the Liberal Party and to throw in his lot with the working class movement. Now, what is wrong with modern society?

The chaos and misery of to-day are the symptoms that capitalism has broken down and that its industrial and political machinery can no longer be operated to satisfy modern social needs. What is needed, then, is *not* a re-adjustment of that machinery by a Labour government. The conditions are demanding new economic and political machinery, new class relationships, new social ties, a new form of government, a new social system—in a word, a social revolution. The leaders of the Labour Party, like Henderson and Webb, know what is needed as well as we do. It is because they know what is needed that they dare not face the task of drawing up a detailed programme of social reconstruction to be undertaken by a Labour government. They are between the devil and the deep sea. If they draw up a programme that would succeed and which would benefit the masses, they must outline a plan which would be tantamount to a declaration of war upon capitalism and all its institutions. They do not want to commit themselves to that; besides, it would mean a big split in the Labour Party. If they draft a showy programme based upon social goodwill to all classes, they know it would be predestined to fail and would therefore drive the disillusioned masses on the road towards Communism.

The Communist Party sees in the Labour Party an important political movement of the working class. We agree with those Labourists who contend that no one can postulate whether the Labour Party will fail or not until it has had its chance. It can only be tested by being returned to Parliament with sufficient power to form a government. The Communist Party, in pledging itself to support the Labour Party at the next General Election, is actuated by no other motive than the earnest desire to help to create the historical conditions which will give the Labour Party its opportunity—either to face, courageously, the enemies of the working class and to sweep over them to Socialism, or to retreat in cowardly confusion before the capitalists, and by so doing to make way for those bolder spirits who will not shrink from challenging the propertied interests. There are several sectarian coteries on the extreme, outside, Left who chant their formulæ and swear that a Labour government *must* prove a ghastly failure. For this reason they refuse to touch the Labour Party with a 20-yard pole. At the same time they are anxious for the Labour Party to assume governmental responsibility in order that it may demonstrate its own ineptitude. Even where such an attitude as this is taken up, it ought to be a duty to return the Labour Party to power in order to facilitate the historical conditions which will concretely expose all the pretensions of pure and simple parliamentary Labourism. The revolutionary realist is one who actively participates in the historical process in order to try and produce the most favourable conditions for him to demonstrate the wisdom of his policy and the folly of his opponents.

### THE NEAR EAST

**W**E have been chided, by certain Labour Party critics, for urging upon our readers the importance of the Near East as a source of future wars. While our Labour Party friends, and the leaders of the I.L.P., were directing a great deal of hot air against the French Government and *its* imperialism, we had to keep telling them that their real efforts ought to be concentrated against British imperialism. The events of the past few weeks have clearly shown how correctly

we had weighed up things. Firstly, the Near East crisis has shown that part of the world to be a veritable cock-pit. Secondly, the bombastic jingoism of the British Government, in its attitude towards the Turks, has revealed it, in comparison with France, as a deliberate provoker of war and a menace to world peace.

The Labour Movement is the international fighting brigade of the world proletariat. The strength of Labour rests upon the consciousness of its international solidarity. By various and subtle ways the capitalist class seeks to break down the possibility of international action on the part of the working class. One way is to stimulate racial and national egoism—a method which is trenchantly exposed in this month's *Review* in the article on "The Asiatic Mind"; here we see how dangerous and reactionary it is for alleged Labour leaders to mouth the language of capitalist imperialism. Another way is to try and trap Labour leaders and Socialist Parties into making attacks upon foreign governments. So long as I.L.P. spokesmen can be found to denounce Soviet Russia, or to attack the rapacious imperialism of France, so long are the masses of this country led, indirectly, to believe in the chivalry and virtue of the British Empire. This leads to an anti-international psychology among the workers. The duty of the Labour Movement is to attack and struggle against the capitalist class in its own particular country. This breeds the consciousness of *class* which is the dynamic force of all international action.

Of all countries in the world, we in Britain have least reason to criticise the imperialism of other nations. The British Government, to-day, is the driving power of world reaction. We have created a breed of statesmen who can conduct the most brazen plundering expeditions under the formulæ of freedom. When Lloyd George hurled his war gauntlet into the Eastern arena, he was at that moment preparing to leave for Geneva to deliver an address on international peace. A President Wilson or a Lloyd George only warble a dithyrambic upon peace for our sentimental Labourists to dance with joy. We hope the events that have happened during the past month have shown them that the most important enemy of world peace is the ruling class of Great Britain.

The workers in France are quite able to look after their own imperialists. And we have a big enough job on if we attend to those who are at present running the British Empire.

HAVE YOU READ THIS BOOK ?

## “Communism & Society”

By WM. PAUL, *Editor of Communist Review*

200 PAGES PACKED WITH FACTS

PRICE **2/9** POST FREE

From Communist Party, 16 King St., Covent Garden, W.C.2

# SOVIET RUSSIA AND TURKEY By Karl Radek

*[We intended to publish the following article by Karl Radek, on the Near East crisis, last month. When the REVIEW was on the point of going to press we found it necessary to hold it over.—*  
EDITOR, COMMUNIST REVIEW.]

**T**ALAAT PASHA, the leader of the Young Turk Revolution and head of the Young Turk Government, fell at the hands of an Armenian nationalist. The next to fall was Diemal Pasha, Governor General of Bagdad, one of the leading spirits in the Young Turk Party, probably also a victim of the Dashniakists.

The old generation is slowly disappearing, that generation which attempted to resist European imperialism and to maintain the independence of Turkey, without divesting itself of any of the old ruling class privileges, and with the self-same methods that the ruling class had used. And now, the leader of the Young Turks, Enver Pasha, enters upon a crazy adventure, betraying not only the Soviet Government, the only honest friend of the uprising Mussulmen, but also the Turkish people, and all the oppressed Mussulman nationalities.

What was this Young Turk revolution of 1909? It was not a movement of the masses, although it drew great masses into its ranks. The Young Turk revolution was merely an attempt to rouse the militant, energetic elements of the Turkish land-owning class against the dismemberment of Turkey, which English imperialism and Russian Czarism had decided at Reval.

The régime of Abdul Hamid not only tyrannized the Turkish masses, but it drew upon itself the enmity of the very classes upon which his power was based. When the old enemies of Turkey, English militarism and Russian Czarism, united to dismember Turkey, the most energetic elements among the army officers united with the bureaucrats and the priests, and succeeded in overthrowing Abdul Hamid. Their well-wishers among the modern publicists applauded the act, but declared that it was insufficient, and that the peasant masses must be drawn into the revolution, for that was the only way to secure their victory. Useless advice, for not only has it never happened in history that a ruling class was willing to relinquish some of its privileges for the salvation of the fatherland, without some pressure from the masses, but the political position of this young revolutionary Turkey made such a move impossible. The war of 1911, the invasion of Turkey by the Balkan states, all this did not yet menace the life interests of the Turkish people. From an historical standpoint, right was with Bulgaria in that war, for it liquidated the expansion policy of the Turkish landowner, and the road to national unity was smoothed to the Bulgarians and Serbians. In that war the Young Turks were fighting for the interests of the landowners, and against those of the Turkish peasants. The Turkish peasant was called upon to risk his life, so that a handful of Pashas might live comfortably at the expense of the Bulgarians and the Serbians. The preparations for the defence of national independence against the encroachments of European militarism, the large expenses for the army, which reached into the hundreds of millions, the ever-rising taxes—all this hindered the development of the Turkish peasants' struggle for internal reforms.

The Young Turk Party drew its power, not from the newly rising class, but from the old corrupt, feudal and bureaucratic class, and could not even rid the country of the old corruption which sucked the last bit of vitality out of the Turkish people.

When the world war broke out, and Turkey was forced to enter on the side of Germany, it was clearly realized that this war would decide the life or death of old Turkey. The Turkish peasants drew from this knowledge the force which enabled them to suffer pains as no other country in the war suffered. The ruling class of Turkey, the Young Turk Party, set all its forces to the defence of the nation's independence; they went so far as to decide the extermination of the whole Armenian people. There is no doubt that the robber interests of the local bureaucracy played a great role in this decision, but neither is there any doubt that the leaders of the Young Turks, Talaat Pasha and Enver Pasha, were driven to this act by reason of governmental necessity. The imperialistic European powers were using the Armenians to break up the Turkish front. The Turkish leaders were faced with the question: Life or Death. No less than the Turks, the English lords and the Czaristic Russian diplomats are responsible for the Armenian blood that was shed. And when the Dashniakists, the party of Armenian nationalism, make the Young Turk leaders pay with their heads for the sufferings of the Armenian people, they are betraying this people. For it is not the Allies who can save the rest of that martyred people; safety lies only in a peace treaty with Turkey which recognizes the Armenian independence, not only in word but in fact.

After the defeat of Turkey, the masses turned away from the Young Turks. They condemned the Young Turk Party as responsible for the war, although in truth war was forced upon Turkey. They condemned the party for the corruption of the officials, who hid their selfish aims behind the flags, "Save the Fatherland." Mustapha Kemal Pasha, who organized the Turkish resistance against the Entente, had to make another appeal to the masses. The best elements among the Young Turks have never given up their work. Some of them attempted to establish connections with the Soviets. And in justice to Talaat Pasha we must declare that he understood the significance of the Soviet Power at a time when the greatest dangers menaced it. In September, 1919, during the Denikin advance, Talaat Pasha began negotiations with the foreign representatives of Soviet Russia, and propagated the idea of a Russo-Turkish understanding. Enver Pasha attempted to come to Russia, in spite of all the danger involved. His pride, his rivalry with Kemal, caused him to turn traitor. He did not understand that to attempt a revolution in Turkey at the time of the war with Greece would not result in a more popular government, but would bring about the victory of the Entente. How lightly he took the revolutionary cause was proved later by his Bashmakian uprising. Enver Pasha declared that the world revolution had begun, and that the subjugated Mussulmans must ally themselves with the European proletariat and its vanguard, the Soviet Republic. But when the cause of the Revolution demanded sacrifices from the Mussulmans of Middle Asia, which sacrifices roused dissatisfaction among the Mussulman population, sorely tried by the intervention and the blockade; when Bashmakian bands took advantage of that discontent and raised their arms against the Soviets, Enver Pasha joined these bands; and he betrayed not only Soviet Russia, but also the cause

of Mussulman liberation. Djemal Pasha, a man of keen and cool intelligence, condemned the acts of Enver. The Angora Government condemned them also. But words alone are insufficient. The Angora Government must realize that the liberation of the Turkish people is possible only through alliance with the revolutionary proletariat. This does not exclude the possibility of making peace with the Western powers, if the terms of peace be found favourable; but Turkey must realize that these are only passing successes, that the final liberation of the Turks is possible only through alliance with Russia. Turkey must conclude peace with the non-Turkish nationalities living on its territory, in order to remove any field of activity for the imperialistic intrigues. Turkey must make all efforts to raise the status of its working masses. We greet with pleasure the decree of the Angora Government which allows the calling of a Turkish Communist Congress. The Turkish Communist Party is not a proletarian party. It is a party which attempts to unite the peasants fighting for their interests, and those intellectuals who have broken with the past. At the present moment the peasantry and the intelligentsia of Turkey have no interest in a revolution. Their present task is to support the movement for national liberation, and to influence that movement so that it will defend the interests of the people. The war will stop in Turkey. But the ravage of war can be healed only when the interests of the peasantry become the ruling interests of the land. The old rats in the palaces of Constantinople will never be able to understand this; but the better elements among the Turkish officers and the intellectuals are beginning to understand. The old Turkey is dead. Turkey must either be a Turkey of the people, or else cease to exist. It seems to us that Djemal Pasha, son of an old noble family, had understood this as well as Talaat Pasha, son of a railway worker. And this must also be understood by all Turks who have shared the sufferings of the heroic Turkish troops on the Grecian front.

## THE FLIGHT OF VANDERVELDE By A. B. Pushkin

*[The cowardly flight of Vandervelde from the Moscow trial of the Social Revolutionaries who were charged, by the Soviet Government, with murder and armed insurrection, has rallied intelligent critics of the Bolshheviks to their side. We publish below an article written in the Berlin "Nakanunie" by A. Bobrishchev-Pushkin. This writer is one of the brilliant leaders of a Russian group of middle-class intellectuals which is opposed to Bolshevism, but which refuses to stand aside and permit the renegades of Socialism to bespatter the Soviet government with imperialist mud.]*

*A. Bobrishchev-Pushkin expresses his opinion upon Vandervelde's ignominious retreat from Moscow.]*

**A**FTER studying the numerous protests, interviews, and declarations published by the defenders of the S.R.s who have left Russia, one cannot but come to the conclusion that they have thrown up their briefs not because of the various pretexts they have given, but because they found it impossible to make any real defence on behalf of their clients.

The sum total of their excuses amounts to a denial of the

validity of the Court. But there was no need to go to Russia in order to learn that the Court was of a class nature. Had not the emigrant S.R.s declared previously that they had no respect whatever for the Court, that they did not recognise it as a Court of Justice at all, and that they were only going to attend this much-vilified Court in order to address the world proletariat from its tribune? The "monstrous trial" was declared to be a great historical event—a duel between the S.R.s and the Communists. How then are we to reconcile this point of view with the idea that the defence was given up because the Court was bad? The S.R.s had declared that the Court was no Court, but only a detachment of the army against which they were fighting—why, then, this retreat at the first encounter? One might perhaps have understood their flight had the defence declared that they had been hindered, that they and the prisoners had not been allowed to give expression to their views. But they themselves admit that the accused and their counsel were accorded complete liberty in this respect. In their Riga declaration, the refusers recognise, "that in the question of the defence the Moscow Tribunal really has manifested a disposition to deal objectively with facts." And how could they do otherwise than recognise this, when it is only necessary to read the declarations of the accused to see that never in any political trial in the whole world could they have enjoyed more complete freedom of speech? Not to speak of the Tsarist Courts, is there a single European Court where one can imagine the accused being allowed to insult the Government or make the accusations which the Soviet Court calmly allows them to indulge in? With a licence hitherto unheard of the accused have carried on their political dispute for the benefit of the world. Thus, so far as the liberty to speak freely is concerned, those who came to defend the S.R.s had no need to run away had they not become convinced that the case of their clients could not bear defending.

The Court is a class Court and a prejudiced Court. With customary directness and honesty the Bolsheviks recognise this, thereby only casting aside the base phraseology which endeavours to conceal the same fact in the West. Where is there a political trial which is not an instrument for the self-defence of the Government? Who will in any way reproach the German Government which, after the murder of Rathenau, has created extraordinary Courts, the judges in which will not be jurists but militant Republicans—in order to defend the Republic? Who will dare say that in France the Courts which tried Dreyfus, Zola, Caillaux, Marty Badina, and other political prisoners were not class Courts, that they were impartial Courts? Was not the Court in Serbia which tried the Communists a class, a prejudiced Court? And the Minister for Justice, Vandervelde, knows this better than anyone—but he adheres to the moral: "We may do anything, the Communists nothing." And yet what other State needs more to stand up in self-defence than Soviet Russia?

Of course, all the European enemies of the Soviet Government have raised a noisy campaign in favour of the S.R.s—but it needs only a hasty examination of this clamour to see how empty of all substance it really is. Justice by the Krylenko family? But who does not know in many European countries, France for instance, judicial clans have sprung up and continued from generation to

generation, bound together not merely by ties of comradeship, but also of blood. I could undertake, as could anybody connected with the legal profession, to name several Russian trials, where the president of the Court, the prosecutor and the examining magistrate were kinsmen. The Communists are here being blamed for what has always been an accepted custom. And the S.R.s protest against Press campaigns! Manifestations? Press campaigns? Why, these occur in every trial which is likely to stir up opposing sides in the public. What would the S.R.s have said had there been no manifestations and no Press campaign in the case of, for instance, the Beyliss trial? As a result of one of these manifestations twenty-five advocates, with N. D. Sokoloff and A. F. Kerensky at their head, were thrust into the dock of the accused; and, to our honour, be it said, this was followed by fresh manifestations by the workers and intelligentsia, and by a new Press campaign. What self-respecting counsel would not stand firm against the provocation of the social classes inimical to his clients? Yet the S.R.s and their foreign counsel, after themselves starting an agitation over the whole of Europe, complain of the counter-agitation that has taken place in Russia!

The other complaints are so trivial one is almost ashamed to speak of them. For instance, amongst the numerous defending counsel, four minor members were not allowed to speak—because they did not fulfil the requirements for defending counsel laid down by the Soviet laws regulating the procedure of the law courts. In the Tsarist supreme political courts even the remaining counsel would not be permitted to plead, since the law demanded that defending counsel must be sworn barristers, and, moreover, they had to receive the approval of the judges. But the Soviet Government permitted foreigners to act as defending counsel. It then appeared that the Court must have consideration for their ignorance of Russian! What European Court would tolerate such a claim? The accusation was delivered, not two days before the trial, as the White Guard Press asserts, but in good time. The foreign counsel then demanded that it should be translated into French and German. They demanded typewriters, which I have never seen used by a defending counsel before. The stenographic report of the first day's trial, it is asserted, was not received until five days later, and without stenographic reports it was impossible to follow the trial. The lawyer Muraver has taken part in a hundred long and complicated trials, and has never once thought it necessary to have stenographic reports; every expert counsel is capable of making all his own essential notes. Nevertheless, within four days the reports of the whole day's proceedings were transcribed and handed to the defending counsel. These reports formerly were given to the defending counsel for his own information two weeks after sentence had been passed. If the defence wished to take its own stenographic report for subsequent publication, surely that was its own business, a matter not for application to the judges, but to the commandant of the court building; and, as everybody knows, such permission was given.

One cannot reply to all the cavillings: their purpose is obviously to make the judges out as monsters and to punish a justification for the withdrawal of the defending lawyers. There have been many direct accusations. A correspondent to *Nakanunie*

asserts that one of the interpreters was an indifferent one ; he, however, neglects to mention that he was replaced by a good interpreter the very next day. The impression created is that this was not a mere accident, but a deliberate plot of the Court to furnish incorrect translators of the speeches.

Similarly unfounded is the complaint that the Court threatened, under certain conditions, to refuse to admit foreign counsel. As a matter of fact, according to their own version, what happened was this: Vandervelde, while speaking, failed to take any notice of two remarks made by the President, Piatakoff, whereupon the latter declared: "If the defending counsel fail to carry out the demands of the Court, then we shall have to raise the question as to whether they can be allowed to take part in the proceedings here at all." Surely a very permissible rebuke to a lawyer who fails to take note of the President's remarks. A European judge, or our former Tsarist judges, would not treat a counsel who thus twice ignored their observations so leniently. The excuse given was that Vandervelde did not hear. A counsel who is so deaf as not to hear a remark after it has been repeated is surely hardly fit to conduct a defence. Vandervelde, of course, is not as deaf as all that. He and his colleagues came as important cultured Europeans to barbaric Russia; but when they discovered that somehow things were different from what they had expected, they simply turned tail. The *Novoe Vremya* hates the Bolsheviki far more than the S.R.s, and yet in No. 351, whilst praising the accused S.R.s for their courage, it characterises the behaviour of the foreign defending counsel, who "fled disgracefully," as cowardly and shameful! But the most damning evidence against Vandervelde and his comrades are their own excuses—the triviality and lameness of which is manifest to every impartial mind. And have you observed how, in all this clamour about typists and stenographers, the real significance and importance of the accusations against the prisoners have been hushed up—driven out of sight? We shall speak of this later, when the particular valour of the S.R.s becomes apparent, but in the meantime the picture revealed to us in the course of the trial is very far from corresponding with the fine dithyrambics sung by the S.R. partisans, and the defence does indeed do well to keep silence.

## THE BRITISH WAY

BEING the HISTORY of BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY  
FROM AUGUST FIRST TO TWENTY-EIGHTH 1922

BY A.B.F.W.

"But after all it is the British way—AND IT PAYS!

We knock a man down and then we shake hands with him."

(A writer to the *Sunday Times*, August 20th.)

**I**F a Liberal may be described as a person who yearns to do good and generous actions, but is invariably obliged to postpone them on account of the wickedness of his neighbours, England has long been a liberal nation, especially in her foreign policy. So this month, she has given up her rôle of Avenging Angel—a part she has not acted nearly as impressively as France and the U.S.A.—and returned to that of Virtue striving to

do right against grievous odds. She has played this part for a century and a half with conspicuous success, and *it has paid!*

The British capitalist press is even now praising the magnanimity of England as a creditor compared with the avarice of America in the same rôle, and lauding the clemency of Great Britain to her enemies in contrast with the ferocity of France. It is instructive to note exactly what England has done and what she proposes to do.

About the first of August the British Government despatched the "Balfour Note" to the diplomatic representatives of France, Italy, Serbia, Roumania, Serbia and Greece, her allied creditors. The note stated that Great Britain was anxious to remit all the debts due to her by her allies in respect to loans, or by Germany in respect to reparations. Unfortunately, it continued, the American Government quite properly was demanding that Britain should pay her debt to America in 25 years, so she could not afford to be too generous. "But while His Majesty's Government are thus regretfully constrained to request the French Government to make arrangements for dealing to the best of their ability with Anglo-French loans, they desire to explain that the amount of interest and repayment which they ask, depends not so much on what France and the other allies owe Great Britain, as on what Great Britain has to pay America."

The generosity of Great Britain is further emphasised at the beginning of the note by the fact that she says she is willing to cancel her war debts to the value of £3,400,000,000 exclusive of interest, while only asking America to give up a niggardly £850,000,000 (the Americans say the sum is £1,000,000,000).

Even the *Daily Herald* described this as a "magnificent gesture." Here was America given an opportunity to help England to save Europe! Surely she would eagerly embrace the opportunity, if only to escape the moral censure and isolation which refusal would entail! How could she expect France and Roumania, etc., to love her if she, and she alone, stood in the way of their release from their crushing debts to England? And yet America refused this dazzling offer.

We must look at the suggestion more closely if we are to realise the true extent of England's magnanimity. Of war debts to England, the Allies owe £1,300,000,000, which they neither intend nor are able to pay. £650,000,000 was owed by the Russian Czarist government, and German reparations are assessed at £1,450,000,000. No moderately sane Englishman expects to see a penny of these last two items. In short, these are all bad debts.

The English debt to America, however, is real money. Both British statesmen and business men have never disputed England's capacity to pay, and have, indeed, constantly asserted her willingness and intention to do so.

As an American article reprinted in the *Times* says:—

"You can put the thing quite simply if you say that, in offering to cancel all that Europe owes her, if we will cancel all she owes us, the British are putting up nothing and asking us to put up five billions of dollars. And since the disparity is pretty patent, they are undertaking to cover the thing by an appeal to sentiment. They are holding up to the U.S.A. the choice between accepting the responsibility for world chaos, which is materially much worse for the British than for us, and cancelling a debt of five billions when the British can pay and have promised to pay, but quite obviously would like to avoid paying."

Lloyd George hoped that America would fear to face the resent-

ment of the interested European nations. However, America knows a thing or two, and was able to strike an equally noble attitude.

"The people of the U.S.A.," declared Senator Borah on August 3rd, "could never be greatly interested in any proposition for the cancellation of any part of the debt to the U.S.A., unless the proposition is accompanied by a definite and specific plan, supported by certain guarantees for practical disarmament, both by land and sea. . . . If we cancel our debts, it would appear simply to fit into a scheme of armaments, of huge land forces, of more wars and more debts, thus continuing the vicious circle."

On August 6th, M. Poincare's "Your money or your life" ultimatum expired. The next day the French Government proceeded to confiscate what they had not already seized of German property in France.

The same day Poincare met Lloyd George, and the series of "grave crises" over the reparation question began.

Lloyd George started by arguing that England had spent more on the war than France, and so was entitled to a larger share of reparations. He followed this by asserting that anyhow Germany could not pay, though she certainly ought to be made to do so. By August 10th, he decided to stand by the decision of the experts appointed by the Allied Commission, and demand a moratorium for Germany.

On August 14th he declared the question must be left to the Reparations Commission set up by the Peace Treaty or the League of Nations. "If these are not accepted, then I am afraid we must agree to differ," was his parting shot at M. Poincare. The conference then broke up, and the matter was referred to the Reparations Commission.

On August 18th M. Poincare told the English Ambassador that the French Government would not be bound by any decision of the Commission unless the gages and guarantees were seized which he had demanded in London (i.e., France must control the Ruhr).

On August 22nd he declared that "the seizure of the German mines and forests is the only policy which can safeguard the rights of France. . . . It is Germany's debt to us that we wish first to recover. Until this is achieved, it is morally and materially impossible for us to settle our debt to our British friends."

Meanwhile, the mark fell to 8,500 to the £. Sir John Bradbury and M. Mauclerc, who had been sent to Berlin as financial experts, returned to Paris, and informed the Reparations Commission on August 26th that Germany was bankrupt; twenty hours after their arrival, an invitation was sent to the Germans to a conference at Paris on August 29th. The Commission promised a final decision regarding the moratorium on August 30th.

On August 25th the German Federation of Trade Unions sent a plea for intervention to the International Federation of Trade Unions and the English Trade Union Congress.

England is left in rather an awkward position. Lloyd George would undoubtedly like to make a generous, and inexpensive gesture, and cancel the worthless German debts. Then, however, the Allies would be enraged at the preferential treatment accorded to Germany, and demand that their debts be cancelled also. If he cancelled the allied debts unconditionally, he would have no lever to induce the U.S.A. to cancel the British debt. Moreover, the

Conservative rank and file have not been fed on facts, and would believe they were really giving something of value away.

Most Englishmen, including many Labour leaders, seem to be still hugging the cherished fallacy that America will ultimately cancel her English debt. They seem to believe Wilson to have been a typical American, and accept at its face value the superficial sentimentality of American business men over on a holiday. America is run in the interest of her capitalists. They can afford to sit tight and ignore the misery of their unemployed. Comparatively speaking, they have not been greatly affected by the loss of the European market. Such is the financial impotence of Europe, that they can afford to laugh at threats of political isolation.

It cannot be expected that France will be content with the "liberal" rôle which England would assign to her. She has secured and expects to secure again something tangible in the way of reparations. The Rhine frontier will mean industrial as well as political supremacy in Europe. She has little to fear from political isolation, so long as she keeps on the right side of America.

From a Communist point of view, the interest of the question really lies in deciding what attitude on the part of England will best serve the purposes of the German Communists. A secondary consideration is its value politically to the Labour Party and to Communist propagandists in the Labour Party. Experience has shown that it is useless to hope for an even temporary alleviation of the miseries of the workers and unemployed here, or in Europe, from arrangements and compromises made in the interests of rival groups of capitalists.

J. H. Thomas is backing the present German Government on the ground that they "see the danger of anything in the nature of a Soviet system." The strong anti-French middle-class element in the I.L.P. will do the same. However, the only constructive proposal the German Government has yet made is that attributed to Herr Stinnes, that the German Government shall guarantee deliveries of timber and coal under the Reparations Commission instead of French control of these two commodities. This would involve six hours' additional labour every week by the miners of the Ruhr. Both French and British miners can calculate from recent experience the effect such a measure would have on them. Intensification of exploitation and distress; deserted by the leaders of the Second International, who have turned down a united international labour front, may drive the workers of Germany into the arms, or rather jaws, of the monarchists.

In a word, it behoves Communists to walk warily with regard to this question. They must remember that foreign capitalists know the "British way," and do not take English liberalism at its face value. They must reveal the logic of events to those workers who have not grasped it, and be ready to give every possible assistance to the struggling masses in the countries concerned.

# THE BERLIN-BAGDAD Railway : Pan-Hellenism and Pan- Slavism By J. T. Walton Newbold

**I**N previous articles in this series we have traced the stages and enquired into the means whereby the bondholding interests of West European capitalism reduced the Ottoman Empire to that state of economic vassalage which enabled them to replace the financial control of the Turkish Government by the Administration of the Ottoman Debt, and, at the same period, to all intents and purposes, to detach from the Turkish dominions the whole province of Egypt. We have, also, examined the comparatively unexplored mystery of Greek Nationalism, of Hellenism, and have revealed it as the political and ideological expression of a bourgeoisie which, whilst resident for the most part abroad, has known how to enlist the sympathies and excite the existing jealousies of the Western powers to its own immediate economic advantage and its own eventual political triumph.

We have sent the broad beam of Marxian realism, like the dazzling rays of a searchlight, playing across the dark waters of the Ægean Sea, and, in that cold white glare, have thrown into relief things that have long been hidden and exposed forces that would rather have remained unseen.

Now, we must proceed with our study of the factors, economic and political, which have contributed most to the undoing of the Ottoman Power, and to the arousing of that welter of racial hatred and war-like horror which has made the Balkans and Asia Minor into the very semblance of hell itself.

For years we have been familiarised not only with the conflicting evidence of Balkan atrocities, but also, through a vast literature upon the subject of Slavonic nationalism, with the intricacies of races, tongues, and religious sects in the Balkan Peninsula. What, of course, we have had little enlightenment concerning has been the vile intrigues which have, by the aid of bribery and all manner of corruption, set the peasantry of Albania, Macedonia, Thrace, as, also, of Anatolia and Armenia, at each other's throats, or have egged them on against the Turkish Government ever with a view to facilitate the schemes of one or other imperialist syndicate of financial bandits lurking in the rear.

In fact, we may take it that we have had such a prolific outpouring of ethnographical, historical and kindred writings, liberally subsidised from some source undisclosed, in order completely to obliterate the muddy tracks of the merchants, bankers, and other adventurers who passed the flaming torch of war and anarchy from valley to valley and from isle to isle till in the end not only the Balkans, but all Europe, roared up in one vast conflagration.

For, never be it forgotten, out of the Balkans the Great War came to make millions of widows and tens of millions of orphans, what time, however, it made hundreds of millions of profits for the Zaharoffs, Castiglioniis, Sassoons, and Rallis.

## CORN AND COMMERCE IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

When, after the wars of the French Revolution and of Napoleon, the monarchies of Europe tried to restore the old régime, what

actually occurred was that they put immense economic power into the hands of their bankers, notably the Hopes of Amsterdam, the Barings of London, and the Rothschilds of Frankfurt, Paris, and Vienna. The Emperors of Russia and of Austria had, of necessity, in order to clear off their debts and augment their revenues, to encourage the production and sale of corn and other agricultural produce for profit. Not only Great Britain, but also the newly industrialised cotton and iron manufacturing areas of North France and Belgium, made demands upon the corn factors of Frankfurt and Danzig, until, by degrees, a big corn trade grew up between Russian Poland, Austrian Galicia, and, with the building of railways, Hungary, and the industrial towns of the Rhineland, of Belgium, France, and Britain.

In the process of exchange between the manufacturers and dry goods salesmen of England and France on the one hand and the agriculturists and corn dealers of Austria-Hungary on the other, there developed a considerable banking and investment business between London, Paris, Vienna, and Budapest. The British and the French provided capital for factories, foundries, and, later, gasworks, railways, and telegraphs, the Rothschilds acted as intermediaries, and the peoples of Austria-Hungary became acquainted with capitalist production and commerce as the clients of Western Europe.

At the same time, Russia, up country on either side of the rivers discharging into the Black Sea, was being brought within the orbit of capitalism by a gradual development of commodity production. Her nobility and gentry were responding to the attraction of gold and the luxuries of the West which gold would buy, and were willing to increase their corn crops and to welcome into their midst the German and the Greek traders.

By the "sixties" not only were the commercial classes of South Germany and of Austria beginning to penetrate beyond the railways of the Dual Monarchy and to invade the potential markets of the Danubian provinces of Turkey, but the Russians were themselves commencing to participate in trade, whilst their friends, the Greeks, were plying an active business in Roumania and had no desire to be disturbed elsewhere in Turkey and in the ports of the Black Sea.

#### THE RISE OF ROUMANIA.

The marketing of the Hungarian grain crop and the vexed question of the political control and financial exploitation of the corn-growing lands of the Danubian provinces of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bulgaria became, by the late "fifties," and, still more, in the "sixties," matters of grave concern not only to the monarchical autocracies of Vienna and Petrograd, but, also, to the landed interests in Austro-Hungary and in South Russia, as well as to the Greek mercantile community so active in Odessa and Galatz, and to the banking fraternity of Paris and of London. As yet finance was concerned for the most part either with loans to governments or with the handling of agricultural produce, both forms of business which attracted the semi-usurious credit merchant to a most profitable market in Turkey and in the insurgent principalities upon its northern and southern fringes. Hence, one can understand why the diplomacy of Napoleon III. assisted in the union of Wallachia and Moldavia and their establishment as the kingdom, albeit under Turkish suzerainty, of Roumania. He favoured a Hohenzollern as against a Hapsburg or a Romanoff, and the new

state was set up on the frontiers of Austria-Hungary and of Russia as a check to both empires, and as a potential field of French bourgeois exploitation.

With the virtual separation of the Danubian principalities from the Ottoman Empire, the *Imperial Ottoman Bank* simply obtained from the new Government, in 1866, a concession to set up the *Bank of Roumania* to carry on its existing business in Galatz and Bucharest. This concern has remained from that time to this the principal bank devoted to the service of commerce in Roumania.

Subsequently, *Bleichroder*, the banker and friend of the Kaiser Wilhelm I., rendered financial assistance of such a valuable and intimate nature to the Hohenzollern dynasty in Roumania that he was awarded by the Emperor the rank of an hereditary noble.

Financially, detached in some measure from French influence in the early "seventies," Roumania was drawn, by reason of the treatment meted out to her by Russia, who took from her Bessarabia, more and more closely to Austria-Hungary and to Germany. Not until the second Balkan war do we find her taking action distinctively hostile to the Central European Powers. Moreover, when, in the Great War, she came in on the side of the Allies, it was with obvious reluctance and under severe diplomatic and semi-military pressure.

Roumania did not, however, play any considerable rôle in the economics and politics of Turkey in disruption. Therefore, we can pass her by.

#### RAILWAYS AND INTRIGUE IN THE BALKANS.

Servia, on the other hand, had the misfortune of lying right athwart the path along which the bourgeoisie of Central Europe must, in the railway era, make their way either to Constantinople or to Salonika.

In 1869, when Austria-Hungary had been laced across with a number of trunk lines, Baron de Hirsch, as we saw in a previous article, conceived the idea of a great railway connecting Vienna with Constantinople. This scheme was sadly curtailed by reason of the suspicion of the Turkish Government, and mutual jealousies delayed the operations until after the Congress of Berlin in 1878.

As a result of the Russo-Turkish War and the Treaty of San Stefano, as revised by the Treaty of Berlin, Bulgaria appeared as a semi-independent principality to the south of the Danube and to the east of Servia.

Austria-Hungary was disposed to curtail the area of the new state and Russia to increase it. The latter regarded it as a stepping stone and the former as yet another barrier to her commercial and political ambitions in the Balkans.

The Congress of Berlin had much to say about railways and about improving the navigation of the Danube. Contemporary literature shows quite conclusively that Austro-Hungarian high finance approved of Britain's policy as expressed by Beaconsfield, and that both parties came away highly satisfied.

Austria not only got leave to occupy and to develop Bosnia and Herzegovina, but, also, to undertake the improvement of the Danube navigation and to impose tolls upon the traffic to pay for it. At the same time, in conjunction with Servia, Bulgaria and Turkey, she was to arrange for the building of railways to Constantinople.

Here, undoubtedly, was the hand of the *Rothschilds*, the bankers, of Vienna, of Frankfurt, of Paris, and of London, the railway monarchs of Austria-Hungary.

The Austro-Germans were to build the Oriental Railway, the British the Euphrates Valley Railway. Already a project for an overland railway to the East was taking definite shape.

*As yet the German and Austrian capital was very cosmopolitan, and had not acquired a strongly marked political complexion.*

Then, in 1880 and 1881, a French bank, promoted by rich Catholic families and the religious orders, and working in hostility to the Jews led by Rothschilds and Bischoffsheims, obtained, by an intrigue with a clerical ministry in Vienna, a concession to set up the *Landerbank*. Then, operating through this medium, they sought to conclude with the Hungarian Government an agreement for a railway, in fulfilment of the Berlin Treaty, to join up Belgrade and Buda-Pest. There was a further project of a National Bank of Servia, under French direction. This pseudo-Servian concern was, in its turn, to build a railway across Servia from Belgrade to the Bulgarian border.

The scheme was killed by British and Greek opposition and by the ruin of the French parent bank, deliberately pushed down, when in difficulties, by the Republican Government in Paris, acting on behalf of the established interests of the cosmopolitans of the *Banque de Paris*, the *Société Générale*, the *Crédit Mobilier*, and their associates.

The repercussions of this adventure on the part of the great Catholic financial house and of its disastrous overthrow were so terrible that, obscure as, on the surface, the incidents now appear, I have given them prominence. *The circumstances attendant on the collapse of the bank in Paris engendered that paroxysm of Catholic fury against the Jew financiers that later on vented itself in the Dreyfus case. The fact that the French interests in the Landerbank passed into the possession of the Berlinerhandels-gesellschaft Bank and of the Deutsche Bank roused the ruined Catholics to a fury of patriotic hatred and a tempestuous cry for revenge. This old score, the French reactionaries have sought, by means of the peace treaties, to wipe out.*

During the "middle eighties" the various links of the chain of railways, some in Hungary, some in Servia, and others again in Bulgaria, in Roumelia, and in Turkey, came slowly to completion. In May, 1888, the *Eastern Railways from Vienna to Constantinople and Salonika* were finished and opened throughout.

Thereupon, the Austrian *Landerbank*, in conjunction with the *Comptoir d'Escompte de Paris* and Jewish capital in that port, established the *Bank of Salonika*, with a view of developing extensive commercial connections between Austria and the Levant.

Two years later, in 1890, the Austrian *Bankverein* and the *Deutsche Bank* bought up and consolidated the several lines, set up head offices of the *Oriental Railways Company* in Vienna, and, calling in the great cosmopolitan *Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas*, founded a holding concern at Zurich and set themselves on the one hand to extend the stock throughout capitalism and, keeping control themselves, to develop the system into something bigger and more grandiose.

The *Deutsche Bank* planned extensions across Albania to the Adriatic and other lines eastward towards Constantinople.

## THE BIRTH OF THE BAGDAD SCHEME.

Having a line now connecting Berlin, Dresden, Prague, Vienna, Buda Pest, Belgrade, and either Constantinople or Salonika; having a political alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary and good relations alike with Servia and with Turkey, the German capitalists around the Deutsche Bank were ready for new conquests. Already, they were toying with projects of railways in Asia Minor, not too seriously, but yet in evident anticipation of eventual concentration thereon.

Now, as long as German-Austrian capital concerned itself with the opening up of the Balkans and was merely interposing a barrier against Russian expansion British capitalism had no obstacles to offer. Even Greek interests had not any very intense opposition to present until the Austrians debouched on the plains of Macedonia and there joined forces with the all-powerful Jewish element that composes the mercantile and financial community of Salonika.

*When, however, German high finance and German steel industry seriously undertook to railroad Asia Minor and to advance towards India, British imperialism interposed its veto.*

In 1888, the Turkish authorities, exasperated at the slowness with which the existing syndicate of British and Austrian concessionaires were prepared to develop the Ismid Railway, took it away from them and handed it over to the Deutsche Bank. There was a great uproar and, responsive to the appeals of the investors, the British Foreign Office insisted on the restoration of the line. Some compromise was patched up and the Germans instituted the almost impotent *Anatolian Railway Company*.

The British capitalists and their creature, the British Government, would neither proceed with the building of the projected Euphrates Valley Railway, to connect the Syrian coast with the Persian Gulf, nor hold out any hope of aiding in the construction of a line across Asia Minor, nor extend the existing Smyrna and Aidin and Smyrna and Cassaba Railways. They would neither build a railway system in Turkey themselves nor permit anyone else to do so.

True, in 1892, they allowed a syndicate of French bankers and railway interests to build a short line from the Syrian coast at Beyrout up country to Damascus and some way into the interior behind that town. This scheme, also, provided for the building of a harbour and warehouses at the former town. The works were completed about 1901.

Meanwhile, in 1899, the Deutsche Bank had been successful in obtaining a concession for a line to join up with the Anatolian Railway and to run through Asia Minor to Adana in Cilicia and thence *via* Aleppo to Bagdad and, presumably, to the Persian Gulf. The new concession was to be exploited by the *Imperial Ottoman Bagdad Railway Company* and, financed by loans raised in 1903 and 1908 by the Deutsche Bank, the work went steadily ahead, section by section.

The British Government took the precaution of occupying the town of Koweit on the Persian Gulf in 1901 and declaring it a protectorate. What was to happen as the Bagdad Railway neared the Gulf nobody quite knew, but meanwhile Germany proceeded steadily eastwards. Just prior to the Turkish Revolution in April, 1908, the Deutsche Bank put through another important transaction, extending the original concession.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GERMAN SUCCESS.

Significantly enough, it was on the very morrow of this "deal," whereby German finance capital had obtained an almost complete monopoly of the resources of the areas through which the railway was to run, that the Committee of Union and Progress launched the movement that overthrew the absolutism of the Sultan and, as the "Economist" said at the time, weakened the prestige at the Porte of the Austrians and the Germans.

The completion of this transaction may then be said to mark the culmination of the thirty years' period during which Austro-German finance capital was steadily thrusting out ahead of its existing limits of successful exploitation the steel railway tracks along which it intended to transport its commodities to the developing markets of countries where the peasantry were just beginning to seek satisfaction of their needs and desires beyond the boundaries of their own villages. During all that period, between 1878 and 1908, German finance, industry, and diplomacy were throwing forward and knitting tightly together the joints of a great trunk line, from either side of which it would, in course of time, be possible to extend "feeders." German imperialism, *i.e.*, the combination of the above named forces of finance, industry, and diplomacy, made for the strengthening and stabilisation of the Ottoman Empire and for the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Balkans. *German imperialism favoured the maintenance of the Sultan's absolutism, as the expression, politically, of an economy wherein there was no manifestation of native bourgeois activity such as, alas, already fermented in the Czech communities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.*

## THE OPPOSITION TO THE DEUTSCHE BANK.

There were, however, as we have seen in previous articles in this series, other elements that did not for one moment favour the idea of the trade of the Near East going from north-west to south-east and *vice-versa*, but desired that it should continue to ebb and flow through the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus from and to the grain ports of the Black Sea.

There had been, says the "Economist" (3/8/89), an "enormous increase of Russian trade on the Black Sea. Formerly, Germany held the first place among the suppliers to Russia; she has long ago ceded it to England." Not only was English capital (*i.e.*, capital, often, Greek in its racial tinge but masquerading as English) vigorously exploiting South Russia, but the capital of the more Radical elements in France was becoming active in that direction.

The *Banque de Paris*, the *Société Générale*, and the *Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris* were, all of them, doing a larger and larger business with Russia. These banks had much to do with the financing of trade operations, notably in cotton, corn, and sugar. The first two went in, also, for participation in industry, and had been very cosmopolitan in their range. The increasing centralisation of German banking in Berlin, however, and the control Berlin was getting over Vienna and Prague, together with the dynamic force of German high finance, supported by the Reich and depending on large scale production, drove the *Banque de Paris* and the *Société Générale* into active competition with those with whom, formerly, they had co-operated.

At the same time, political exigencies were impelling Czarist Russia and Republican France towards each other. In Marseilles, also, there was an enormously strong Greek community, and this, always liberal in its professions and clamant for "the self determination of small nationalities," was in close touch with the Radicals of France.

Clemenceau and Briand were both original members of the French Phil-Hellenic Society and favoured the process of liberalisation, also, in Russia.

Now, in the early "nineties," the French Radicals and the Greek Nationalists of Crete, ever liberally subsidised by the rich exiles of London, Manchester and Marseilles, each in their respective spheres, became simultaneously assertive. The latter, needless to say, became most noisy after French finance had most liberally endowed Czarist Russia with funds. The Greeks became particularly irritable when they saw Salonika, Greek in tradition but predominantly Jewish in population, linked up with and becoming a prosperous terminal of a railway owned and controlled by other Jews (so they alleged) in Berlin and Vienna.

The whole tendency, stimulated by the opening of the Oriental Railways and the promotion of the Bagdad Railway, for Germans and Austrians to invade the Levant was most distasteful to the Greeks of the dispersion, to the Greeks of Marseilles and of London.

These were the people who stirred up the Cretan trouble in 1896 and so involved Greece in a war with Turkey, which, had it been successful, would have wrenched Salonika from the hands of the Austrians and the Jews and made it, again, a Greek city. The war failed, but the aim was there and the intention remained. It was revived again in the summer of 1906. One week (4/8/06), the "Economist" reported a renewal of the Cretan agitation for autonomy under the Greek kingdom, and the next week that the *Banque de l' Union Parisienne* was issuing large new capital for the *Bank of Athens*.

In 1904, 1906 and 1907, "French" financial assistance was forthcoming for industrial and railway extensions in Greece and, in the latter year, a line was opened running from Athens to Larissa, which was planned to extend so as to link up with the Salonika system, but whose extension was stopped by the opposition of the Sultan.

Steadily, from the moment that the *Entente* was established, Franco-Greek capitalism crept on tressels and railway track nearer and nearer to the coveted goal of Salonika.

*In April, 1908, the Committee of Union and Progress, whose headquarters was Salonika, anticipated matters by the revolutionary rising that gave the Ottoman Empire a constitution and, incidentally, lit the train leading to the European powder-barrel.*

The story and significance of the Turkish Revolution and the ensuing break-up of the Ottoman Empire we must tell in another article.

# POLITICAL APATHY & THE CLASS STRUGGLE

BY E. T. WHITEHEAD

**O**F the difficulties that confront the Communist movements in the English-speaking countries, particularly in Britain and the United States, one of the hardest is that of political indifference of the wide masses.

In the countries of Central Europe it may be said to be almost a habit for the self-respecting intelligent worker to be a regular of a political party. In Germany, for instance, there are more than a million and a half workers who are members of political parties, but in Britain it is doubtful if the working class membership of all political parties reaches fifty thousand, and in the States the figure is perhaps even less.

In America, especially, there is an extraordinary distrust of "politics" of all kinds and shades; it has been a long and painful experience that "politics" is a system of pretence, bluff, dishonesty, rigging, wangling, selling out, feathering nests, and all the other evils of Tammanyism.

The distrust of the working class of Britain of "politicians" of all shades, whether purely political or those acting politically on the industrial field, is almost as great. In both countries there is an extraordinary lack of knowledge as to what are the real functions of a political party of the working class, and as to the reason for the necessity of a political party of the working class at all.

The school of industrial unionists, who taught that industrial organisation is all that is required, has been in part responsible for this state of affairs. The numberless debates that have taken place in the past two decades on "parliamentary versus industrial action"—debates that must run into some thousands, and in which the industrialists usually had the best of the argument, have left fixed prejudices against political parties with the older school of working men. "Politics" is so closely identified with mere "voting" in their minds, and with mere "talking," that it will take long-sustained efforts to rid them of that prejudice.

Another factor that contributes largely to this apathy to economic interests lies in the tremendous counter attraction offered in the world of sport. The capitalist Press, both in Britain and the United States, fosters this to such an extent that it becomes a veritable narcotic nation—wide in its effects that stupefies the intelligence of the workers towards their true interests.

This militates so seriously against all possibility of forming a Mass Party that this present condition of political indifference must be studied and allowed for in Communist work.

As evidence of this wide political indifference the ballot figures, either in national parliamentary ballots or in municipal ballots, may be taken. Despite gaudy and noisy campaigns, often less than 50 per cent. of the electorate go to the poll in parliamentary elections; less than 25 per cent. in municipal elections.

The main task in breaking through this deep-seated political apathy lies in *simple and fundamental things*. Firstly, in proving to the masses that the Communist method is the only method that gives any possibility of achieving class emancipation; and, secondly,

in manufacturing that confidence that the Communist method itself will achieve its tasks. Much of the revolutionary spirit of to-day is the spirit of despair, not the spirit of conscious optimism. The "morale of the home front" of the working masses is at the lowest possible ebb. It is especially the task of Communists to build up that morale and create buoyancy. Many believe that no method, neither political nor industrial, will ever succeed in breaking the chains of class emancipation; that the resources and cleverness of the bourgeoisie will resist our efforts for all time. To such it is necessary to prove scientifically that capitalism as a social system is doomed.

I repeat, then, that if we can drill in those two fundamental truths, that the Communist method is the only method, and that the Communist method will succeed, half our battle is already over.

This has not been done in the past. The economic situation in Britain for the past two years has been ideal for the formation of a strong numerous party, but this has not been achieved. Even in South Wales, after the failure of the Miners' Lock-out, when it was at last conclusively proved that the strongest trade union in the world goes under before the forces of the State and capitalism in a passive strike, and that the pure industrialist tactic was ineffectual, even there, in that hotbed of class-consciousness we were unable to numerically strengthen and consolidate our position in a way the economic situation offered.

Moreover, it is further true that the "attraction methods" used by British and American Communists are far from complete and by no means take into account all the qualities of human nature. Our appeal and agitation is almost wholly made on the ground of *Combativeness*, whilst it is probably true that the masses in these countries are more easily reached by firing their idealism. The few idealists who have been prominent in the British Socialist Movement—Morris, Edward Bellamy, Robert Blatchford, etc.—have proved more powerful recruiting factors than the purely Marxian propagandists.

It is probable that the proportion of human beings born with natural responses to logical or Marxian propaganda is not higher than 10%, whilst the proportion in whom an idealistic appeal finds a natural response is still higher. If the force from emotion for the ideal was added to the force derived from the logical class struggle appeal, the strength behind the Communist Movement would be considerably added to. It is very common among Communists to deride the idealists. It is just as easy for the scientist to deride the artist, for the butchers to deride the bakers, although in truth all are useful members of society. This derision and deliberate rejection of the forces to be mobilised by idealism is one of the most limiting factors in the thinning of the forces behind Communism to-day.

What then are the "implications" (word beloved of the neo-Communists) of the factors enumerated above. On the one hand we see the bourgeoisie successfully using all the latest advances in scientific psychology in directing their advertising campaigns, their press campaigns to dope the workers, usually by the aid of the counter attractiveness of sport and plenty of pictures of murders, divorce cases, bathing girls, etc. They used these advances in knowledge in their publicity campaigns "for propaganda in enemy countries" and to "build up the morale of the home front."

Shall we in reply to this still continue to dish up the same dry economics and express surprise that it does not find an immediate response and set the world afire with its irresistible and incontrovertible logic, supremely oblivious of the fact that only very exceptional human beings are constituted in such a way as to be responsive to a pure logical appeal?

Not a bit of it! To continue in the old rut is to fail to be realists and to fail to be scientific. We ought to realise that there is a whole science in awakening and in mobilising political opinion and subsequently marshalling it through suitable organisational machinery so as to get it to function to produce results. For countless centuries the steam had boiled away from pots and kettles until the genius arose who harnessed the steam through the steam engine and caused it to attain power and results.

A Communist Party can be well likened to a steam engine in that it is a machine constructed to utilise energy to produce results. We have got the machine beautifully built, we have got illimitable steam in the shape of the smouldering sense of social injustice and social robbery. But we haven't yet solved the problem in Britain of getting this steam into our machine. It may mean certain modifications in the machine or it may mean certain modifications in the fuelling arrangements. Anyhow it is a job in the domain of political mechanics, and is *the* job that needs to be tackled. We have got the economics, we have got the logic, we have before us examples of how to do it, though not in relation to our own national psychology, which has been evolved under definite historic conditions, and it should not be difficult to solve the rest of the problem if we set ourselves to the task.

# THE ASIATIC MIND

## BY WILLIAM PAUL

### I.

#### HODGES THE HISTORIAN.

**M**R. FRANK HODGES, Secretary of the Miners' Federation and student of law, in common with his colleagues of the Second International, is one of those polished and windy adventurers who prates about internationalism, but who is too cowardly to *act* in an international manner on behalf of the working class. He, more than anyone else in this country, was responsible for the disgraceful and treacherous policy of sabotage carried out against the American miners in their heroic struggle against their masters. The keynote which explains this crime against international working class solidarity was struck by Mr. Hodges in his stupid criticism, at the recent Labour Party conference, of the tactics of the Russian Communists which, he contended, were the result of their "Asiatic mind." Here we find a so-called leader of Labour so ignorant of elementary social theory that he actually attempts to explain the policy of the *international* class struggle from a *racial* standpoint. Such a melancholy exhibition of *reactionary thinking* was bound to result in *reactionary deeds*. The plausible snob who won the applause of MacDonald, Henderson, Thomas and the *Morning Post*, for his attack upon the revolutionary leaders of

Russia is just the sort of servile type to act, in the interests of capital, as an international scab upon the workers. Thus the "Asiatic mind" theory carried into practice rings like a death knell to those, like the miners of America, who during their struggle vainly appealed to Hodges and the Amsterdam International for assistance.

Mr. Frank Hodges is certainly wasting his time studying for the bar. As a lawyer he will only be able to exhibit his already matured gifts of equivocation and dissimulation. His greatest and most precious talent surely lies in his superb and almost uncanny faculty for historical generalisation. When he showed, at the Edinburgh conference of the Labour Party, that the revolutionary policy of dictatorship was a racial attribute of the Asiatic mind, he opened up new and wonderful paths of historical investigation. It is true certain unsympathetic critics might urge that the *Morning Post* had already chided the Bolsheviks as being Asiatics; we all know, however, that that organ of reactionary imperialism only says such things in order to split the working class movement. It is also true that Mr. Lloyd George has, on many occasions, chastised the barbaric rulers of the savage Muscovite country for being Asiatic and oriental in their tactics. Mr. Winston Churchill, too, has repeatedly expressed his disgust, in various ways, at the anti-European policy of the Russian Communists. Neither Lloyd George nor Churchill, however, had the dashing courage of Mr. Frank Hodges to throw these reactionary and anti-international taunts in the face of a Labour conference. In any case they lacked the requisite historical education and polish, not having been to Ruskin College, to work out the "Asiatic mind" theory to its logical conclusion.

Since Mr. Hodges supplied us with the new key to history we are able to see many things in a new light. Observe how, for example, men like Oliver Cromwell have swindled the historians. Cromwell executed a king and proclaimed a revolutionary dictatorship. No Englishman, according to our polished authority, would have done such things. Mr. Hodges has unmasked Cromwell and shown him to be an Asiatic. The English mind always conceives political and social conflicts as a constitutional and peaceful process. Parliamentary action is one of its racial virtues, and ballot boxes flow in its very blood. The leaders of the French revolution, like Danton, who sent a monarch to the scaffold, and who instituted a terror against their class enemies, were simply a bunch of Asiatic maniacs trying to pass themselves off as real Frenchmen. By applying this "Asiatic mind" theory to revolutionary periods one cannot help making some amazing discoveries. By developing the method a little further, and in other directions, we should not be at all surprised were Mr. Hodges able to establish, as an historical fact, that Judas Iscariot and Ananias were polished Welshmen and Jesus Christ a Russian suffering from an Asiatic mind.

## II.

### RACIALISM AND "EDUCATION."

In the August issue of the REVIEW we showed, in an outline of the German crisis, that the junkers of that country, sought to stampee the workers by patriotic and emotional references to the greatness of their "Teutonic mind." This racial appeal was used to try and hurl the masses of Germany against the Republic in the interests of the Kaiser and the reactionaries; and it was couched in exactly the same language as that used at Edinburgh, by

Hodges, against the Communists. Students of history are aware that the superficial snob, like the reactionary humbug, always betrays himself by his manner of attempting to explain world-wide complex *social* movements as the outcome of inherent *biological* racial qualities or as the result of inborn national characteristics. Mr. F. Hodges, who makes frantic endeavours to emulate the average bourgeois intellectual, is miles behind middle-class Liberal thinkers, who, in general, subscribe to the statement made generations ago by John Stuart Mill, who, in criticising the shallow pates of his own day, emphatically declared:—

“Of all vulgar modes of escaping the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences.”

And T. H. Huxley, who made no rhetorical claims to being either an internationalist or a “polished” labour leader, commenting on racial and national characteristics, said, very truly, that it was a subject about which “more nonsense, and often very mischievous nonsense, has been, and is, talked than upon any other topic.”

The indispensable condition necessary for the perpetuation of capitalism is a working class divided against itself, nationally and internationally. Ever since the rise of private property, which brought in its train the class struggle and consequently the class State, it has been one of the principal tasks of the propertied interests to weaken the exploited masses by stirring up racial feuds among them. A dismembered working class is impotent; and it is this impotency that has been the strength of the ruling class throughout the history of exploitation. When Mr. Hodges, in urging the Labour Party to create disunity in the working class movement by expelling the Communists and by appealing to the racial prejudices of the delegates, in his reference to the “Asiatic mind” of the Russian revolutionaries, he simply adopted the classic tactic advocated by the most cunning defenders of slavery in Greece and Rome. Plato, in his *Laws*, and Aristotle, in his *Politics*, show how to minimise the possibility of revolts through dividing the slaves against themselves by means of their racial animosities. On several occasions the Roman State was shaken by slave insurrections. It was found that Spartacus had organised his revolt from slaves who mainly were Thracians and Gauls; in the Sicilian slave wars the rebels were mostly Syrians. The Roman slave owners realised that once the slaves surmounted their racial hatreds the first step towards organised revolt had been accomplished. Thus Varro, in his great work, in which he shows, among other things, the best method of managing slaves, urges upon the Roman ruling class—“You should not buy too many slaves of the same race, for nothing breeds trouble in the household more than this.” There was nothing inconsistent in the policy advocated by Plato, Aristotle, and Varro. They were slave-owners and sought to perpetuate that system of exploitation. It is, however, hypocritical and treacherous for a highly-paid leader of wage-slaves, in the twentieth century, to adopt the policy used by slave-owners, thousands of years ago, to keep the masses divided and, therefore, in subjection.

When we come to modern capitalism we reach a period where the motto of the Roman slave-owners, divide and conquer, in many subtle and devious ways, is utilised to an amazing degree. The existence of large imperialist States depends upon the fomenting of racial hatreds and national jealousies among the workers. In

keeping with the economic interests of the capitalist class and imperialism, the whole educational system is saturated through and through with the poison of racial and national bias. This is so well known to honest Labourists and trade unionists that an attempt, through the Labour colleges and Plebs League, has been made to counteract the alarming and dangerous historical fallacies taught in modern educational institutions. So serious do the capitalists view this movement of independent working class education that Lord Sydenham, speaking in the House of Lords, denounced the Plebs League as a seditious agency!

Capitalism not only exploits the workers as wealth-producers. It is also necessary for it to control their minds in order to govern their actions and thus be able to use their bodies as cannon fodder during imperialist disputes. To achieve this it has been necessary for the propertied interests to invent a conception of history based upon racial differences and national characteristics. Each imperial State teaches its workers that *they* alone belong to the most superior race in history, and one which is destined to rule the world. For generations the German masses have been taught about the wondrous historical rôle to be played by the Teutons. Even English writers, like Houston Chamberlain, and French savants, like Gobineau and de Lapouge, have helped to swell the heads of the German junkers by their stupid theory of Teutonic superiority. Likewise in Britain, we are told about the amazing racial qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race. When Britain and Germany go to war the masses are led to the slaughter because they have been mentally doped, in many cases by their labour leaders, to believe that their particular race or nation possesses the sacred things in life worth defending. Thus, in organising a war, the imperialists see to it that the opposing nation is presented to the workers in the blackest colours. Serious historians will write and show that the enemy is a menace to civilisation and culture. Sober scientists will attempt to prove that the other side, as a result of its racial mind, or in consequence of its inborn national characteristics, must be crushed in the field of battle. Thus, by prostituting history and science, in the service of imperialism, national and racial hatreds are fomented among the international proletariat. This severe indictment of modern education as a medium of propagating racial bias and national hatred among the workers in the interest of capitalism may, at first sight, seem grossly exaggerated. The Press of this country has, time after time, exposed the racial doctrine at work in *other* lands. Quite recently the *Manchester Guardian* (12/7/22) proved that the educational establishments in Germany, even with the Social Democrats as the controlling elements in Parliament, were under the domination of scholastic reactionaries who were teaching racial fallacies as one of the methods of rallying the masses to the support of the junkers and monarchists. The same thing is true in France, and identical forces are at work in this country. The racial doctrine reaches its most dangerous level in those capitalist countries, such as America and South Africa, where the workers are drawn from many lands. One of our most courageous publicists, in exposing the function of modern education as an instrument for dividing the international working class, through the advocacy of race egoism, says:—

“Most serious of all is the persistent attempt to seize the school system for Imperialism. To capture the childhood of the country . . .

to poison its early understanding of history by false ideals and pseudo heroes, and by a consequent disparagement and neglect of the really vital and elevating lessons of the past . . . to feed the always overweening pride of race at an age when self-confidence most commonly prevails, and by necessary implication to disparage other nations, so starting children in the world with false measures of value and an unwillingness to learn from foreign sources—to fasten this base insularity of mind and morals upon the little children of a nation and to call it patriotism is as foul an abuse of education as it is possible to conceive. Yet the power of Church and State over primary education is being bent consistently to this purpose, while the blend of clericalism and autocratic academicism which dominates the secondary education of the country pours its enthusiasm into the same evil channel. . . . Philosophy, the natural sciences, history, economics, sociology, are to be employed in setting up new earthworks against the attack of the disinherited masses upon the vested interests of plutocracy. . . . Biology and science weave their convenient theories of a race-struggle for the subjugation of the inferior peoples, in order that we, the Anglo-Saxon, may take their lands and live upon their labours. (*Imperialism*, pp. 229-230-234, by J. A. Hobson.)

Mr. Hobson may not be aware that this form of capitalist-class domination and bias in educational spheres is now termed by its votaries as “*impartial*” culture and social science!

Several honest trade unionists and Labourists realise these evils of the modern educational system, and have resolutely set their power against them. But the Labour Party is teeming with ambitious and egoistical careerists, like Hodges, who use Labour Party conferences to propagate reactionary racial dogmas which are even rejected and denounced by distinguished Liberal publicists like J. A. Hobson and J. M. Robertson. The British Labour Party, in its statements upon international policy, always looks like a barking mongrel that has been tied behind the chariot of middle-class Liberalism.

The imperialist idea behind the advocacy of inherent racial differences and inborn national characteristics is to divide the world into inferior and superior groups. In order that modern capitalism may flourish it is necessary to destroy every shred of international solidarity among the workers. By always pointing out to the masses in each country that *they* belong to the world's superior race it is possible to stimulate an emotional racial pride which can readily be harnessed in the interests of the plundering war expeditions of capitalism. While the propertied interests pay lip service to democracy, which is *theoretically* based on the equality of all citizens, in *practice* every intelligent worker knows that there is no equality, either politically or economically, under capitalism. In the same way the politicians and savants of propertied society talk about racial and national equality; in reality, however, they use every instrument of public opinion to stir up racial and national jealousies among the masses. Once the venal historians and shoddy scientists are permitted to establish that there are inferior and superior races they speedily show that this not only justifies racial and national subjection, but that it implies the existence of *inferior and superior classes*. And if it is historically necessary for a superior State to rule over a colony of inferior people it is equally logical for a superior class, the propertied interests, of course, to rule over social inferiors like the proletariat. Thus the fallacy of superior and inferior races becomes a weapon of reaction in the hands of the capitalists, to dominate backward races abroad and to rule over inferior masses at home.

## III.

## RACIALISM AND CLASS STRUGGLE.

In the idealistic and shining moments of the revolution of the bourgeoisie they inscribed "the liberation of the entire human race" and the "rights of man" upon their banner. They needed these uplifting and emotional appeals in order to stimulate the activity of their class in its terrific struggle against the economic and political powers of feudalism. The propertied interests never lack ideals to sustain them in their effort to extend their economic dominion; and, as we have already noted, they even harness culture and "impartial" social science in the service of property. As the capitalist system, in its hunger for new markets and foreign areas of plunder, is compelled to subjugate the native races, it formulates "scientific" reasons to justify this policy. Just as Aristotle, in the jingo days of the Athenian slave State, contended that it was only natural that inferiors should be doomed to toil in the interests of their superiors, so imperialist capitalism produces an epidemic of writers on the racial question who consider it as a process of nature that certain peoples are so inherently inferior that it is necessary for some large superior State to take them in hand. This amazing theory may be found elaborated in thousands of superficial and "scientific" volumes professing to deal with ethnology and anthropology. These writers, having satisfied themselves that "backward" people are in reality members of some inferior human stock and could never, under any circumstances, raise themselves to the status of a superior race, supply the historical and theoretical reasons that support imperialism and racial subjugation. The theory has always been exploited by the ruling class, particularly during those periods when the propertied interests found it necessary to embark upon colonial and plundering expeditions to get slaves, tribute, trade routes, mineral zones, or "spheres of influence."

The reactionary and imperialist doctrine regarding superior and inferior races is not only directed against backward and coloured peoples; it is also utilised as a class weapon against the rebellious labouring masses in every modern capitalist country. In this respect, as always, the Church has assisted the ruling propertied interests by translating the theory of racial and social inequality into an important part of its creed. Its smug-faced sermonising of the workers to meekly accept the social condition into which God, in his infinite wisdom, has placed them, gives the racial doctrine the odour of sanctity. By thus receiving the halo of religion the racial theory, as applied to the class struggle, tends to duplicate the caste system within imperialist States.

It is interesting to observe the psychological reaction of the race dogma upon the ruling class at various periods in history. The slave-owners looked upon their slaves as occupying a status in the national world somewhere between the brute and the human species. The haughty Greeks and Romans defined a slave as an articulate tool. In the middle-ages the barons looked upon their serfs as part of the live stock of their demesne. When the revolutionary burghers aspired to become a ruling class they were treated with the utmost contempt by the blue-blooded aristocracy, who viewed trade and commerce as a natural occupation for the vulgar orders. To-day, when the bourgeoisie is politically and economically triumphant, it views the proletariat with undisguised disgust.

A detailed analysis of the history of the class conflict, within

any imperialist country, will show that the race dogma is not only used against backward natives, but is equally useful as a weapon of class subjection. It is no accident that the first and greatest attempt made, in recent times, to state the case for superior and inferior races, in the terms of class, should have appeared after the first great onslaught of the European proletariat against its masters, which culminated in 1848. Not only had the *Communist Manifesto* appeared by this time, but a new and deeper note had been struck by the working class movement. From a mere protest for the passing of several incidental reforms, the workers were now beginning consciously to organise to challenge the propertied interests in every sphere of society in order to destroy its power. Up to 1847 the Socialist movement imagined that it was only necessary to change the hearts of their masters. With the appearance of the *Communist Manifesto*, in 1847, it was seen that the real aim of the proletariat, in carrying out its historic task of emancipation, was to *uproot* the political domination of the capitalist class and destroy its social system of wage-slavery. Conscious of the many elements of division that separated the masses, the *Communist Manifesto* concluded its marvellous revolutionary statement by the inspiring appeal—“*Workers of All Lands Unite.*” It was in France, in 1848, that the revolutionary proletariat delivered its first powerful blow at its masters. And it was in France, a few years later, that there appeared Gobineau’s well-known work on the natural inequality of human races. This marked the beginning of a long stream of books, which sought to sustain the thesis:—That due to the inherent inequality of races the common and inferior masses should only be too delighted to accept the rulership of their natural superiors.

These “scientists” who discussed the racial theory put forward the most fantastic notions. Some, like de Lapouge and Reimer, carried the dogma to such a degree that they calmly discussed the best means whereby the world could be swept clean of inferior racial types and a “natural” aristocracy perpetuated. They anticipated our modern eugenists by actually proposing to organise ways and means for the purpose of impregnating women with the superior seed of the great race! It is interesting to note, that according to the racial classification drawn up by these two gentlemen, that Frank Hodges belongs to the inferior or Celtic group!

In England, Sir Francis Galton, in his *Hereditary Genius*, attempted to work out an elaborate argument by showing the *innate differences* among various classes and their relation to racial stocks. By means of overlooking the most obvious social facts he was able to show the superior mental qualities possessed by the propertied classes.

The Bolshevik revolution has, naturally, created a bewildering number of books on the surpassing racial qualities of the ruling class. The other week one was published—*The Revolt Against Civilisation* (by Lothrop Stoddard). In this amazing volume it is demonstrated, by a showy display of “scientific” fundamentals, that the only thing that matters is the racial “germ plasm.” By a series of the most absurd generalisations, which are accepted in certain quarters as the very last word in scientific analysis, the author, anticipating Frank Hodges, damns Bolshevism upon racial grounds. No doubt serious and honest students of social science can afford to laugh at such hysterical nonsense, which prostitutes science in order to stimulate the egoism of the ruling class. But

when we find similar arguments, of a racial character, being bandied about in Labour conferences, and reprinted in bold type in the official organ of the I.L.P., it is necessary to draw attention to the matter. The propertied interests have been told so often, during the centuries, that they are *the superior ones* of the world, that it becomes one of the many factors which makes them fight ferociously in the class struggle not only to maintain their economic and political powers, but to guard these as cherished legacies handed to them for protection, by history and Nature, against the proletarian rabble.

The bias of racial superiority, and the mental pompousness which it creates, can best be seen at work in the mind of imperialists, like Winston Churchill, who arrogantly assert that Labour is unfit to rule. In this way the dogma of racial inferiority becomes a reactionary boomerang when used by superficial Labourists. The superior Hodges who sneers at the poor benighted antics of the Russian Communists and their low Asiatic mind, is himself, in turn, struck down by the same argument by the more superior and bombastic Winston Churchill. Aristocrats like Lord H. Cecil smile contemptuously at those who imagine that he and his like are evolved from the same quality of germ plasm as the masses. The Churchills and Cecils, etc., firmly believe that their class is destined to rule because it belongs to an inherently superior race whose special innate characteristic it is to look after the unfortunate masses and workers who come from an inferior racial stock. We see, thus, how the fallacy of inferior and superior races becomes an important weapon in the class struggle.

#### IV.

#### A RACIAL SCIENTIST AT WORK.

As an illustration of how even distinguished scientists can descend to stupid gibberish, and reach the same mental depths as that touched by Frank Hodges in his attack upon the Russian Communists, observe how a well-known and well meaning anthropologist gets muddled up in dealing with Bolshevism from the racial standpoint. Sir Harry Johnston, in reviewing the book on *The Revolt Against Civilisation*, which we have already mentioned, says:—

"In Russia, prior to the War, there was an aristocracy of about two millions in number, mainly of Norse, Finn, German, Polish, Caucasian descent; handsome in person, talented, but somewhat enslaved by the Greek form of Christianity (the Middle Ages embodied); there was a middle class of some thirty millions composed firstly of much the same racial elements, but additionally with large Slav and educated Jew elements superadded, very intelligent and enlightened, but not warlike. There were about a hundred millions of land-affixed, illiterate, sturdy peasants—proto-European, Slav, Mongol, Tartar in composition; and lastly, and terribly, there were some six hundred thousand Anarchists—Bolsheviks whom we had formerly known as 'Nihilists,' of very mixed racial origin—Aryan, Finn, West Asiatic Mongols, and long-embittered Jews."

In the same strain he babbles on:—

"To us this insensate outbreak of Anarchism seemed at first childish unreason, the sort of incoherent raving against the hard-working burgesses which we English, Scottish, Belgians, Dutch, French, Scandinavians, Swiss, Austrians, and Germans mostly are. It was the outcry not of the peasant and cultivator, the cabinet-maker and engineer, the chemist and professor of sciences, the surgeon and physician, the naturalist and stock-breeder, the financier and house-keeper, the electrician, plumber, builder, and cook; but of professionless wild-eyed Slavs and semi-Tartars of Germany and Hungary, and, most and worst of all, of unbalanced Russia." (*Observer*, July 2nd, 1922.)

These Nihilists, Anarchists and Bolsheviks—all interchangeable

political terms according to our learned author—are organised to oppose the love of science and to advocate murder. We wonder if Sir H. Johnston is aware that the handsome and talented racial elements which formed the ruling class of the old régime were responsible for the notorious illiteracy of the Russian peasants; that they organised massacres of the masses and covered the snowy wastes of Siberia with prisons which held the noblest fighters for freedom that history has known? Does he know that the only attempt ever made in Russia to educate the masses and to enable them to have a “love for science” was *after* the “wild eyed Slavs” rose to power? The beauty and culture of the Russian aristocracy were not attributes of their racial character, but came from their wealth and leisure which was based upon the enforced labour and compulsory ignorance of millions who were compelled to drag out lives of painful burden. The culture and riches of the one group, and the ignorance and poverty of the other, cannot be explained upon racial grounds but only from the standpoint of *class relationships*. No one knows this better than Sir Harry H. Johnston himself. In his magnificent volume on *The Negro in the New World* (page 383) he shows how callous the ruling class of South America was in its attempt to justify the enslavement of the negroes, by quoting some of them who argue:—

“The institution of slavery operates by contrast and comparison; it elevates the tone of the superior, adds to their refinement, allows more time to cultivate the mind, exalts the standard in morals, manners, and intellectual endowments; operates as a safety for the evil disposed, leaving the upper race purer, while it really preserves from degradation in the scale of civilisation the inferior, which we see is their uniform destiny when left to themselves.”

“It is by the existence of slavery, exempting so large a portion of our citizens from labour, that we have leisure for intellectual pursuits.” (Page 384.)

These arguments are much more reasonable than those put forward by Sir H. Johnston in his stupid lament over the disappearance of the handsome and cultured parasites who enslaved the masses of Russia under the bloody régime of Czarism.

Sir Harry Johnston is one of those queer, lop-sided, humanitarian Liberals who have a great deal of well merited sympathy for the coloured subject races, but who have nothing but the utmost contempt and hatred for the rebellious proletarian masses of Europe. He is of the type who is able, and this is to its credit, to rise above the clap-trap regarding the eternal inferiority of the negro race, but who become violent and ignorant reactionaries when embroiled in the class struggle at home. He is like the lady who is most enthusiastic in her endeavour to find homes for lost cats and dogs, but who denounces those in Russia who have tried to provide homes for children of the working class. How easy it is for a calm and scientific investigator to trip himself, when denouncing Bolshevism, may be seen in Sir H. Johnston's criticism of Mr. Lothrop Stoddard for his bigoted intolerance towards negroes. Sir Harry assures us, however, that this author has the racial virtue of possessing “a thorough-going Anglo-Saxon belief in freedom.” Anglo-Saxon freedom, it will be noted, has the rare and thorough-going racial quality of drawing the line at the black races; in this it is very similar to the limitations of Sir Harry Johnston who can scathingly denounce the slave-holders of past generations, but who descends to a low level of infantile idiocy when defending the slave owners and imperialists of his own day. The thorough-going nature of Anglo-Saxon freedom

may be further judged by the admission by Sir H. Johnston, in *The Negro in the New World*, that the Anglo-Saxons were much crueller in their treatment of the negroes than were the Spaniards.

## V.

## INTERNATIONALISM.

The events of the past few years prove that the overthrow of capitalism will not be accomplished by the J. R. MacDonald Sunday school tactics of peaceful persuasion. Unless the proletariat is powerfully organised in every social plane, the capitalist class will rend the whole social fabric in its desperation to defend its political and economic privileges. There is nothing it will refuse to do, from cruelty to cajolery, to maintain its power. It has, as a result of centuries of carefully stimulated racial passions, a powerful weapon for reactionary purposes. As the class struggle grows more intense the propertied interests will attempt to smash international proletarian solidarity with the weapon of racial and national egoism. France has used its black troops on the Rhine against the Germans. To attack these coloured soldiers, as has been done in certain Labour circles, is simply to antagonise them, and by so doing to play into the hands of the European imperialists. Those who criticise certain habits of coloured soldiers might remember the shameless conduct of white troops in colonial and subject countries. The presence and conduct of capitalist armies anywhere, irrespective of their colour, is not the fault of the soldiers; it is due to the imperialist policy of capitalist States, and it is against it that the protest must be made.

In South Africa, in the recent strike; in America, and in the European countries, capitalism fights the masses by emotional appeals to racial differences. Samuel Gompers in America, like Frank Hodges in Britain, plays the capitalist game by continually harping on the racial issue. The Labour movement must carefully watch these men, because the racial maniac, particularly in the trade union international, is a power of strength to the enemy. Even the British Labour Party, despite all its declarations of sympathy for India, etc., has no intention, if it comes into power, of handing the government of these countries over to the native peoples. Messrs. Henderson and Thomas, despite their flowery phrases will see to it that the British Empire remains—an Empire. Any other attitude must not be expected from a Party dominated, at present, by privy councillors.

The Communist attitude to the racial and national problem is one of enabling and assisting the masses of the world, despite their colour, creed, or race, to work out their emancipation by means of the international class struggle. Since the Soviet revolution it has been demonstrated that the so-called backward races of the Near East are capable of grasping the significance of the Soviet structure of social organisation. Although it has taken the European races over a thousand years to travel from barbarism to their present point of social development, it does not follow that it will take other races a similar period to build up a modern social system. Japan is a case in point. The fruit of the struggle of the centuries is a harvest which the backward peoples can enjoy *now*. Society is, at present, on the verge of a world revolution. In the liberation of new elements, and with the appearance of new social forces, it is possible that the present backward races may be so stimulated by the impetus of transition that they will sweep to the front. The much abused

Machiavelli, one of the most brilliant political thinkers of all time, contended :—

“Such is the nature of men that, when they have reached their ends by a certain road, they cannot understand that, the times being different, success may be won by other methods and the old ways are no longer of use.”

This germinal thought is now one of the accepted facts of modern evolution. It is a sheer perversion of the theory of evolution to imagine that development goes on and on in a straight line. This “end on” Huxleyian conception of development has been abandoned. Modern science is beginning to understand that after certain groups of the human race have carried on the struggle for a considerable period, less specialised but virile groups come forward to do new pioneering work by beginning on new lines with the materials created by its predecessors. The Russian Communists, with their “Asiatic mind,” have stimulated into enthusiastic and intelligent action millions of people recently emerged from tribal society. This is one of the greatest achievements of the Russian revolution, of which very little is known in this country. While capitalist America and Australia fear the advent of the yellow workers, these, by taking their place in the factories and workshops of Russia, become full-fledged citizens of the Soviet Republic.

The Communists, unlike the Labourists and imperialists, do not split the workers into racial or geographical groups. Our task is to replace the sentiment of race and nationality with an international consciousness of class. The creation of an organised and disciplined international class-conscious proletariat is the only effective reply to the reactionary imperialists who seek to divide the masses against themselves by means of racial and national hatreds. By extending the Federal Soviet Republics from one country to another the world-proletariat will create an international system of society wherein the economic interests of the human race will become identical. Only in this way can human solidarity be achieved. Throughout the ages the struggle of the human family over the means of life compelled it to throw up social organisations—the clan, the racial tribe, the city and national State—which divided it against itself. The achievement of Communism, through international class struggle, means the triumph of man over the material forces which have made human unity hitherto impossible. Only through the creation of Communism, with its world-embracing economy and culture, can man, as Marx well said, “by thus acting on the external world and changing it,” change his own nature. This is the aim, to be achieved through struggle, that the Communist International has boldly set out to achieve.

The Second International proclaims itself as an organ of the world-wide struggling masses; in reality it is merely a sheet used as a cover for capitalism. And when Frank Hodges attempted to stab the Russian revolutionaries with the racial weapon of the “Asiatic mind,” he succeeded in cutting a gaping rent in that shoddy fabric, and exposed the menace of racialism and reactionary imperialism that lurks behind it.

# THE JESUS-THINKERS

BY MICHAEL GOLD

**J**ESUS suffered and died for something He believed good; He was not a verbose, tricky journalist, a successful parson, a cunning exploiter of labour, or even a politician, and for this we must respect Him. For His age Jesus was undoubtedly an innocent and beautiful poetical voice of all that is best in the emotions of the animal Man; we can love Him for that, as we love Shelley and Whitman. We have all of us His tender child-hunger in our veins, that makes us dream of a simple and gentle world, where there is no strife, where all is mild and fraternal, and where men are as little children. It is a beautiful weakness to try to live in that world now. It is a cowardice, too, and must be extirpated from one's soul with a terrible knife if one is to become a man. The spirit of Jesus, His legend in one's blood, leads to confusion, ineffectiveness, and despair in the modern world. Exactly as we must learn to break loose from our earthly fathers to become men, so we must cast off the Heavenly Father of Jesus, and stand with firmly planted feet on the earth. Just as we outgrow the fantasies and follies of childhood, so must we outgrow the follies of the young superstitious Jesus in order to understand reality and conquer it.

For Jesus was a savage and a child. He was subjective, as are children and savages. He believed only in the workings of His own imagination; He did not construct His picture of life from the world around Him, as do active men, scientists and others who live on this planet of mud and blood and suffering. Jesus made no concessions to the outer world. Neither does a child. How painful and long is the process by which it learns that fire burns, and knives cut human flesh, and all food is not equally good. What years of stubborn battling before it yields to the truth of human limitation! Jesus never yielded to that truth; He claimed up to His death that His desires were everything, and the world nothing. And He did not love humble men and women enough to understand their problems, and to teach them a way out. He strove to make them perfect at a bound. He was the most savage of despots, exactly like a child. He wanted a world fashioned after his own fantasy, and since the world could not respond, He felt Himself a persecuted saint. Why did He not think out the simplest programme that would benefit the suffering world of the poor by even the slightest fraction? Why did He leave them in misery, with only the vision of a perfect and impossible world before their tear-blurred eyes? It was because He was a child—Jesus was ever the Son of God. He was never a man, He remained a child.

It is still necessary to discuss Jesus, because His legend has crept into the blood of every social philosopher of the western world, and it causes much damage still. Our pacifists are Jesus-thinkers, our Liberals are all Jesus-thinkers (except in wars against other nations), most of our Socialists hoist the flag of Jesus and become bitter humanitarians when they wish to attack Soviet Russia; the taint is everywhere.

The Jesus-thinker knows that he is good, fraternal, just and equalitarian; and he wants the world to become that way. Human misery wounds him to the heart; he would die, as did Jesus, to

make men happy and free. He is a fine type of super-being, but he makes the typical Jesus-mistake of refusing to admit that there are obstacles in the path of such a world. There are governments, policemen, capitalists, politicians, armies, navies, gunmen, the state. To the Jesus-thinker these count for nothing. It is necessary only to be noble and to save other souls for nobility. It is not necessary to think out plans for meeting the opposition, for there is no opposition to nobility. It is not necessary to think about what might happen if millions of the poor suddenly rose against the rich; and the rich turned machine guns on them. It is not necessary to think about what to do with men who try to assassinate the leaders of a free and fraternal world, as they who sought to assassinate Lenin.

The Jesus-thinkers care only for the nobility and purity of their own souls. They are ethical. But does a doctor dream of ethics when he is cutting some rotten flesh out of the side of a sick man? Does a drowning swimmer think of nobility and purity when he is caught by an undertow? He thinks only of objective things, of the force of the waves. He thinks of his own force. The doctor thinks scientifically when he is performing an operation. There is a science in human history, too; that is what the Jesus-thinkers will never admit or see. They mistake their own longings for the movement of humanity. They are egotists, worried about their own souls. They refuse to be objective. It is an ethical crime in their eyes to acknowledge that the majority of mankind acts in certain ways, and to study those ways scientifically, in order to control them for the greatest ends. Jesus-thinkers believe in every science but the science of human happiness.

For Jesus-thinkers want a fraternal world, but they are not willing to pay the full price—which is thought and action. They want only to feel. They want humanity saved as Jesus saved it, preaching and seducing to righteousness a few simple fishermen in a little village of Palestine. They are villagers. They refuse to look at the immense forces of economics and politics with which the fate of humanity is now bound up. They refuse to join parties, to aid in the control and manipulation of those forces. They have no programme to carry out, to manœuvre for, to scheme for, to fight for and fight others for. That is why they can be pure and pacifistic. The best pacifist generally has a fine income. Poor people are notoriously bloody and bitter when aroused. And the poor have a definite programme, based on the source of all our woes, the industrial system. But the best Jesus-thinker is one who has nothing more to gain in this world; he is above the battle. Poor people have so much to gain; no wonder they cannot help fighting.

Jesus-thinkers, like Debs and Anatole France, act on the theory that the Russian Bolsheviks have some sort of special craving for bloodshed, and that is why they sent a message asking for the release of the Social Revolutionary leaders. It does not matter that these leaders plotted for the death of Lenin, and aided Wrangel, Denikine, and the Allies in the killing of hundreds of thousands of poor Russian workers and peasants. The Jesus-thinker pardons his enemies (sometimes). Would a Socialist Jesus-thinker have pardoned Wrangel and Kolchak? Might he have perhaps even not resisted them, but turned the other cheek? It would have been a lovely ethical gesture, but it would have not been scientific, say the Bolsheviks. And it is not scientific, men being what they are, to give the Russian nation the impression that these Social Revolu-

tionaries were correct in sending an assassin with poisoned bullets to shoot Lenin. Other men are waiting to shoot Lenin, and the Allies still wait outside the borders to swoop down and kill, maim, rape, hang, burn and destroy the citizens of the first workers' republic at the next sign of faltering or weakness. Jesus-thinkers hate to believe this, however. They can never believe anything but goodness of the enemy; they are not scientists, and refuse to accept reality.

I have mentioned Debs in the foregoing paragraph and his message to the Soviets. Debs, of course, is not of the cheap, rangy Socialist political type that seized upon this opening to subtly stir up more sentiment in the west against the Russian regime. He is a friend of the Soviets. He is a labour man to the core, and a great labour man. His message to the striking railroad workers and miners was virile and realistic. It is what Lenin might have said to them. But why this Jesus-taint in the blood of the grand old Debs? Why, if he is behind the strikers, though they have killed scabs here and there, and burned down buildings, does he turn against the Russians, though they have been stung into protection against their own scabs? It is a mystery—a Christian mystery.

No; Jesus was a child, and we must not follow a child in a world where all the strength and wisdom of a man are needed if one is to survive. Millions of human beings die of famine in this world. Millions live in slums, amid bed-bugs, dirt, disease and hunger. Millions work under masters who starve them and shoot them down in strikes. The hospitals are filled with the innocent victims of poverty, the jails, the asylums tell their story. There is a giant edifice of tyranny and woe built upon human bodies. What is to be done? We must study the conditions and fight a way through this wilderness. We must not think about our own souls; we must think of the destiny of humanity. We must drive through at any cost—the world infamy must end. And it is not enough to feel this all—one must think and act. The legend of Lenin is more beautiful to me than the legend of Jesus. A strong, practical man with a heart as pure as that of Jesus leads great masses to emancipation; steels himself against the bloody sacrifices that must be made, and wins to a tentative victory. Victory—not purity. The Russian Bolsheviks will leave the world a better place than Jesus left it. They will leave it on the threshold of the final victory—the poor will have bread and peace and culture in another generation, not churches and a swarm of lying parasite minister dogs, the legacy of Jesus.

—(From *The Liberator*.)

## TRADE UNIONS AND COMMUNISM *By Karl Kreibich*

**S**INCE the Special Convention of November, 1921, which achieved the unity of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party, a systematic Communist activity was started in the Czecho-Slovakian trade unions. A special party organ was launched to guide the work within the trade unions and to unify all the Communist elements for the purpose of winning over the trade unions to the Communist cause.

The General Congress of Trade Unions, held in January, 1922, brought considerable moral success for the Red Labour Union, in spite of all the machinations of the Social Democratic Trade Union bureaucracy, although it was, strictly speaking, the first appearance of the organised Communists within the trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia. If we consider this circumstance it will not surprise us to learn that the Congress did not bring us complete victory.

As is well known, in Czecho-Slovakia there exist parallel with the Central (Czech) trade unions also German trade unions.

In the German trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia, Communist work started from the spring of 1921. That happened, in the first place, because within the German labour movement the process of transformation of the left opposition within the Social Democracy led it much sooner into the Communist Party; and, in the second place, because the more overbearing behaviour of the German trade union bureaucracy in its relation to the Communists forced the latter to intensify its labour and to carry on its activity with much greater determination. Even Communist secretaries of trade unions would be often dismissed; among the textile workers entire local branches were excluded for having adopted the Communist view. Besides that, the German trade union bureaucracy saw a menace to its rule coming from two directions. The Communists within the German separatist trade unions led the fight both for a revolutionising of the organisations and against the national separatism of the trade union bureaucracy, demanding the union of the Czech and German workers. Among the workers in the building trades, the agricultural workers, the chemical and the wood workers, whose central trade unions had already been under the leadership of the Communists, a strong centralising current started with the result that a number of local branches of the German separatist trade unions united with the Czech organisations.

The Communists' idea reached the workers in the Czecho-Slovakian unions by two roads. When the Czecho-Slovakian Social Democratic Party split in the autumn of 1920 a part of the active workers in the trade union movement also separated from the reformists and followed the majority of the old party which then formed the Left Social Democratic Party. When these Lefts in their turn followed the road of the Communist International and took the name of the Communist Party, a certain part of those workers within the trade unions returned to the reformists, while another part, smaller and without influence, led by the railroad worker Brodetsky, organised the Centrist group. The majority of the Left trade union workers entered the Communist Party and with it the Third International. Thus, the trade unions of wood workers, chemical workers, and workers of the building trades found themselves under the leadership of Communists.

Nevertheless the majority of these comrades on entering the Communist Party did not understand sufficiently clearly their duties as workers within the trade unions. While the Czech Communist Party and the German Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia both participated in the Third Congress of the Communist International, only the German trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia

were represented at the first Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions.

The resolutions of the Third International Congress and of the Executive Committee of the Communist International placed two tasks before the Communists of Czecho-Slovakia : the formation of a single Communist Party and active work in winning over the trade unions. Immediately after the Congress the first task was successfully realised at the Unity Convention of November, 1921. This was possible only because all active comrades as well as all the Communist forces of the movement concentrated on it as their most important task. On account of this the work in the trade unions and, it may be noticed in passing, also the work among the youth was neglected. Only after the Communist Party was united did real work begin for the winning over of the trade unions, as we have already remarked in the beginning of this article.

The task of co-ordinating the work in the trade unions met with great obstacles with the very first steps. Along with the comrades who became Communists and leaders in the trade unions in the way described above, there was still another group of Communist trade union workers, whose activities developed somewhat differently. Thus among the agricultural workers a group of left wing comrades, immediately after the split within the Social Democratic Party started a determined activity towards winning over for the revolution their union, comprising about 200,000 members, the strongest trade union of Czecho-Slovakia. These comrades working in complete harmony with the slogans of the Communist International won over their trade union at the last Convention. That happened when neither the tactics of the Red Labour Union International nor the principles of Communist activity in the movement were clearly formulated. Besides, the connection of these comrades with the R.I.L.U. was rather weak and Communist leadership within the trade unions was non-existent. For this reason these comrades had to work on their own account and at their own risk. Immediately after they had gained the union the General Centre of Czecho-Slovakia started a bitter campaign against them. The trade union of Agrarian workers was covered with mud and dirt, and its work was hindered in various ways. A second organisation bearing the name "Odbrove Zdrujehni" worked parallel with the trade union commission in order to split the agricultural workers. Unfortunately the comrades at the head of the union of agricultural workers allowed themselves to fall victims to provocation and to be excluded from the general trade union organisation, instead of accepting the fight while remaining within it. However, they were not entirely to blame. Part of the blame must fall upon those Communist leaders of other trade unions who did not offer them the necessary aid in the general trade union organisation. On both sides there was lacking a clear understanding of Communist duty within the trade union movement. As a result of that there was the absence of unity and co-ordination in all activities. Thus when the newly organised Communist Party started its work of unifying all activity within the trade unions and of preparing for the general convention of the trade unions, the Union of Agricultural Workers was

still outside of the national organisation. The attempt to correct this blunder before the Convention was unsuccessful (1).

Another unpleasant consequence of the old blunders was a certain strained relation between the Communist at the head of the Union of Agricultural Workers and the leaders of other trade unions. In this way the difficulties which the young United Communist Party met on the way of its trade union activity were considerable, even in its own ranks. This proves once again the old truth that all hesitation and obscurity result in disaster.

The greatest merit of the General Trade Union Convention held in January was that it drew the attention of the working masses to the conflict between Amsterdam and Moscow. It also revealed the weak spots of our own movement. Our comrades active in the trade unions have learned much from this Convention and have received great encouragement for continuing their work of winning over the trade unions to their side.

Great activity has been shown during the last several months. The results were soon apparent. In Slovakia the labour movement remains in the hands of our comrades despite all the machinations of the Social Democrats who do not stop before the lowest methods in their support of the State institutions. Unfortunately there is a lack of skilled forces, and this interferes with full activity. The Union of Shoe Workers, won over during the Easter Convention, joined the other trade unions in favour of the R.I.L.U.

Naturally, the Amsterdamers who shout to the entire world about "the Communists work of scission" have already started organising a new union in order to split the Shoe Makers' Union.

Important battles are to be fought this summer at the Convention of communal workers, woodworkers, machinists, stokers, tobacco workers and painters.

The social democrats are making great preparations for the Convention of the woodworkers. And one can see clearly the hypocrisy common to the Amsterdam officialdom; the very same social democrats who, on an international scale, oppose the organisational Communist groups within the trade unions, and who consider these as forces for destroying the unions, adopt the same methods and organise their own groups within the trade union of Czecho-Slovakian woodworkers for the purpose of winning it over to its own views.

A very serious condition obtains in the trade union of railroad workers, where under the boss rule of the Centrist, Brodetsky and his clique, the membership is constantly diminishing. Our comrades are now organising a conference of all members thrown out by this clique in order to begin a systematic attempt to save the Railroad Workers' Union from being completely destroyed by the unscrupulous rule of the Centrists.

An important stage in our work within the trade union was the National Conference of Communist Trade Unionists in Czecho-Slovakia held during Easter in connection with the Party Convention. The importance of this conference, the first of its kind, lies in this, that it united all Communist workers who are active within the trade unions, and gave directions in accord with the

---

(1) The Trade Union of Agricultural Workers took no part in the General Trade Union Convention where its votes could have equalised the Right and Left forces, and where it could have an influence on all decisions.

resolution of the Communist and the Trade Union International. The duty of the Communists to remain in all central trade unions, in all general labour union organisations was made clear and unequivocal. All opposing tendencies were stamped as harmful to the labour movement. All comrades who were conducting policies of opposition to the unions were requested to change their methods and to submit to the tactics of the Party and of the Communist International. Where local branches or individuals have been excluded it was decided to undertake an energetic agitation, within the unions, for their re-instatement. Only after the complete failure of this campaign do the excluded groups have a right to enter a similar trade union standing on the platform of the R.I.L.U. The workers must not be encouraged to oppose the trade unions or to refuse the payment of membership fees or to quit them. Naturally, no Communist is to support the tendencies just named, and still less to lead them.

At this Convention it was made clear that the members of the Party are to submit to Party discipline, and to work in accordance with the resolution of the Communist International, the Red International of Labour Unions, and the Party. Of particular importance is the resolution making it a duty for every Communist to aid in the organisation of Communist nuclei within the trade unions. The unions have not only a passing importance; they must serve as the basis for organisations of a new type whose aim is to win over that entire mass of workers who have a sympathetic leaning towards Communism. The principles upon which the organisation of these nuclei is to proceed were elaborated in detail.

The resolutions of this Convention have already had a favourable influence on the Communist workers. Requests are coming from various centres regarding the organisation of nuclei and about the calling of similar conventions in the larger districts. The first Convention of this kind was held recently in Marin, the second one in Hardubitz.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that with the adoption of the theses at the Conference of the Communist Trade Workers the work could proceed without faults, or in complete accord with the theses. Much time is needed before all contradictions can disappear. On one hand it is necessary to get rid of a certain hesitation and inconsistency, on the other hand one must reject a certain amount of false radicalism. The fact, for instance, that the appeal issued by the R.I.L.U. on the 1st of May reached Czecho-Slovakia later than that date, and could not therefore have been followed, is not the fault of the Czecho-Slovakian comrades. A great mistake on the part of our workers within the trade unions is their neglect to read the trade union press or even the publications of the R.T.U. A great need is felt for a Communist central trade union organ in Czech and Slovakian languages. While the German Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia, immediately after its organisation in March, 1921, started a trade union paper, the Czech Communist Party failed to do so. This mistake has not been corrected until to-day, with the result that the Party, composed in the majority of Czecho-Slovakians, is publishing a trade union paper for the German minority. The papers published by separate trade unions led by our comrades, cannot of course take the place of a central organ. It is for this reason all the more urgent to

start the publication of such an organ.

All these defects must be removed within the shortest possible time and the resolutions of the convention described above must become concrete reality.

If the comrades will fulfil their duties in harmony with the resolutions adopted we shall make a great success in the work of winning the trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia. The masses are growing daily more favourable to our cause. The employers' offensive against labour is growing more and more impudent, and the struggle between capital and labour is becoming more and more bitter. The treason of the Czech Social Democrats within the trade unions is becoming more evident. They do all within their power to terrorise the efforts of the workers in order to save the employers and the State, while their comrades, who occupy the offices of ministers, offer all their aid to the merciless exploiters.

At the same time the German Social Democrats within the trade unions openly unite with the Czech social patriots who now reject the principle of trade union centralisation earlier defended by themselves. The aim of both groups is not to allow the organisation of a united labour front either in the trade unions or in the political struggle, but on the contrary, to dissipate the proletarian energy, to betray the proletarian interests and to organise a united front with the bourgeoisie against the Communists and masses. The more evident this appears the more workers join our ranks. Conditions in Czecho-Slovakia are such that the winning over of the great masses of the proletariat to the revolutionary cause depends entirely on a systematic and energetic campaign by our party in general, and every one of its members in particular.

¶ Buy ALL your Books and Periodicals from the

## Communist Bookshop

16 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2.

¶ HISTORY  
FICTION  
ECONOMICS  
SOCIOLOGY

BOOKS OBTAINED TO ORDER

# INTERNATIONAL REVIEW



## On the Comintern

BY V. MILUTIM.

**H**ITHERTO the work of the Comintern has found little reflection in our Press. The Fourth Congress is approaching, and we have nothing that would throw any light on the questions that will figure on the agenda.

Only the polemics between comrades Preobrazhensky and Radek, and the feuilletons of comrade Lozofsky raise the veil to some extent on the activities of the Communist parties abroad, and give us a broader view of them than we usually get in dry newspaper correspondence and telegrams. Yet it is clear to everyone that on the proper valuation of the rate of development of the Communist movement and on the definition of its character, depends the conclusions we will arrive at upon all the important questions affecting the development of the world revolution and upon the practical tasks that now confront the Comintern.

The guiding idea of the Third Congress was "caution," if one may so express one's self. Trotsky and others called for a strict calculation of strength before taking action. The wounds received in the March defeat in Germany still smarted. The question of a united front was raised, the essence of which was, how to get the lead of the masses and free them from the influence of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals in the field of action.

A year has passed, and we should take stock of the Communist movement.

Objective historical conditions have been and are favourable for us. The bourgeoisie is unable to solve a single problem of international politics, and each additional conference forces them only deeper into the mire. The antagonisms of the capitalist states are clearly visible on the background of the avowed bank-

ruptcy of the Versailles Peace, and is causing the relations between them to become more strained. The split between France and England in this connection is characteristic. Not a single step has been taken in the direction of economic restoration. At the same time the class war is becoming more acute, and in some countries, like Italy and Germany, is assuming the character of armed civil war.

The consolidation of the Communist Movement has and is taking place with increasing force. This is an undoubted fact.

When, however, we compare the scale of present-day historic events and class movements with the strength of the Communist Parties, we will see how insufficient are the latter.

In the dispute between comrades Preobrazhensky and Radek, the latter's more cautious estimation of the present position of the Communist Parties in the West is correct. Comrade Trotsky aptly described the present position in the following manner: "Capitalism has lost its capacity, but the workers are not yet prepared."

An over-estimation of our strength undoubtedly would be harmful. We must recognise, for instance, that the carrying out of the United Front is, in general, not being done with sufficient success. Our Communist Parties in the West are still unable to manœuvre the masses during action, and are still less able to follow the successes of such actions. In France the carrying out of the tactic of the United Front was such, that the E.C. of the Comintern several times had to intervene. In Germany, where considerable attention has been devoted to the United Front, our policy has been at times indistinct.

The fault of this lies not only in the objective conditions, but also to

a certain extent to the lack of preparedness of our Parties; and insufficient leadership by the Executive of the Comintern.

The general opinion of comrades who have been abroad is that the ties between the E.C. of the Comintern and the Communist Parties are weak.

The influence of the Comintern is great. The E.C. has given clear political directives on all the most important political questions. But the organisational contact and direct leadership of the work of the Parties have clearly been insufficient. More frequently errors already committed have been rectified, and those responsible for them were pointed out. But no measures were taken to prevent the possibility of a repetition of the same errors. In this connection the first great step in advance can best be seen in the work done by the Comintern in connection with the French Communist Party. The practical decisions carried by the Executive of the Comintern with regard to this Party has caused a great advance in its work, and was refreshing for its work in general. Much more should be done in this direction.

The Executive of the Comintern should actually guide the work of each individual Party; for in this way it would guide the whole of the Communist Movement.

Of course, this does not mean interference in the petty details of the work of the Central Committee of the Party, or to pass decisions which have no connection with previous decisions. But it is necessary to follow the work in general in the various countries by means of periodical reports and testing the watchwords put forward by the Parties in their respective countries. It would be useful, for instance, to carry out such a test in connection with the carrying out of the United Front.

Special attention should be devoted to the Party Press, which is very weak. The German newspapers are better than the others; nevertheless, it is weak in carrying out mass campaigns. Finally, there is the question raised by comrade Preobrazhensky on the establishment of a University for our West European Communist Parties. This is a serious question, and by no means deserves the frivolous attitude displayed towards it by comrade Radek. With rare exceptions, our West European Communist Movement lacks thoroughly trained Marxists. The former Marxist theoreticians who have remained in the Second International have slipped down the inclined plane

into the hospitable embrace of revisionism. We have hardly any theoreticians of our own in the West.

Thus the serious question arises of how to raise and expand the spreading of Marxian theory and to train cadres of well-trained Marxists. There is no doubt at all that many errors would have been avoided if the leading posts in our movement were occupied by people thoroughly imbued with warm, revolutionary sympathy and able to wield the weapons of precision of the Marxian method.

At the present moment the centre of Marxian thought is Soviet Russia. This opinion was expressed to me by comrades in Austria and Germany. It would be quite natural to make use of this situation for the needs of the Communist Parties of other countries not only by means of translations and articles, but by more vital methods.

Even before the revolution we organised schools abroad which gave us quite a number of trained comrades. Now we must do this for our foreign comrades on a much larger scale.

In general, we must bring the work of the Comintern nearer to the localities. There are many brilliant pages in the history of the work of the Comintern, but we must not ignore the rough detailed work which consolidates what has been already achieved and enables us to advance further. History is pouring water on our mill wheel, but our grindstones are not strong enough to grind all the grain of present day actualities.

## Denmark

THE general strike in 1920 ended with the political victory of the workers—the latter forced a change of government, the promulgation of an amnesty, etc.—but economically the workers suffered defeat.

The employers obtained the right to conclude collective agreements with separate trade unions instead of with the central organ of the united trade unions.

In the summer of 1920 there was a strike of sailors, stokers, and transport workers, lasting two months. The strike ended in defeat, and the stokers lost their 8-hours working day. In the spring of 1921 nearly the whole Danish working-class was engaged in a struggle against lowering of wages, and 70,000 workers were locked out.

At the conference of trade unions

in 1921, nearly all the leaders—about 120—were in favour of accepting the reductions in wages, which were to be regulated in accordance with the cost of living. In March, 1921, wages were reduced by 10 to 15 per cent.; in August, 1921, there was a further reduction, and in April, 1922, they were reduced again by 15 per cent., whilst the cost of living had only fallen by 10 per cent. Against this reduction the Danish workers struggled for eight weeks, but were defeated—they maintained their 8-hour working day, but even here a whole series of exceptions were allowed in favour of the employers.

The last conference of the trade unions concluded an agreement with the employers without submitting it, as had hitherto been the practice, to a referendum of the unions—hence there is a great deal of discontent among the workers, particularly amongst the unskilled, who constitute about one-third of the organised Danish workers. This discontent even threatens to lead to an open split.

There was also considerable unemployment. The following are the official figures, which only account for those registered in the State bureaux and who are receiving State support.

1913	...	...	7.5%
1917	...	...	9.2%
1918	...	...	17.4%
1919	...	...	10.7%
1920	...	...	6.1%
1921	nearly		20.0%

Now there are 40,000 registered unemployed. The total number, however, is at least 50,000.

## Norway

SINCE August 1921, the question of remaining within or of leaving the Amsterdam International has agitated the Norwegian trade union movement. As in other countries, so in Norway, reaction in the meantime has grown stronger. The employers are attacking the 8-hour day and the right to summer holidays—at the same time wages have decreased inordinately.

On January 16, 1922, the general secretary of the Norwegian Federation of Trade Unions decided to propose simultaneously to the Red and the Amsterdam trade union internationals that an international trade union conference be called as soon as possible to discuss the question of a united workers' front against the capitalists of all countries, and the measures to be adopted to attain the

"peace of the world." In accordance with the suggestion of Amsterdam, a preliminary conference met in Brussels on February 17—there were present Ole O. Lian (Norway), Jouhaux, Mertens, Fimmen, Onidequeest, but Thomas was not president. Jouhaux presided.

The Norwegian delegate explained why they had taken the initiative in suggesting the calling of an international conference, and proposed as a preliminary step a conference between representatives of the Moscow and Amsterdam internationals, together with representatives of Norway. This preliminary meeting would have discussed the details of an international trade union conference and would have drawn up the agenda, which might include the attitude of the trade unions to the League of Nations and its labour bureau, etc. The Amsterdam delegates declared they "had always fought for a united trade union front" and that "the union of the Russian trade unions with the Western European unions would give rise to a great wave of enthusiasm amongst the workers of the whole world." They further declared they were ready to meet "bona-fide" representatives of the Russian workers—but for this, they said, it was unnecessary to enter into negotiations with the Red Trade Union International to which only the Russian organisations belonged, with perhaps two or three other unimportant small organisations. They recognised that in the trade unions of all countries there were minorities in favour of Moscow—but these minorities must limit themselves to a struggle within their organisations and not precipitate matters to a split.

The Red Trade Union International replied in favour of joint action.

At the trade union conference, summoned by the Amsterdam bureau at Genoa in May, 1922, Ole O. Lian, representing Norway, proposed that the general secretary of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, Rudsutak, who was then at Genoa, should be invited, but this proposition was negated, only two voting in its favour. Lian also attended the Rome conference, but after a short time left, convinced that there was no hope of forming a united front, and that the Norwegian unions must break away from Amsterdam. The majority of the secretariat of the Norwegian trade unions are in favour of withdrawing from Amsterdam. A whole series of separate trade unions have passed resolutions in the same

sense, and it is calculated that 80 per cent. of the membership of the trade unions is in favour of such a policy. The question will be decided finally at the national conference of the Federation in 1923.

On July 17 the Norwegian secretariat sent the following wire:— "Having discussed the invitation of the Amsterdam Bureau to participate in the conference to be held in Amsterdam on July 18, the secretariat passed a resolution demanding that the Communist International and the Red Trade Unions should also be invited, and that the subject to be discussed should not be merely the defence of the Republic in Germany, but the united front of the proletariat in all countries for a common struggle against the universal reaction."

## Alsace-Lorraine

THE formation of the *Alsace Party* (a body with strong tendencies), under the provisional leadership of *H. Zorn von Bulach*, marks a further step in the adaptation process which has been going on for almost four years, and which is flattered by the French Government with the title of *transition régime*, in which the complete absorption of Alsace Lorraine, with its peculiarities, into the great French family, will find its official expression.

The announcement of the formation of this body has awakened a lively echo in all camps and throughout the whole Press. The chauvinistic and clerical Press in the service of the Bloc National, uses this fact as the welcome occasion for rekindling hatred against Germany. They naturally do not forget to attack the growing Communist movement.

It is our task in the following article to disclose the closer connections and the reasons for the founding of this party;

"Faites aimer la France" (See to it that France gains friends) was the watchword given to the French army of interior officials that swept the country after the departure of the Germans. Thousands of business people, usurers, and profiteers, peopled the province in order to carry on their crooked business among their "newly recovered brethren."

How a great portion of these missionaries fulfilled the work entrusted to them was to be seen recently in the weekly paper, *Le Cri*

*de Strasbourg*, which usually takes the lead in the Boche and Alsace provocations, in an article which most appropriately characterised the mentality of the *nouveaux-venus* (immigrants). It is interesting to note that the author, who is a native of inner France, writes as follows: "One has to acknowledge that, particularly among immigrants, there are many people of decidedly doubtful morality. Tradesmen who, greedy to enrich themselves, flood Alsace with spurious products; shady business people who exploit the credulity of the Alsatians; interlopers; and among the French authorities, officials of ill-repute, concerned with recovering their reputations, and receiving undeserved promotions . . . etc. They have all entirely failed to appreciate properly the position in Alsace, and take no account of the distress they cause to the Alsatians."

The greater portion of the inner French officials understood not a word of German, and this was the prime cause for the injustice and the discontent. It often happened that a defendant in court understood nothing of the proceedings except the sentence. It was hastily and without any understanding attempted to impose the French language upon the German-speaking districts, which contain the greater portion of the population.

The native officials were almost entirely set aside, particularly the teaching staffs who to-day are not given the same status as their French colleagues, and do not receive the same treatment. The whole staff of officials is embittered, for after four years they still have to subsist on starvation wages, whilst many of their French colleagues still receive additional colonial allowances. In the private industries, too, the most lucrative positions are reserved for the French. And one is guilty of no exaggeration in saying that Lorraine never saw so many pensioned officers in its mining works and foundries.

Almost every day some section of the inner French Press makes it its task to discredit the social insurance (insurance for workers and clerks, etc.) taken over from the German régime, as "Institution boche," and to make propaganda for the less favourable French Acts. Practical attempts are already being made to abolish the *Miners' Friendly Society Laws*, in order to set up the "Caisse autonome," which at present prevails in the interior, an institution which would deliver over the workers, hand and foot bound, to the despotism of

the employers.

The proportionately much higher taxation of wages and salaries constitutes a further ground for discontent. In addition to this, there are the wretched party politics of the Alsace Lorraine deputies in the Chamber, who, in their flunkey-like submission, have not uttered a word of protest against all these grievances.

The severing of the three provinces from the German economic area has intensified the general European crisis, and will here, through the gross mismanagement and incapacity of the government, be extremely disastrous. The sequestration of individual undertakings which merely fill the pockets of some patriots will be seen by everybody, even the most short-sighted, to be a stupid blunder. A further contribution to the intensification of the economic anarchy is the expulsion of the German skilled and technical workers, of whom there is an appreciable scarcity to-day. It was attempted at the time to replace the expelled Germans with workers from the interior of France. These, however, were employed, not according to their actual business and technical knowledge, but according to the well-known French method of favouritism (*camarades de promotion*).

The consequence of all these evil conditions is reflected in the *Annual Records* of the smelting industry, published in the course of the last month, which, almost without exception, shows gigantic deficits. (Rom-bacher Smelting Works: 27 millions; Kneuttinger Foundry: 30 millions; Hagendinger Works: 25 millions). The employers naturally throw the whole blame upon the eight hour day, and demand a law which shall render possible the "elastic application" of the Eight Hour Day Act. The economic horizon of the Alsace iron and steel industry for the near future, looks very gloomy. Owing to the rapid depreciation of the mark and to the uncertain political conditions, the metal-mining industry is almost at a standstill. It is easy to see that with all the abuses that are carried on, the irritation will increase every day. The government, which, through its incapacity and chauvinistic policy, is continually stirring disaffection among broad circles of the population, finds no other means of helping itself than ascribing all this discontent to German influence and Bolshevik instigation. An unbearable espionage makes itself felt in the country.

The Alsace-Lorraine workers have already long recognised that the "liberation" was not perchance pursued in order to win the hearts of the population, but solely to capture the country with its riches. That French capitalism is no less brutal in its exploitation than the German has already been sufficiently proved. The young Communist Party, which is gaining a surer foothold every day, will pursue its aims in spite of the chauvinist bourgeois enmity. For this party there is no Alsace-Lorraine irredenta. Its attitude towards the Alsace-Lorraine problem, which has been quite unconsciously raised again by the Alsace Party, is the following:

Standing on the basis of the actual facts, we consider the final solution of this question to be possible only with the solution of the economic and political problems of Europe as a whole, and in the Communistic sense. Alsace-Lorraine will then be neither French, nor German, nor neutral. It will belong to the great Rhineland economic area, Alsace to the upper Rhine, Lorraine to the Mosel-Saar district; and within the framework of such a great unity, these two provinces, which for centuries have been the bone of contention of two neighbours, greedy for power and territory, will then be able to realise their full economic strength.

## Japan

### JAPANESE SOLDIERS, COMRADES,—

Recently, after three years of intervention in Siberia, the Japanese militarists, under the pressure of the social forces of Japan, were compelled to declare that they would send you home.

We warned you then that this was a mere promise, and that the militarists, your officers and generals, will seek a fresh pretext in order to postpone the evacuation.

What is happening now?

In the first place, the militarists have declared that the evacuation depends upon the negotiations with the Government of the Far Eastern Republic. This means that your evacuation depends upon the concessions which the Far Eastern Republic will be compelled to make to the Japanese Imperialist Government as a reward for the occupation by the latter of Russian territory, for the murder of Russian workers and peasants, for the assistance which it has rendered to the Czarist generals and monarchists, and its plunder of

the working population of Siberia.

Secondly, the Japanese Imperialists, in order to strengthen their demands, have submitted to the Far Eastern Republic, but have resorted to the most bloody and treacherous methods of oppressing the toiling population of the Russian Far East. These militarists have dispatched to these places, which they have been compelled to evacuate, Russian monarchist generals, the most bitter enemies of the toiling Russian population.

In Spask, for instance, the Japanese militarists allowed General Diderix to occupy the town. For this purpose, they sent for him from Harbin. Furthermore, the Japanese militarists established the monarchist system in Vladivostok, at the head of which was this very Diderix, who consecrated his coming into power by shedding the blood of hundreds of Vladivostok workers, whose bodies he afterwards flung into the Gulf of Amur.

Recently, the Japanese militarists have threatened that if the Far Eastern Republic does not pay their price, they will hand over all the arms which they had seized in the Far East to their agent, the monarchist Diderix.

Comrades, Japanese soldiers! You see that your generals and officers do not intend to send you home *peacefully*, but even while taking the preliminary measures for your evacuation, they are saturating their path with the blood of the toiling population of the Premore District. The

Japanese militarists are not only by this means seeking to revenge themselves upon the Russian workers and peasants, but are striving to provoke them into doing something which will give them a pretext for keeping you in Siberia.

Comrades, it should be clear to you now that your departure from Siberia depends upon yourselves. As we have once already told you, you must, in an organised manner, demand from your officers your immediate repatriation. Your organised will must be expressed through Soldiers' Councils, which you should organise immediately. Bear in mind, comrades, soldiers, that your fight with the militarists will not finish here in Siberia, but will be continued in your own country, after your return home. Your Soldiers' Councils must, therefore, be the organisations by means of which you will fight against and finally overthrow the militarists of Japan.

Let your sojourn on the territory of Siberia, and your contact with the Russian Revolution serve you as a fruitful lesson in organisation and determined struggle against the monarchist system which is oppressing your brothers and fathers, and for the overthrow of militarism.

Down with the Japanese militarists!

Long live the Council of Soldiers' Deputies of Japan!

Long live the Alliance between the Toilers of Japan and Russia!

(The Communist Party of Japan.)

## VOLUMES ONE AND TWO OF THE Communist Review

*Bound separately in strong cloth covers and indexed  
may be obtained, post free, for*

PRICE **5/6** PER VOLUME

¶ Order from any Labour Bookseller