

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 78

12th Sept. 1922

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

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Politics		In the International	
Stinnes, the Executor of Rathenau's Will. By E. Ludwig.	581	The Attitude of the Communist Party of France in the Event of War. (Resolution)	584
The Program of Action of the United Social Democrats. By E. Alexander.	582	Labor Movement	
The Far East. By A. Bolgar.	583	The French Trade Union Movement Since the War. By A Trade Unionist	585
Poland's Machinations Against Soviet Russia. By J. Schaffir.	584	The Colonies	
		The Débauché of Gandhism. By E. Roy.	586
		Agriculture	
		The International Agricultural Workers' Congress	588

POLITICS

Stinnes, the Executor of Rathenau's Will

By E. Ludwig (Berlin).

In the opinion of Herr Stinnes, the submission of the Wirth Government to the latest decisions of the Reparations Commission and to the Belgian demands for guarantees, is nothing short of treason. When the mouth-piece of the Stinnes concern, the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (whose editor in chief is the Social Patriot Paul Lensch) voiced this opinion, it was promptly suppressed. As a counter-move, and in order to show to the world, how he, unlike the Government, has the interest of the nation at heart, Stinnes published the agreement concluded on August 14th, between himself and the Marquis de Lubersac, the representative of French Big Industry.

There can be no disputing the fact the German Government is eager and willing to knock down the interests of the German nation to the highest bidder. So far it has hesitated to make public its final decision, because its own fate is still hanging in the balance between France and England. Nor can there be any doubt that what Stinnes is pleased to term the saving of the German nation is but the saving of his trust by French bayonets in consideration for a six per cent commission, not to count the other profits.

Stinnes who controls the German Federation of Industry, plays Poincaré's game, surrendering the German apparatus of production to French imperialism and combining Germany's and France's coal and steel industries into trusts under the latter's political leadership. To clear the road for the economic penetration of the Ruhr Valley, by the iron and coal trusts located in the *Rue de Madrid* in Paris, under the pretext of patriotism,—that was really the aim of the agreement of August 14th.

Whenever big capital is preparing for plunder, it adopts a plausible subterfuge. The Stinnes-Lubersac Agreement is no exception; its outward purpose is the reconstruction of the devastated French provinces. Out of pure compassion for the peasants and workers of Northern France, who after four years of peace have not yet a roof over their heads, and in an attempt to honor the Wiesbaden Agreement of the late Rathenau, providing for reparations in kind (which Stinnes once did his best to sabotage), Lubersac, the president of the United Cooperatives for the Reconstruction of the Devastated Regions, and Hugo Stinnes, have agreed that:

"The Corporation for Building Construction in Essen, is to be the clearing house for the execution of all reparation-in-kind orders, in accordance with the agreements of Wiesbaden and Berlin."

Georg Bernhard, (former Social Democrat), commenting on this agreement in the *Vossische Zeitung*, maintains that in this way "things are by some method made to fit into a system". Hugo Stinnes systematizes matters by pocketing the whole reparation business and marching off in a westerly direction. The above mentioned clearing house, the Corporation for Building Construction is controlled by him. By being the agency for the

"increased shipments of building material, as for instance, concrete, gravel, lime, roofing (§ 7 of the agreement)."

Stinnes will to all effects and purposes control all reparations-in-kind which have thus become the private affair of the capitalists of Rue de Madrid, and of Herr Stinnes in Germany. The greatest transaction ever made, which bids fair to surpass all fabulous war profits, is to be carried out by Hugo Stinnes at the expense of German and French labor.

The Stinnes Trust will not only get all the orders from the Stinnes Clearing House, but it will furthermore receive reparations coal from the German coal trusts and from French capital which is a party to the agreement. For purposes of the orders under the agreement, a certain part of the reparations coal, going to France under the Spaa Agreement will every month be surrendered to Stinnes:

"The distribution of this coal is assigned to the firm Hugo Stinnes and the Rheinisch-Westphalian Coal Trust (§ 7 of the agreement)."

This clause which the German Stinnes press lauds as reducing the German coal tribute to France, and hence as a patriotic deed, invests Stinnes with the mastery over German industry. By having acquired the right to distribute the coal from the arch-enemy, Stinnes forces the industries participating in the reconstruction business, which do not belong to his trust, into dependence, and compels them to submit to his conditions to increase his own profits. Simultaneously he performs the trick of making the coal mined in his mines and used in his factories, into reparations coal, thus forcing the German Government to pay him for that reparations coal which he used for transacting his billion deal. The coal clause of the Treaty of Versailles destined for the reconstruction of French economy is providing Hugo Stinnes and his French kindred with some extra profits. But Hugo Stinnes is not satisfied with these gigantic profits

realized on the reparations and coal business; for "systematizing things" as he has it, he also asks a fat commission:

"The Corporation for Building Construction is entitled for its general expenses, to a rate of interest which in no case is to exceed six per cent of the price paid in Germany for the commodities."

These six percent on a total of 13 million francs or 1500 billion paper marks, represent about 45 billion paper marks. Hence, it can hardly be called an exaggeration, when the *Rote Fahne* estimates that Stinnes' total net profit out of these transactions will be close to 100 billion paper marks.

And who foots the bill? The German Government, and through it, the German proletariat. All shipments under the Stinnes agreement go to the French Government as its own, under the Treaty of Versailles. Stinnes saves the German nation by exploiting, together with the French industrial kings, the devastation and misery wrought by him and his kindred through the war. Germany's reparations accounts will furthermore be credited with the six per cent commission, and the commissions and profits from the financial transactions which, under the terms of the agreement, remain with the German banking interests, especially the *Dresdener Bank* (§ 3). This move also won for Stinnes the favor of the banking interests.

This magnificent plan, however, remains for the time being, on paper. The Government which is loth to abandon its English orientation is offering some resistance. Another source of opposition—and more serious for Stinnes—are his capitalist competitors who will have no share in the profits. That this resistance is far from insignificant, is shown by the fact that the semi-official Stinnes press (which includes most prominent bourgeois papers) is continuously reiterating the statement that both the Government and the Industry are most heartily welcoming Herr Stinnes' gigantic plan.

To overcome the opposition within the Government, Stinnes is using the strong man, M. Poincaré. "Poincaré is in perfect sympathy with the plan and Lloyd George is also aware of it", writes the substitute of the suppressed *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Tägliche Rundschau*. So why should Wirth be undecided! He will, on the contrary, do his best to prevent the Reich from becoming a bankrupt in the course of the guarantee negotiations with Belgium, that is, bankrupt for the chief creditors of the Reich,—Stinnes and Poincaré.

As to the resistance on the part of his competitors, Stinnes is endeavouring to silence them by pointing to the large profits for the trusts which will materialize from the combination of French ore and Ruhr coal. According to a dispatch of the *Vossische Zeitung*, the French iron industry is, quite apart from the reparations problem, trying to get into touch with German industry. The Stinnes Agreement creates, so to speak, the psychological preliminary condition for "the improvement of Franco-German relations", meaning the peaceful penetration of the Ruhr Valley with the help of Stinnes. This will close the circle; German Big Industry, will not turn a deaf ear to the convincing arguments of higher profits advanced by Herr Stinnes.

The trade-unions and the Social Democrats, however, are suddenly left out in the cold. For two weeks they have been praising the patriotic sacrifices of the industrial barons when, alas!—this sacrifice turns out to be a profit of 100 billion marks. Under the impression of this readiness for sacrifice, they have induced the miners to work overtime, put a stop to the movement of protest of the German proletariat against the high cost of living, and have ordered the police to increase the persecution of the Communists; they have, in short, become the pacemakers of Hugo Stinnes who in turn, is the pacemaker of Poincaré. Now that Stinnes has drawn the logical conclusions from their policy of cooperation and coalition, they feel themselves cheated, and employ harsh words against their officials, only to follow in the end the Wirth example and submit.

The Peace Treaty of Versailles is bearing its fruits. With the active assistance of German capital, France is gaining the imperialist hegemony in Europe. Under the slogan of "save the nation!", the greatest flight of capital from Germany ever witnessed is taking place: The surrender of the essential part of the German machinery of production to the political power which guarantees its profits. Stinnes and *Rue de Madrid* have taken the reparation business in hand. Not long and they will endeavor to control Russian reconstruction. The Franco-German Steel Trust which was born on August 14th, threatens the Russian proletariat. It subjects the German proletariat to untold misery and hardships, depriving it as it does, of the basic means for reconstruction, and makes it the coolie of international capital, at the same time saddling the French workers and peasants with new military burdens and taxes. Against imperialism and war danger, against misery and famine,—that remains the slogan under which the international proletariat must carry on the struggle against Stinnes and Poincaré.

The Program of the United Social Democrats of Germany

By E. Alexander (Berlin).

On September 24th, Nurnberg will witness the happy remarriage of the reformist leaders of the Social Democrats and the Independents. Just as this amalgamation is the exact opposite to a revolutionary deed, so is the program accompanying it the counterpart of revolutionary and Marxian principles.

This platform, called a program of action and published simultaneously by the *Freiheit* and the *Vorwärts*, brought about within a few hours the unity between the hostile brothers *Wels* and *Crispien*, because it renounces all action, and hence the unfolding of the decisive problems with which German and international labor is confronted today.

The program of action of a party which unites in order to reach that programmatic aim, a Socialist society, that is, a program of immediate action for which the amalgamation is both the reason and the instrument, should at least, with a few clear, and unambiguous sentences, define its attitude to the situation in which the decay of capitalism has placed the proletariat. In the tentative draft of the program of the new party, both of whose parts still swear by Marx, one searches in vain for the semblance of an attempt at analyzing the moving forces of the imperialist phase of capitalism. Just as the word *revolution* is carefully avoided in the program (for Ebert or Stampfer could take exception to it), they have carefully refrained from explaining that today, when capitalism is nearing fulfillment, the capitalist methods of production are acting as a brake on, and are shackling, the forces of production in society. Nor has any mention been made of the fact that the words of the Communist Manifesto, "Capitalism can no longer feed its slaves" have been fulfilled to the letter, in crises, war and famine. To make a long story short, the program eliminates the social revolution, which has today become the task of the German and international proletariat, and refrains from mentioning anything about the workers rising against their oppressors, because a single breath of these matters would have sufficed to render the unity in Nurnberg impossible.

Because there is no compass to guide the party, and because not a solitary syllable in the whole program of action points out to the working class the historical necessity for actual social revolution, the introductory sentence that "only through Socialism can mankind attain to liberty and wealth", and the concluding sentence about the "realization of Socialism", become pompous platitudes.

There remains the program of action as divorced from the task of the present,—the realization of Socialism. It is what it is bound to be in these circumstances, a jumble of political, social and international demands, divided into six chapters, beginning with "the protection of the republic", and ending with that on "international policy". An election appeal, rather than a program!

Struggle against anarchy and reaction, defense of the Republic. Well said. But not a word is mentioned of the fact that the proletariat can only defend the Republic against the Ludendorfs and Kahrs, and against Wels' coalition brother, Stinnes, by seizing the reins of government, as the first step towards becoming the ruling class in the state. Restriction to mere defense, that is, negation, is but final renunciation of the dictatorship as the only means of emancipating the working class. And the modest phrase of "striving for political power", which in the program of the united party is to replace the unequivocal demand for the proletarian dictatorship in the Leipsic Program of the Independents, is nothing but an entry into the market of ministerial portfolios in the Ebert Republic, of supporting and participating in the Coalition Government.

Then follow sentences dealing with class and social politics; mere reminiscences of the venerable Erfurt Program.

Finances, economy and international policy,—all must consequently support the policy of coalition and fulfillment. The program has much to say against high prices and hunger, imperialism and war dangers, but it demands a continuation of the policy which has resulted in hunger, profiteering, Stinnes profits and new imperialist conflicts. It advocates "taxation at the source", but forgets to mention indirect taxes and Wirth's financial schemes of the past and of the future. It will not safeguard the eight hour day, when the trade-union bureaucracy has just been a party in depriving the railwaymen of the eight-hour day and in forcing the miners to accept overtime,—all in order to please Stinnes and Poincaré.

The program of action by means of which amalgamation is to be effected, is a program of passivity, of subjecting German

labor to the dictatorship of Allied imperialism, and to the dictatorship of Hugo Stinnes.

Stampfer, writing in the *Vorwärts*, is not quite satisfied with the program. In the first place, because once (horrors!!) the word *class struggle* is mentioned, and secondly, because he would have liked a parallel to the Görlitz Program advocating coalition quite openly, which was fathered by Ebert and Noske. But the letter is here intended to kill the spirit; the few sentences about class struggle and Socialism, are the camouflage behind which the once "revolutionary" Independent Party, the party of revolutionary phrases, retreats with flying colors into the camp of the coalition, the party of openly counter-revolutionary deeds. Even Stampfer will be satisfied in the end.

The masses, however, which judge a program not by its words, but by the spirit animating it, will soon perceive that such a patchwork program will not spare them the social revolution which the Wels' and Crispiens prefer not to mention, because it steadfastly refuses to die, notwithstanding all their earnest counter-revolutionary endeavors.

The Far East

By Alex Bolgar.

In February of this year, some weeks after the Washington Conference, the New York *Nation* published the officially confirmed proceedings of Japan's intervention in the Far East. Upon the basis of this report it is now established that Japan harbored the definite plan of undertaking, with the concurrence and support of France, an undisguised annexation of the whole of the Far East, or at least the greater portion of its provinces. The report also establishes the fact that Japan, under the influence of the international situation, had repeatedly changed her plans, at one time reducing the territory to be annexed, at another time increasing it, now again suddenly equipping "Russian" forces which she dispatched at the convenient moment.... At present, we are told, Japan is in possession of the southern portion of the coast provinces which she intends to extend further; she is in complete possession of Sakhalin and of Lower Amur, an invaluable economic as well as strategic district; she is mistress of the whole of the Pacific coast.

This picture of Japanese imperialist greed, drawn by the official representative of a rival power, was in every respect completed at the first congress of the Communist and revolutionary organizations of the Far East, held in Moscow in January 1922, the full proceedings of which are now reproduced in book form, (published by the Communist International).

That which in the above quoted report resounded as a cry of warning, became in Moscow a battle summons to the revolutionary organizations, and to the representatives of the oppressed and exploited against imperialism. In direct connection with the mighty complex problems of the Far East, this imperialism enters upon a new stage of world historical importance. The Moscow Congress unmasked this imperialism, stripped it of all disguises, and one acquired here, not only abundant material for an exceedingly instructive chapter in the problem of imperialism, but also a deep insight into its nature and history.

The conception of imperialism, even in Communist writings, is used very ambiguously. It is employed in the narrow sense of expressing an aggressive nationalism, as well as in the wider sense as an essential phase of capitalism in general. A careful examination of its true manifestations, contributes a great deal to the clearing up of this exceedingly important question.

The problem of the Far East offers a rich supply of such questions. Yet that which is generally understood by the term *Far East*, is nothing uniform and consolidated; it is rather, that chaos out of which a new world will be born. The realization, however, that the question of the Far East has at present become the most important converging point of imperialist world politics, —a realization from which the appropriate action logically follows: the bringing of the revolutionary union of the workers and peasants of the Far East into connection with the international proletariat under the banner of the Communist International,—is the great historical merit of the Communist International.

Under the collective term of the *Far East* is to be understood a powerful complex of peoples which in its mass, as well as in its separate parts, is exposed to the efforts at extension of economic, political and military power (and this is the chief token of imperialism). It is clear that theoretically, this imperialism is viewed differently by the working class and the non-prole-

tarian, but none the less equally oppressed population. The Moscow Congress has, however, overcome this difficulty by its *practical* attitude, when it declared, that "revolutionaries must not adopt the false position that it is necessary to support only the proletarian movement in the colonies. It is not the fault, but the misfortune of the backward countries that their proletarian population is exceedingly limited in number.... The result of our present discussions shall be a clear understanding that the possibility of victory for the national revolutionary movement will be so much the greater, the more the proletarian masses play an independent role in this movement, the more the proletarian elements of the oppressed peoples enter as leaders into this national revolutionary struggle".

The linking up of the class conscious proletariat with the eager revolutionary non-proletarian elements, was not only laid down as an abstract demand, but was also worked out in all its details. The inclusion of the broad masses of the peasants is exhaustively treated, with consideration for the hegemony of the proletariat in the general revolutionary movement. The attitude of the Party with regard to this principle finds expression in the following resolution:

"Although under the existing international conditions the division of the program of the Communist Parties into a maximum and minimum program is only of relative importance, one must still allow this division to apply for the time being to the countries of the Far East, inasmuch as the next stage in the development of these countries is the democratic upheaval and the independent—political and economic—class organization of the proletariat."

The Moscow Congress was in every respect an effective counterblast to the Washington Conference. Whilst in Washington there arose a new organization, a new quadruple alliance of imperialism, in Moscow there was established a union of all peoples threatened by the quadruple alliance created in Washington. Whilst in Washington, burning questions, like those of Mongolia and Korea, have been passed over, and others again, like the Chinese have been settled with the old formula of the "open door", in Moscow, all the special requirements of the peoples concerned have been thoroughly gone into, all their injuries have been laid bare and the means of recovery fully considered.

The Congress has thereby contributed enormously to the understanding of the whole situation of the Far East. The exotic, mystical element has been dispelled in the vivid illumination of the problem, and what remains is sheer exploitation in its most cunning form. In variegated forms the different methods of this exploitation pass before us: the systematic enslavement of China by European, American, and Japanese intruders, both before and after the world war; the sufferings of the Korean population who are dominated by the tiny fraction of Japanese capitalists (one and a half per cent of the native born), who rob them of their wealth in coal, graphite, iron and gold; the armed expeditions of Japan against the Mongols,—all these reveal Japan, as the representative power of imperialism in the Far East. In Washington, it was already evident that the ruling class in Japan had not only capably carried out the methods of pre-war Prussia, but that they had also learned much from post-war France. It has been rightly asserted that the few apparent concessions which Japan made at Washington in regard to the disarmament question, have been more than made up by the fact that she is able to devote herself unhindered to aggressive extensions of power in Asia.

In view of the pending Far Eastern Conference, all this acquires increasing importance. What the world may expect in this connection, is shown by the following communication from a London report of the *Tägliche Rundschau*, of September 1st:—

"The Conference between the representatives of Chita and Japan will begin on the 3rd of September at Changchun, a station on the Southern Manchurian Railway, half-way between Mukden and Kirin, where the Russian track joins the normal track. The Foreign Minister of the Republic of the Far East, Janson, has set out for that place from Chita.

The Japanese press regards the mass of munitions under Japanese guard in Vladivostok, amounting in value to 300 million yen (30 million pound sterling) as a trump card for the negotiations. The withdrawal of Japanese troops towards the end of October is regarded as irrevocable. If however, Chita does not accept the conditions regarding the fishing rights at Nicolayevsk and the compensation of the Japanese in regard to the protection of her rights in Siberia, then it is threatened that the munitions will be handed over to the Vladivostok *White Guards*, who have already issued a Czarist manifesto and prepared a defensive front against Chita. This plan is approved by the entire Japanese press."

White Guardist Admission of Poland's Machinations Against Soviet Russia

By G. Schaffir.

As is always the case, when thieves begin to squabble over the booty, dangerous secrets come to light, whose exposure was not intended. In Poland a quarrel has broken out between the representatives of the so-called Russian Red Cross which was set up by the Russian White Guards interned in Poland, and the representatives of the Russian Committee which was established after the conclusion of the Peace of Riga, and at whose head there stand late Czarist Gendarmes, correspondents of reactionary newspapers and the like.

The reason for the quarrel was, that the Russian Committee, had attempted to seize the large funds of the Red Cross, as became true patriots. Indignation went beyond all bounds when the Deputy Commander of the Polish Safety Police, a late Russian officer, interfered in the quarrel. This officer also took part in the control of the Red Cross, but was obliged to resign in consequence of a little episode. This little episode was, that the guardian of law and order of the Polish Republic was caught in the act of attempting to steal parcels received from America. He was therefore dismissed. Of course, this gentleman is still doing his best to make the relations between the rivals of one and the same counter-revolutionary camp more acute.

The squabble assumed such proportions that the parties began to denounce each other. And such revelations were made as compel us to take notice thereof. The revelations were published in part in a Paris paper of the Cadet Party *Posledniye Novosti*, which supported the Red Cross Party.

The person making the disclosures, reveals the events which took place at the end of 1921 and the beginning of 1922, on the Russo-Polish frontier and which almost resulted in very serious complications in the relations between Russia and Poland. It deals with the invasion of the Russian border provinces by bandits.

The Soviet Government, on its part, called the attention of Pilsudski's Government to these invasions, who naturally, with an aristocratic gesture repudiated all participation of the Polish Government in these acts. On the other hand, they shifted all responsibility upon the "warlike neighbor", — Soviet Russia.

And now the Paris organ of the Cadets, on the 24th of August, 1922, writes as follows: —

"Whilst the Polish Government took up the position of the *de jure* recognition of the Soviet Government, it decided at the same time to weaken Soviet Russia wherever possible, and to form troops for the organization of revolts in Soviet Russia, at least in the border provinces. . . . There was convened in Warsaw, a congress of the internees, under the name of *Congress for the Organization of Workers' Commandos*. . . . The Russian Committee was to place its quarters at the disposal of the Congress. The more prudent portion of the leaders, however, insisted that the chairman should apply for written instructions from the Polish officials. Although it was Sunday, the mayor of Warsaw mobilized his whole technical apparatus and within half an hour, the permission for using the Committee's quarters for the purposes of the Congress was granted. The delegates were well selected, hence, the pro-Polish "General" Yakovlev as chairman. He immediately set to work and dispatched labor commandos to Kressa. . . . Three points of assembly were agreed upon: Grodno, Baronovitchi and Rovno. Yakovlev and Zanzonov commanded in Grodno and Rovno, whilst Balachov and Savinkov worked in Baronovitchi and Bibsk. The internees began to quit their camps and come to Warsaw. There the Russian Committee furnished them with documents with which they were directed into the various troop divisions, or as they were called, *Workers' Commandos*.

In Rovno the work went on more undisguised. There, the internees arrived directly from the camps, with documents from the Second Division of the Polish General Staff. Such a wholesale despatching of Russians to the frontier could not remain hidden from the Bolsheviks who had their agents in the Safety Police. A great stir was made. The Polish Foreign Office and the Russian Diplomatic Mission exchanged a number of unpleasant notes. The Poles declared to the Foreign Missions the whole misunderstanding to be but the work of the Germans who wished to compromise the Poles and raise discord between them and the Bolsheviks, and for this purpose caused old documents to come into the hands of the Bolsheviks, which related to the formation of the Savinkov and Balachov troops in the year 1920, and in which documents they had altered the figure 0 into 2. . . ."

The quotation is undoubtedly long, but also instructive. The facts are of great importance, as the organization of invading

bands against Soviet Russia has not yet ceased, (in the Far East and in Turkestan for instance). This testimony by a White Guardist paper is so much the more valuable to us because it adopts a friendly attitude towards the Entente.

We call the attention of the workers of all countries, but particularly of the workers of Poland to these facts. They may judge for themselves as to the truth of the stories told in the bourgeois and social-traitor press regarding the "Red Imperialism" and the "aggressive" intentions of Russia against Poland.

They may judge for themselves, whether Soviet Russia is not in the right when she defends herself, sword in hand, against the bandits of the Entente, against the Wrangels, the Petluras, the Savinkovs and other white guardist adventurers; against the bandits who will not permit her to peaceably carry out the work of reconstructing the economic life of the country destroyed through the interventions and the blockade.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Attitude of the Communist Party of France in the Event of war.

Resolution Adopted by the Convention of the Seine Federation.

At the Convention of the Seine Federation of the French Communist Party, which was held on the 3rd of September in Paris, a resolution was unanimously adopted which we publish below:

I.

The danger of war in Europe still continues to exist. The Versailles Peace Treaty imposes a burden upon the German proletariat which it cannot bear. The Parliament of the Bloc National, however, obstinately demands the carrying out of an impossible treaty, and seeks by every imaginable pretext to justify a military occupation of the Ruhr District. This imperialist policy of provocation which is so reactionary that the English and Italian bourgeoisie decline to take any part in it, is undermining the German State, accelerating the collapse of the mark, and thrusts the German worker into indescribable misery. The German bourgeoisie enriches itself whilst the impoverishment of the masses is being continually intensified. A fresh revolution is coming on in Germany, which the French bourgeoisie, in complete solidarity with the German bourgeoisie, will attempt to defeat in exactly the same manner as the first. The bourgeoisies of these two countries are at one and the same time engaged in rivalry and yet are solidly united; they compete in their quests for raw materials, labor power and markets, but they are united in their determination to suppress the rising proletarian revolution.

II.

The utter inability of Germany to comply with the demands of the Versailles Peace Treaty, creates a situation from which a new world war must inevitably result. French capital sees itself compelled to use force against Germany if it does not wish to take the burden of the war upon itself. It cannot allow a revolution on the French frontiers. A French invasion of revolutionary Germany is a sure prospect for the near future. If the French proletariat permits the French army to be constituted as the Gendarme of Europe, and to crush the movement for emancipation of the German proletariat, it will assume in the face of history the responsibility for a calamity, the heavy consequences of which will long have to be borne by the working class of the whole world.

III.

On the other hand the imperialist policy of France can find expression in the occupation of the Ruhr, which act would seal the alliance between the French iron capitalists and the German coal barons, and assure the hegemony of the French iron and steel industry in Europe. This seizure of the Ruhr Basin would not only be an oppressive burden for the proletarians of this district, who are immediately concerned, but its effects would also very speedily make themselves felt by the whole of the French proletariat through a general reduction of wages, for the French bourgeoisie within the Ruhr District, will, thanks to the low value of the mark, have found a supply of cheap labor power. The French proletariat must be blind not to oppose with all the means at its disposal, the realization of such a plan.

IV.

The task of the Communist Party consists in the first place, in exposing and bringing home to the French workers, the present situation and the importance of the approaching events. The Party must bring the organized as well as the unorganized workers to the consciousness that the government

of the Bloc National wishes to debase them into breakers of revolution. To bring the masses of dispossessed workers and peasants to an understanding of the actual situation means to rouse the spirit of resistance against the criminal conduct of the governing men of France.

V.

The Party leaders have immediately instituted a sympathetic campaign through the press, and by public meetings, against war in the spirit of the foregoing statements. This campaign must sooner or later be conducted jointly with all the workers' organizations which are willing and prepared to conduct an open fight against war. Only such a campaign will put the party into a position to exercise a determining influence upon the masses at the decisive moment. It alone, will be able to bring to shame the criminal plans of the ruling class; it alone can open up an auspicious prospect for the revolutionary struggle.

VI.

The Party, in closest collaboration with the German brother party, and the Communist International, must take advantage of the revolutionary conjuncture which a fresh war would offer, while it must, with all its means, direct and develop its struggle towards the idea of the revolutionary general strike for the overthrow of capitalism.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The French Trade Union Movement Since the War.

By a Trade Unionist.

At the conclusion of the war the fermenting process within the French trade union movement was no less strong — if not stronger — than in the other combatant countries. The strength of this fermenting process was in part a measure of the agitation and of that dissatisfaction which took possession of the working masses of France since the middle of 1917, but particularly since the October Revolution in Russia, when they began to see conclusively that the "war of liberation", the war for "humanity and democracy", was nothing else than a gigantic act of robbery and plunder, and the "sacred unity", a means of harnessing them to the cart of robber imperialism. However, what was still lacking in the French trade union organization was a real sturdiness of mind, a clear revolutionary class consciousness. For this, just as the social patriotic and social imperialist aberrations of the labor movement, can only be an accompanying phenomenon and consequence of a strong development of industrial capitalism. As is known this is not the case with France.

The opposition to the social patriotic and social imperialist leadership of the trade union federations in France, does not arise from a clear theoretical recognition of the world political interdependence, and of the historical task of the proletariat, but in the first instance from a reaction against that contradiction which showed itself between the theory and practice of the so-called "revolutionary" syndicalism of the pre-war time, and its conduct during and immediately after the war. We can best illustrate the contrast between the two attitudes by the following examples. In the special number of the *Voix du Peuple* (Voice of the People), devoted to the history of the splitting of the French trade union movement (published in January 1921 by the leaders of the C. G. T.) the reformists expounded their standpoint and that of the opposition as follows:

"With the ones, the war had only increased the spirit of bitterness and revenge, whereby they forgot the circumstances, the impossibilities, in short, they forgot everything that constitutes the elements of serious, prepared and consciously pursued action. They have in fact forgotten trade union action, they have lost the consciousness of reality of the causes and principles which necessitate a relative degree of caution, as taught us by the cruel lessons of defeat. Action has become for them a magic word and they would not recognize that the action demanded by them could take no other form than that of a desperate revolt."

And then Jouhaux and his friends describe their attitude in the following words:—

"But others thought that this revolt would doubtless not be lacking in a certain beauty but unfortunately it could not produce any useful results. Whilst they would march with the mistaken conviction that every action signified a step forward, others are determined to base their whole activity upon earlier acquired methods of an intelligent and conscious investigation."

We will hear on the other side, how a representative of the opposition, Comrade Tommasi, characterized the tactics of the reformist leaders at the federation congress at Lyons, in September 1919:—

"At that time, when there were still very few organized workers you used to say: 'To the devil with the big battalions; what we need is a conscious minority who are not afraid of action.' But today the big battalions are with us . . . ! Today we are two millions strong in the C. G. T. Still you do not raise the claim to deny evolution (we will avoid the word revolution, — we are all revolutionaries); you will not disavow the evolution which has taken place in the masses. And I say: Whilst the masses are constantly evolving to a more definite activity, to a class activity, you are now obsessed with the big battalions; you have no certainty that these great masses will follow you on the day of action. I now claim that there is lacking somewhat, if not of courage — none of us is lacking in courage — in any case, the psychological sense."

Thus the two tendencies confront one another. On the one hand the former revolutionaries, the apostles of "revolutionary gymnastics" who have become the agents of imperialism, the guardians of the bourgeois "order", the champions of the "sacred unity"; on the other hand the opposition which resists this trend of activity, it is true, not from perfectly clear revolutionary insight, but because there still hovers before their vision, the "glorious past of the revolutionary C. G. T." of the pre-war time, and in the future the example and model of the Russian Revolution. The masses, however, pressed after the satisfaction of their desires and longings, after a human status within a human society which they had been promised as a reward for their heroic deeds in the service of the "Fatherland". And they were also ready for action and for the fight for this better position if the leaders would only have called and led them to it.

The three years that separated the end of the war from the deciding act which was crowned with the splitting of the French trade union movement, i. e., from the unity congress of December 1921, were years of serious defeats with regard to the efforts of the working class for their final emancipation and for the recognition of the historical tasks and travails of the French working class.

The great labor struggles of May—June 1919, which broke out in connection with the new regulations regarding the working day, or quite independent of them, brought the working class a partial degree of success. The bourgeoisie obsessed with the vision of the red spectre of Communism, which from the east had cast its shadow right across Europe, yielded under the pressure of the working class. But the great movement of the railwaymen failed. The fight overtaxed the resources of the workers' organization; the reformist leaders were prepared to stifle the movement; the revolutionary ones had neither the authority, nor strength, nor determination and clear insight enough to use the movement at least for the increase of revolutionary class consciousness. The movement of the 21st of July was a still greater fiasco, which revealed not only the treachery of the reformists but also the weakness of the opposition.

From the ideological point of view the situation was not much better. The *Lutte de Classe*, on the eve of the Congress of St. Etienne, correctly pointed out that the revolutionary minority, already at the federation congress of Orleans (September 1920), determined its fundamental point of view in demanding that the C. G. T. break away from the Amsterdam Trade Union International, and withheld from participation in the Geneva International Labor Bureau, but instead affiliated to the Red International of Labor Unions. But the declaration contained in this resolution, that affiliation to the Red International of Labor Unions, "can by no means be considered as a violation of the charter of Amiens", furnished proof that the opposition was not at all clear as to the further measures which the revolutionary trade union movement had to adopt. "The Charter of Amiens", a document limiting the tasks of the historical development of the French workers' movement, and the Red International, — the result of three years revolutionary struggles on the part of the Russian, the Western European, and the world proletariat during the period of social revolution, — these two are incapable of any reconciliation as the drafters of the minority resolution of Orleans intended. This was evidenced already in those divergences which could be traced in the speeches of different representatives of the revolutionary minority. One of these representatives, Mayoux for instance, even gave expression to the opinion that the *Syndicalist Party* is a real party, whereby this statement of the fact received its own approval.

The period of November 1918 to December 1921 was in the main, with regard to organization as well as to ideology, a period for the assembling of the forces of the opposition, of a continually widening breach between the revolutionary and reformist camps, of a greater intensification of the differences between these two tendencies. Jouhaux, Dumoulin and Merrheim, pursued their way without ever proposing to abandon it. For them the opposition was then as it was previously, nothing more than a "small group affiliated to the trade union organization, and taking part

in trade union activity in order to deprecate its value, by attacking its representatives."

But in the course of the three years which followed the discontinuance of the war, the "little group" grew to a power with which the leaders had to reckon. After the Federation Congress of Lille (July 1921), it became clear to the leaders that it wanted but another "victory" such as they had gained at this congress, and the leadership of the Federation would slip from their hands. At Orleans, the revolutionary minority received 683 votes against 1489; at Lille the votes were already 1348 to 1556. The bourgeoisie whose spiritual and political influence over Jouhaux and Merrheim is unmistakable, thereupon insisted that their friends make an end of the opposition before it had grown too strong for them. The representative of the Amsterdam Trade Union International at the Lille Federation Congress, *Mr. Fimmen*, declared that a split "was preferable to a unity which in reality was undeserving of the name". An attentive observer at this time rightly asserted that the Congress of Lille would be the last congress of the united C. G. T., whilst many revolutionaries were still confident that at the next congress they would be able to defeat the reformist majority. (For instance, *Comrade Rosmer*, in his article on the Lille congress in the *Red International of Labor Unions*.)

Yet another important fact made its impress on this phase of development of the French trade union movement. In connection with the first congress of the Red Trade Unions, the Charter Congress of the Red International of Labor Unions, a divergence of mind and position was even seen among the "revolutionary" trade unionists. This congress decided upon a step which perhaps did not sufficiently take into account the syndicalist and anarcho-syndicalist prejudices. It decided upon a close fighting alliance with the Communist International. This was immediately resisted by a portion of the revolutionary syndicalists, with the appeal to their "principles, program, and previous decisions", namely to the "full, unrestricted independence", and the "absolute autonomy" of the French trade union movement, the "right of self determination of the R. I. L. U.", in all its activities as a *conditio sine qua non* to the affiliation of the French "minority" to the Red International of Labor Unions. The way to the gathering of the revolutionary trade union forces on an international scale is not a smooth one; it is a road on which one has to encounter thousands of difficulties, and on which one is torn and bleeding before reaching the goal.

We have seen that the splitting of the trade union movement was for Jouhaux and Merrheim, as good as decided on, after the Lille congress. The stages in the further development up to the time of the split are a recent memory, and I will not go over them again. It would be useless to expend regrets over the accomplished historical facts, if one did not blind himself to the fact that this split is neither conducive to the spreading of the influence of the trade union organization among the working masses, which is an urgent need in France, nor does it serve to repel the offensive of capital which here, as elsewhere, has set in with full force since the middle of 1920. We can more rightly claim that with the congress of the new revolutionary C. G. T. U. at St. Etienne, an important step was taken towards the creation of a genuine revolutionary, fighting organization of the French working class in the national as well as in the international sense of this word.

This is, as we have said, a twofold aspect of the case. As regards the national aspect: with the repudiation of the anarcho-syndicalist excrescence of federalism, with the gradual overcoming of the sectarian notions as to the best forms and methods of the class struggle, a broader way opens up before the C. G. T. U. for the bringing in of greater masses of the workers into a close knit organization, as well as into the struggle itself for the daily interests of the proletariat and its final emancipation.

The recent struggle of the metal workers at Lille and Havre, the fight against the wage tax, the fight for the pardoning of the victims of military revenge justice, these important manifestations of the activity of the C. G. T. U. since the congress of St. Etienne, are evidence that the new Trade Union Federation and its leadership have perceived that action is the life of organization, that one cannot regard as "action" every proceeding on the part of "active minorities" (*minorités agissantes*), but that action must in the first place be *action on the part of the working masses themselves*. Whether the efforts exerted in the direction of building up the organization have reached the same level cannot for the moment be seen. That the literary squabbles of the "pure" and anarcho-syndicalists in the *Committee for the Defense of Syndicalism* are inessential goes without saying.

With regard to the international aspects of the new revolutionary French Trade Union Federation, we Communists cannot claim to be wholly satisfied with it. We know, however, as Marxists, that a step on the road is of more importance than the best worded program. We have confidence in life which is itself eternal movement and eternal revolution, — the more so as we

have the unshakable conviction that *we are living in the epoch of social revolution*.

Besides the C. G. T. U., however, there stands the C. G. T. and beyond these two trade union federations, the French working class, which still contains such a large percentage of unorganized workers. How does the matter stand? The fate of the C. G. T. is that of bourgeois society with which it is closely bound up through its activity during and since the war. The split pushes it more and more over to the right; its *raison d'être* for the present consists in offering itself to the bourgeois "order" as a dam against the flood of revolution.

With regard to the working masses it is true that at present they do not engage in such extensive action as those of England, Germany, and North America. But the movement of the metal workers in Lille and Havre referred to above, go to prove that the French workers too, are determined to defend tenaciously the gains won during the earlier period of "storm and stress". The time is coming when this will probably be necessary on a yet greater scale. The growth of the French trade union movement since the termination of the World War, gives us cause to be confident that the working class as well as the trade union organization will prove themselves capable of new and greater tasks.

THE COLONIES

The Débauché of Gandhism

By E. Roy.

II.

Non-payment of taxes was not the only disturbing feature of Indian unrest during the months of January and February. Widespread disturbances throughout India, from the Punjab to Madras, from Bombay to Burma, arose from the attempts to enforce the various measures of the Non-cooperation program, such as boycott of cloth and liquor-shops, resulting in encounters between police and people, and mob-risings, with loss of life and many arrests which tended to increase the general disquiet. The correspondent of the *Morning Post* writing from India at the end of January, says:

"In large areas, particularly upper Assam, conditions border on anarchy. Rent and revenue payments are refused, and where resort is had to loyalist volunteers and *Gurkhas*, the Gandhites have openly ridiculed such military procedure. In a police affray arising from picketing in Serajunge (Bengal), the police fired, killing five and wounding 200. The present tension, unless eased by stronger Government action, will have a most serious outcome."

In Bombay, the movement was more peaceful, consisting mainly of boycott of schools and enlistment of volunteers, so that in a mass-meeting held in Bardoli in January, under the auspices of the Non-cooperators, Mr. Gandhi was able to declare the district self-disciplined and fit enough for the adoption of Civil Disobedience. But even this model atmosphere was ruffled when the Bombay Government announced on Feb. 9, that the Municipalities of Ahmedabad and Surat would be superseded for two and three years respectively, for having resolved to conduct their schools independently of Government control and for refusing the Government education grant.

At this critical moment, an unexpected pin-prick exploded Mr. Gandhi's faltering resolution, and sent him scurrying back to the protection of law and order. On February 4th, a riot occurred in Chauri Chaura, a village of the United Provinces, in which a procession of volunteers was fired on by the police and the infuriated mob charged the police station, captured the building, killed 23 policemen, and then set fire to the police-station, cut the telegraph wires and tore up the railway. The news of this untoward but by no means unusual event, whose counterparts were being enacted all over India in every province, leaked through the official censorship on Feb. 6th, just in the moment when Mr. Gandhi and the Viceroy were exchanging their famous notes, and full details reached the Mahatma on the very day on which he announced the formal inauguration of *Maas Civil Disobedience*.

The gruesome details of burned policemen and dismantled telegraph-wires were more than Mr. Gandhi's sensitive conscience could bear. By some extraordinary mental process, he held himself and his declaration of Civil Disobedience to be responsible for the whole occurrence, and with a loud wail of dismay and despair, announced a five-days' fast (reduced to two days on the supplications of his followers) as penance and punishment for the tragedy of Chauri Chaura. In an article published on Feb. 10th in *Young India*, Mr. Gandhi declares:

"I regard the Chauri Chaura tragedy as a third warning from God against the hasty embarkation on mass civil disobedience, and it is my bitterest cup of humiliation, but I deem such humiliation, ostracism or even death preferable to any countenancing of untruth or violence."

Without loss of time, on Feb. 11th, a Conference was hastily convened at Bardoli, wherein the Working Committee of the Congress revoked not only Mass Civil Disobedience, but all picketing, processions and public meetings as well. The peasants were ordered to pay land-revenue and all other taxes due the Government, and to suspend every activity of an offensive nature.

Mr. Gandhi's harkening to his conscience did him the good service of delaying the order for his own arrest, a fact of which he was unaware at the time. The Government at Simla, a little amazed at this temperamental outburst and sudden change of heart, stayed its hand temporarily to permit Mr. Gandhi to lead the movement into confusion worse confounded. The national uprising which they had feared and prepared against during the last three months, was checked and thrown into rout by the good offices of Mr. Gandhi himself, whose incorrigible pacifism and dread of the popular energy could be counted upon to prevent the explosion. What Governmental repression in all its varied forms had failed to accomplish, the agonized appeal of the Mahatma was able to effectuate. Truly, as a Pacifist Reformer, Mr. Gandhi may well congratulate himself on his success in soothing the just anger of the populace, even though he may have to admit his utter failure to melt the heart of the Government. That which arrests, tortures, floggings, imprisonments, massacres, fines and police-zoolams could not quell,—the blind struggles of a starving nation to save itself from utter annihilation,—Mr. Gandhi by the simple magic of love and non-violence, reduced to impotence and inactivity, which insured its temporary defeat.

The Bardoli Resolutions were received throughout the country with mingled feelings of triumph, relief and alarm,—triumph on the part of the Government and its supporters, relief to the feelings of those moderates and secret sympathizers with the victims of Government repression, and alarm on the part of those Non-cooperators whose ideas of strategy and tactics differed widely from those of Mr. Gandhi.

While the Nationalist press on the whole supported Mr. Gandhi in his *volte-face*, and local Congress Committees immediately began to put the Bardoli Resolutions into practice, a section of Extremist opinion found itself outraged by the sudden retreat from the Ahmedabad decisions. Some Mahratta newspapers criticized Mr. Gandhi for stressing isolated incidents like Chauri Chaura and Bombay to the detriment of the movement as a whole. Mr. S. R. Bomanji, in a lecture delivered in Bombay on "The Lessons of Bardoli" declared that the people were asked to sacrifice everything and were prepared to do it, because they thought Mr. Gandhi was leading a fight for freedom. Mr. Gandhi was the most greatly admired man in India, but that did not preclude them from the right of thinking, and and in the hero-worship of Mr. Gandhi, they were losing their individuality.

The regular session of the All-India Congress Committee was held in Delhi on Feb. 24th, and the Bardoli resolutions were presented for endorsement. Pundit Malaviya, Mr. Gandhi's *alter ego* of Pacifism and Moderation, urged the ratification of Bardoli, and the complete abandonment of Non-cooperation in all its forms. Mr. Gandhi, still horror-stricken at the bloodshed of Chauri Chaura that presaged Revolution, hugged the Bardoli decisions without going to the length of Pundit Malaviya's surrender. But an angry section of earnest Extremists, realizing the disastrous effect upon the movement of the abandonment of all aggressive tactic, and smarting under the Government's ill-concealed triumph, urged the repudiation of Bardoli and the renewal of Non-cooperation, including Civil Disobedience. Mr. Gandhi himself, caught in the unpleasant predicament of being "let off" by the Government for good behavior, felt himself stung to self-defense by a return to his abandoned position. Accordingly, a compromise was struck, and the Delhi session of the Congress Committee sanctioned all forms of Non-cooperation, including individual civil disobedience, both defensive and aggressive, and picketing. The Resolution affirmed that "Civil Disobedience is the right and duty of a people, whenever a state opposes the declared will of the people."

The Delhi decision was a complete reversal of Bardoli, and as such, constituted a direct challenge to the Government.

The arrest of Mr. Gandhi, already once postponed, could be henceforth merely a matter of time and place. The wider issues of imperial policy as well as the Government of India, demanded it. In England, the Die-hards were clamoring for his blood, together with that of Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, whom they identified with the liberal policy of the Montford Reforms. Lloyd George, threatened with a General Election by the dissolution of his Coalition, ran hither and thither, hatching devices for saving his job. Having achieved the Irish Free State and "Independent" Egypt as sops to Liberal opinion, it became necessary to placate the Conservatives by some blood-offering, and this he proceeded to do by the sacrifice of Indian hopes and aspirations.

India's victimization to Lloyd Georgian and Imperial exigencies took three outward and visible manifestations. The first was the attempted splitting off of the Muslims from the Nationalist Movement by granting certain concessions to the claims of the Caliphate; the second was the dismissal of Mr. Montagu and the appointment of a Conservative to his post; the third was the arrest of Mr. Gandhi, with the purpose of dealing the *coup de grace* to the Non-cooperation Movement. Mr. Lloyd George is a clever politician, but events have not justified the wisdom of any one of these three steps.

The revision of the Treaty of Sévres had formed one of the demands of the Non-cooperators from the very beginning, as a means of bringing about the Hindu-Muslim unity so essential to the success of Indian nationalism. But Mr. Gandhi was not the only angler for Muslim good-will. The historic "divide and rule" policy of the British Government, which had met with so much success in India by the separation of Mussulmans and Hindus, could not be checkmated by so simple a manoeuvre as taking up the cudgels for the Caliphate. It was clear that if Muslim support could be bought by concessions to religious fanaticism, the British Government would be the first to buy it over, if it considered it worth while.

The time came when this policy seemed expedient. At the end of January, Lord Northcliffe, in the course of his Indian tour, published a significant and sensational letter advising concession to Muslim opinion, and the conservative press in England echoed his advice. The Viceroy of India took advantage of the approaching Paris Conference to telegraph the Home Government his oft-reiterated plea on behalf of some revision in favor of the Caliphate. It was evident that the Die-hards, influenced by traditional belief in the militant fierceness of the Mussulman, were inclined to placate this element at the expense of the Hindu community.

In a word, the Imperialists stole Mr. Gandhi's thunder, and hoped thereby to split the strength of the Indian Extremists. The Paris Conference, duly presided over by Lord Curzon who had his instructions, granted most of the things that Indian Muslims had clamored for. But the result has been somewhat disappointing. Seith Chotani, President of the Indian Central Caliphate Committee, issued a statement on behalf of his organization regarding the Near East proposals, which he stigmatizes as "pro-Greek" and entirely unacceptable to Indian Muslims. "Indian Muslims and their fellow-countrymen demand that England keep her promises to the letter and spirit". In view of international complications, England cannot very well concede more, so the ruse of buying up Muslim good-will can be said, on the whole, to have failed.

As for the dismissal of Mr. Montagu, this served its purpose with the Die-hards, but at what a cost to Indian public opinion only Lord Reading as the man on the spot, best knows. Mr. Montagu enjoyed a wide popularity among Indian Moderates, based on a fictitious idea of his friendliness to Indian constitutional reform, and this popularity has attained a frenzy of adulation since his spectacular martyrdom on the altar of British Liberalism in India. This frenzy is enhanced by a growing fear that his successor, Lord Peel, symbolizes a reversal of the Reform policy adopted in 1919. The slightest act of reversion on the part of the India Office will be heralded in India as the beginning of reaction and oppression. What Mr. Lloyd George has gained at home, he has more than sacrificed in India by this peculiarly inopportune victimization of pseudo-liberalism, which in reality, was never anything but a sugar-coated imperialistic pill.

As for the arrest of India's Mahatma! Mr. Lloyd George, should beware of the *Idea of March*. Scarce twelve days after the Delhi decisions, and simultaneously with the dismissal of Mr. Montagu, Mr. Gandhi was arrested on the charge of "tending to promote disaffection against the existing system of Government" by certain speeches and articles, and a few days later was brought to trial. True to his gospel of Non-cooperation, Mr. Gandhi pleaded guilty and offered no defense, urged the judge to find him guilty and to give him the maximum sentence, and in the course of a long written statement which he read out before the court, he reaffirmed his doctrine of non-violent Non-cooperation with the existing system of government in straightforward, eloquent words.

The judge who sat personifying British justice and honesty must have felt some inward qualms of conscience in the face of this ringing indictment, which fell upon the courtroom like the voice of suffering India itself. In a few words, half-explanatory and almost apologetic, he pronounced sentence,—*six years simple imprisonment*,—and the farce was over. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, apostle of Non-resistance, leader of Non-cooperation and beloved Mahatma of India's struggling millions, was led off to jail.

Let neither Lloyd George, nor Lord Reading, nor the thinking public be deceived by the calm that fell upon India's

millions at news of Mr. Gandhi's incarceration. The Non-cooperators, those who intoxicate themselves with the opiate of non-violence, may attribute it to *Soul-Force*; the Government may deem it the justification of its policy of repression; but for those who know India of today, this unearthly calm presages a storm more violent than any which has yet shaken the political horizon. That which is lacking is leadership in the Indian movement today. But without disrespect let us say frankly, that no leadership for a time is preferable to Mr. Gandhi's misleadership. He performed gallant service in the last three years, in leading the Indian people out of their age-long hopelessness and stagnation onto the path of agitation and organization which attained a nation-wide response, and scope. His own mental confusion was but a reflection of the confused and chaotic state of the movement itself, just staggering upon its weak legs and learning to walk.

All honor to Mr. Gandhi, who found a way for his people out of the entanglements of Government censorship and repression; who by his slogans of non-violent Non-cooperation, boycott and Civil Disobedience, he was able to draw the wide masses into the folds of the Congress Party and make the Indian movement for the first time truly national. But the movement had outgrown its leader; the time had come when the masses were ready to surge ahead in the struggle, and Mr. Gandhi vainly sought to hold them back; they strained and struggled in the leading-strings of Soul-Force, Transcendental Love and Non-violence, torn between their crying earthly needs and their real love for this saintly man whose purity gripped their imagination and claimed their loyalty.

Mr. Gandhi had become an unconscious agent of reaction in the face of a growing revolutionary situation. The few leaders of the Congress Party who realized this and sought a way out, were rendered desperate, almost despairing at the dilemma. Mr. Gandhi had become a problem to his own movement, and lo! the British Government, in its infinite wisdom, relieved them of the problem. Mr. Gandhi out of jail was an acknowledged force of peace, a sure enemy of violence in all its forms. Mr. Gandhi in jail is a powerful factor for unrest, a symbol of rational martyrdom, a constant stimulation to the national cause to fight its way to freedom.

Since his arrest, two wings of the Congress-Party have developed into clear-cut prominence. One veering towards the right, headed by *Malaviya*, seeks reunion with the Moderates, the abandonment of Non-cooperation and a bourgeois program of constitutional reform within the Empire. The other struggles vainly after the vanishing slogans of Gandhism,—*Satyagraha*, Non-violence, boycott of foreign goods, and the reconquest of India by the *Charka*. (Spinning-wheel.) In this camp which is all that remains of Extremism, reigns consternation and confusion, but a few voices are rising clear and strong above the din. The voice of Mr. C. R. Das, President of the last Bengal Provincial Conference, recommending the capture of the Reform Council and the formation of peasant and workers' unions; the voice of *Dr. Munji* in the Maharashtra Conference, which proclaimed that "the aim of the Congress is thoroughly worldly and for worldly happiness and has to be attained by worldly means which should be easily understandable and practicable"; the voice of nationalist journals which cry that the nation must be organized for the struggle, and that the real work lies among the masses.

New leaders are surging to the front, ready to learn by past mistakes and to build a new program for the future. Upon their understanding of the present Indian situation depends their present success or failure. The mass-movement among the workers and peasants is still strong and powerful; the Aika peasant movement in the United Provinces, the outbreak of unrest among the Bhils in Central India, the three months strike of the workers on the East India Railroad, prove where the real strength of the Indian movement lies. Reformist trade-union and cooperative workers are already in the field to capture the allegiance of the Indian masses. It remains for the Congress leaders to anticipate them by formulating such a program as will bring the workers and peasants of India to their side. In the dynamic struggle of mass-action under wise political leadership lies the true and only solution of the Indian struggle for freedom.

AGRICULTURE

The International Agricultural Workers' Congress

The second international Agricultural Workers Congress which was held on the 15th to the 17th of August 1922, is very instructive for the whole proletariat. There existed for decades

in various countries, weak agricultural workers' organizations in the shadow of the trade union movement. Only after the World War, have these vegetating organizations grown into more active life, and in the year 1919, the revolutionary period, there was constituted the Agricultural Workers' International. At the Congress, one and a half million agricultural workers, in fifteen unions, were represented by 24 delegates from England, Scotland, Germany, France, Italy, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary and Austria.

The speeches of Friedrich Adler who greeted the Congress in the name of the Social Democrats, and of the English delegate R. W. Smith, revealed the character of the Congress. R. W. Smith actually declared: "For the misery which today fills the world, the workers have no responsibility. But the consequences of these conditions are placed directly upon the backs of the working class. We must seek a way which will lead us out of all this. We must be prepared to enter into this with heart and soul. But if we wish to succeed in our aim we must not forget to make concessions. We must not desire to rule either over our comrades or over our enemies."

Every agricultural worker will be able to understand these tactics which were accepted by the Congress with enthusiastic applause. The Social Democratic leaders *do not wish to rule over the enemy*. This means that they do not desire the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is the naked truth. They also do not wish to rule over the agricultural workers, and they declare "we must not forget to make concessions". Peasant tricksters! They wish to thwart the agricultural workers' struggles, i. e., make concessions. What does this mean? It means domination over the agricultural proletariat. Dictatorship of the bureaucracy over the workers and concessions, mean class peace with the bourgeoisie. Thus do the Social Democrats represent the class interests of the agricultural worker. The agrarian capitalists continue their outrageous rule, and answer the most elementary demands of the striking agricultural workers with the bayonet and with volleys of bullets.

M. de Rode appeared in the name of the International Labor Bureau. Like Mr. Thomas, M. Rode is also one of the most richly salaried functionaries of the Labor Bureau. M. de Rode spoke to the effect, that the "international regulation of working hours was a desirable thing". He did not speak, however, with regard to the 48 hour working week. This had its reasons! It must be mentioned here that the regulation of the working hours of the agricultural worker was on the agenda of the International Labor Bureau, at its sixth Session, which took place in January 1921, but due to the intervention of the government representatives of the great agrarians of Spain and Switzerland, the question was removed from the agenda and postponed until after the harvest. The following demands were taken as the basis for the resolutions:

The eight hour day, unconditional prohibition of employment of children under 14 years, regulation of housing conditions, social insurance against sickness, accident, invalidity and old age, measures for the limitation of unemployment, settlement of right of combination.

These demands are the most urgent of the every day fight of the agricultural worker. The true fight for these demands is the active class struggle. The tactics approved by the Congress are incapable of realizing these demands. The Agricultural Workers' International leaves the agrarian question untouched. The agrarian question is one of the most important questions of proletarian, political and economic power. The idea of the revolutionary capture of the soil is ripening among the millions of proletarians. Thus do the Amsterdamers defend the interests of the world proletariat! That was characteristic: Concessions to the agrarian baron, "do not desire to rule", but blunt rejection of the revolutionary, Russian and Bulgarian agricultural workers organizations. The English, French, Belgian and Dutch delegates and the rest who spoke no word over the most fearful exploitation and robbery of the 100 million agricultural workers, will not admit the other millions of revolutionary workers of Russia and Bulgaria into the Agricultural Workers' International. Whilst the Congress brought in a vote of confidence to the counter-revolution, it protested against the condemnation of the counter-revolutionary S.R.'s.

The proceedings of the international agricultural workers' congress should serve as a warning to the proletariat. It is necessary that the Agricultural Workers' International become representative of the class interests of the 100 million agricultural workers.