

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4. No. 60

21st August 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.
— Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliessfach 29, Vienna VIII.
— Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

- V. I. Lenin: English Pacifism and English Aversion to Theory.
- Politics.
- Karl Radek: A New Stage in the Liquidation of the Versailles Treaty. III.
- W. N. Clark: Supporters of the English Labour Government showing Signs of Disappointment.
- In the R. I. L. U.
- A. Lozovsky: The Struggle for the Unity of the International Trade Union Movement.
- In the International
- Open Letter from the E. C. C. I. to the C. P. of Sweden.
- The Co-operative Movement.
- The Peasant International and the International Co-operative Alliance.

English Pacifism and English Aversion to Theory.

By V. I. Lenin.

The following article by Comrade Lenin was published a few days ago in the "Pravda" for the first time. The manuscript had not been dated by comrade Lenin. Hence it is impossible to state exactly when it was written. The "Pravda" estimates that it was probably written about the beginning of 1915. Ed.

In England there has existed up till now an incomparably larger measure of political freedom than in any other European country. Here the bourgeoisie has been more used to governing than is the case in other countries and understands the art of governing better. The relations between the classes are more developed and in many respects clearer than in other countries. Freedom from compulsory military service affords the people greater liberty in respect to their attitude to war in so far as everybody is free to refuse to enter the army. The government is therefore compelled (in England the government constitutes in its purest form a committee for conducting the business of the bourgeoisie) to exert all its forces in order to arouse "popular" enthusiasm for the war. It would be quite impossible to achieve this aim, without committing a fundamental breach of law, were the proletarian mass not completely disorganised and demoralised by the minority of best paid and qualified workers organised in the unions going over to liberal, that is to bourgeois politics. The English trade unions comprise one fifth of the wage workers. The leaders of these trade unions are liberals for the greater part, and Marx long ago designated them as agents of the bourgeoisie.

All these peculiarities of England enable us on the one hand to understand the nature of present day social chauvinism the more easily, as it is precisely the same in the countries with a despotic form of government, as well as in the democratic countries, in the militarist countries as well in those without compulsory military service. On the other hand they help us, when regard is had to all the facts, to estimate the importance of those reconciliatory tendencies with social chauvinism, which find ex-

pression for example in the glorification of the slogan of peace etc.

The most complete expression of opportunism and of liberal labour politics is undoubtedly to be seen in the Fabian Society. In this connection the reader should carefully peruse the exchange of letters between Marx and Engels and Sorge. He will there find a brilliant characterisation of this society by Engels, who treats Messrs Sidney Webb & Co. as a gang of bourgeois scoundrels, who wish to poison the workers and to influence them in a counter-revolutionary direction. We can be quite sure that not a single one of the influential and responsible leaders of the Second International has at any time attempted to refute this judgement of Engels and that none of them have attempted to cast any doubt upon the correctness of this judgement.

Let us lay aside theory for a moment and compare the facts. We shall see that the attitude of the Fabians during the war (see for example their weekly paper "The New Statesman") and that of the German Social Democratic Party, including Kautsky, is exactly the same. The same direct as well as indirect defence of social chauvinism, the same uniting of this defence with the inclination to utter all sorts of kind, humane and almost left phrases regarding peace, disarmament etc. etc.

The fact exists and there follows from it, no matter how disagreeable it may be for various persons, the inevitable and indisputable consequence: that the leaders of the present day German Social Democratic Party, including Kautsky, are in practice just as much agents of the bourgeoisie as the Fabians, whom Engels long ago characterised as such. The repudiation of Marxism by the Fabians and its "recognition" by Kautsky and Co. make not the slightest difference to the matter when it comes to actual policy, but only proves the transformation of Marxism into Struvinism by certain writers, politicians etc.... Their hypocrisy is not their personal sin; they can, under certain circumstances, be the best fathers of families. Their hypocrisy is the result of an objective contradiction in their social position.

Ostensibly they represent the revolutionary proletariat and in reality, are agents for the promotion of bourgeois chauvinist ideas in the ranks of the proletariat.

The Fabians are more honest and sincere than Kautsky & Co. as they have not promised to go in for the revolution — but politically they are of the same kidney.

The "deep-rootedness" of political freedom in England and the high stage of development of English political life in general and of the English bourgeoisie in particular have resulted in the various shades of bourgeois opinions in this country finding quickly, easily and freely a new form of expression in new political organisations. One of these organisations is the "Union of Democratic Control". The secretary and treasurer of this organisation is E. D. Morel who is at present a constant contributor to the central organ of the "Independent Labour Party", the "Labour Leader". Morel was some years ago the candidate of the liberal party in the constituency of Birkenhead. When Morel, soon after the outbreak of the war, spoke against Russia, he was informed by a letter from the Birkenhead Liberal Association dated 2nd October 1914 that in future his candidature would not be acceptable for the Liberal Party, that means, he was simply expelled from the party. Morel replied in a letter dated 14th October which he then published in a special pamphlet under the title: "The outbreak of the war". In this pamphlet, as well as in a number of other articles, Morel exposes his government by proving how incorrect it was to point to the violation of Belgium neutrality as being the cause of the war and to claim that the object of the war was the destruction of Prussian imperialism etc. etc. Morel defends the programme of the "Union of Democratic Control": Peace, disarmament, the right of self-determination of all territories on the basis of a plebiscite, and democratic control of foreign policy.

From all this it is to be seen that Morel as a person undoubtedly deserves recognition for his sincere sympathy for democracy, for his turning from the chauvinist bourgeoisie to the pacifist bourgeoisie. When Morel proved by facts that his government deceived the people when they denied the existence of secret treaties, although they existed all the time; that the English bourgeoisie, even in the year 1887, was perfectly clear as to the inevitability of the violation of Belgium neutrality in the event of a Franco-German war and emphatically rejected every idea of intervention (Germany at that time was not yet a dangerous competitor), that the French militarists of the type of Colonel Boucher have before the war, in a number of books, openly announced their intention of conducting an aggressive war on the part of France and Russia against Germany; that the well-known English military authority, Colonel Repington, in the year 1911 characterised in the press the increase of armaments in Russia since 1905 as a danger for Germany — when Morel proves all this, we must admit that we are dealing with a courageous bourgeois who is not afraid of breaking with his own party.

Everybody must however immediately perceive that he is nevertheless a bourgeois, whose phrases regarding peace and disarmament remain empty phrases, as without the revolutionary action of the proletariat there can be no talk either of a democratic peace or of disarmament. And Morel, who has now fallen out with the Liberals on account of the question of the present war, remains on all economic and political questions a liberal. Why is it regarded, not as a piece of hypocrisy, but as a merit when Kautsky in Germany uses the same bourgeois phrases concerning peace and disarmament, decorated with marxist terminology? Only the backward development of political conditions and the lack of political freedom in Germany prevents a bourgeois league of peace and disarmament springing up, on the basis of the programme of Kautsky, with the same ease and rapidity as in England.

Let us recognise the fact that Kautsky adopts the standpoint of the pacifist bourgeoisie and not of the revolutionary social democracy. We are living in the midst of sufficiently great events to have the courage to recognise the truth "regardless of persons".

In their aversion to abstract theory, proud of their practicality, the English often approach political questions in a direct manner. They thereby help the socialists of other countries to find the real content within the husk of every kind of terminology — including the "marxist". In this connection the pamphlet, "Socialism and War", which was published before

*) "Socialism and War": The Clarion Press 44, Worship Street, London, E. C.

the war by the chauvinist paper "The Clarion", is instructive. The pamphlet contains a "declaration" by Upton Sinclair the American Socialist against war, and the reply of the chauvinistic Robert Blatchford, who has for long occupied the same imperialist position as Hyndman.

Sinclair is a sentimental socialist without theoretical training. He puts the question "simply", he is incensed at the approach of war and seeks salvation from war through socialism.

"We are told" — writes Sinclair — "that the socialist movement is still too weak, that we must rely upon evolution. But evolution proceeds in the hearts of men; we are the instruments of evolution, and if we do not fight, then there will be no evolution. We are told, that our movement against the war will be suppressed. But I declare, and I am profoundly convinced of it, that the suppression of all activity which has as its aim, on the ground of the highest humanity, the prevention of war, would constitute the greatest victory of socialism, — the greatest it has ever gained — as this would rouse the conscience of civilisation and stir up the workers of the whole world as never before in history. Let us not be too anxious regarding our movement, let us not attach too much importance to numbers and the appearance of outward strength. A few thousand with enthusiastic faith and determination are stronger than a million of more cautious and respectable people. And there is no greater danger for the socialist movement than the danger of becoming an accepted institution**).

As we see this is a naive, not well thought-out theoretically, but a thoroughly right exhortation against allowing socialism to become rotten and a summons to revolutionary struggle.

What is Blatchford's reply to this?

"That war is caused by capitalist and militarist interests, all this is quite true. And I am striving, not less than any other socialist, for peace and the overcoming of capitalism by socialism. But Sinclair will not convince me by means of rhetorical and beautiful phrases, he will not be able to get away from the facts. Facts, my dear Sinclair, are obstinate things and the German danger is a fact. Neither we nor the German socialists are in a position to prevent war. Sinclair tremendously overestimates our forces. We are not united, we have neither money, nor weapons nor discipline. There only remains one thing for us: to help the English government to increase its fleet, as there is and can be no other guarantee for peace."

On the continent of Europe the chauvinists, neither before nor after the outbreak of the war have ever proclaimed themselves so openly. In Germany there prevails in the place of such sincerity the hypocrisy of Kautsky and the playing with sophisms; the same is the case with Plechanoff. It is especially instructive therefore to observe the conditions in a more developed country. Here it is impossible to mislead anybody by sophistry and by a travesty of marxism. Here the questions are stated directly and correctly. Let us learn from the "advanced" English.**)

Sinclair in his appeal, although this appeal is at bottom thoroughly correct — is naive, as he has neglected to observe the 50 years development of the socialist mass movement and the struggle of tendencies within this mass movement; he fails to observe the conditions of growth of revolutionary action along with the existence of an objective revolutionary situation and a revolutionary organisation. One cannot make up for this lack by "sentiment". One cannot by means of rhetoric evade the hard and ruthless fight of powerful tendencies in socialism — the opportunist and the revolutionary tendency.

Blatchford baldly proclaims the truth, and puts forward the concealed argument of the Kautskyites who fear to speak the truth. We are still weak and that is all — says Blatchford. But through his sincerity he immediately reveals and lays bare his opportunism, his chauvinism. That he serves the bourgeoisie and the opportunists is to be seen at once. After having admitted the "weakness" of socialism, he weakens it himself by advocating an anti-socialist bourgeois policy. Like Sinclair, but on the other side, not as a fighter but as a coward, not as a hot-head but as a traitor, he also fails to take into account the conditions for the creation of a revolutionary situation.

But in his practical conclusions and in his policy (renunciation of revolutionary action and of the propagation and preparation of this action), Blatchford, the vulgar chauvinist, follows precisely the same path as Plechanov and Kautsky.

***) Re-translated from the Russian.

Marxist phrases have nowadays become a cloak for the complete denial of Marxism. — In order to be Marxist one must expose the "sham Marxist saintliness" of the leaders of the II. International, one must fearlessly keep in view the struggle of two tendencies in socialism and think out the questions of this struggle to their logical conclusion. — This is the inference to be drawn from the English conditions which reveal to us the Marxist essence of the matter without Marxist phrases.

POLITICS

A New Stage in the Liquidation of the Versailles Treaty.

By Karl Radek.

III.

America's Return to Europe.

Why did the United States enter the World War?

The United States were the chief suppliers of munitions and material for the world-slaughter. If Great Britain had not had the command of the sea, the United States would have supplied corn, cannon and cartridges to both groups of belligerents. But the way to Germany was cut off by the English fleet. It was only by supporting the Entente that the United States were able to coin gold out of blood. For the destruction of the cities of Europe, there sprung up out of the ground new cities in America: cities of tinned meat factories and cities of munition works. American industry grew at a rate unexampled even for this continent of rapid changes. It soon became apparent that the Entente Powers were no longer in a position to pay for their orders. Thereupon the Banking house of Pierpont Morgan undertook the task of financing them. The mountain of debts continued to grow, but the Allied cause in Europe grew continually worse. Russia lost one army after the other. Roumania was crushed. The Austro-German coalition had opened its way to Turkey. Who was to pay the Allied debts to Pierpont Morgan? Wilson, who had been elected as president for the second time on the programme of peace and neutrality, led America into the war against the clearly expressed will of the majority of its population, after first having broken the resistance of the country with all the means of the capitalist dictatorship.

The entry of America on the side of the Entente decided the victory of Entente capital. The people who were being fed with the wheat and meat of the huge continent of North America; the men who were being armed by Vickers, Schneider-Creuzot and the Bethlehem Steel Corporation vanquished the famished men who were only being armed by Krupp and the Skoda Works. America emerged from the war having spent 33 milliard dollars and having in its portfolio a promissory note from the Allies amounting to 10 milliards. Aboard the ship "Washington" there set out for Europe, Wilson, the democratic pacifist President of the United States. The petty bourgeois masses of West, South and Eastern Europe hailed this puppet of Morgan as the Messiah who, after the guns, would bring them the fourteen commandments of the new dispensation.

Why did the Messianic Wilson return to America a hopeless paralytic, and why did the United States fail to bless mankind with peace and welfare?

The idea of the League of Nations brought forward by Wilson signified in practice the attempt of the leading clique of America Financial Capital to gain the hegemony of Europe. It was wrecked against unsurmountable obstacles, both in Europe and in the United States themselves. America's hegemony involved the freedom of the seas; but Great Britain would not entertain the idea of dismantling the fortresses on the rocks of Gibraltar and Malta, nor the fortifications on the sands of Suez, Aden and of hundreds of other British naval bases. France, having seized hold of the Rhine, declared: "As regards Self-determination and the slogan, 'Against annexations' you have expressed yourselves very finely. We have freed from annexation, Alsace and Lorraine, and the Saar basin can have self-determination after fifteen years, if the Germans can rake up sufficient milliards to buy out the mines and the pits which will yield supplies in the place of those destroyed in Northern

France." In short, the attempt of American financial capital to establish American hegemony in Europe met with the resistance of Allied capital. It goes without saying that the indebtedness to America, amounting to 10 milliard dollars, is no trifle. But not only the debtor appears to be tied down, but also the creditor. The American financial oligarchy could not, immediately after the war, turn upon those powers which it had only just previously helped to attain victory, if it did not wish to compromise itself in an unheard of manner in the eyes of the American masses. As regards military aid in the future, the result of the war constituted the beginning of new groupments of the powers with entirely unforeseeable combinations of forces.

If the leading elements of victorious European capital showed determined resistance against the attempt of the American financial world to attain dictatorship over Europe, so in America this attempt did not meet with the support even of the bourgeoisie. The industrial bourgeoisie has a huge home market in America. It sees the possibility of capturing South and Central America, where only England has remained as a serious competitor. It has its eyes on Eastern Asia, where there is imminent a struggle for a future a hundred times more attractive than the reconstruction of ruined Europe. The Allied powers owe 10 milliard dollars to the American state. It will be necessary to compel them to pay, in order to reduce the pressure of taxation (the interest on the state debt at present equals the amount of the whole pre-war budget), which threatens to increase the cost of production. If Morgan had personally lent 4 milliards to the Allies it would have been his own business to obtain repayment.

The masses of the American farmers and of the petty bourgeoisie are tired of the war. Intervention in European affairs involves the danger of being dragged into new military adventures. The Versailles Peace is pregnant with the danger of new wars. If Europe has become so mad as to have no other choice than that of a world war or the pangs of revolution, then the rational American must turn his back on her.

And America turned her back on Europe. Wilson with his League of Nations in one hand and with Morgan in the other was crushed. There came into power the Republican party, the party of the conservative industrial bourgeoisie, behind which there stood the Oil Trust, headed by Rockefeller, and the new commandment was issued: Isolation from European squabbles and long live the squabble over oil between ourselves and the Allies!

Why are the United States again concerning themselves with the Welfare of Europe?

It is a matter of course that the United States of America, represented by their leading class, never for a moment thought of renouncing this world and devoting themselves solely to honest work within the four walls of America, no matter how huge its extent may be. America is too large, too rich and too much interested in the development of world politics to do such a thing.

In the first place the American bourgeoisie has exported capital abroad, in spite of the fact that in America itself during the last years a huge number of new joint stock companies were founded with new capital amounting to eight milliard dollars a year. This capital was exported first of all to the countries of South America, Africa and Eastern Asia, but partly also to Europe. In Europe it served to bless a number of countries possessing a relatively stable capitalism, as Norway, Switzerland etc., where there was no risk. Forty per cent of the exported capital found its way to South America. To Eastern Asia there was exported in 1922, capital amounting to 110 million dollars; in 1923 it amounted to 70 million dollars. The participation of the United States in the loan for the reconstruction of the areas destroyed by the earthquake in Japan is one of the means of strengthening that portion of the Japanese bourgeoisie which is opposed to the sharpening of the relations between Japan and America.

In the second place the United States conducted a very energetic world policy. "There is no admiral who in his whole life has sunk so many ships as did the American State Secretary, Hughes, at the Washington Conference within thirty five minutes", stated the English military writer Colonel Repington regarding the result of the Washington Conference which put an end to the supremacy of Great Britain upon the seas. At this same conference the United States compelled Great Britain to renounce the alliance with Japan. At the Lausanne Conference the United States appeared as a first class power highly interested in

the situation in the Near East. While the American ambassador Child only played the part of a spectator, the representatives of the Oil Trust aimed at obtaining from the English their consent to the participation of American capital in the distribution of the oil fields liberated from Turkish tyranny, and they obtained this consent.

Even regarding Russian affairs America never for a moment remained so inactive as would appear to the reader of the notes and speeches of the honourable Mr. Hughes, who pretends to have no further knowledge of Russia than the fact that there is no "democracy" there. The book by Devonport and Cook ("The Oil Trusts and the Anglo-American Relations") fully confirms the assumptions of the Naphta expert of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Arens, that the Genoa Conference was cut short by the American Oil Trust which, not deciding itself to take the concessions for oil in Russia, was fearful that the English Oil Trust would conclude this bargain. Even the oil scandal in America, which has caused so much damage to the Republican administration, was engineered by agents of Standard Oil, which had no hesitation in compromising the government which it supported if only it could thereby compromise the Sinclair Company which had dared to enter into oil bargains with the Soviet government and had thereby thwarted the policy of Standard Oil. The American policy regarding Russia is a dog in the manger policy.

It was only in regard to Germany that the United States remained inactive, waiting for the moment when the transition to activity would give them the possibility of obtaining the greatest results at the cost of least effort. In our Report to the IV. Congress of the Comintern on the Liquidation of the Versailles Treaty we wrote:

"By refusing to grant a loan to Germany, America can place German economics and finances in such a position in which the dollar will be able to buy up the industry of Germany at the cheapest price. When ex-Senator Knox made the proposal that America should intervene in the economic affairs of Europe, he brought forward the following scheme for the financial control of Germany: Since France is the enemy of Germany and since England does not enjoy the confidence of France, it follows that neither English nor French financial control of Germany is possible, and it is necessary to appoint as controller the American State Secretary, Hoover, who appears to be an unbiased person. This is the programme of America's control of Germany, a programme which in the event of a further aggravation of the economic situation in Europe might soon become a reality. The Versailles Treaty, which has established the complete domination of France over Germany, is thereby liquidated and there only remains the question, in which form the Allies acknowledge this liquidation. The question, which at present cannot yet be answered, consists in whether this liquidation shall take place in the form of an agreement between American and French capital, or between American and English capital."

We have only been mistaken in so far as instead of Mr. Hoover, Mr. Owen Young was appointed. All other predictions have been fulfilled. This situation was the result of the following circumstances:

a) The Mark collapsed and Germany was compelled to agree to everything which her saviours dictated to her. The correspondent of the "Kölnische Zeitung" states that when the leading American financiers revealed to him the conditions under which America would "save" Germany, he drew their attention to the fact that Germany is hardly able to accept these conditions, as in this event she would have no say in the decision of her fate. To this objection to the conditions of the "salvage" the American financiers answered by shrugging their shoulders. But this is not all. The principal obstacle in the field of foreign policy for America in the reparation question is the fear of giving a rebuff to France. As late as January of last year, Poincaré proudly declared that he did not intend to hand over the fate of France to international financial capital. It was precisely for this reason that he went into the Ruhr in order to decide independently the reparation question. At present the organ of the English Foreign Office, "The Daily Telegraph", is in a position to declare calmly and openly that when M. Poincaré obtained support for the Franc by English and American banks, he pledged himself to subordinate himself to the decisions of the Experts' Commission, which is headed by the representative of the American banking house of Morgan, "General" Dawes. So long as France was not in a situation compelling her to abandon her independent

policy, America could not apply pressure upon her without siding openly with England against France. America did not decide upon such an indelicate attitude towards France, because France can still be of use to her against England. At present America is carrying out her own policy and is playing the role of the saviour of both Germany and France.

b) No less favourable is the position of the American government from the point of the situation within the country. The chief question for the financial oligarchy of America, which is pushing the United States towards Europe, consisted in how to secure the support, or at least the neutrality, of the broad masses. This support is secured for Morgan by the agrarian crisis and the beginning of the industrial crisis. Already in 1921 Albert Shaw the editor of the American "Review of Reviews", in the traditional number of the London "Times" devoted to the anniversary of the separation of the United States from England, wrote as follows: "For the first time in history the farmers of the United States have begun to understand that their own welfare depends to a larger extent upon foreign relations than upon the other elements exercising an influence upon agrarian production."

In the meantime the agrarian crisis has not declined but increased. In 1922 two millions of the agrarian population had to abandon farming. In 1923 these figures had already reached three millions. A considerable portion of the Northern agrarian regions have fallen out of cultivation. The bankruptcy of many agrarian banks has begun. The government is compelled, before the elections, to bring forward some programme which promises amelioration of the condition of the farmers. The return of the United States to Europe is dangled before the eyes of these masses as a means of winning a new market for American grain. This is to a large extent a swindle, as the essence of the American crisis consists, not merely in the shrinking of the European market, but also in that America is producing grain at a higher price than Argentine, Canada and Russia. But the peasant masses are not yet able to judge so well that Morgan is not still able to throw sand into their eyes. It is characteristic that petty bourgeois representatives of the masses of farmers, as La Follette and Johnson, declare themselves in favour of "helping Germany".

The second factor which favours the attempt to draw America into the jungle of the reparation question is the industrial depression which commenced in the Spring of this year. The reduction of the steel production by 20 per cent; the heavy crisis in the textile industry; the falling off in the production of motor cars by 20 per cent; the crisis in the coal industry — all this proves that American industry has out-grown the home market. The economic expedition to Europe is presented to the masses as a means of reducing unemployment, of winning new markets in Europe, which before the war had purchased 62 per cent of American exports and had furnished about 50 per cent of the American imports, while at present it absorbs only 55 per cent of American exports and supplies 31 per cent of America's imports. Finally, 4 milliard dollars in gold, i. e. 40 per cent of the total world's gold supply, lying unused in the American banks, threaten to depreciate this gold. A so-called gold inflation is threatening. Capital is value producing surplus value; American gold is seeking to penetrate into Europe in order to squeeze out surplus value from the white European coolies.

"General Dawes completes the victory of General Pershing."

This is the title which the American review, "The Literary Digest", gave to an article dealing with the attitude of the press to the Experts' Report. There was a time when Europe pictured American capital to herself as a benevolent uncle who dies at the convenience of his spendthrift European nephew. Afterwards, instead of the comical old man with the high hat and with the star-spangled banner in his hand, there appeared the innocent bride with the huge dowry, the daughter of the millionaire and manufacturer of tooth-paste in Chicago, who, by conferring her hand, renders happy Prince Heinrich the sixty seventh of Reuss-Greiz etc. Now, pacifist America with her milliards appears in the person of General Dawes, the only genuine military thing about whom is his epaulettes. General Dawes is a provincial American attorney who, in guarding the interests of small gas companies, wriggled his way into banks financing these enterprises and finally penetrated into their administration. Since God rewards the pure in heart, Mr. Dawes feathered his nest and entered into the large family of poor millionaires. As such a poor devil with a few millions he became an agent of Morgan. When America entered the war he procured for himself the rank of General and fought bravely in the Commissariat of General

Pershing. Having returned to America, he hung his sword and laurels on the wall and devoted himself to the old profitable work: he represented Morgan in many enterprises delegated to him. When Morgan decided to include Germany and the rest of Europe in his system of enterprises, General Dawes, in order to cut a more brilliant figure, furnished up his old uniform and headed the Experts' Commission. Up to that moment the gallant General Dawes had only been known to America as a pleader at the Courts, as one who smoked a pipe with the bowl upside-down and played the violin with considerable skill.

The General now has every chance of kidding himself that, as with Columbus, so with him a new era in the history of mankind is being ushered in: the epoch of the discovery of Europe by America. Columbus, as is known, was an honest man, but up to the present his adventure has resulted in that the feudal and capitalist robbers of Europe have skinned the peaceful population of America to the bone. We do not wish to say anything uncharitable regarding the heart and the conscience of that artistic pipe-smoker and violin virtuoso, General Dawes, but we must admit that he differs from Columbus in that he goes to Europe with a definite scheme in his pocket for plundering her. The Experts' Scheme, as we shall show later, is the most refined instrument for the exploitation of Germany. The Swedish bourgeois economist Professor Gustav Kassel, is entirely correct when he writes ("Svenska Dagbladet", of 6th July):

"The Dawes Plan appears as the most perfect and successful plan for systematically sucking the juices from a nation living under the conditions of modern culture."

Supporters of the English Labour Government showing Signs of Disappointment.

By W. N. Clark (London).

Although the British Labour Government still enjoys a large degree of popularity among the broad masses of the workers, there are indications all round that the process of disillusionment and disappointment, which must inevitably result from its policy of class collaboration and abandonment of principle, is steadily making headway, particularly among the more advanced section of the workers. This fact was recently borne out by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. J. H. Thomas. Speaking at a luncheon of the South African Luncheon Club, this notorious labour imperialist expressed in the presence of the avowed enemies of Labour the insolent contempt he feels for the opinions of the rank and file of the Labour Movement, thanks to whose efforts he and his colleagues occupy their present positions as ministers of His Majesty. In the course of his speech he declared:

"I have had an opportunity of seeing in advance the agenda for the next Labour Party Conference. It goes without saying that there were a number of resolutions in it condemning, in Labour language, the Labour Cabinet." (Laughter.) "There were a number of resolutions setting out in detail how Labour Ministers had betrayed the cause, and there was one demanding that in the interests of true democracy J. H. Thomas should be expelled, not merely from the Labour Party, but from the Cabinet." (Renewed laughter.) Even for an after-luncheon speech this speech of Mr. Thomas was more than usually stupid. With his political experience, Mr. Thomas must undoubtedly be aware that it is precisely those workers who take a keen interest in the work of the Labour Party and show sufficient interest to get resolutions passed at local branches and organisations, who do the real spade work in the Labour movement, and that it is upon their activity and enthusiasm that the fate of the movement largely depends. Once the Labour government loses the confidence of this section of the workers its days are numbered, no matter how proficient its members may prove themselves at taking tea with royalty or delivering successful after-dinner speeches before South African magnates.

But is it not only among the rank and file of the workers that there are growing signs of discontent at the government's failure to carry out a Labour policy. There are many sincere pacifists who saw in the coming to power of a Labour government the realisation of their cherished dreams of a new era of Peace in Europe and a departure from the policy of rivalry and armaments. It is not surprising that some of these people are now receiving a rude awakening. One by one the pacifist planks in the Labour platform have been abandoned. Reduction of arma-

ments, revision of the Versailles Treaty, abolition of Secret Diplomacy — these were some of the things to which the Labour Party pledged itself again and again. Secret Diplomacy has for years been the *Bête Noire* of nearly all I. L. P. propagandists, who saw the causes of war, not in the contradictions in capitalist society which drive the sections of the world bourgeoisie at each others throats, but solely in the machinations of a handful of Machiavelians called "diplomats", who sat in secret council and plotted wars — solely actuated thereto, apparently, by a diabolical instinct. It was continually urged from a hundred I. L. P. platforms that once this institution of Secret Diplomacy were abolished, and a "sane and rational method established for settling national disputes" etc., humanity need no longer be haunted by the spectre of war. In spite of the fact that Mr. MacDonald, who combines the office of Foreign Secretary with that of Prime Minister, was one of those who helped to found the "Union of Democratic Control", there seems little likelihood of any of our "secret diplomats" being forced to draw the unemployed dole under his regime, nor do we hear of the publication of the secret documents stored in the archives of the Foreign Office, as was the case not only in Russia after the October revolution, but also in Bavaria under the administration of Kurt Eisner (a member of the Independent Social Democratic Party) in November 1918. On the contrary the English tradition of "continuity in foreign policy" has once more been confirmed.

Among those who have been moved to voice their protest against the government's foreign policy, particularly as regards the Versailles Treaty and the reparations question, is the well-known pacifist Mr. E. D. Morel, the author of "Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy", "Truth and the War" etc.

In a letter to the "New Leader", the official organ of the I. L. P., he writes:

"... The time has come for plain speaking. Men whose loyalty and services to the Party cannot be questioned are beginning to feel serious concern at the apparent jettisoning, in matters of foreign policy, of convictions and pledges which have been the inspiration of the Party for the last five years, and which have materially assisted in placing the Party where it is today, because the country believed that those pledges were seriously meant.

"It is very much open to doubt whether the Party would be in office at this moment but for the belief entertained in the country as to the sincerity and capacity of its leaders to give to our foreign policy a distinctive tendency harmonising with the repeated declarations of its leaders over a term of years.

"... if our Party is not to lose a considerable amount of popular support and the confidence of its own followers, the impression must no longer be conveyed that principle is to give way to expediency in matters upon which its leaders have nailed their colours to the mast so tightly that they can only wrench them free by pulling down the mast itself. That it should have been possible for the Conservative leaders last week to affirm dogmatically that a Labour Government had re-established the authority of the Versailles Treaty not again to be questioned by any British government, without such affirmation being queried by so much as a negative interjection, is the kind of thing which is calculated to spread the dry-rot of suspicion and disillusion in our ranks. For everyone is aware that so long as an unamended Versailles Treaty continues to be the public law of Europe, Europe will not know Peace. We have been told so by our leaders for five years, and we knew it without their telling us. Principles proclaimed for years cannot be abandoned in a night by a Party to whom principles are realities.

"... There is a regrettable and growing tendency to treat the Parliamentary Party in these affairs as a tame cat. That will not work... Men up and down the country, in Parliament and out of it, who have gone through the burden of the day, fought for principle and for truth, and seen them gradually take root in the minds of others, will not readily allow them to be set aside because their friends are in power."

This "Revolt of the Back Benches", as Mr. Morel's letter is headed, is only symptomatic of the change of feeling which is gradually taking place in the country as it becomes more and more recognised that the so-called Labour Government is merely carrying out the will of the British bourgeoisie which still remains in undisturbed possession of power. This change of feeling should provide very favourable soil for our British Party in its propaganda work.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

The Struggle for the Unity of the International Trade Union Movement.

(The Results of the III. Congress of the R. I. L. U.)

By A. Lozovsky.

During the course of its development the labour movement has undergone many crises. One of the most important of these crises, owing to its character and consequences, is the national and international split in the trade union movement. The root and source of this split is to be traced back to the outbreak of the war, when the leading elements of the socialist parties and of the trade unions identified the fate of the labour organisations with the fate of the capitalists of their respective countries. The four years of war and the six years of peace which followed it opened the eyes of broad masses of workers and made it clear to them wherein lies the source of weakness of the proletarian masses. This experience has proved the following: the more peacefully the socialist parties and trade unions were disposed towards the bourgeoisie, the deeper they drove a wedge into the working class. The history of the last ten years is the history of the decay of the social democratic parties and of the reformist trade unions; it is the history of a slow recovery on the part of the proletarian rank and file by means of the founding of Communist Parties and revolutionary trade unions, or trade union minorities. The splitting of the political parties, the drawing of all sound proletarian elements away from the influence of these parties, was the pre-requisite for the overcoming of the crisis. The process of the formation of the Communist Parties began, with the exception of Russia, with the commencement of the war and found its international expression in the formation of the Communist International, the five years existence and success of which we have recently celebrated. While the political labour movement faces all the revolutionary elements with the direct task of building up the Communist Parties as rapidly as possible, the interests of the labour movement demand the preservation at all costs of the unity of the revolutionary movement by means of a struggle within the trade unions for a revolutionary programme and revolutionary tactics. There is no contradiction in the fact that the revolutionary workers have, on the one hand, split the social democratic and the so-called independent parties in order to form revolutionary communist organisations and that, on the other hand, these same workers combat with all their power, those communists who wish to split the trade unions. The different character of these two types of workers organisations compels the communists to conduct a different policy regarding them in order to achieve the same end: the capturing of the masses. The setting up of the communist parties was everywhere accompanied by the slogan: "fight for the unity of the trade unions, fight against the theory of destroying the trade unions", and in those cases where such a theory has arisen, the Communist International declared the most energetic fight against it.

But if the Comintern has always fought against splitting the trade union movement, why then was the Red International of Labour Unions created? The R. I. L. U. was created after the Amsterdam International had linked up its fate with the League of Nations, after the Amsterdam International had, along with the representatives of the largest employers organisations, taken part in throttling the revolutionary labour movement in all countries, after the Amsterdam International had proclaimed the sharpest struggle against the Russian revolution and the Communist International. From the beginning of 1920 the discontent with the old programme and the old tactics made its appearance in all countries, but this discontent did not yet possess a sufficiently clear and definite ideological character. It was necessary to bring together these multifarious views, to assemble the revolutionary forces existing in the international trade union movement around an ideological and organisational centre, to work out a clear policy and to take up the struggle against reformism which was poisoning the labour movement in a common revolutionary front. There therefore arose in 1920 the R. I. L. U. which continued to develop. From the first day of its existence the R. I. L. U. emphatically pronounced against the splitting of the trade unions. That alone is to be seen from the following facts:

1. The R. I. L. U. pronounced itself against the slogan of destroying the trade unions.

2. The R. I. L. U. proposed to the Amsterdam International to restore the unity of the French and Czechoslovakian trade union movement.

3. The R. I. L. U. has at all its congresses decided that all revolutionary unions shall affiliate to their respective Internationals.

4. The R. I. L. U. has several times openly declared that the International Propaganda Committees will be dissolved as soon as the revolutionary unions in questions are admitted into the respective internationals.

5. The R. I. L. U. at its II. Congress issued the slogan of the united front and often approached the Amsterdam International with the proposal for common action.

6. At the International Peace Congress at the Hague the R. I. L. U. attempted to propose the united front to the Amsterdam International. Similar attempts were undertaken after the Ruhr Occupation and before and after the Frankfurt Conference.

7. The R. I. L. U. regards the united front in the trade union movement as the first step towards the organisational union of the divided portions of the movement.

8. In every case in which tendencies to split the trade unions appeared in the ranks of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. the R. I. L. U. has opposed this attitude with the greatest determination and defended the slogan of trade union unity with all the means at its disposal.

All these facts are known to those who have more or less carefully followed the activity of the R. I. L. U., the decisions of its congresses and the instructions of its executive organ.

How did the Amsterdam International and the organisations affiliated to it reply to all these measures of the R. I. L. U.? They replied with a furious campaign against the Communists and with their expulsion from the trade unions. If the R. I. L. U. had allowed itself to be actuated by the same motive as the Amsterdamers, that is, by the wish to get rid of their opponents at any price, then to-day the disruption of the trade unions along the whole line would have been an accomplished fact. The R. I. L. U. was only prompted in its attitude by its regard for the requirements of the class struggle, and in spite of every provocation stood by its standpoint: against splits and for unity.

The III. Congress of the R. I. L. U. drew the logical conclusion from the four years struggle for unity in proclaiming the slogan of amalgamating both Internationals by means of an International Unity Congress. The conditions for this have become much more favourable, as the consciousness of the necessity for unity has penetrated the broadest masses. A change can be seen in the English labour movement as a result of the bourgeois policy of the "Labour Government".

We must openly admit that the raising of this question at the Congress of the Comintern, as well as at the Conference of the R. I. L. U., met with resistance. This resistance is mainly to be explained by the fact that the opponents of this slogan had not thoroughly thought out the trade union tactics of the R. I. L. U. and of the Comintern. This slogan met with specially energetic opposition on the part of the German delegation which regarded the slogan of the amalgamation of the two internationals as "opportunism", even "menshevism". Why the communists can be together with the reformists in a common national organisation and why they cannot be together in an international organisation would be hard to say. The opponents of this slogan have unwittingly promoted the splitting tendencies which are to be found among a section of the German workers. We must prove our will to unity by facts, and the proposal to convene an international unity congress is the best proof that trade union unity is for us no empty phrase and no manoeuvre as a few over-clever comrades think. The National Council of the C. P. of Germany adopted a resolution regarding this question which is anything but clear. Here it was said that the slogan of uniting both internationals is to be understood in the sense that unity is to be accomplished on the basis of the programme of the R. I. L. U. To understand the decisions of the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern in such a way is not to understand them at all. Of course it would be best if all the workers were to recognise the platform of the R. I. L. U., but in that case what sense would there be to speak of amalgamating the two internationals? We propose however an amalgamation of both internationals and the creation of a united international in spite of the fact that half of the organised workers do not accept the programme of the R. I. L. U. We are not at all afraid of being in an international organisation with such people as do not recognise our programme. Our programme has been recognised by history and it will

finally be recognised by the whole working class. This unity proposal is not, as some comrades think, a coalition between the leaders of the R. I. L. U. and the Amsterdam International. The unity of the international trade union movement can be set up in the event of our succeeding in arousing ten millions of proletarians to take an interest in this campaign. Some comrades are so afraid of reformism that they anxiously ask: "What will happen if the Amsterdam International accepts your proposal and agrees to the International Unity Congress?" To which we answer: "Excellent! We will be only too pleased if the Amsterdamers accept this proposal, as it is precisely the task of our unity resolution to realise this unity". — "Well, and what if you are in the minority in this united International?" ask the same comrades. — "If we are in the minority then we shall fight for the majority and hope to win this majority." — "You are prepared to take part in an international unity Congress without any previous conditions?" — "Yes, we are prepared to take part in an international unity congress without any previous conditions. The relation of forces at the unity congress will decide the programme and tactics of the new international." — "And if the Amsterdamers lay down conditions, what then?" — "If that is the case, the negotiations will soon show what conditions of either party are acceptable and what are not acceptable by both parties. The working masses will judge themselves." — "And if the Amsterdamers refuse negotiations regarding unity?" — "If they refuse so much the worse for them. We will not abandon our struggle for unity."

In our struggle for unity we have our eye on the masses and attach very little value to the good-will and the mood of this or that leader. As soon as the unity of the international trade union movement is a necessity for the masses, we have to fight for this unity and mobilise the broadest masses against those who oppose this unity. And there is not the least doubt that unity is threatened. The danger comes from two sides: before all from the side of the right wing of the Amsterdam International. This was to be seen at the Vienna Congress, when the right Amsterdamers endeavoured to render the resolution as vague as possible in order to leave open every loophole. After the Vienna Congress the Bureau of the Amsterdam International sent a letter*) to the All-Russian Central Trade Union Council proposing negotiations on the basis of the decisions adopted in Vienna. To these negotiations the Amsterdamers attached the following two conditions:

1. They will conduct negotiations only with the Russian trade unions and only with regard to the affiliation of the Russian Trade Unions to Amsterdam.

2. The negotiations regarding the affiliation shall have as their basis the programme and statutes of the Amsterdam International.

That the Amsterdamers laid down such conditions is not to be wondered at. They are continuing the sabotage which they began at the Vienna Congress. If we look up the letters which have passed between the Amsterdam International and the All-Russian Trade Union Council during the last two or three years, we see that all these proposals have already been made on many occasions, to which the All-Russian Trade Union Council has always replied that it had no hand in drawing up the programme and the statutes of the Amsterdam International and therefore has no reason to recognise them as pre-conditions. It is in this manner that the right Amsterdamers sabotage the unity of the trade union movement. There is nothing surprising in this. But it is less easy to understand why the representatives of the left wing take part in this combination. Do the leaders of the left wing of the Amsterdam International believe that this way is the shortest cut to the restoration of the unity of the International Trade Union movement? If they really believe that they will soon be convinced of the incorrectness of their standpoint. Some leaders of the Amsterdam International, apparently, consider it possible to prescribe conditions, thereby forgetting that the conditions depend upon the actual relation of forces. We must therefore advise the one and the other to abandon the idea of their being able to impose their will upon the revolutionary trade union movement.

What is the explanation of this policy of the Amsterdam International? It is due to the fact that there are a number of men in this international who would rather split the Amster-

dam International than declare themselves ready to unite with the revolutionary workers. At the International Congress of the Metal Workers the representative of the French Federation declared that in the event of the Russian Metal workers Federation being admitted into the International, the French Federation would withdraw from it. For those people who have concluded an alliance for life and death with the bourgeoisie, who grovel before Herriot, splitting is better than unity. We must at all cost destroy that will for further splitting and dismemberment of the labour movement, which to a large extent still exists in the Amsterdam International. We can only do this if all the revolutionary organisations affiliated to the R. I. L. U. realise that the fight for the unity of the international trade union movement is a long and serious one, that it is no mere manoeuvre, but a real desire corresponding to the needs of the masses. Unity can only be the result of a long, persistent, systematic propaganda among the masses. The followers of the R. I. L. U. must link up the every day struggles against national and international capital, our struggles for the Eight Hour Day, for improving the conditions of the workers and our defensive and aggressive actions, with the question of unity of the trade union organisations, we then shall be able to mobilise the masses for this slogan and convert this slogan into a battle-cry of ten million proletarians. It is hard to say how much time we shall require to achieve this unity. But no matter how much effort it may cost us, the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. will continue the struggle they have taken up and will, in spite of all the sabotage of the reformists, bring about the national and international unity of the trade union movement.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Open Letter from the E. C. C. I. to the C. P. of Sweden.

To all Members of the Communist Party of Sweden!

Dear Comrades,

It is in the interest of the development of the communist movement in Sweden that you now devote the most serious attention to the inner differences in your party. These differences have arisen as a result of the non-communist deviations of the right wing of the leading party comrades. You must arrive at clearness and give careful thought to these differences in order, after mature consideration, to adopt a decisive attitude and thereby secure the communist line in the central committee of your party.

The Executive Committee of the Comintern through special instructions directed the attention of your central committee to its unavoidable tasks. These instructions however were very inadequately carried out in practice. The right majority of the bureau of the party central has neither in the organisational work nor in the political and economic struggle shown sufficient interest for the development of a lively communist activity. It has never taken the trouble to render all Party members in Sweden sufficiently acquainted with the decisions of the Comintern.

The representatives of the right wing have also not always adopted a clear attitude to such remnants of petty bourgeois ideology as Pacifism and Religion. During the past year the Enlarged Executive was compelled to correct the standpoint of comrade Hoeglund regarding such an elementary question as the attitude of communists to religion and to make it clear to him that the Communist Party must not be indifferent to the religious prejudices of their members, even when they demand neutrality towards religion on the part of the bourgeois state.

In addition to this the central committee of the party during the last years has not succeeded in maintaining comradesly relations with the Communist Youth League, although the Youth League achieved relatively great success. The fact that comrade Hoeglund, in the Norwegian Question, in the beginning systematically supported the opportunists of the "Labour Party" in their fraction fight against the communist wing and finally, after the open breach of the Traumaletes with the International, sharply attacked the Executive and the Norwegian Communist Party, must be characterised as a serious fault. All the representatives of the remaining parties of the

*) Published in Inprecorr of 14th August 1924.

Comintern have recognised that the Tranmaelites were on the wrong path when they desired not to abolish collective membership in the Communist Party of Norway, when they permitted the party to be the cockpit for various anti-communist tendencies, when they rejected the revolutionary slogan of the workers' and peasants' government etc.

The Norwegian opportunists let their own obstinacy come before the resolutions of the World Congresses and the unity of international leadership of the movement. Comrade Hoeglund has also disregarded international party discipline. The Executive Committee however acted in a conciliatory manner and endeavoured to induce Hoeglund to loyal co-operation with the Comintern and with the left wing of the Swedish party, which upholds the line of the Comintern. After the December Conference in Moscow the Executive hoped that the inner conflicts in the Swedish Party would cease. The majority of the central committee of your party wished after the conference to gain time, on the one hand in order to create trifling disputes, and on the other hand to convene in all haste a party conference at which they intended to remove the representatives of the left wing of the central committee. That could only have led to the splitting of the party in Sweden. At the session of the Enlarged Executive the representatives of all communist parties pronounced against Hoeglund and his followers and supported the standpoint of numerous Swedish party organisations, in accordance with which the party conference should not be held until after the parliamentary elections.

In Moscow, comrade Hoeglund failed to answer the question, whether he would comply with this decision of the International. We still believe that he will do so. In the event of Hoeglund and his immediate followers, in spite of everything, opposing this resolution, then we call upon you, members of the Swedish Party, to support with the greatest unanimity the efforts of the left wing in the interest of the preservation of party unity.

The Executive does not at all wish to remove comrade Hoeglund from the central committee of the party, unless he himself desires to destroy international fighting unity. He must be compelled to co-operate closely with the most prominent representatives of the left wing, as for example, comrades Chillum, Samuelson, Tunnel and others. This effective collaboration can however only be based on the decisions of the Fifth World Congress. Without desiring to limit the right of the Swedish comrades freely to elect their central committee, we say it openly that in our opinion you would best serve the further revolutionary development of your party, if your next party congress were to correct the tendency of the central committee of your party in the sense that the majority of the presidium of the central committee should consist not of right but of left leaders, who stand entirely on the standpoint of the Comintern and show a stronger will for communist activity. In addition to this all party organs, from the highest to the lowest, must be supplemented by new active forces from the ranks of the factory workers.

Dear Comrades, study the most important decisions of the V. World Congress and also the resolution of the Comintern regarding the Swedish question. We hope that you will be in agreement with these decisions. That is of decisive importance. On the firm basis of these decisions it will not be hard for you to overcome rapidly the inner differences of opinion in the party, to gather together all revolutionary forces, and in

solidarity with the whole Communist International to conduct the fight against the enemies of the Swedish proletariat against the capitalists and the social democratic leaders. In this fight you will build up your party to a powerful, victorious, Communist mass party.

Long live the Communist Party of Sweden!
Long live the Communist International!
Moscow, 22nd of July 1924.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The Peasant International and the International Co-operative Alliance.

The Peasant International (International Peasants' Council) has addressed a letter to the International Co-operative Alliance in London, proposing that connections shall be established between the Alliance and the Peasant International, which latter body is at the same time the only international union of agricultural and peasant co-operatives. It is suggested in the letter that there shall be a constant exchange of material as well as the setting up of connections for joint trade in the agricultural, peasant and workers' co-operatives, while it also contains a number of practical proposals as:

1. The establishment of an International Society for wholesale purchasing in which the consumers' societies of the International Co-operative Alliance, as well as the agricultural unions of the International Peasant Council, shall participate.

2. The establishment of an international co-operative bank in which the co-operative unions of both international organisations shall have shares.

3. Constant inter-communication both in the field of business and ideas, joint participation in international actions against exploitation by private capital, for the protection of the interests of the workers and peasants and their co-operative organisations, and against war and economic decay.

4. Mutual information etc.

In addition to this the International Peasants' Council suggests its participation in the Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance which is to be held at the beginning of September in Geneva and expresses its readiness to send its representatives to the Congress.

The letter is officially signed by the Presidium of the Co-operative Section and the General Secretary of the International Peasants' Council.

The German "Arbeitsgemeinschaft", which is a member of the I.P.C., and also the Small Holders' and Peasants' League of Baden have approached the I.P.C. with the request that the latter assist them through the Soviet Co-operatives in supplying them with food for poultry.

The Co-operative Section of the I.P.C. applied to the appropriate Soviet and economic organs in order to ascertain the conditions and possibilities for carrying out a definite order on the part of the above named organisations.

This case marks the beginning of direct trade connections between the organisations affiliated to the I.P.C.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4. No. 61

28th August 1924

Editorial Offices: Langlegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.
— Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliesstach 29, Vienna VIII.
— Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

- E. Verney: Conference of the "Minority Movement" in Great Britain. Youth Movement.
To the Working Youth of all Lands.
To the Children of the Working Classes of the Whole World.
Karl Radek: A New Stage in the Liquidation of the Versailles Treaty. IV. Co-operative Movement.
The Significance of the Co-operative World Congress.
Labour Movement. Appeals.
To the Builders of the Whole World. Appeal of the C. C. of the C. P. of Bulgaria.
In the International. Statutes of the Agitation and Propaganda Section of the Executive Committee of the Comintern.

Conference of the "Minority Movement" in Great Britain.

By E. Verney (London).

The Conference of the British Minority Movement is an event of the greatest importance. This Conference, organised by the British Bureau of the R.I.L.U. is being held just before the Trade Union Congress.

The situation in England after these last three years of industrial struggle clearly proves that the capitalists have been unable to solve the post-war economic crisis. There are still over a million unemployed, there are no signs of a trade revival, and as a result of this, the workers are still burdened with high prices and rents, with increased taxes and lower wages. The present international situation will bring no improvement. The Dawes Scheme which will reduce the German workers to a coolie level, only intensifies the situation, as the British capitalists, forced to compete with the resulting cheapening of German commodities, will have to reduce still more the cost of production. This will mean further attacks on the wages of the British workers. The capitalists, united for common action, have secured victory every time by attacking and defeating the workers by sections. The workers, however, are beginning to realise that nothing can come from this sectionalism, and that they must fight as a class or be continually crushed. The series of unofficial strikes during this recent period, although losing their full value through their isolated character, shows that everywhere the workers are beginning to wake up to the reality of the situation. Discontent with the Reformist leadership is ripe.

There is an unmistakable desire among the workers for co-ordinated action. This is expressed in the growth of the Minority Movement. The bankruptcy of the reformist leaders

who have encouraged sectional fighting, disregarding the demands of other sections, has led to continual set-backs and defeats, and also intensified inter-union rivalry. The militant workers, convinced that there can be no industrial truce, are beginning to revolt against the old leadership which has nothing to present but a class peace. This revolt will develop into a mass Minority Movement which will sweep away the old T.U. bureaucracy, and by unity in the fight for immediate demands, the workers will at last get on the right road towards the final struggle for power. The Minority Conference is a big step on this road.

The Minority Conference is the result of a concerted campaign of the British Bureau of the Profintern to concentrate all the militant Trade Union elements into a compact movement with a national centre for guiding and co-ordinating the activities and propaganda of the revolutionary minorities, and to formulate a new programme to unite all workers in the common fight against the capitalists. This programme will be built up out of practical experiences. The active elements in the Trade Unions who up to now have had no contact among themselves are alive to the necessity of co-ordinated action. This is seen in the increased influence of the Trades Councils. This conference of militant Trade Unionists, united in the National Minority Conference, will have a great influence on the Trade Union Congress, which is the most important which has yet been held, and which meets a week later. It is significant that the General Council of the T.U.C. has already prepared a new Charter to present to the Congress. Although this contains nothing radical enough to rally the workers in a common fight for