

in the name of the Independent Socialists to the proletariat. In this appeal the bourgeois character of the Scheidemann Government was pointed out and reproached with wishing to abolish the Councils, which were called the "supporters and defenders of the Revolution"; and the proposal was made of legalizing the Councils, giving them political rights, and giving them the right to veto the decisions of the National Assembly and the right to submit decisions to a popular referendum.

Such a proposal inflates the complete mental (geistiger) bankruptcy of the theoriser who defends democracy and does not understand their bourgeois character. The laughable effort to unite the Council System, i.e., the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, shows the lack of common-sense of the Yellow Socialists and Social-Democrats, and the reactionary policy of the petty middle-class (kleinbürger), as well as their cowardly concessions to the increasing power of the new proletarian democracy which cannot be held back.

22.—The majority of the Yellow International at Berne, which condemned Bolshevism but

did not risk putting it into a formal resolution for fear of the working masses, has acted correctly from the class-standpoint. The Majority is already in full agreement with the Russian Minority (Mensheviks) and Socialist-Revolutionists, and with the Scheidemanns in Germany. The Russian Minority and Socialist-Revolutionaries who complain about the persecution by the Bolsheviks take pains to conceal the fact that this persecution has been brought about through the Minority and Socialist-Revolutionaries taking part in the civil war on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Just the same in Germany have the Scheidemanns and their party taken part in the civil war on the side of the capitalist against the worker.

It is therefore quite natural that the majority of those who took part in the Yellow International at Berne should have condemned the Bolsheviks; nevertheless this is not a defence of "pure democracy," but an expression of self-defence by people who feel that in the civil war they are standing on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

From this the class-standpoint of the Major-

ity of the Yellow International at Berne can be fairly seen: the proletariat, however, should not be afraid of the truth, but should look it openly in the face and draw from it all political deductions.

On the basis of this thesis and in appreciation of the reports of the delegates from the various countries, the International Communist Conference declares that the main task of the Communist Party, in countries where the Council-Power (Räte-macht) is not yet set up, consist in the following:—

1) To explain to the great mass of the working class the historical meaning of the political and practical necessity for a new proletarian democracy which must be set up to take the place of the bourgeois democracy and Parliamentarism.

2) In the building up and extending the Councils in every department of industry in the military, in the fleet, also amongst the land workers and small farmers; and

3) In the conquest of (eroberung) a solid and conscious communist majority within the Councils.

## The Split in The French Socialist Party.

AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN EUROPE.

Toward the end of December, 1920, a congress of the French Socialist Party was held at which a split occurred. As we have no exact and full information about this congress we are compelled to depend upon the information given in the capitalist press.

Splits in the French socialist movement have been of frequent occurrence. At the end of the last century, in the 80's and 90's there was in France a large number of Socialist Parties and factions, representing the different currents in the socialist movement; the possibilists or opportunists; the Guesdists or Marxians, who adhered to the position of the German Social-Democrats; the Blanquists, who denied the necessity of the mass struggle; and the so-called Socialist-Radicals, who defended the interests of the petit-bourgeoisie.

In 1890 all these parties and factions were forced to unite into one party under the increased pressure of the reaction in France. In 1900 the French Socialist Party split again into its component parts as a result of the famous Dreyfus Case which aroused tremendous forces. Several prominent socialist leaders of that time—Jaures and Millerand—took a keen interest in the trial, considering it their duty to fight against the French militarists and in defense of the upper bourgeoisie, of which a numerous element, the large financial interests, were composed of Jews, who considered it their duty to defend their co-religionist, Dreyfus.

The Marxian section of the French Socialist Party, the Guesdists, organized in the Labor Party of France, fought against the opportunist policies of Jaures and Millerand. The participants in the struggle against the militarists were carried away by the fight and considered the activities of the militarists to be so dangerous that they believed it necessary for Millerand who was a "socialist" at that time, to enter the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry. The followers of Jaures and Millerand believed that the French Republic was in danger, and Millerand therefore took upon himself the task of saving the bourgeois republic in close co-operation with the infamous General Gallifet, who became notorious by his barbarous cruelties in suppressing the Paris Commune.

Millerand entered the Cabinet, June 22, 1899, thereby arousing a determined opposition in the ranks of the French Socialist Party. In 1900, there was convened, in Paris, the World Congress of the Second International.

The question of the acceptance of a post in a bourgeois ministry, by the "socialist" Millerand in the same Cabinet with the murderer, Gallifet, was brought before the congress and made an issue by the Guesde faction of the French Socialist Party. This question was brought up and discussed at the Paris Congress, in connection with another question—the tactic of the seizure of power by the proletariat which even at that time was a principle question, since the German revisionists under the leadership of Bernstein, advocated the peaceful evolution of Socialism by means of parliamentary action.

It would be inconsistent to expect any decisive action by the elements composing

Paris Congress of the Second International at that time. The question of the seizing of political power by the proletariat was closely connected with another of great significance—the question of the necessity of overthrowing the capitalist state by force of arms. The opportunists denied the correctness of Marx' famous statement, that force is the midwife of the old society, pregnant with the new order. In the course of the discussion, the renegade Kautsky, then the foremost Marxian theoretician, displayed his real colors. Although theoretically a Marxian, he was in reality an opportunist, even at that time, which can be readily seen from the following excerpt from a resolution introduced by him:—"...In the present development of the democratic state the conquest of political power by the proletariat cannot be achieved by means of armed forces, but can only be the result of long and strenuous efforts in the sphere of political and economic organization of the proletariat, as well as its physical and moral regeneration, and of the gradual penetration of its elected representatives into the municipal councils and legislative assemblies."

This resolution introduced by Kautsky at the Paris Congress of 1900, played into the hands and supported the opportunists and anti-Marxians, who argued against the inevitability of armed revolution. This resolution of Kautsky was, in our opinion, his first step in the direction of the social patriots and renegades of our time. Plekhanoff, aptly characterized it as being an india rubber, or caoutchouc, resolution. The first part of Kautsky's resolution relegates into the background the question of armed insurrection, while the second part entirely justified the action of Millerand in accepting a ministerial post in the same cabinet with the murderer Gallifet. Kautsky's resolution adopted by the Paris Congress precipitated a split in the French Socialist Party: the Guesdists and Blanquists leaving the so-called "United" French Party.

After a while the different factions again united into one party organized upon a federative basis, but the various factions never ceased fighting among themselves up to the outbreak of the war in 1914. When the war began all the contending socialist factions united and formed a block with the bourgeois government and thus betrayed the cause of the proletariat. Guesde, who was one of the foremost exponents of revolutionary socialism in France, accepted the post of minister, without portfolio, in order to save the "fatherland" from destruction. The noisy dragsmonger, Herve, who previously had fought against militarism, was the first to announce his anti-militarist position and become a traitor to the cause of the proletariat. In short the French Socialist party, under the leadership of Guesde, Renaudel and Sembat, went over, bag and baggage, to the side of the bourgeoisie during the whole period of the imperialist world-war.

In the French party contained other elements, who constituted a minority; the "centrists" whom Comrade Lenin characterizes as men contaminated with the decay of "parliamentarism" who are spoiled by the atmosphere of parliament, officials, softened by

the holding of sinecures and accustomed only to routine work. These "leaders" merely form a transition from the outlived epoch of the working class movement from the period of 1871-1914—an epoch that contributed much of value, especially in the art of organization of the exploited masses on a large scale, which was necessarily slow, sustained, and systematic work—an epoch which formed the background before the World War, which introduced the era of social revolution. The "centrist" are revolutionists in words, but in deeds support directly or indirectly the social traitors.

At the head of the centrists, stood Longuet, Pressman, Cachin, and Frossard, etc. At the end of the World War the centrists expelled the social-chauvinists from the executive offices of the party and had on their side the great majority of the membership up to the last congress of the Party. During the period of the world war the French working class, intoxicated with bourgeois patriotism, followed in the footsteps of the social traitors. Later disappointed with the consequences of the war they repudiated the chauvinists and went over to the side of the centrists.

The economic and political conditions in France forced the French proletariat to turn to the left. They could not remain halfway between the right and left wings of the French socialists. Their act in joining the centre was only a transitional stage in the revolutionary movement of the French proletariat. Already during the war, there appeared within the French Socialist Party a small group of Communists under the leadership of Comrade Loriot. For a long time Loriot fought almost alone against the right and centre and was the subject of ridicule by the opportunist leaders. Loriot, undismayed, bravely kept up the fight in the face of the greatest obstacles, against the social traitors to the French proletariat.

The growth and influence of this small group of Communists, with Loriot at their head, was aided by the centrist Longuetists, themselves. After the manner of all centrists, the Longuetists endeavored to convince the French workers that the economic chaos caused by the war, was not the proper environment in which to advocate the armed seizure of political power by the workers. The Longuetists, were attempting to delay the realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Meanwhile the economic chaos continued despite all attempts of the capitalists and the state to restore the ruined industries. The French bourgeoisie were disappointed in their hopes of wringing a huge indemnity from Germany, which was utterly ruined by the war. All these circumstances aroused a serious discontent within the ranks of the French working class driving it further and further to the left.

Still another event influenced the French working class movement—the visit of Cachin and Frossard to Soviet Russia. These two comrades are among the most prominent leaders of the French socialists, Frossard was secretary of the party. The Communist group within the French Socialist Party grew more influential and stronger day by