

the cause of Socialism and of revolution in France, or in any other country, of a single one of the allies and auxiliaries essential for its final victory.

[*Le Temps* (Semi-official Opportunist Daily), February 20]

WHAT WILL THE SOCIALISTS DO AT STRASSBURG?

As the date of the Socialist Congress at Strassburg draws near, controversies in the camp of the revolutionaries regarding the Third International have increased in bitterness and there is growing confusion in the ranks of those who aspire to restore to Socialism the unity destroyed by the war. Out of this conflict of opinion regarding tactics and methods three contradictory policies have emerged. One is to retain the Second International, which is to be purified by excluding the Moderates. Another plan is to form a new International with the coöperation of the Moscow Communists, so as to bring together all groups of Socialists, including the Bolsheviks, with the hope of amalgamating them into an organic whole. The third plan, proposed by the extreme Radicals, is to endorse and join the International of Lenin without further ado, thus going over unconditionally to Bolshevism.

Several important Socialist conventions, notably those of the Seine and of the North have adopted resolutions indicating that the Moderate wing of the party has completely lost its former influence. The struggle for party control is no longer between the old majority group — now practically eliminated — and the former minority group. It is not between those called 'Social Patriots,' because during the war they manifested some repugnance to sacrificing entirely patriotic duty to Socialist theories and the fierce guardians of the pure revolu-

tionary idea. No, it is a fight between extreme Internationalists and open adherents of Lenin and his Russian policy. Only a year ago the latter group was an almost invisible minority, practically without influence in the party; now it stands on an equal footing with the old radical minority, which has since become the conservative majority. More properly we can no longer speak of a Conservative wing of the French Socialist party. Immediately after the war the Internationalists overwhelmed the Moderate element with new recruits. They increased their membership from 34,000 to 134,000. But they thus sealed their own doom; for most of these young men were more radical than they. These new members joined the ranks of the 'Convulsionists,' who stand by Bolshevism through thick and thin.

Some leaders dream of reconciling the two radical groups so as to achieve unity at Strassburg, by excluding the Moderates. However, the Extremists of to-day are apparently as intolerant of the Extremists of yesterday as the latter were of the former Majority. At the convention of the Socialists of the Seine it was impossible to agree upon a common platform. Possibly this can be accomplished at Strassburg. In order to do so there, it will be necessary to assume that what is irreconcilable is reconcilable. It is enough to compare the resolutions presented by the 'Committee on Restoring the International,' which voice the views of the present majority (such men as Cachin, Longuet, and Mayéras), with the resolutions of the 'Committee for the Third International,' representing the ultra-radical wing. The first set of resolutions approves the recommendation of the Independent party of Germany in favor of restoring unity of Socialists throughout the world by

amalgamating those parties belonging to the Second International which remained faithful to the class struggle throughout the war with the groups forming the Third International. They proclaim sympathy with the Russian revolution, but demand a preliminary conference before endorsing it. On the other hand, the resolutions of the new Extremists assert the Socialist forces can only be rallied around the organization already formed at Moscow as a nucleus, and demand that the Socialist party adhere to and endorse the principles and acts of that body.

The controversy centres, therefore, on a question of tactics. So far as purposes are concerned, both factions seem to agree. According to the platform of the more conservative of the two groups — those who do not wish to go to Moscow — the Socialist party will continue to organize the working class as a class group for the purpose of gaining control of the state and of socializing all the instruments of production and exchange. The resolutions of the second group state that the task of the proletariat is to seize the reins of power in the capitalist state and to replace the existing government by a purely proletarian organization. This new government would be organized in the form of Soviets. The dictatorship of the proletariat would immediately expropriate all capital, destroy the right of private property, inaugurate compulsory labor, and socialize the instruments of production and exchange, including factories, mines, and transportation systems. It would place the administrations of these directly in the hands of the peasants, the miners, the railway men and the sailors. The method of accomplishing this is for the masses to act as a unit, employing armed power if they are resisted by force. Practically both platforms have the same object in view, though

this purpose is disguised somewhat in the more conservative of the two programmes.

The essence of the situation is that all agree to support Bolshevism — but the group at present in control of the party machinery prefers preliminary negotiations, not in order to guarantee its principles, but to assure its present leaders that they may remain in control. The latter are not quite certain that they will be welcomed by Lenin.

[*Frankfurter Zeitung* (Radical Liberal Daily), February 13]

LORD HALDANE'S WAR BOOK

WE have recently reviewed a book written by the former Lord Chancellor of England, Earl Loreburn, entitled, *How the War Came*. The author was a leader of the Little England anti-Imperial Liberals, and his book is a charge against the Imperialist wing of the Cabinet, which in Earl Loreburn's opinion had entered into an alliance with France in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, or at least without the knowledge of Parliament. Now there lies before us the work of another Liberal statesman, who likewise was a member of a cabinet, and was also Lord Chancellor of England after Earl Loreburn's resignation. However, he belongs to the Liberal Imperialists and is indeed one of their leading members. His work entitled, *Before the War*, is not a reply to Earl Loreburn, but is for the most part a republication of newspaper articles which quite possibly were written before his predecessor's work was published. Loreburn speaks as a defender of the Constitution, and from this standpoint condemns the agreements made with the French. Haldane speaks from the diplomatic and military standpoint, and judges the Anglo-French arrangements solely