

THE  
COMMUNIST  
INTERNATIONAL

Nos. 11 - 12 - 13

May, 1929





# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

---

Vol VI. Nos. 11-12-13.

Workers' Library Publishers,  
35 East 125th St., New York.

---

## Contents

	Page
Forward for the International Red Day against Imperialist Wars.	
<i>Editorial</i> ... ..	454
The Reserve Army of Unemployment. <i>C. Wurm</i> ... ..	457
The Anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution in Hungary.	
<i>Bela Kun</i> ... ..	470
Trotsky's Travels. <i>S. Novikov</i> ... ..	478
For the Forthcoming Plenum of the E.C.C.I. ... ..	488
Problems of the Revolutionary Movement in India. <i>P. Schubin</i> ...	502
Social-Fascism in Germany ... ..	527
The Revolt of the Liquidators in the Red Trade Unions of Czecho- Slovakia. <i>G. Henrikovsky</i> ... ..	533
After the Fifth Party Congress of the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia ...	540
Trotsky at the Tribune of Chamberlain. <i>A. Martinov</i> ... ..	547

# Forward for the International Red Day against Imperialist Wars

**T**HE Sixth World Congress of the Communist International raised as the central problem of the present period, the question of the inevitability of an imperialist war, and consequently of the mobilisation of all our Communist forces for the organisation of a mass struggle against it.

Beginning from the Sixth Congress, all the facts, all the events of political and economic life have in the most convincing fashion confirmed the accuracy of this estimate of the situation and the imperative necessity of fulfilling this chief task. The development of the antagonisms dividing the imperialist States on the basis of the struggle for markets, is symbolised by the gigantic struggle which is now occurring over the whole of the world between the two colossi, Britain and the United States. The regrouping of capitalist States behind one or the other of these irreconcilable antagonists is proceeding at an accelerated rate.

**B**UT there is one thing which unites all the imperialists in a common bond of hatred: the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, which is carrying through the construction of socialism. The conflicts arising among the imperialist States in no wise lessen their main hatred in principle of the proletarian State. On the contrary, the intensification of the antagonisms between the imperialist robbers is inevitably intensifying the menace of war on that sixth part of the world's surface which has freed itself from the rule of capitalism.

The growth in intrinsic antagonisms among the imperialists and their intensifying hatred for the Soviet Union find their expression in the witless policy pursued by the bourgeois States, a policy directed to the increase of all their military, naval, technical and scientific possibilities to war ends. From the time of the Sixth World Congress, the armaments and the naval and military budgets of the great

imperialist powers have grown to a colossal extent. Britain and France had merely to conclude an agreement on naval armaments for America immediately to set about the construction of fifteen new warships. Dozens and hundreds of examples illustrating the monstrous intensification of armaments can be found in every country. We see that the intrigues of British imperialism, directed against the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, are continuing and increasing. We have seen this during the recent events in Afghanistan. We see a consolidation of an anti-Soviet base in the Balkans (the State coup-d'état in Yugo-Slavia). We see the conclusion of innumerable military agreements between France, Poland, Roumania, etc. The construction of warships, the production of the most highly perfected armaments, air vessels and military chemical products predestined for the supply of the countries bordering on the Soviet Union, have never been carried on so intensively as at the present time.

In the "intellectual" sphere, i.e., in the sphere of the ideological preparation of the masses for war, imperialism is also exerting the maximum of effort. Cinema, wireless, theatre, press, school, etc., are all orientated on the "inevitable."

**I**N these incredible efforts for the preparation of the imperialist war, which are concealed under a variety of pacifist rags, social-democracy, especially during recent months, is forming one of the most active forces on behalf of imperialism and for the object of creating the resources necessary for the war. In Germany social-democracy is busying itself in the construction of cruisers. In France it is participating in the creation of an air ministry.

The Sixth World Congress was consequently more than right when it sounded the alarm and mobilised the sections of the Communist International for the struggle against the in-

inevitably approaching imperialist war. It did so in a quite definite form, declaring:

“The Congress instructs the Central Committees of all the Communist Parties immediately to commence political, organisational, agitational, and propagandist work in preparation for an International Day for the fight against imperialist war and defence of the Soviet Union. On this day the toilers must demonstrate against the capitalist offensive under the slogans: ‘War against imperialist war’; ‘United workers’ front against the capitalist offensive’; ‘Defend the Soviet Union’; ‘To the aid of the revolutionary peoples in the colonies’; ‘Expose the lies of the social patriots’; ‘Establish proletarian defence organisations.’ ”

All the sections of the Communist International were thus bound to take into consideration the definite situation in each separate country, and to work out the indispensable practical measures for carrying through this international demonstration of the proletarian struggle against war.

The extensive militant demonstrations of the masses, the large strikes in Germany, Poland, France and Czecho-Slovakia, were bound to render easier the fulfilment of this task of preparing for an International Red Day. Nevertheless, since the Sixth World Congress, apart from a few rare exceptions, the majority of the Communist Parties have done almost nothing to effect this preparation of Communist forces and of the proletarian masses for the international day. This example of passivity was characteristic of the position as stated by the Sixth Congress, and in particular the recognition of the underestimation of the danger of imperialist war and the insufficiency of international conviction in our own ranks of the existence of this danger. The present moment is the last opportunity for all Communist Parties to realise where this kind of passivity is leading to. This realisation must henceforth find expression in all parties in a systematic and redoubled preparation for the international Red Day. It is urgently necessary to struggle in the most energetic fashion to effect a mobilisation of all our forces, and to sound the militant alarm in all our organisations, in order to realise this task.

EVERY separate section of the Communist International must, taking the issues proclaimed by the Sixth World Congress as a basis, prepare and put into action a definite plan of work adapted to the situation existing at the given moment. It is necessary at once to plan and organise mass meetings and demonstrations. It is necessary to carry on systematic work inside the factories for the preparation of International Red Day. It is necessary to popularise the idea of an International Red Day of struggle against imperialist war, and to publish the slogans for that day, the methods of work, etc., in our press.

But especially we must make use of every demonstration of the masses, every strike, and all our campaigns generally in order to mobilise the men and women workers, the peasants, soldiers and sailors for the International Red Day. It is also necessary to turn the attention of all our organisations to the development of work in the army and in the fleet. It is just as necessary to deal with the issue of drawing the mass organisations into participation in all this work, the Red trade unions for example, and the federations of ex-soldiers and war-invalids, the organisations for proletarian self-defence, etc.

All this activity of the Communist International sections must be quite definite and easily understood by the masses. There must be no fine-sounding phrases about the war, but a systematic explanation of the inevitability of the imperialist war by reference to the facts. This preparation of our International Red Day must be closely bound up with the everyday struggle of the workers against capitalist rationalisation, against intensifying exploitation, for the raising of wages, etc. It must develop under the slogan of the most resolute struggle against the social-democrats, who for their part are also preparing for an international day “in defence of peace,” fixed for August 4th. The international day organised by the social-democrats is nothing other than a further development of all the policy of delusion and pacifist illusions carried on by the social-democrats in order to render easier the participation of the masses in the imperialist war.

The International Red Day organised by the sections of the Communist International

is a day of united proletarian front, closing around the Soviet Union and directed against the imperialist war and the social-democrats who are preparing for that war.

Thus, by bringing into being the International Red Day, the date of which will be fixed very shortly by the presidium of the

Communist International, we shall drive out of our ranks all passivity, we shall develop all our forces and all our energy, we shall mobilise all our organisations for systematic work in this direction!

Forward! To the International Red Day against imperialist war!

## Paris on the Barricades

By GEORGE SPIRO - 25 cents

The Story, in fiction form, of the heroic struggle of the Parisian proletariat in defence of their Dictatorship, 1871.

## Report of Sixth Congress of The Communist International

1 doll. 25 cents

The complete stenographic report of this, the most important Congress since 1920.

## Lenin on Organisation

75 cents

All of Lenin's writings on the subject of organisation from 1901 to 1922.

**WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

35 East 125th Street, New York City.

# The Reserve Army of Unemployment\*

## Unemployment in the Post-War Period

C. Wurm

I.

THE most important social tendency, for the workers, is the continual increase in the productive masses as an accompaniment to the reproduction or accumulation of capital. This continual increase in the army of wage workers is a fact which may easily be verified by reference to the occupational statistics of all the capitalist countries.

Another factor in the above-mentioned increase is the organic construction of capitalism. This construction has a two-fold economic significance. In the one case it shows the manner in which capital is divided into constant and variable capital; in the other, the material nature of the productive progress or the relationship between the productive apparatus and labour. With Marx, we term the first the value-basis of capital and the second its technical basis. The value-basis of capital, Marx points out, so far as it is conditioned by its technical composition and reflects its changes, is the organic composition of capital.

The continuous modification in the organic structure of capital manifests itself through the developing productive technique which grows apace with capitalist accumulation, which thereupon again reacts upon actual accumulation. This shows clearly that variable capital diminishes in comparison with constant capital. The same sum-total of capital therefore provides work for a constantly decreasing mass of labour. The continual alteration in the organic structure of capital, therefore, implies a continual modification in the productive capacity of social labour. The productive capacity of social

labour is growing; the worker, in the same space of time, produces an ever-increasing quantity of use-values. The productive processes are being continually transformed by capital. In this relation, the productive methods play a two-fold part.

“The increase of some is a consequence, that of others a condition of the increasing productivity of labour.” (Marx: “Capital.”)

We have already said that with the rise in the productive power of social labour the demand for labour-power decreases; thus we have the substantial decrease in the variable constituents of capital in comparison with the much slower rate of modification in the material constituents of capital. It should here be noted that, with the increase in productive capacity, not only does the quantity of goods produced by one worker increase, but the value of these goods diminishes.

“The increase of the difference between constant and variable capital is, therefore, much less than that of the difference between the mass of the means of production into which the constant, and the mass of the labour-power, into which the variable capital is converted.” (Marx: “Capital.”)

The more the productive power of social labour increases, the greater is the amount of investing capital needed in order to establish new enterprises.

Let us now turn to the process of the concentration and centralisation of capital. The constantly increasing concentration of capital in the hands of individual capitalists, linked up as it is with the process of accumulation, constitutes the foundation of the specific productive methods of capitalism. As individual capital holdings grow, they in their turn stimulate the growth of the productive apparatus. This growing concentration of the means of production in the hands of many in-

\* As the Editors do not consider comrade Wurm's interesting article is indisputable in all details we are offering it as material for discussion.

dividual capitalists is heightened by the unification of already established capital holdings. The difference between this process and concentration lies in the fact that we have here merely a modification in the division of already established capital, unrelated to any change in the sum total of social wealth. The unification of various single capital holdings is the centralisation of capital. This is brought about by the credit system. "Competition and credit, the two most powerful levers of concentration." (Marx: "Capital.")

The consideration of the laws of the centralisation of capital becomes all the more important, in our investigation, as it is precisely this centralisation which powerfully stimulates accumulation; thus is the rate and range of unemployment increased as this also is similarly linked up with capital concentration. The large-scale mobilisation of capital on a credit basis first caused a sudden broadening of the scale of production. On the workings of this process of centralisation, Marx says:

"The growing circumference of the masses of capitalism leads to the material basis for a continual transformation of the means of production themselves. Capitalist methods of production are continually conquering sections of industry which have so far not been subject to them or only so in name." (Capital.)

Our present investigation of the concentration and centralisation of capital leads us to the following conclusion: a steady drop in the number of employed workers in relation to the growth of technical equipment.

Thus the process of capitalist accumulation, in which is included the process of centralisation, leads us to an ever-increasing army of unemployed.

The ratio of employment provided by accumulated capital is continually decreasing. The industrial reserve army is, on the one hand, the product of capital accumulation, and on the other, an actual lever for capital accumulation, as upon this reserve army rests the existence of the whole of capitalist economy. This reserve army provides for capitalism, with its continually changing methods, the necessary reserve of labour power, independently of an increase in population. One can well imagine its need in the case of a sudden expansion of trade, which

might arise from various causes. There are times when it may be necessary suddenly to increase the man power in one particular industry without having to attract labour from other branches of production. Let us take as an example the German coal mines during the British miners' lock-out. Through the stoppage in British production, the output of coal in the Ruhr district rose by three million tons per month. In consequence of this, there was a simultaneous increase in activity in all other branches of industry. The German coal barons could only take advantage of the situation created by the British lock-out by reason of the fact that a sufficiently large unemployed reserve was at their disposal in the Ruhr district. Had the coal barons been compelled to await normal access to the labour supply through the ordinary growth in population, the exploitation of the crisis would obviously have been impossible.

The distinctive features of capitalist exploitation appear in the uninterrupted cycle: moderate productive activity; high-pressure production; crisis and stagnation.

These cycles—the periodical recurrence of crises—arise from causes which are inherent in the mechanism of capitalist production and are definite phenomena of capitalist economy. True, crises are not unknown in the social epochs preceding capitalism, but their causes did not arise as results of the economic system. In this connection, it must be emphasised that these crises in modern capitalist production—which, in the pre-war period appeared at regular intervals of from 8 to 10 years—first became characteristic in the period of modern industrial capitalism and not in the earlier stages of capitalist production. The causes are in general related to the law of capitalist accumulation. Compared with the twentieth century, changes in the technical productive apparatus proceeded with extreme slowness in the earlier days of capitalism. This corresponded to a quite gradual appearance of an alteration in the organic structure of capital. In contrast with the period of developed capitalism, which is characterised by sudden and eruptive expansions in the scale of production, in its earlier epoch we note a certain parallelism between the development of capitalist accumulation and that of the working population. The slow progress of

accumulation was dictated by the definite limits of the working population at the disposal of capitalism. Capitalism "found a check in the natural limits of the exploitable labouring population, limits which could only be got rid of by forcible means." (Marx: "Capital.")

However, as soon as sudden expansions in production became manifest, it became necessary to bring into being the corresponding reserve of labour power to be continually at the disposition of industry. It had to be conjured up independently of the normal increase of population. And we have seen how capital provided itself with this reserve by continually increasing the amount of product from the same number—or from a reduced number—of workers. In this way was secured a body of workers permanently superfluous and thus at the disposal of capital whenever sudden expansions of markets occurred.

Sudden and swift expansion of capitalist production, however, implies also a contrary tendency, which appears with equal swiftness, the tendency towards a crisis. As Marx shows, from the time when machine industry became so deeply rooted that it exerted an overwhelming influence on national production, when, owing to this, exports began to gain on imports, when the world-market opened up huge spheres in America, Asia and Australia, and finally, when the industrial nations in mutual conflict became numerous enough—then these phenomena appeared at regular periods.

These periods of crisis, even in the pre-war period, were beginning to repeat themselves with ever greater frequency. The duration of a cycle shortened from ten to an average of eight years. This tendency towards a shortening of the cycle is still more pronounced in the post-war period. The upward curve gets shorter and shorter: crisis and paralysis are becoming constant phenomena of the present stage of capitalism. Friedrich Engels once described this tendency in a happy prediction, in one of his letters to Vikhnevsky:

"When three countries—for example, England, America and Germany—compete on the world-market under comparatively equal conditions, there can be no outcome but chronic over-production, as any single one of these

countries is capable of meeting the entire demand."

The previously mentioned shortening of cycles and extension of crises, the expansion and contraction of capitalist exploitation at ever narrower intervals, brings about not only a permanent increase in surplus population, but also a continually increasing amount of long-period unemployment.

Unemployment, following in the wake of increased accumulation, is growing at a still faster rate than those alterations in the organic structure of capital which are taking place as a result of changes in the productive processes.

Thus the machine of capitalist production ensures that the absolute increase of capital is unaccompanied by any marked rise in the demand for labour power. The more the productive capacity of labour develops, the more precarious becomes the existence of the workers.

This relative surplus population—a distinct phenomenon of capitalist production—takes on the most varied forms. Every unemployed worker, and every short-time worker, forms part of it. As Marx pointed out, wherever industry, favoured by advantageous conditions, amalgamates, the shrinking of the labour market takes its severest form. But, at the same time, whatever may be the temporary fluctuations of the labour market, one fact stands out clearly; the number of employed workers as a whole is increasing—a fact to which Marx frequently drew attention.

Comrade Varga claims that this law, developed by Marx as a general law of capitalism, does not apply to the post-war period. We read in his pamphlet "The Decline of capitalism": "Unemployment caused by mechanical advance is no longer balanced by the expansion of production."

Similarly Varga said at the Sixth World Congress: "The new type of unemployment is shown in the fact that the number of workers employed by industrial capital in the United States has decreased."

Two questions now arise. Firstly, do Varga's statements represent the facts? And secondly, if they do, are we right in drawing from them the same conclusions that Varga has done?

In the pamphlet by Varga which I have quoted, there is mention of a decrease of industrial workers in the period 1919-1925 of nearly two million. Already at the Sixth World Congress this statement was answered, and it was mentioned that it was not right, on the basis of doubtful and unverified statistics to draw conclusions revising the whole teaching of Marx.

In any case, is it justifiable to draw conclusions from statistics which cover a period of only three years?

Before we take up Varga's arguments one by one, we would state that a comparison of the years 1919 and 1925 is not admissible, as 1919 was a year of pronounced speculative crisis in the United States. The number of employed in 1919 cannot therefore be claimed as normal. Therefore for the post-war period we are given only the figures for 1923, 1924 and 1925. Thus such conclusions as Varga's were drawn from a study of these two years, when it was in precisely these two years that an all-round process of rationalisation was being carried out in the United States. We cannot admit that Varga's figures are suitable for the investigation of this question.\*

\* How careful one should always be with statistics is clearly shown by the investigations carried out under instructions from the American Minister of Labour, Davis, on the question of unemployment in the United States, according to which there were 1,874,050 unemployed in January, 1928. It is well known that the American newspapers claimed that, according to this figure, the number of employed had sunk in the period from 1925 to 1928 by 1,874,050. But how did the Ministry of Labour arrive at this figure? They compared the estimated number of wage earners in the manufacturing industries and on the railways in 1925, with the figures of the occupied workers in January, 1928, which came to a considerably smaller total. From this they concluded that there had been a shrinkage of 7.43 per cent., and from this they concluded that all other occupational groups, such as agricultural workers, miners, office workers and shop assistants, as well as domestic workers, had decreased by a similar extent. In this way they came to the figure given above. This is obviously a mockery of serious statistical methods. What is then the distinctive feature of the labour market of the United States? The unequal development of different industries and the resulting social strata. In the published figures, however, this was entirely ignored, so this investigation was quite worthless.

As the question only concerns the definition of certain tendencies, we can avail ourselves of much more exact enquiries. We think it is important to go back as far as 1914 in order to demonstrate the real tendency in this development.

TABLE I.\*

*Employment in the industries of the United States.†*

*Enterprises with an annual production of over 5,000 dollars. (In thousands).*

Year	No. of workers	No. of employees	Units of power h.p. 1,000's
1914	6,888	956	22,294
1919	8,990	1,429	29,327
1921	6,938	1,141	—
1923	8,768	1,350	33,094
1925	8,384	1,340	35,696
1904	5,468	520	13,488
1914	7,036	964	22,437

Before we draw specific conclusions from these figures let us quote some statistics with regard to the number of workers employed in the most important industries.

TABLE II.

*Number of workers employed in important industries (in thousands).*

Industry	1914	1919	1921	1923	1925
Foodstuffs & luxury articles ... ..	528	723	618	672	665
Textiles ... ..	1,506	1,610	1,510	1,715	1,627
Iron and steel ... ..	618	859	572	892	851
Timber ... ..	865	864	703	932	921
Leather ... ..	307	349	280	345	315
Rubber ... ..	74	159	103	138	141
Paper ... ..	453	510	467	527	537
Chemicals ... ..	349	461	314	384	381
Quarries ... ..	336	303	293	352	353
Metal (other than iron and steel) ... ..	238	304	212	297	275
Tobacco ... ..	179	157	150	146	132
Engineering ... ..	619	998	662	908	859
Musical instruments ... ..	49	69	45	58	47
Shipping ... ..	313	859	406	606	560
Railway repair shops ... ..	366	516	418	523	458
Miscellaneous ... ..	216	291	223	272	262
Totals ... ..	7,015	9,030	6,938	8,768	8,384

\* Unless another source is mentioned all the following statistics are taken from the "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1926."

† Not including mining and related works, such as building, water, gas and electricity.

Now, what do the above figures show us?

American industry developed at twice the rate of 1904-1914 during the period of the world war.

In the period 1904-1914 the number of workers and employees rose by about 2 million. The horse-power employed in the various enterprises increased by about 7 million.

In the later period of five years, from 1914-1919, we see an increase in workers and employees of 2.6 million, while the productive power is increased by 7 million horse-power.

During the war period the recruitment of labour for industry was extraordinarily high, while the increase in power was not so marked.

We have already remarked that, owing to the speculative crisis of 1919, a comparison with that year does not correctly portray for us the true line of development of American industry. In order to obtain this we must analyse the entire period 1914-1925. Here we see that American industry during this period attracted some 1,369,000 new workers. The quantity of power units increased by about 12.5 millions in the same period. It is most instructive to note in Table II. which industries attracted the largest amount of fresh labour and also most increased their power.

	Newly employed workers	Additional H.-P.
Shipping ...	247,000	1,287,000
Engineering ...	240,000	1,457,000
Iron and steel	233,000	2,931,000
Railway repair shops ...	192,000	463,000
Totals ...	912,000	6,138,000

From these figures we may note that in the period 1914-1925 these heavy industries took on about two-thirds of the new labour and about half of the newly developed power. Table II. also shows that the number of workers newly employed in the remaining twelve industries only reaches 450,000. During the period of which we have spoken the number of workers in these remaining industries in no way approached that of the fresh labour employed by heavy industry.

This phenomenon is, of course, by no means accidental, but is closely related to the general process of the displacement of the workers by machinery. In this respect heavy industry

has an increasingly important significance. Its extension implies the displacement of workers by machinery in other industries. It is not without interest here to remark that a similar process is observable in Germany.

Now let us glance at the post-war period alone. We have already claimed that it is incorrect to compare the figures of 1919 with those of 1925. A comparison of the number of workers engaged in industry in 1923 and 1925 shows a falling off of about 400,000. Can we base upon this the supposition that a real retrogression in employment had taken place? In this connection let us examine the facts. We have already established that the recruiting of workers for industry during the war period did not substantially pass that of the pre-war years. We noted, in fact, that in the ten years before the war there were 600,000 less workers engaged than in the five-year period during the world war. The rate of engagement of labour during the war period then was twice as high. This tendency was based upon the peculiar conditions of the development of American capitalism during the world war.

After the 1921 crisis in the United States we note the appearance of a contrary tendency, which reached its peak in the period of 1923-1925. Large-scale rationalisation took place in American industry. Naturally this resulted in the dismissal of a number of workers. It is sufficient to compare the increase in horse-power with the fall in employment. While the number of industrial workers decreased by 4.5 per cent, the horse-power used rose by 8 per cent. In a consideration of this crisis, which followed on the rapid mechanicalisation of productive processes and the resulting temporary decrease in the number of employed, nothing can justify the claim that these phenomena must, by economic law, result in an absolute fall in the figures of employment. At the moment that we are concluding our investigations we have received a book by the well-known statistician, Jurgen Kuezynsky, *Wages and the Crisis in America*. Included in this work are figures regarding the number of workers engaged in industry in the United States. On the basis of these figures, which have been taken from official sources, we have made a comparative table in which the year 1919 is represented by 100. We have

done this in order to combine with these figures those of the Federal Reserve Board which were compiled on the same basis.

*Index figures of production and wages in the United States in the most important industries (1919 to 1927).\**

Year	Production A	Total Employed workers B	Percentage Employed workers C	Production per worker D	Total Wages E	Wages per worker F
1919	100	9,095,631	100.00	100	100	100
1921	80	6,946,333	76.37	98	84	102
1922	104	8,134,222	89.43	116	89	99
1923	120	8,780,012	96.53	115	113	109
1924	112	7,935,938	87.25	118	104	109
1925	125	8,383,443	92.17	132	107	113
1926	129	8,402,543	92.38	134	109	114
1927	126	8,077,829	88.81	137	105	114

If we compare the figures of percentages of occupied workers from the year 1923 onward we can clearly observe the reflex of the crisis of 1914 and of the rationalisation which during the period of 1923-1925 was proceeding at its sharpest rate. This is evidenced by column D, which shows the production per worker. We also see that in 1924, besides the fall in employment resulting from rationalisation, there was another set-back which can be traced to the decrease in total production. While the index figure of employment fell from 96.5 to 87.3, the index of industrial production (column A) fell from 120 to 112. With regard to rationalisation at the present, we may note a slowing down of the process. According to column D, in 1923-1925 production per worker rose from 115 to 132, namely, 17 points; from 1925-1927, however, it only rose 5 points.

The fall in the number of the employed in 1927 by 4 points was undoubtedly principally caused by the depression in that year. In 1927 steel production fell by 10 per cent., motor-cars by 22 per cent., and the total index of production sank 3 points. Column D also shows that the further mechanicalisation of production played its part here. Incidentally we may also note that in 1927 the number of workers employed in anthracite coal-mining rose by 16.7 per cent. as compared with 1926; in building construction—which is also not in-

\* Columns B and C are based upon the figures of Kuczynsky.

cluded in the preceding tables—the increase in employment during the years 1923-1926 was estimated at 48 per cent. Further increases in employment may be noted in the following branches: street railways, general transport, cinematograph, radio and commerce.

That the total of employed in certain single industries in the United States has decreased we have already remarked. This phenomenon is emphasised in the Open Letter of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. to the Workers' Party of America, in which it is stated that the result of rationalisation is a speeding-up of labour, which, in certain industries, through the diminution in the number of workers, must necessarily lead to a considerable increase in unemployment. That the number of workers in particular industries can—either for a definite period or permanently—be decreased, is not only possible but has little direct relation to our problem. Such decreases in the total number of workers employed in single branches of industry arise inevitably from the mechanism of capitalist production; that is, from the continual transformation in methods of production. In this connection Marx shows that in agriculture the decrease in living labour elements can be absolute, and that the increase in the absolute total of labour power does not necessarily take place in all branches of industry, nor to the same measure in each branch where it does occur.

In the first volume of *Capital* he cites an example of this, and points out that at a given stage of development an extraordinary expansion of production can be connected with not merely a relative but an absolute decrease in labour. Then follows a study of this phenomenon in the British woollen industry: "Between 1852 and 1862 considerable increase in British wool production took place, during which the number of employed workers remained almost stationary."

This covers a period of ten years. After these periods of stability which intervene during the process of technical development there must occur another expansion of production in which the number of employed workers will once again increase.

But that is not the question with which we are at present concerned. Our question is, as comrade Varga has it: Is the number of work-

ers employed by industrial capital really diminishing? Varga answers this question in the affirmative, and instances a fall of 2 million. This example, however, as we have shown, cannot be properly supported by statistics.

The other question is as follows: Is such a real decrease in employment compatible with the laws of capitalism in its monopolist or imperialist stage? In other words, the concrete question is: Can we take as a model the United States, this expanding and militant capitalism, which through the cheapening of the machine process and through the powerful "forcing of workers' wages below value," has forged for itself the most mighty weapon for conquering foreign markets?

In the consideration of this question we must reckon with the two distinct tendencies connected with capitalist accumulation. These two tendencies are: the employment of the least possible amount of labour in order to produce the same or a larger quantity of goods, with the object of securing the same or even more surplus value; and, secondly, the employment of the largest possible number of workers, as the total of surplus value increases with that of the amount of labour power used at any given stage of the process of production. These two tendencies are antagonistic. The first leads to constant dismissal of workers, and the second draws the workers back into the process of production and, as Marx points out, enlarges the area of wage-slavery.

Marx handles the question of the unemployment of workers through mechanical improvements in a most penetrating manner. Already in the first volume of *Capital* he examines the pretensions of the supporters of the theory of compensation—those who claimed that when machinery freed a number of workers, at the same time a definite amount of capital was released which could re-employ those workers. Marx showed, however, that the employer who has just installed new machinery does not release this variable capital but transforms it into constant capital. And even if a part of this capital were released Marx shows how it would be absorbed in spheres where the dismissed workers could not be employed. It is quite clear that if, through the installation of

new machinery, capital be released which shall employ mechanics, turners and others, this would not help very much weavers who had lost their employment through mechanical improvements. Incidentally, it must here be noted that the construction of new machines employs fewer workers than these machines displace.

Ricardo's claim that the merchandise which had earlier been produced for the consumption of workers who now found themselves unemployed, and which were now upon the market, could be used as capital for their re-employment was successfully demolished by Marx. Marx pointed out that according to this theory no man able and willing to work could suffer want in capitalist society.

It is true that machinery can provide increased activity in certain other industries such as the following:

1. In those industries which employ raw material to that industry in which the new machinery has been installed.

2. In those concerns where further work is done upon the products of the industry concerned.

3. In luxury industries. Marx shows how luxury products grow with the mass of product from those surplus values they are nourished.

4. Through the formation of new branches of production which, through machinery or changes in process, are called into being.

5. Through expansion of production in those branches of industry which will only bear fruit in the far future.

6. Increase in the non-productive strata of the working class, which arises from increased revenue.

But this new employment of workers is only possible through extra capital seeking outlet, and not through capital which has already been functioning and has been converted into machinery.

The possibility of re-employing unemployed workers who have been released through the installation of new machinery—the raising of the productive capacity of social labour—can nowhere be brought into dialectic relation with the law of capitalist accumulation.

The raising of the productive capacity of social labour is no single example but a steady

tendency in capitalist economy. It is, as Marx pointed out, that network of social relationships and technical processes which we specifically call the capitalist method of production.

With this tendency is related the law of the accumulation of capital—the motive of capitalist production. The mutual relation between these two is as follows: the accumulation of capital takes place on the material basis of constant changes in the method of production, while in the course of accumulation one always comes to a point where the development of the productivity of social labour is the strongest instrument for accumulation.

This dynamic process in capitalist production is characterised by Marx, who showed that all methods by which the social productivity of labour is increased are at the same time methods for the increased production of surplus value, which, in its turn, forms the basis of accumulation.

Thus we return to our original theme, showing that the accumulation of capital and the tendency towards an ever higher organic structure in industry—which sometimes mutually condition each other and sometimes proceed one from the other—are the two factors which determine the number of workers engaged in the productive process.

Let us now examine each of these two laws separately. Accumulation or the growth of capital includes the growth of its variable portion, that portion which is embodied in labour power.

The rule relating to changes in the technical structure of capital has a contrary working, as it leads to a decrease in the demand for labour power. Thus with regard to our problem, the demand for labour, these two tendencies work in contrary directions.

Here, however, a limit in the working of the rule relating to the technical structure may be mentioned. A relative decrease in the number of employed becomes apparent when, owing to a change in processes, only the new accumulated capital becomes effective. In such a case, when the released capital is not 100 per cent. converted into constant capital a demand for labour power must result. Thus, for the purposes of our particular problem, this rule relating to changes in technical processes only becomes important when it concerns old capital

which has arrived at the stage of self-reproduction and is substituted by new.

We observe that under normal circumstances newly released capital may possibly provide substitute employment, but, nevertheless, always in a lesser degree. This being so, the sum total of employed must increase.

Old capital which at specific intervals undergoes organic transformation thus releases workers in an increasing ratio. Here it must also be noted that variable capital can also grow without implying an increase in the number of employed. And indeed, when the worker is producing more value, in spite of the stationary cost of labour, wages rise. At such times the capitalist is concerned in securing a certain amount of work from a lesser number of workers. The bigger the scale of production, the more distinct does this motive become, as Marx pointed out.

Yet no one will claim that wages in the United States are rising, therefore this particular point is irrelevant in this case.

The question now arises to what extent these two contrary tendencies (accumulation and structural transformation) cancel each other out. What is then the consequence of this process? Marx clearly shows, in answer to this question, that the result is the growth of variable capital resulting in a growth in employment. And again, in *The Theory of Value*, where he cites the following from Ricardo's *Principles of Political Economy*: "The demand for labour grows with the increase in capital, but not in the same ratio. The ratio is a constantly declining one." Here Marx writes that in the last sentence Ricardo has correctly described the law governing the growth of capital.

Marx's conception here is based upon his discovery of the law of the declining rate of profit, which, in its turn, is founded upon an examination of the organic structure of capitalism. The level of the rate of profit is determined by the amount of variable capital. Thus the appearance of alterations in the structure of capital is reflected in profits by the tendency for the rate to sink.

The tendency of capitalist production begets, with the continual relative decrease of variable as against constant capital, a higher organic composition of total capital, of which the in-

evitable result is that the rate of surplus value at an equivalent or even rising degree of labour exploitation, is expressed by a falling general rate of profit.

Yet the relative decrease in variable capital and relative increase in constant capital—although there is absolute growth in both cases—is only an expression of the increased productivity of labour. Yet this fall in the rate of profit proceeds, not from an absolute, but only from a relative decrease in the variable elements of total capital. But as, through accumulation, total capital continually increases, so must the sum total of profits. To what extent then do these two contrary tendencies balance each other? Here we revert to the same question, which previously arose when considering other aspects of our problem. What answer does Marx give us? He shows us that the total mass of profits can increase progressively. This, in spite of the progressive fall in the rate of profit. It is not just that this *can* be the case, writes Marx, it *must* be the case, temporary fluctuations aside, on the basis of capitalist production. For the same development of the productive power of social labour, the same laws which manifest themselves in the relative fall of variable capital in relation to total capital, and the consequent accumulation . . . all this development is expressed—apart from temporary fluctuations—in the steady increase in the amount of social labour employed. Finally Marx shows definitely that on the whole the relative decrease of variable capital and of profits corresponds to an absolute increase in both.

There can be no doubt regarding Marx's position on this subject.

Nevertheless, we will not categorically claim that an absolute decrease in the number of employed is impossible; that is, that it cannot be theoretically discussed and its possibility theoretically conceded. Marx himself has done this in an allusion to the political consequences of a decrease in the total number of employed. At the same time, however, he stresses the fact that it is a special necessity of the capitalist method of production that the absolute total of wage-earners increase. For, as he points out, a development of production which would decrease the total number

of the employed would bring about a revolution, as it would eventually involve the majority of the population.

For a yet greater expansion of production inevitably follows, covering new ground. This development becomes more and more marked until finally a country is in a position to supply an entire market. This then is the struggle for trade, and the United States are now engaged in a struggle for monopoly of the world's markets. It cannot be denied that the United States, in the course of this struggle, have not the least intention of not fulfilling the first necessity of capitalist production, namely, an expansion of the absolute number of occupied wage workers. If there be any decrease in the number of wage earners then it is certainly not in the United States.

## II.—UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE GREAT IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

### 1. *Germany*

With the end of the world war a substantial increase in unemployment took place in Germany. At that time there existed no published statistics of unemployment. Only the free trade unions carried out any statistical investigations of the question, in which they had been engaged since 1907. These data show us that in the period 1907-1913 an average of 2.3 per cent. of the members of the free unions were unemployed. As a whole, these workers who were released during the process of accumulation could be re-employed, so that in general there was no marked increase in the industrial reserve army. A different situation prevailed, however, in the beginning of the post-war period. Particularly after the stabilisation of the mark, we may note a steady increase in the number of unemployed. The number of unemployed reached six figures. According to the trade union statistics, unemployment developed as follows:—

Number of unemployed and short-time workers registered with the free Trade Unions. In percentages of total Trade Union membership.

	1907-13	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922
Unemployed	2.3	1.8	3.7	3.8	2.8	1.5
Part-time	—	—	—	—	5.4	2.8

	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	(Oct.) 1928
Unemployed	9.6	13.5	6.7	18.2	9.0	9.0
Part-time	26.8	15.3	8.6	15.4	3.4	3.7

Number of Unemployed Relieved (in thousands)

1919	1920	1921	1922	1923 Dec.
1,000	300	150	12	1,500
1924 Dec.	1925 Dec.	1926 Dec.	1927 Dec.	1928 Dec.
458	1,062	1,700	1,888	1,700

In general these figures show a decrease in unemployment until the end of the inflation period. The lower the value of the paper currency fell, the lower became the standard of living of the workers. German capital went through the inflation crisis at the cost of the working class. The surprising depths to which the real wages of the workers fell at that time may be realised by the fact that already in 1922—when inflation had not yet reached its highest point—the equivalent of a day's wage for a carpenter in the furnishing trades was 27.2 lbs. of bread, as compared with 6r lbs. in 1914. The fall in the real wages may be still more readily apprehended when we survey the total cost of living. According to the report of an investigating committee of the I.F.T.U., in Germany the average monthly wage of an employee on October 1st, 1922, was 15,500 marks. To live at the same level as in 1914 a monthly wage of 66,329 marks would have been necessary.

At the beginning of the stabilisation, the number of unemployed rose rapidly, and by the end of 1923 reached 1.5 millions. By the end of 1924 it had fallen to 458,000, and then at the end of 1925 again rose to 1,062,000. The rationalisation process, which began in the first months of 1924, steadily accelerated, leading to a remarkable increase in unemployment. By the end of January, 1926, there were 2,020,000 workless, and in December, 1926, there still remained 1,748,579. Then by October, 1927, the figure had fallen to 355,416, but by the end of 1927 had again reached the height of 1,188,000. In May, 1928, it fell to 629,740, reaching 654,064 in July of the same year and then rising again. By the end of December, 1928, there were 1,700,000 unemployed in receipt of relief.

We are now concerned with analysing the above figures in order to ascertain the reason for these fluctuations. Undoubtedly the development of a crisis is reflected in the figures since the stabilisation of the mark. Thus we see clearly the stabilisation crisis reflected in the figures of 1924: then follows the rationalisation period of 1925 and then a new boom at the beginning of the British Miners' Lock-Out, and then in 1928 the first signs of a newly beginning depression.

Statistics also enable us to follow the number of workers employed in concerns with over 5 workers, in 1925, 1926 and 1927. It is true that here no precise estimate is possible, but the tendency is unmistakable. We may here compare two different sets of figures, namely the occupational figures for 1925 and the Trade Survey statistics of 1926 and 1927. The first is a census on a given day, while the second is the average figure for the whole year. It must be remembered that the Trade Survey figures, showing an average, will be somewhat lower.

Number of Workers employed in medium and large Industrial Concerns.

	Concerns with 5-49 Workers.	Concerns with 50 or more Workers.	Totals.
1925	2,692,200	6,925,400	9,617,000
1926	2,102,100	5,458,200	7,560,300
1927	2,309,600	6,557,000	8,866,600

A comparison of these figures shows that about 2 million fewer workers were employed in 1926 than in 1925. Of these 1½ millions were released from large concerns. In comparison with 1925, 1927 shows a decrease of only 368,000, so that, when we remember the different methods of securing the figures, we can say that in general the number of workers employed in moderate and large concerns in 1925 and 1927 was about the same.

The large number of dismissed workers in 1926 was doubtless the result of the rationalisation crisis which was only overcome in the middle of 1927.

Now if we compare the Trade Survey statistics of 1927 with the occupational census figures of 1925, it becomes obvious that in 1927 heavy industry had only a small share in the absorption of superfluous labour. Here also we see the result of rationalisation, which

is most strongly developed in heavy industry. Apart from heavy industry, this tendency is only apparent to any extent in the manufacture of electrical accessories. In other industries, such as metal goods, textiles and food-stuffs, we see a rise in the number of employed in 1927 of about 225,000 as compared with 1925.

These instances show us that the development in the various branches of industry has not been similar. This shows that rationalisation has not yet been fully introduced into the lighter industries.

There remains yet one question to be examined. Whence came the 1,306,400 workers who were newly employed in German industry in 1927? The figures show 1,680,000 unemployed in receipt of relief in 1926. In 1927 there were about 850,000, as well as another 165,000 who received emergency relief. Thus there was a decrease of some 600,000 unemployed who found employment in industry in 1927. But whence came the other 700,000 workers? Here we must remember the natural increase caused by persons entering industry. Of these latter, 260,000 were described as having entered the status of wage-workers. There still remain 340,000. They are composed of workers in those concerns which in 1926 were not yet included in the statistics. We can therefore count 140,000 as having come from these very small concerns into moderate or large concerns. The remaining 200,000 may be counted as having for the most part come from the land, especially as in 1926 a number of workers returned from the cities to the land.

These observations have enabled us to observe those tendencies relating unemployment with periodical crises. A glance at the unemployment figures for a period of good trade shows that it is two to three times higher than the average for the years 1907 to 1913. That is the essential point in unemployment of the post-war period. This means that less and less numbers of the reserve army are absorbed into production. Here we see the effects of rationalisation, through which more workers lose employment than those who are re-absorbed by the expansion of production. Or, as Marx says, "If the means of production,

as they increase in extent and effective power, become to a less extent means of employment of labourers, this state of things is again modified by the fact that in proportion as the productiveness of labour increases, capital increases its supply of labour more quickly than its demand for labourers." (Marx, *Capital*.)

On the other hand, we also see that one of the most important industries, namely building construction, was completely stagnant. In 1925 there were 16,000 less building workers employed than in 1927. Had the development of the building trades proceeded at the same average rate as the other important industries there would have been 420,000 more building workers employed in 1925. The reason for this special phenomenon in the building trades, in spite of the severe housing famine, exists in the post-war economic conditions. Among the reasons were the political policy regarding housing, lack of capital, the high rate of interest on mortgages, the rise in the cost of freehold, and other factors which, from the point of view of the capitalists, rendered building construction profitless.

So far as the figures for recent years can show us, it would appear that the building industry is again beginning to expand. The total of workers employed in the building trades has distinctly risen in the last two years.

Apart from this extreme exception then, we may note that an ever greater number of workers are outside production. Yet this great army is one of the greatest dangers for the future of capitalism.

## 2. *England*

The great increase in unemployment began in England after the end of the world-war. In January, 1919, there were already 678,703 insured unemployed. From December, 1919, until September, 1920, the number of unemployed rose by 200,000, reaching the million mark in February, 1921. The highest monthly figures for unemployment in the years 1921-1928 were as follows:—

	Insured Unemployed	Per cent. of Unionists Unemployed
1921 June ...	2,171,000	23.1*
1922 January ...	1,925,950	16.8
1923 January ...	1,493,036	13.7
1924 January ...	1,371,470	8.9
1925 August ...	1,440,628	11.4
1926 June ...	1,751,133	12.9*
1927 December	1,194,305	9.8
1928 December	1,520,000	12.0

Now let us take the figures of the Trade Unions. We note that the percentage of unemployed Trade Unionists in the period from 1921-1928 fluctuates between 8 per cent. and 23 per cent., as compared with 4.5 per cent. which was the average of the years 1900-1914. Thus we note that the post-war unemployment in Britain is about three times as great as in the ten years preceding the war. The following industries are particularly affected: coal-mining, iron and steel, textiles and building. The causes of this unemployment, which we shall not examine here, are mainly rooted in the decline of British capitalism.

Among the most important factors must be counted the loss of Britain's world-position, the industrial development of the colonies and Dominions during the war, loss of important export trade (British export trade has sunk by 25 per cent.), inflation in European countries, accompanied by simultaneous deflation in Britain, loss of its supreme position in merchant shipping, and the stationary character of the productive capacity of social labour.

There is no prospect in the near future of Britain emerging from the difficulties in which she finds herself. On the contrary, the attempt at rationalisation of the coal, iron and steel and textile industries—to mention only the most important—must inevitably lead to a further increase in unemployment. There are already over a quarter of the total number of British miners without employment. Thus is Britain menaced by this gigantic army of unemployed, which at the period of militant growth among the workers must become a special danger to British imperialism, especially as all means of fighting against unemployment have been proved useless.

(\*) Not counting locked-out miners.

### 3. *The United States*

Even in the United States, a country which in recent years has enjoyed such remarkable prosperity, there exists a fairly large unemployed army. As there are no official statistics of unemployment in the United States, we are compelled to rely on greatly varying estimates, which are considerably affected by political bias.

The Minister of Labour, Davies, estimates that there is a permanent unemployed reserve of at least 1 million. Other estimates have placed the figure as high as 5 millions for the first months of 1928. On April 20th, 1928, Senator Wagner, in a speech in the United States Senate, estimated the number of unemployed in that country as 5.8 million. These startling differences in estimate reveal political motives: it was prior to the election and Senator Wagner is a Democrat. We shall probably be nearest the truth if we estimate the present number of unemployed in the U.S.A. as from 3 to 3½ millions. Thus in America, unemployment is a factor of wide importance. Here also rationalisation played a dominant part. The productive capacity of an industrial worker rose 37 per cent. in the period 1919-1927.

### 4. *Summary*

Roughly we may estimate the industrial reserve army in Europe in pre-war time at 3 to 4 million, and in the U.S.A. from 1 to 1½ million.

In the post-war period unemployment has gone considerably beyond this point. In non-European countries unemployment reached its peak in 1921 (U.S.A.). In Europe the highest point was reached considerably later. Professor Hickmann estimates the total of unemployed in Europe during the first three months of 1925 at 5 millions, and in the whole world at something over 10 millions; and it is quite possible that these figures are too low. Voytinsky's estimate is 15 millions for the same period.

Although since that time unemployment in general has decreased, yet the world total must be at least between 10 and 12 millions.

We have seen that in the great capitalist countries, such as Britain and Germany, unemployment is nowadays from two to three times as high as in the pre-war period. At the

end of 1913 in Germany the industrial population was nine and a half million persons, of whom 460,000, about 4.7 per cent. were unemployed. In the post-war period, over 10 per cent. of the industrial population became unemployed.

These high figures cannot be explained either by cyclical crises or by the seasonable nature of some forms of employment. We are concerned here with unemployment of a permanent nature, unemployment which proceeds directly from structural changes in capitalist economy. Such structural changes may imply either continual causes, such as growth, remodelling or decay; and also sudden or revolutionary occurrences such as breakdowns, closing down and so on. We might designate this permanent form of unemployment "structural unemployment."

With regard to unemployment in Germany, both continual and sudden factors have played their part in varying degree. One of the continual factors has special importance, namely,

the strong tendency towards concentration and centralisation which has appeared since the war.

This has led to a distinct increase in the productive power of labour and in consequence to a considerable growth in the ranks of the reserve army of industry. This tendency, which is inherent in the methods of capitalist production, was observable even in the pre-war period in Germany, although much less defined. Thus the average unemployment, according to Trade Union statistics, rose, in Germany, from 121,250 in 1907 to 167,000 in 1911, 183,250 in 1912, 280,000 in 1913. But now this same tendency is far more perceptible.

The general law of capitalist accumulation, with all its reactions upon the working-class, is now manifesting itself in forms which lay heavier and heavier burdens upon the masses and which involve the workers in the most terrible suffering. There is only one way out: the proletarian revolution and the victory of Socialism.

# TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD

by

**JOHN REED**

A vivid account of the November revolution in Russia as witnessed and recorded by that brilliant journalist and author, the late John Reed

*Cloth 4s.*

*Post free 4s. 5d.*

*Paper 2s.*

*„ „ 2s. 3d.*

*Of all booksellers or direct from*

**MODERN ★ BOOKS ★ LIMITED**

26 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON, W.C.1

# The Anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution in Hungary

Bela Kun

## I.

**T**HE victory of the October revolution was necessary before everyone could understand the importance of the Russian revolution of 1905. It was necessary to realise that, as Lenin said, without the dress rehearsal of 1905 the 1917 October revolution would not have been possible.

Thus we shall never be able truly to measure the historical significance of the proletarian revolution in Hungary until—in a new epoch of the international proletarian revolution—looking back from the standpoint of the new Socialist Soviet Republic of Hungary, we may consider it as the dress rehearsal in Hungary of the victorious European revolution. Inflexible faith in the revolution is not enough; one must also have that saturation in Marxist revolutionary theory which made it possible for Lenin, even in the blood-drenched atmosphere of the defeat of 1905, to appreciate the tremendous eventual result of the creative power of that vanquished revolution. That result being, of course, the Soviets as the concrete form of proletarian dictatorship.

A whole series of particular characteristics and experiences in the proletarian revolution in Hungary still awaits historical evaluation and verification. So far, however, as its positive revolutionary significance is concerned, we may still use the words which, ten years ago, Lenin spoke two days after the victory of the Hungarian rising, on 23rd March, 1919, in his speech to the Eighth Congress of the C.P.S.U. :

“So far the Soviet power had only been victorious among the peoples adhering to the Russian Empire. Short-sighted persons, especially those who are unable to escape from old routine habits of thought—even among socialists—have hitherto been able to proclaim themselves of the opinion that only peculiarly Russian characteristics had brought to life this unexpected turn in the direction of pro-

letarian Soviet democracy; that possibly the old peculiarities of Tsarist Russia are reflected in the peculiarities of this democracy as in a crooked mirror. Now this conception is destroyed in its very basis. . . .

“The bourgeoisie and many of their adherents, at the end of 1917 and in 1918, said that we were usurpers; they could find no other words for our revolution except ‘force’ and ‘usurpation.’ If even now such voices arise—whose absurdity we have repeatedly proved—claiming that the Bolshevik power rests upon force, the example of Hungary would compel them to silence.

“The difficulties of the Hungarian revolution are tremendous. The imperialists can much more easily strangle this country, so much smaller in comparison with Russia. But however great may be the difficulties which still exist in Hungary, we have in this case not merely to deal with the victory of the Soviet power but also with the moral victory which we have achieved. The most liberal and democratic of the bourgeoisie—even those most inclined towards compromise—recognise that, in the period of gravest crisis, when a new war menaces a land already exhausted with war, the Soviet power is a historical necessity. They have realised that in such a country there can be no other power but the Soviet power, the dictatorship of the proletariat.”

The Communist International was founded hardly two weeks before the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The worldwide historical importance of its foundation lay in this: that it really began on a world-scale to fulfil Marx’s solution, which, as Lenin said, after the long development of socialism and the working-class movement must find its expression in the proletarian dictatorship. The Communist International’s first step in the fulfilment of this historical path was to lead the proletarian revolution in Hungary to victory with the establishment of the Hun-

garian Socialist Soviet Republic. It is from the perspective of the historic mission of the International that we must above all consider the significance of the proletarian revolution in Hungary.

## II.

The strategic and tactical lessons of the proletarian revolution in Hungary, which, by means of Bolshevik self-criticism, were drawn by the Hungarian Communists and throughout the International, have become the common possession of the whole international revolutionary working-class movement. These mistakes lead back to the fact that the proletarian revolution in Hungary had no such dress rehearsal as was the 1905 revolution for the October revolution.

The Communist Party of Hungary was founded only four and a half months before the victory of the proletarian revolution; and at the very moment of its birth the struggle for power began. The Party developed its spirited revolutionary agitation among the working masses, who, despite the fact that neither revolutionary spirit nor the desire for revolution failed them, had grown up under the influence of reformist teaching and without revolutionary traditions. The Hungarian Labour movement was specially lacking in Marxist theory. And in the socialist movement the question was never posed as to what forces and what questions of the Hungarian toiling masses—with the proletariat at their head—should bring them to revolution. The Hungarian social-democracy, functioning in a country which in many respects was similar to Tsarist Russia, had never introduced the question of a bourgeois democratic revolutionary transformation; and, of course, still less the question of a socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship. The question of the leadership of the working class in the revolution was naturally just as unrecognised. Even without representation in parliament, it was a party of parliamentary fetishism. The objective which they provided for the working class was the struggle for democratic reforms under the leadership of the bourgeoisie.

The Social-Democratic Party was not the leader of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1918 in Hungary. The party had at the most approved, after much hesitation, of the

revolution which followed upon the breakdown of the war—a revolution which they had done everything possible to avert. In their endeavour to hinder the revolution they even went so far that their leaders accepted positions in a government which was formed to liquidate even the elementary revolutionary mass movement which then existed. And this in spite of the fact that the only class which the revolution and the downfall of the Hapsburg regime found at all prepared—and which, united with the soldiers and peasants, had smashed the rule of the Hapsburgs—was the working class. The Hungarian bourgeoisie was almost buried under the wreckage of the old Hungary. The defeat of Hungary in the war was in every sense of the word a national defeat for all strata of the bourgeoisie, and also of course for the semi-feudal landlords. There was not only a possibility of oppression by a foreign nation, but one could also foresee that a considerable section of the Hungarian people might actually come under foreign rule. In this situation the Social-Democratic Party became the sheet-anchor for the Hungarian bourgeoisie, and even for the representatives of vestigial feudalism—the big landlords who had not yet approximated to the later stages of capitalist development. The majority of the working class, although not prepared for revolution, was, nevertheless, at first ready for this task, inasmuch as it carried on the class-coalition policy of the war period; in fact, this policy was still further expanded inasmuch as the “revolutionary democracy” became the protagonist of capitalist private property and even of the semi-feudal elements which still remained. The founding of the Communist Party of Hungary, following shortly after the bourgeois revolution, brought the leadership of the revolution into the hands of those working masses who were not prepared to take up the salvation of the bourgeois and semi-feudal elements. The slogans “All Power to the Workers’ Councils,” and “Armed Uprising,” through the agitation of the young Communist Party, became widely known and took root with tremendous rapidity among the masses of the workers. Through the catastrophic defeat in the war and the outbreak of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the armed

forces of the State were completely disorganised. This disorganisation was completed, through the agitation and organising activity of the Communists, by the arming of the workers. The bourgeoisie could only hope for protection from the Social-Democratic Party. But the Social-Democratic Party itself was now by no means homogeneous. Its members, and even some of its leaders—those who joined the Communists after the overthrow of the dictatorship—were hesitating; they were unwilling to serve as maintainers of bourgeois rule. The fatal error which followed, the union of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties, was partly due to the fact that the Hungarian Communist Party, despite all its revolutionary vigour, was a young party without revolutionary traditions. On the other hand, one must also take into consideration that during the war period the Social-Democratic Party did not fully differentiate its policy, so that among its membership as well as in its leading sections could be found a large number of revolutionary elements. The "Unity ideology," which had been fostered in the Social-Democratic Party, had, however, prevented these masses from attaining a completely revolutionary standpoint.

The Communist Party itself, in its totality—despite the experiences of some of its leaders in the Russian revolutionary struggle for power—was not in a position to estimate correctly the position of the Party or the revolutionary situation. Thus it happened that, during the four months of its activity, the Party was not in a position to solve one of the most fundamental questions of the Hungarian revolution; the peasant question.

Thus from these circumstances proceeded the two fundamental errors of the revolution: the union with the Social-Democratic Party and the doctrinaire, unbolshevik treatment of the peasant question—a treatment which lost for the proletarian revolution and for the working class which led it the most important reserve army for that revolution, namely, the peasant masses. At the very beginning these two errors determined the fatal end of the revolution.

### III.

Apart from the mistakes above described, the proletarian revolution in Hungary dis-

closes a whole series of special characteristics. Without an analysis of these characteristics, both the victory and the downfall of that revolution remain incomprehensible.

The success of the revolution was even at that time a riddle—not only for the social-democrats in the various European countries, but also for the different pedants in the Communist Party—a riddle which they found it painful to solve. On March 24th, 1929, Paul Levi, then a leader of the Communist Party of Germany, writing in a provincial German Communist paper on the victory of the Hungarian proletarian revolution, said:

"The new revolution in Hungary, which has replaced the bourgeois democracy by a Soviet government, is not actually the fruit of a victorious battle waged by the proletariat against the Hungarian bourgeoisie and junkers. It is not the result of a struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie in which the latter has been vanquished; it is simply the result of the fact that the Hungarian bourgeoisie has—and there is no other word for it—given up the ghost."

It did not occur to this sensitive renegade—so sensitive that he had to excuse himself for being rude to the bourgeoisie—that it was necessary to analyse the special conditions and forms of the Hungarian proletarian revolution. The concrete circumstances of the victory of the Hungarian revolution, however, are obviously so distinct from those of the October revolution in Russia that it should have been absolutely essential for Party leaders—whose task it was to support the Hungarian revolution as actively as possible—to analyse those distinctions. The fact that some Communist leaders of that time, instead of organising international support for the young Soviet republic which needed it so badly, should busy themselves with fault-finding, naturally worked most disadvantageously for its success.

The final step to the victory of the proletarian revolution in Hungary was, in fact, not an armed uprising. However, this in no way implies that the conquest of State power was not the act of the armed proletariat. The city workers—and to some extent the agricultural workers—fought in a series of armed conflicts with the decaying and partly disarmed

bourgeoisie. Industrial and agricultural proletarians had occupied both factories and estates, from which they had expelled the managers and directors by armed force. A number of armed collisions took place in various country towns and villages with the small remaining armed forces of the State. In most cases the necessity for armed action was not present, as the bourgeoisie relied mainly upon the social-democracy. The latter, however, were unable to fulfil the role of a Noske because, as we have shown above, through their own lack of definition of policy, they could not control their own membership. The difference between the proletarian revolutions in Hungary and Russia is not that in the one country it was the result of armed insurrection and in the other not. In both cases the relationship of the opposing classes—which had become distinct at the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—was one of force, namely, the victory would belong to whichever class possessed more arms. The difference was only in this: that in Russia, at the outbreak of the revolution, the bourgeoisie possessed more arms and could offer more resistance than in Hungary.

The common feature of both revolutions was that the internal revolutionary situation was enhanced by the international position of the particular country where the revolution was taking place. This international situation, although different as regards the two countries, in each case worked towards a weakening of the resistance of the bourgeoisie. An analysis of the international and internal factors of the two revolutions would make apparent the special conditions attending the Hungarian revolution.

As Lenin demonstrated, the October revolution was facilitated by the possibility of connecting the Soviet assumption of power with the termination of the imperialist war. While the October revolution found itself confronted by the imperialist war, the proletarian revolution in Hungary based itself on the mass feeling induced by the imperialist peace. Just as did the ending of the imperialist war and the demand for peace, so did the resistance to the imperialist peace-enforcement bring non-proletarian masses over to the side of the proletarian revolution. In Russia the peace-policy

of the Bolsheviks for a certain time brought the entire peasantry over to their side as active supporters. In Hungary, the resistance to the proletarian revolution by the bourgeoisie—and especially the nationalist petty-bourgeoisie, the petty-bourgeois intellectuals and the middle strata of the peasantry—was weakened by the expectation that Bolshevism would organise the struggle against the imperialist peace.

Even among the workers this important international factor manifested itself in an interesting manner. The masses of the Communist Party were naturally not composed of the aristocracy of labour. Yet when the shadow of the imperialist peace lay heavy on the land, important elements in the labour-aristocracy took their place side by side with the Communist Party. These elements feared the economic results of the territorial mutilation of the country, of the separation of industrial districts and the allocation of areas of raw material to other states. Not for a moment did the Communist Party fall into the error of nationalist-Bolshevism. The Communist Party with great energy and success exposed the Wilsonist and social-pacifist illusions of the Second International. But it exposed also, with equal clarity, the movement for the maintenance of Hungary's territorial integrity and the maintenance of the Hungarian oppressors' rule. The Hungarian Communist Party in its agitation emphasised that it was opposed to all wars based upon an infringement of the self-determination of peoples; and the Party disorganised the troops which the Social-Democratic war minister despatched against the Czecho-Slovakian and Roumanian armies. The Hungarian bourgeoisie's overtures to the Entente and the social-pacifism of the Social-Democrats had failed when confronted by the facts of the imperialist peace. This brought all hesitating elements for a while over to the side of the proletarian revolution. The petty-bourgeois patriots—one of the greatest enemies of the proletarian revolution—believed, with a section of the labour aristocracy, that their only hope for the organisation of resistance to the imperialist peace was in the Soviet republic. It is interesting to note how Lenin estimated the proletarian revolution in Hungary quite contrarily to the point of view of the Social-Democratic leaders who accused the Commun-

ist Party of nationalist Bolshevism and to the pedantic attitude of Levi. In his speech at the session of the Moscow Soviet on April 4th, Lenin said: "Hungary shows an example of a revolution under quite different conditions. Undoubtedly Hungary will have to carry on a hard struggle against it bourgeoisie. That is unavoidable. It is a fact that when those wild beasts of prey, the British and French imperialists, foresaw the Hungarian revolution they wanted to subdue the country and to prevent the revolution from happening. The difficulty with us was that while the Soviet power defied patriotism and smashed patriotism to pieces, yet we were compelled to conclude the Brest-Litovsk peace."

Had the Communist Party surrendered, it would have been the maddest pedantry and treachery to the revolution, especially as an important part of the petty bourgeois masses, particularly the bourgeois intellectuals, were weakening in their resistance to the proletarian revolution. The leaders of the social-democratic party, responding to the mood of the petty bourgeois, proposed the common assumption of power. The assertion of the Austrian and Hungarian adherents of Austro-Marxism, that the Hungarian proletarian revolution was really not a proletarian revolution, but a nationalist-Bolshevist, petty-bourgeois opposition to the imperialism of the Allies, is the grossest calumny. It is, however, undeniable that the proletarian revolution, from the international point of view, found itself confronted by extremely difficult, almost insuperable tasks, owing to the fact that after its victory it found itself faced with the imperialist peace-enforcements and the necessity for an armed struggle against them.

As distinct from the Russian revolution, the Hungarian proletarian revolution succeeded at a period when one of the two antagonistic imperialist groups lay defeated. Lenin distinctly stated, when speaking on the conditions necessary for the victory of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, that the revolution could only carry on because of the possibility of utilising the struggle between the two imperialist robber bands and because these bands were not in a position to unite against the Soviet enemy. As German-Austro-Hungarian imperialism had already been defeated, this

same situation did not prevail at the time of the Hungarian revolution. Lenin clearly foresaw the peril involved in this situation and plainly indicated the danger to the proletarian revolution contained in the victory of Allied imperialism and the ending of the war. This situation affected the destiny of the proletarian revolution in no less than three directions. While the war-weary workers were by no means eager for new warfare, certain strata of the small bourgeoisie not only wanted war but wished to take the leadership of the revolutionary struggle into their hands and to transform it into a nationalist war. The exhausted workers of the neighbouring countries, particularly Germany and Austria, were horrified at the prospect of another war. They submitted to the fact that their social-democratic leaders—the Bauers just as much as the Scheidemanns—should use a sort of blackmail against the Entente what they termed as the westward-tending Bolshevik peril. The workers of the new victor countries—especially those of Czecho-Slovakia and the newly expanded Roumania—were lost in the rapture of national liberation and supported their rulers to the utmost. The Entente were enabled to send the armies of Czecho-Slovakia and Roumania against the revolution in Hungary. Under such conditions the proletarian revolution in Hungary could only fulfil one of its tasks from the point of view of international revolutionary tactics, namely to hinder the march of the Balkan army, under General Franchet d'Épernay, against Soviet Russia. Its second task, the support of the westward tendency of proletarian revolution, it could not fulfil, as its foreign policy and also the leadership of its military operations were weakened as the result of the internal situation and the international position of the Soviet Republic.

One of the greatest differences between the Russian and the Hungarian revolutions lay in the military situation. Lenin proved that in the preparation for the success of a proletarian revolution in Russia one must take into account the tremendous expanse of the country and the poor means of transportation, making it possible to carry on an extended civil war. The situation was fundamentally different in Hungary. Even in 1848, Engels showed

how the Hungarian revolution of that time was faced by great difficulties as a result of the narrow limits of its area. At that time the unfavourable transport conditions assisted the revolutionary army, the basis of whose operations was  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times as great as that of the Hungarian Red Army of 1919. While Kossuth, in 1848 and 1849, was able to carry on the war from Budapest, later, in the smaller Hungary of our day, the loss of the capital was equivalent to the breakdown of the revolution, both politically (the largest part of the workers were concentrated here) and from a military aspect (Budapest was the basis of the war industries). At the time of the outbreak of the proletarian revolution the front lay in the north, a distance of two or three days' march from Budapest, and in the East the Red Army, shortly after the first offensive of Roumania, withdrew its lines to a similar distance from the capital. Thus contrary to the Russian example, the war against Soviet Hungary was carried on by regular armies, which rendered it cryingly imperative for a large number of military specialists to serve in the Red Army, even before it had been possible for the revolution to have overthrown the officer caste.

Finally, a fundamental difference lay in the relations with the peasants in Russia and in Hungary. The erroneous handling of the peasant question by the Hungarian Communist Party as a subjective factor, becomes even plainer when the distinction is observed between the objective historical positions of the Hungarian and Russian peasantry. Lenin perceived that one of the conditions for the victory of proletarian revolution in Russia was the existence among the peasants of a widespread bourgeois-democratic movement. He saw that the party of the proletariat had an opportunity to take away from the Social-Revolutionaries—the majority of whom were opposed to the Bolsheviks—the expression of the demands of the peasantry and to realise those demands as soon as the proletariat had gained power. It is undeniable and cannot be sufficiently stressed that the Soviet power in Hungary committed a fatal mistake when it put before the peasants the choice of whether they wanted the division of the land or whether they wished for the continuation of the large estates. They did not recognise the

necessity of relating the proletariat with the bourgeois revolution. One source of this error was the effort to keep up the supplies of food for the towns. Another reason was that, based upon our policy of "Immediate Socialism," we wanted to bring the semi-feudal properties, together with large-scale capitalism, directly over into socialism. Owing to the great differentiation among the peasantry, the objective situation was different from that in Russia. This became apparent even at the time of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, when the whole of the peasantry did not even then support the revolution. Even at this period the struggle between the wealthy peasants and the agrarian proletariat (farm servants and day labourers) was becoming sharper. The agricultural wage earners wanted to prevent the large estates—where they earned their living—being partitioned and passing into the hands of the landowning peasantry. From this circumstance the Communists drew the wrong conclusion, and gave the agrarian wage earners no land; they held the large estates as co-operative farms, but in actuality as centralised Soviet undertakings. Thus the former farm labourer of a large estate, in spite of an improvement in his standard of living, did not mark a sufficient change in his circumstances brought about by the revolution. He did not look upon himself as an owner of the land but as a "State Farm Servant." Besides this, the historical past of the Hungarian peasantry was different from that of the Russian. When the revolution broke out, there existed no party among the peasants with the characteristics which Lenin instanced in the case of the Social-Revolutionaries. Among the peasants there existed no revolutionary movement, either under Communist or any other leadership, such as existed at the beginning of the 20th century among the Russian peasantry. As a result of these circumstances, then, the victory of the revolution in Hungary was rendered far more difficult than that in Russia, not as a result of subjective errors but as a result of the objective situation. These distinctive circumstances placed the proletarian revolution in Hungary, at its very first victorious step, before the most powerful objective obstacles. These objective obstacles, however, were not

insurmountable. The conception that the Hungarian proletarian revolution was from the beginning doomed to failure—a conception which was held by the Hungarian social-democrats and the erstwhile Communist leaders such as Paul Levi in Germany, and the Austrian Strasser and Ruth Fischer—was a defeatist position with regard to the whole question of the proletarian revolution in Western Europe. In the international situation, at the time of the Hungarian revolution, as a result of the ending of the imperialist war, no Soviet power in any country could have had as favourable a prospect as had the Russian proletarian revolution immediately after its inception.

This only goes to show that the Hungarian Soviet Republic needed even more the immediate and direct support of the international proletariat, and could dispense with such support less easily than could the Russian Soviet Republic.

#### IV.

The internal situation of the international Labour movement at the period of the Hungarian revolution was, however, completely disadvantageous to the success of that revolution. But still less favourable for our revolution was the military position of the Russian Soviet Republic. On March 18th, 1919, it was reported that the vanguard of the Red Army had taken possession of Kar-nopol. This had a great influence on the

“Eastern Orientation” of the social-democracy as well as other sections of the petty bourgeoisie. On April 4th, 1919, Lenin, in his letter to the Petrograd workers, sounds the alarm with regard to the eastern front. He writes:

“The situation on the eastern front has considerably worsened. To-day Koltchak took possession of the Votkinska works. We shall probably lose Bugulma, and Koltchak is pressing further on. The danger is frightful. We appeal to the Petersburg workers to strain every nerve and rally all their forces for the support of the eastern front. The soldiers will be able to feed themselves there and to assist their relatives by despatching food. The main thing is that there the fate of the revolution is being decided. If we can win there, we can put an end to the war, because the Whites will receive no more assistance from abroad. In the south we are on the point of victory. But no forces can be transferred from the south until we have completely won.”

All this made still more difficult the military situation of the proletarian revolution in Hungary, because we had partly depended upon the Russian Red Army and the uniting of the Russian and Hungarian Red troops in order to ensure our success. Here lay also the hopes of the petty bourgeoisie. It was from this hope that there proceeded the neutrality—and even at the beginning the benevo-

THE ENGLISH EDITION of the *COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL*  
(New Style) will be published twice monthly.  
Subscription Rates 8s. per annum in England, \$2 per annum in U.S.A.  
post free through any bookseller.

---

Owing to technical difficulties, this present issue embodies three ordinary issues. The *COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL* will revert to its usual form on June 1st (No. 14)

lent neutrality—of these elements towards the proletarian revolution. This also had a great deal to do with our coalition with the social-democratic party, because we had reckoned that after the union with the Russian Red Army we would be in a position to drive the weakest and most hesitating social-democratic elements out of the government and out of the leadership of the united parties. Also this was the first source of hesitation among the workers. This hesitation increased when, after the downfall of the Bavarian Soviet Republic, and right on top of the defeat of the Russian Red troops in the south-east through the treachery of Grigoriev, and the advance of Petlura's and Denikin's troops, the hope for assistance from the east and west disappeared. Outside the little Soviet Republic, encircled by imperialist troops (Czechoslovaks in the north, Roumanians in the east, Jugoslavs and French in the south and Austrians in the west), behind the enemy troops there were only small Communist groups engaged in activity to support our republic, activity which hardly went beyond the borders of ordinary propaganda. The coalition with

the social-democratic party, the errors in the blockade, prepared the ground for the democratic counter-revolution.

The internal political errors reduced the power of resistance of the proletarian revolution, so that as a consequence it was not in a position to await the warmly-expected assistance of the international proletariat.

The proletarian revolution in Hungary then, after  $4\frac{1}{2}$  months' struggle, remained as the dress-rehearsal for the new proletarian revolution—the proletarian revolution of Europe.

But even in its overthrow it served, as the Second Congress of the Communist International stated, as a beacon for the proletariat of Central Europe. Whatever revolutionary defeatism may say, whatever the social-democrats and renegades from Communism may proclaim, the blood of the workers did not flow in vain in this revolution; already new shoots are sprouting in the Hungary of the White Terror. "Laetius ec trunco florabit" as the Hungarian jacobins wrote on the walls of their cells at the time of the French revolution.

# Trotsky's Travels

## (From "Anti-Kautsky" to Kautsky)

S. Novikov

**T**ROTSKY has said of himself that he came to Lenin through fights with him. From 1903-4 down to 1917 Trotsky vacillated between Bolshevism and Menshevism, providing a classic type of the conciliator, and working to all the extent of his (outstanding!) power and ability in favour of Menshevism. In October Trotsky "came" to Lenin. Beginning with the Peace of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 down to the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1927, during a whole decade, Trotsky carried on a fight against Lenin and Leninism inside the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern. For ten years Trotsky was moving farther and farther away from Lenin, his teaching, his Party and his International, carrying on ruthless fights the while. Since 1928, when he found himself outside the ranks of the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern, Trotsky has been coming through fights to . . . . Kautsky, Bauer and Dan. Trotsky's Communist zenith was reached in his polemic with Kautsky in 1920, when Trotsky replied to Kautsky's learned lampoon "Terrorism and Communism" with the pamphlet "Communism and Terrorism" (Anti-Kautsky). Trotsky's further development after Lenin's death and especially in 1928 right down to the present day has been and remains unswervingly in the direction from "Anti-Kautsky" to Kautsky and from Lenin to Bauer-Dan.

### THE KAUTSKIAN LESSONS OF OCTOBER

In his "Terrorism and Communism," written in 1919, Kautsky sketched the prospects of the Soviet republic in the style of the Trotskyist documents of 1928. "Lenin's government is threatened by another Ninth Thermidor . . ." "Without democracy Russia will go to pieces, but through democracy Bolshevism must go to pieces. The final result is quite predictable. It need not be a Ninth Thermidor, but I fear it will not be far removed from that."

In his answer to Trotsky's pamphlet, in 1921, a few months after the introduction of the NEP, Kautsky asserted that capitalism, militarism and absolutism had been finally restored in Soviet Russia. The Soviet republic was experiencing a reaction, and it was threatened with the catastrophe of Thermidor. At that time Kautsky considered that the possibility of a "democratic" liquidation of the Soviet dictatorship was not excluded. "It is possible," he wrote, "that there will be a peaceable establishment of democracy and a proletarian peasant regime on the lines of Georgia before its seizure by the Bolshevik bands." If the Bolsheviks did not face up to a democratic liquidation of their dictatorship (i.e., the resurrection of Menshevik Georgia, only not in its former frontiers, but throughout the territory of Soviet Russia—S.N.), there would inevitably be a white-guard dictatorship, anarchy, and the plunging of Russia into barbarism. Such were to be the results of the reactionary policy and the theories of Bolshevism. (Kautsky, "From Democracy to the Slave State.")

Kautsky did not stand still. In 1925, just before the Marseilles Congress of the Second International, he issued the notorious denunciation: "The International and Soviet Russia," in which he argued that Thermidor had already arrived in Soviet Russia, that the N.E.P. was economic counter-revolution, and the repressions against the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries were political counter-revolution; that the Soviet State was a Russian form of Bonapartism and absolutism worse than Tsarism; that all Soviet Russia was a counter-revolutionary formation from top to bottom, with a counter-revolutionary basis of N.E.P. capitalism and a counter-revolutionary superstructure of Soviet Bonapartism. The Bolsheviks themselves had carried out the counter-revolution, they had themselves proved to be their own counter-revolutionaries and had thus held on to power.

Kautsky presaged our perdition by an elemental rising of the popular masses and the "peaceable" intervention of western European democracy. He considered a peaceable, democratic liquidation of the Soviet dictatorship desirable, but not at all probable. He personally would be for the "reform" of the Soviet regime, but objectively there were greater chances of a "revolution" against the Soviet dictatorship, and of an elemental revolt. He was against the technical preparation of the revolt, against a putsch, but in favour of the Russian "socialists" (i.e., the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries) participating in the elemental revolt.

Entering into a polemic with Dan and Bauer, who declared that a rising against the Soviet regime would inevitably end in counter-revolution, Kautsky insisted that one must not discredit in advance the inevitable "revolutionary" overthrow of the Soviet regime through a national elemental revolt by making such prophecies. He, Kautsky, on the contrary, was confident that both "reform" and "revolution" (i.e., counter-revolution—S.N.), would bring Soviet Russia to democracy, and through democracy to socialism sooner or later. (Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia," brochure and articles in "Kampf," 1925, No. 8/4.)

Kautsky stabilised himself at these views and introduced them in their entirety into his pseudo "materialist conception of history," which was planned and executed as Kautsky's philosophic and political testament and as a great encyclopædia of revisionism.

#### BAUER'S PROPHECIES AND FRITZ ADLER'S COUNSELS

Bauer, Dan and the other leading theoreticians and politicians of the Second International are not in agreement with Kautsky on all points. For them it is indubitable that the U.S.S.R. has a counter-revolutionary base of N.E.P. capitalism, and that the Soviet regime is the dictatorship of the C.P. over the proletariat and peasantry. To that extent they are in accord with Kautsky. But they do not consider that the U.S.S.R. has a counter-revolutionary superstructure, that the Soviet regime is Russian Bonapartism, that Thermidor has already arrived. They de-

clare "merely" that the Soviet regime is being subjected to a Thermidorian-Bonapartist-Fascist degeneration. They agree that the restoration of capitalism has taken place in the U.S.S.R., although it is hidden under the superstructure of Red imperialism and militarism, but in distinction from Kautsky, they are ready (in words) to give their preference to a peaceable, democratic liquidation of the Soviet dictatorship, i.e., to "reform" rather than to "revolution."

From the very first days of October Bauer has unceasingly declared that a dictatorship of the proletariat was established in Russia owing to the backwardness of the peasantry; that only owing to the backwardness of the proletariat was this dictatorship, which existed until the middle of 1918, replaced by the dictatorship of the Communist Party, by the dictatorship of the Bolshevik bureaucracy over the proletariat and peasantry; that this shortlived dictatorship will probably be replaced in turn by the rising Bonapartist dictatorship, which in the last result will be replaced by a stable regime of a peasant-democratic republic.

The historic mission of the Soviet regime, with its military despotic socialism and "Asiatic Marxism," Bauer considers to be the uplift of the cultural-political level of the peasant masses. According to Bauer, the cultural revolution which we have effected among the peasantry must inevitably lead to the self liquidation of the Soviet dictatorship. "With the productivity of the peasant labour there will also be a growth in the culture of the peasant masses, in their self-consciousness, their will to power; they will become a political force, to which the Bolshevik regime will be compelled gradually to adapt itself, and Russia will be bound gradually to develop into a peasant democracy." ("The Soviets and the Peasant," "Arbeiter Zeitung," 28th Dec., 1928.)

Thus the left wing social-democrats with Bauer at their head consider that the U.S.S.R. is experiencing an evolutionary process which is to end with the transformation of the dictatorship of the proletariat into peasant democracy.

Even "Vorwaerts" is not entirely in agreement with Kautsky on the question of whether Thermidor has already arrived; through the

lips of the Russian Menshevik, Garvi, "Vorwaerts" recently declared in a leading article that "In the last resort, owing to the Bolshevik experiment the working class has been extraordinarily enfeebled, and the peasantry have come to the forefront. Now it is only a question of how the experiment will work out on balance, whether in a democratic, a Bonapartist, or in a Fascist form," (P. Garvi, "The Blind Alley of Bolshevik Policy," "Vorwaerts," 5th Feb., 1928.)

Finally, the general secretary of the Second International, Fritz Adler, declares that Soviet Russia is threatened with the danger of being transformed into an instrument of reaction. Consequently, "once the expectations of October have proved unjustified, it is necessary at least to save March" (i.e., the achievements of the bourgeois February revolution of 1917—S.N.). The inimitable Fritz warns us that the Second International will "defend" the U.S.S.R., if it renounces its speculation in world war and carries out an honest peace policy, if Bolshevism will effect a reconciliation with international social-democracy and will conduct itself in regard to the European social-democrats as it would to its natural allies in the struggle against the danger of reaction in Russia. In a word, if the Comintern capitulates to the Second International, Fritz Adler will unite all the vital forces for the salvation of the Russian revolution. Of course, in 1929, Lenin would have admitted the shattering of his October, 1917 hopes, and would have accepted all these conditions. That "is what Lenin would do to-day in order to save the Russian revolution." (F. Adler: "What would a Lenin do to-day in order to save the Russian revolution?" 5th Feb., 1929.)

So declaims the general secretary of the Second International, Fritz Adler. Is he interested in what Lenin would do? We answer that Lenin would laugh to scorn Fritz Adler's counsels and would have counselled the uninvited counsellor to manifest his own intellectual ability and to turn for sympathy to Trotsky.

#### THE PLATFORM OF "DEMOCRATIC" TROTSKYISM AND DEMOCRATIC CENTRISM

In his notorious letter of October 21st, 1928, Trotsky gave a perfect Bauer-Dan estimate

of the U.S.S.R.'s prospects. Thermidor has not arrived yet, but it is arriving and will be achieved irrespective of who is victorious, the right wing or "centrism" (or Stalinism, as following the example of all social-democracy, Trotsky exalts the official line of the party). The U.S.S.R. is passing through Kerenskyism upside down. The post-Lenin leadership is running the October film backwards. Behind Kerensky's back the power slipped from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat; behind Stalin's back the power is slipping from the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. The dictatorship of the proletariat still exists, but it is already being transformed into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This is the dictatorship of the Party-Soviet bureaucracy, an almost super-class regime, operating in the best case on the basis of the middle peasantry. The return to undamaged dictatorship of the proletariat is still possible without a second revolution, by the method of an extensive Party and Soviet reform, and namely by the establishment of secret voting at first inside the Party, then in the trade unions and a little later in the Soviets. But if the Party does not effect this extensive Party-Soviet reform (according to the recipe of Trotsky-Bauer-Dan—S.N.) the U.S.S.R. is menaced with an inevitable Thermidorian-Fascist-Bonapartist dictatorship. ("Fahne des Kommunismus," 1929, No. 1.)

In this Trotskyist estimate of the "real situation in Russia" and the prospects of the Soviet revolution it is impossible to discover any noticeable objective difference from Bauer-Dan's and the earlier Kautsky prognoses even under a microscope. Kautsky of the 1919-21 period and Bauer-Dan continually have never maintained anything else than that Soviet Russia is threatened with Thermidor, and that the U.S.S.R. can be saved from counter-revolution by resort to extensive Soviet reform. By Soviet reform Bauer-Dan and Co. mean nothing other than the restoration of secret voting in the trade unions and the Soviets. For them it is clear and evident that after the introduction of secret voting there must automatically ensue the legalisation of all parties and the fall of the dictatorship.

In a leading article in the columns of the left-wing social-democratic newspaper, the

“Leipziger Volkszeitung,” the Russian woman Menshevik, Domanevskaya, quite soundly crucified Trotsky’s new platform as put forward in his letter of October 21st as “democratic” Trotskyism. “Trotsky is now borrowing his ‘vitaly important’ slogans from the program of Russian social-democracy, which all these years has times out of number demanded secret voting for the workers in order to ensure them freedom to manifest their will, freedom of organisation and the right to strike.” “The Trotskyists,” writes this learned Menshevik feminine economist, contributor to the Russian Menshevik “Socialist Courier” and the foremost German social-democratic journals, “are gradually emerging on to the true road.” “The more speedily they succeed in crystallising their political position down to its last logical conclusion and in abandoning the road of their old Utopia, the more speedily will a unification of all the class-conscious political groupings inside the Russian working class become possible, and the greater will be the chances of success in the struggle for the democratic liquidation of the Communist Party dictatorship.” (“Demokratischer Troztkismus,” in “Leipziger Volkszeitung,” 30th Jan., 1929.)

Madam Domanevskaya is not in the least embarrassed by the circumstance that in his letter of October 21st Trotsky drew a strict line of demarcation between himself and the Mensheviks. The learned Menshevik dame realises that Trotsky is moving towards social-democracy through fighting with them, and consequently she willingly offers him her hand and heart, her advice and affection.

The social-democrats perfectly realise that having put forward the Menshevik “program of action” for the U.S.S.R., the program of extensive Party-Soviet reform (by the restoration of secret voting in the Party, the trade unions and the Soviets) Trotskyism has arrived at Menshevism. Trotskyism is Menshevism with a War-Communism mask. In the fights through which Trotsky is moving towards undiluted Menshevism the mask will fall away, and the pure Menshevism will be left.

The Trotskyists’ allies, the Democratic Centrists (the little group of Smirnov and Sapronov) have already arrived at undiluted

Menshevism, they have caught up to and left behind Bauer-Dan, they have overtaken Kautsky of the 1919-21 period, and have arrived at Kautsky of 1925-29. Jointly with this later Kautsky they assert that Thermidor has already been consummated, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is already non-existent, that the U.S.S.R. has already been transformed into a Nep-kulak-peasant, petty bourgeois republic with a full-blooded Thermidorian-Bonapartist-Fascist dictatorship, against which it is necessary to prepare a second revolution.

So far Trotsky has disputed this openly Kautsky position, doing so from the aspect of his own Bauer-Dan position. In its estimate of the prospects of the U.S.S.R. Trotskyism has the same attitude to Democratic Centrism as Bauerism to Kautskyism. But just as Kautskyism (i.e., the right-wing social-democracy) reveals the essence and prognosticates the morrow of Bauerism (i.e., left-wing social-democracy) so Democratic Centrism prognosticates the morrow and reveals the essence of Trotskyism.

THE COMMENTARY OF THE GERMAN TROTSKYISTS  
(THE SLOGAN OF DEMOCRATIC DICTATORSHIP  
FOR THE U.S.S.R.)

German Trotskyism has already accomplished this revolution from Trotskyism to Democratic Centrism and from Bauer-Dan to Kautsky. For the eleventh anniversary of the October revolution the Urbahns group issued a manifesto which is filled with pure Kautskian slander against the U.S.S.R., the C.P.S.U., and the Comintern. This notable production of German Trotskyism contains the following lines on the ultimate fate of the Russian revolution and the prospects of the U.S.S.R. “Lenin is dead. The present rulers are playing into the hands of reformism, which declares that it has been proved to be right. ‘See!’ the bourgeoisie and its reformist tail will exult, ‘they cannot manage the conquest of power. Communism is shattered. It is not possible.’ The clear-thinking class-conscious worker will not allow himself to be hoodwinked, but the great mass which has felt sympathy for the revolutionary teaching, will be lost to the revolutionary movement for a considerable length of

time. Consequently it is necessary to effect a retreat all along the line. And Lenin had this possibility in mind. He swept away all the trimmings and in every situation struck an unadorned balance. The retreat has to be in the direction of democratic dictatorship. If it is not effected in good order the counter-revolutionary influence will get the upper hand and will destroy all the achievements of 1917." ("Der November, 1917 und 1928." "Fahne des Kommunismus," 1928, No. 45.)

Thus, after slinging mud at the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern and slandering the working masses of the world by saying that they are lost to the revolutionary movement, and for a considerable time at that, by the twelfth year of the proletarian dictatorship the German Trotskyists were putting forward for the U.S.S.R. the slogan of retreat to democratic dictatorship, in other words, to the Menshevik Bauer-Dan program of the democratic liquidation of the proletarian, socialist dictatorship.

Bauer has always opposed our slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat with his own slogan of democratic dictatorship, or the dictatorship of a democratic parliament. At one time Martov toyed with the slogan of the dictatorship of democracy; Bauer and Dan are now pronouncing in favour of the democratic alliance of the proletariat and peasantry; and the general secretary of the Second International, Fritz Adler, advises us to retreat from October to March, i.e., to the positions of the February revolution. He assures us that Lenin would do this to-day in order to save the Russian revolution. (Adler: Ibid. "Kampf," 1928, 2, p. 59.) And the German Trotskyists, who exalt themselves into "orthodox Marxist-Leninists," and who calumniously hide behind the name of Lenin, put forward for the U.S.S.R., the "orthodox" Austro-Marxist-Menshevik utopia of the democratic self-liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the country where socialism is being built up. Justice demands that we should explain that Urbahns anticipated Adler by three whole months!

In putting forward their proposal for the liquidation of the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat and for retreat to the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasant-

try, the German Trotskyists appeal to Lenin, who according to them allowed for such a possibility. In his polemic with Kautsky in 1918, when Kautsky had not as yet said a word even about the coming Thermidor, when Kautsky occupied a more seemly position than that now taken up by Trotsky and his German pupils such as Urbahns, and his teachers in the style of Bauer and Dan, Lenin wrote that even if the October revolution had not grown out of a bourgeois-democratic to a proletarian-socialist revolution, "even so this did not prove that the proletariat ought not to have seized power, for only the proletariat could really carry the bourgeois-democratic revolution to its conclusion." ("The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky.") Turning to Kautsky and Bauer-Dan for deliverance, the German Trotskyists turn upside down all Lenin's arguments, and in the twelfth year of the victorious proletarian-socialist revolution propose to the working class of the U.S.S.R. that they should retreat to the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, i.e., in the most favourable case to the Bolshevik position of 1905 to 1916, but in reality to the present Menshevik position of the democratic alliance of the proletariat and peasantry, to the incomparable position of Friedrich Adler, the inimitable general secretary of the Second International.

THE BRAIN-RACKINGS OF THE GERMAN TROTSKYISTS. (IS IT THERMIDOR OR NOT YET?)

When on the Eleventh Anniversary of the October revolution the German Trotskyists presented us with a new constitution, the constitution of democratic dictatorship, they did not know of the existence of Trotsky's letter of 21st October, they did not know that in distant Alma-Ata Trotsky presented us with a charter of Menshevik liberty; secret voting in the party, trade unions and Soviets—in other words a constitution of democratic dictatorship. Despite the tremendous difference in latitude and longitude between Alma-Ata and Berlin, in both places Trotskyist intellect was at work with iron obedience to law in one and the same Menshevik direction. Both here and there the Trotskyist mountain gave

birth to a Menshevik mouse (the democratic liquidation of the dictatorship).

Trotsky's letter of October 21st appeared in the organ of the German Trotskyists only at the beginning of January, 1929. But now to the German Trotskyists the situation in Russia became as clear as daylight! A genuinely tragi-comic farce was played. Bartels, the editor of Urbahn's newspaper "Volks-wille," read Trotsky's letter (in which Thermidor had not as yet been accomplished) and understood it in exactly the opposite sense, i.e., that Thermidor had already been accomplished. Thus becoming convinced that "it was impossible to save the Russian revolution," Mr. Bartels made the organisational deductions from this miserable situation. . . . he resigned from the Leninbund and passed over to the social-democrats, and this time not merely intellectually and politically, but organisationally. In his declaration to the Leninbund this orthodox "Marxist-Leninist" confesses that he has struggled ruthlessly for twelve years against social-democracy, but now he is convinced that the Comintern, the C.P. of Germany and the Leninbund are all going to pieces, and that social-democracy is the bulwark of proletarian unity. ("Social-democracy the bulwark of unity," "Leipziger Volkszeitung," 22nd Jan., 1929.) In a word, this pupil of Trotsky has arrived at social-democracy . . . through fighting it.

The editors of the "Fahne des Kommunismus" have not so far made Bartel's organisational deductions, and they advise Trotsky to reconsider his attitude to Democratic Centrism, for they remark quite justly that the disagreement between the Trotskyists and the Democratic Centrists are being more and more smoothed over. ("Fahne des Kommunismus," 1929, No. 4 Editorial note to Trotsky's letter to the Democratic Centrist, Borodai.)

Finally, Trotsky's deportation has afforded the Trotskyist chief organ an excuse for complete desertion to the Democratic Centrist positions: Trotsky's deportation is, they assert, equivalent to Robespierre's execution and Ninth Thermidor. For the October revolution Trotsky's deportation will have similar consequences to that of Ninth Thermidor for the French revolution. Thus Ther-

midor has been accomplished. But as sound, solid Germans, the German Trotskyists cough and correct themselves: "By careful and exact investigation we must establish whether it is not time to cease regarding the Stalin hegemony (!) as representation of the working class, and whether in consequence we ought not to struggle against that hegemony by all methods. It is clear that a continuation of this course will bring Thermidor ever nearer." ("Fahne des Kommunismus," 1929, No. 5.) Thus Thermidor is only just making its appearance. Whether it has already appeared or is only just arriving the German Communists instruct their economists and publicists to investigate, and meantime they are carrying on an intellectual preparation for the struggle against the Soviet regime "by all methods" i.e., they are preparing for a revolt and civil war against the dictatorship of the proletariat and its party.

The German Trotskyists' growing approximation to Kautskyism and Democratic Centrism is to be measured not in days, but in hours, and they are catching up to Trotsky in this regard. Calling the Communist policy anti-proletarian, the "Soviet Trotskyists" (Soviet, that is, in the territorial sense, but really ideologically anti-Soviet), have in fact really already slipped into Democratic Centrism. The heroes of Democratic Trotskyism, the "democratic" Trotskyists, are distinguished from the Democratic Centrists by no more than the sound of a single consonant.\* One must hope that the democratic Trotskyists will not resist its supplications for long but will speedily inform the world of the arrival of Thermidor. Then old man Kautsky will be able to fling his arms out to heaven and exclaim: "Now you are repentant! Trotsky, like a prodigal son, has returned to his intellectual father," the road from "Anti-Kautsky" will have been traversed to its end. And so coming to his finale, Trotsky will be able to exclaim: "I came to Kautsky through fighting him." Even if he does not say this, all the same history will say it for him. It has already been said by quite a number of the more prominent publicists of international social-democracy: Emile Vandervelde, Fiodor Dan, Kurt Rosenfeld, and finally by Bartels

\* I.e., "D.C.'ists" and "D.T.'ists."

himself. "Trotsky has not yet arrived at the Marxist conceptions of Martov and Dan, but events are already compelling him to apply the definite slogans of the Russian Mensheviks." (K. Rosenfeld.) "The Trotsky of the present day may rather conduce to the return of Communist workers into the social-democratic party than strengthen any C.P. whatever and so do damage to social-democracy." (Dan.) "The return to democracy—that is the decisive feature in Trotsky's position." (Bartels.) Absolutely correct! Trotsky's allies are telling the dry truth about him!

On Trotsky's deportation the Trotskyists of western Europe formed a committee and organised a fund for the salvation of Trotsky. An idle task! No power on earth can save Trotsky from the embraces of Kautsky and Bauer-Dan. That could be done by only one man on earth, by Trotsky himself, if he were to renounce—Trotskyism! i.e., if he were to renounce himself. But he is not capable of such a miracle of self-resurrection. During all the years of the imperialist war Lenin did not cease pointing out the ideological-political relationship of Kautskyism and Trotskyism. When he parted with Kautsky in 1917, Trotsky's road crossed with that of Lenin, only after ten years to describe a curve which brought him back to Kautsky, and that on a fundamental question of the international workers' movement; on his estimate of the prospects of the Russian revolution and the fate of the U.S.S.R.

TROTSKYISM'S LIQUIDATORIAL PLATFORM  
ON THE CHINESE QUESTION. (THE SLOGAN  
OF "INSTITUTIONS FOR CHINA")

But Trotsky has arrived at Menshevism behind a Trotskyist mask in regard to yet another fundamental question of the international revolutionary movement—in his estimate of the prospects of the Chinese revolution.

In his letter on the Sixth Congress, dated September 9th, Trotsky writes that in the Comintern program the "slogan of democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" has in the last resort been transformed into a super-historical abstraction for four-fifths of humanity (for Asia, Africa, and South

America). The debates at the congress show undoubtedly that the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry connotes the Kuomintang road in all its possible historical variation."

For the benefit of the U.S.S.R., and in the name of the salvation of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the imminent Thermidor (unfolding in the heads of Trotskyists) in the twelfth year of the Soviet regime Trotsky and Co. are putting forward a program of retreat to democratic dictatorship. In the U.S.S.R. democratic dictatorship appears to the Trotskyists as quite real and historically concrete in its application. But for the backward countries of the East, for Asia, Africa and South America, "democratic dictatorship" is put into contemptuous quotation marks and is transformed into a super-historical abstraction. Astounding logic!

That is the logic of historical Trotskyism, with which Trotsky himself, according to his own assurances, has nothing whatever in common. Even in 1909 Trotsky called the Leninist idea of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and the strict Leninist destruction between the socialistic and the democratic dictatorship "anti-revolutionary," a "formally logical" scheme and a "hopelessly idealistic abstraction." Whilst, starting from the abstraction that "our revolution is a bourgeois revolution," the Mensheviks arrive at the idea of adapting all the tactics of the proletariat to the conduct of the liberal bourgeoisie including its conquest of State power, the Bolsheviks, starting from just as pure an abstraction—"democratic, but not socialistic dictatorship," arrive at the idea of the bourgeois-democratic self-limitation of the proletariat, in whose hands is the State power." (Trotsky, 1905.) Both in 1909 and in 1928-29 Trotsky considered and still considers the Leninist idea of democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry and the Leninist theory of the growth of the democratic into the socialistic dictatorship as an anti-revolutionary abstraction. Trotsky, this "orthodox Bolshevik-Leninist," is quite unable to re-arm or to disarm himself from the old historical Trotskyism.

To the Leninist conception of the growth of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat

and peasantry into the socialistic dictatorship of the proletariat, Trotsky, both before and after 1917, in fact, at all times, opposed his "original" theory, the theory of permanent revolution in words and of the common practice of co-operation with Menshevism and the liquidators in deed. And the same Trotsky is now presenting us with an estimate of the prospects of the Chinese revolution. For China he puts forward the slogans of a national assembly, of equal agreements. "The struggle for these slogans and in parliament must at the first outbreak of revolution lead to the setting up of soviets and to the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, operating on the basis of the rural and urban poor. Meantime, our heroes of strategy "are jumping over the present reactionary period in the development of China, and are endeavouring to stop all the holes by the universal panacea of democratic dictatorship, which in China's case manifests Kuomintang connotation." (Trotsky: "On the Sixth World Congress" in "Fahne des Kommunismus," 1928, No. 40.)

Before us we have a complete Chinese variant of the theory of permanent revolution. The bourgeois revolution in China is completed. In prospect is the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, operating on the basis of the rural and urban poor. But at the moment China is experiencing a Chiang Kai Shek-Stolypin form of reaction. Consequently the slogan of Soviets is recalled. The "abstraction" of democratic dictatorship is thrown aside as a useless rag, and all the holes are to be stopped up with a genuinely Trotskyist liquidatorial bundle of rubbish; the slogans of Chinese institutions and Customs autonomy, i.e., a quite seemly social-democratic program, which can be subscribed to by any old Wong-Ting-Wei and Otto Bauer. We do not know whether Bauer has read Trotsky's letter of September 9th, which contains the new Trotskyist-liquidatorial program on the Chinese issue. But alas, we must disillusion Trotsky and his followers. In his estimate of the final outcome of the Chinese revolution, on fundamentals Bauer has twice been afforded the possibility of agreeing with Trotsky—once before and once after the publication of Trotsky's letter on the Sixth Congress. And, in fact, Bauer asserts that the Chinese revolution has

ended in the formation of a national bourgeois State, the formation of a bourgeois Chinese republic. Bauer is dissatisfied with the Chiang Kai Shek regime; he would prefer a more democratic regime with a national assembly and complete Customs autonomy. But Bauer also objects to the struggle in parliament for the slogans put forward by Trotsky. And finally, Bauer is no less sceptical than Trotsky in his attitude to the slogan of "the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry," evidently considering that behind this "super-historical abstraction" is concealed a Communist-Populist illusion as to the possibility of China's jumping over the natural phase of historical development, namely, capitalism.

Anticipating Otto Bauer, the German Trotskyists as early as June last year announced that China had entered upon a road of capitalistic evolution, that the Chinese revolution had ended in the victory of the bourgeoisie and the formation of an independent national bourgeois State, that owing to the unsound policy of the Comintern the historical possibility of China having a non-capitalist evolution was already excluded. (\*)

China is being decolonised. Such is the discovery of the German Trotskyists, to which they add the second, no less profound discovery that the U.S.S.R. is being transformed into a semi-colony, owing to the increasing activity of the concessions policy, the searches for foreign loans, the readiness to recognise the Tsarist debts and so on. "When the concessions to the imperialists exceed a certain limit quantity will pass into quality, and the proletarian State will become a semi-colony. That has not occurred as yet, but a considerable distance has been traversed along the road leading to this end." ("Fahne des Kommunismus," No. 25, 1928.)

Such is the final summary of the Trotskyist analysis of the prospects of the U.S.S.R. and of China: "China is being decolonised and transformed into a bourgeois national State, in the direction of a constitutional Assembly.

(\*) Trotsky's letter of September 9th was published in the "Fahne des Kommunismus" on October 5th, whilst Bauer's articles on China were published in the "Arbeiter Zeitung" of August 3rd and December 27th, 1928.

The U.S.S.R. is being colonised and transformed into a fascist bonapartist republic, unless the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government call to the Trotskyist vikings: 'Come and rule and lord it over us . . . in order to retreat to democratic dictatorship.'

Thus having leapt across the "super-historical abstraction of the democratic dictatorship in the case of four-fifths of humanity," and across the historical concrete fact of the Soviet dictatorship over one-sixth of the world's surface, Trotsky has jumped to the slogan of "institutions for China" and "democratic dictatorship for the U.S.S.R." These are two sides of the one and the same liquidatorial medal.

#### THE END OF THE ROAD

In connection with Trotsky's deportation from the territory of the U.S.S.R. the Trotskyist flysheets and the Trotskyist journalist small fry raised an outcry: "Where is Trotsky?" We give the most exact report possible: "En route from Bauer to Kautsky!"

Consequently there is nothing astonishing in the fact that the Dresden bourgeois publishing house "Avalun" have published a book by Trotsky on "The True Situation in Russia," announcing it with advertisements of an astoundingly, screamingly sensational character. It is not astonishing that in the pages of the "Arbeiter Zeitung" Dan aligns himself with the Trotskyist analysis of "the true situation in Russia," and writes mockingly: "Trotsky himself must admit that in essentials his view is in agreement with those views which were worked out by the Russian social-democrats before him." (Dan "The Tragicomedy of a Romantic" in "Arbeiter Zeitung" for 8th December, 1928.)

It is not surprising that the Berlin social-democratic publishing house "Laub" have published a second novelty of Trotsky's: "The International Revolution and the Communist International," giving it the appealing advertisement, "Trotsky's voice from exile." The social-democratic publishers have paid its author the—for a "Leninist-Bolshevik"—murderous compliment: "The importance of Trotsky's work rises above the narrow framework of Party-Communist and Soviet-Russian polemic to the status of a fundamental

contribution to present-day international Marxist literature." ("Klassenkampf," 1928, No. 4.) Trotsky's "Marxism" is quite acceptable to international social-democracy. That is the essence of the matter. Consequently the bourgeoisie and social-democracy willingly gave international publicity to Trotsky's anti-Soviet writings.

Waves of sympathy are flowing towards Trotsky from the Second International, its parties and publicists. The social-democratic press is expressing its sympathy for its new ally. "Vorwaerts" speaks up in favour of Trotsky being granted the right of asylum in Germany. In the "Arbeiter Zeitung" Dan writes an "inspired" article: "The right of asylum for Trotsky!" For universal information he declares that "all the sympathies of social-democracy are on the side of Trotsky." He says that the social-democrats have nothing to fear from Trotsky's political activity. On the contrary, the present Trotsky, torn asunder as he is by internal conflict, may inflict a mortal blow on the Communist movement outside Russia and impel the Communist workers to return to social-democracy, rather than strengthen and consolidate any kind of Communist Party whatever or do any injury to social-democracy. ("Arbeiter Zeitung," 20th January, 1929.) And this is the reason why Dan is screaming himself hoarse over the right of asylum for Trotsky; with Trotsky's help he hopes to inflict a mortal blow on the Comintern in Europe. Mr. Dan is a very poor prophet; he may or may not with Trotsky's help inflict a mortal blow on the Comintern some time in the future, but by his clumsiness he has already dealt Trotsky a mortal blow, one from which the ally of international social-democracy, the renegade Leo Trotsky, will never recover. The Executive of the Socialist International held recently in London called for moral and material support to Trotsky. The president of the German Reichstag, the social-democrat Loebe, took Trotsky on in a public speech in the Reichstag: The German republic was ready to give shelter to the refugee. Trotsky sent Loebe a telegram with a request for support to his application for a visa to Germany. Loebe supported the request in the Cabinet. Having first made an intellectual journey to the book-market of Dresden and Berlin, Trotsky is now preparing to make a

real trip to the Promised Land of Hindenburg-Hilferding freedom and democracy.

The German Trotskyists hastened to explain the (for them) inconvenient fact of Trotsky's correspondence with Loebe: this, you see, was just as revolutionary an act as Lenin's journey through Germany to Russia in a "sealed carriage." These harlequins do not realise that Lenin and other Bolsheviks, accompanied by the revolutionary Platten, travelled to revolutionary Russia to prepare the October revolution and to carry Russia from February to October, whilst Trotsky sought assistance from the counter-revolutionary social-democrat Loebe to enable him to enter Germany, in order thence to carry on the struggle against the children of October, the Comintern and the U.S.S.R., and to carry the U.S.S.R. from October to February. A tiny difference, which recalls Marx's saying that all great historical events and personalities appear twice, so to speak; the first time as a tragedy, the second time as a farce. The mouse-like romping of

international social-democracy and the Trotskyists around Trotsky's deportation is at the best a tragi-comic farce.

Trotsky's publication of a series of anti-Soviet articles in the columns of British, American, and Dutch newspapers, his sensational story of his exile in the pages of the yellow capitalist press, and finally the thirty pieces of silver in the form of several thousand prosaic dollars received by him for this clean business, all turn this tragi-comedy into filthy history. In his gutter-press sensationalism Trotsky reports to the international bourgeoisie: "Our method is the method of internal reforms. . . . Anyone who expects a speedy overthrow of the Soviet regime is condemned to one more cruel disappointment." So Trotsky has not yet arrived at Kautsky. He is still travelling towards him by way of fights . . . in the pages of the yellow press. Trotsky has not come to Kautsky yet, but he has surpassed Kautsky, for Kautsky is not published in the columns of the bourgeois press. The renegade Trotsky has surpassed the renegade Kautsky.

# For the Forthcoming Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

## Discussion in the Trade Union Commission on the Problems of Strike strategy and Trade Union Work

### I.—COMRADE GUSSIEV'S SPEECH

**C**OMRADES: The first of the most significant facts of the last few months in the realm of the workers' mass attacks is the result of the elections to factory committees in Germany—a result which was a little unexpected. The most important feature of the elections has been our acquisition of considerable influence in the large enterprises. Hitherto the C.P. has had influence in the small enterprises, but now it is quite openly penetrating into the large enterprises, and not only penetrating but at once winning to its side well-nigh half the workers. And this is happening despite the fact that the new election tactics of our German C.P. have been marked by uncertainty in their application. For in the first place part of these tactics was completely abandoned, *i.e.*, the organisation of electoral commissions, which, on the analogy of the committees of struggle in the Ruhr, were intended to develop extensive mass work. And, on the other hand, the remainder of the tactic was applied without co-ordination, and irresolutely. In reality all these campaigns for the factory committees were carried out on the old lines, and the only new thing in them was our comrades' extensive adoption of independent lists. But the mass action which was indicated in the Comintern's instructions, and especially the setting up of mass organs, elected by the masses themselves, was not achieved. Despite all these very serious defects in the organisation of the campaign, we are faced with the fact that our Party is penetrating into a number of large enterprises, and is there winning well-nigh half the workers.

The fact that we have won half the workers in a number of the large enterprises compels

us to consider the problems from a somewhat different angle. At the moment I confine myself only to pointing out that the fuss over the expulsions, over the possibility that our comrades will be excluded in tens of thousands, is, in my view, entirely without justification. Once we have gained such a colossal influence in the enterprises we can mobilise the workers against expulsions, and the social-democrats will have to retreat. I shall deal with the question of how to mobilise the workers later. The second problem connected with our successes at the elections is that of organising new trade unions. How is this question to be considered in the light of these successes? Once we have won the masses why should we renounce the conquest of the trade unions? Once we are on the way to further winning the masses, why should we renounce our former plan for the conquest of the trade unions and organise new unions, especially at this moment, when our forces are quite manifestly growing, and growing not day by day but hour by hour? What justification is there for raising this question at this particular moment?

Comrades, so that there should not be any doubt so far as the principle is concerned, I have at once to say that the time may come when we shall not only build up new unions, but shall break up the old ones if they become an obstacle to the road of revolution.

But is the present situation such that one can at this juncture propose to start immediately on the organisation of new trade unions in one form or another as a definite slogan, a definite task of the present day, and consequently propose to start to cause a split? For the organisation of new trade unions will involve a split.

The conditions for winning the trade unions

from within are more favourable at the present moment than they have been hitherto, and they improve with every day as the workers' movement develops and our influence grows. If the trade union opposition continues to grow as it has grown recently, it is by no means beyond the bound of possibility that we shall win a certain part of the trade unions and drive out the trade union bureaucrats from them in the near future. Then, is there any sense in putting forward the proposition to organise new trade unions at this particular juncture? That is the first question.

I have taken only the fact of the growth of our influence among the working masses, and have shown that this fact witnesses against comrade Lozovsky.

Now take a second fact—the activity of the unorganised. This fact has been admitted by all the comrades who spoke at the International Conference. Its most characteristic feature is that not infrequently the unorganised workers have proved to be entirely without assistance during the strike or have received insignificant assistance, whilst the organised workers have received their wages and lived under normal conditions. Despite this, the unorganised have maintained a better bearing, have been stronger, than the organised. What is the significance of this fact? It seems to me that many even prominent comrades have failed to get a thorough appreciation of this fact. The social-democrats, and also the right-wingers and conciliators, wax indignant at the declaration that the unorganised have proved to be on a higher level than the organised. Take for instance, the social-democrat Paul Schultz, who in "Gewerkschaftsarchiv" published an article, "The Lessons of the Ruhr," which began with these words: "The struggle of the 213,000 workers in the Ruhr has ended, as frequently happens, with only partial successes to the credit of the workers. The result would have been better if the number of the unorganised had not been so disproportionately high." And after a line or two: "The chief blame for the failure lies on the unorganised workers." This is a shameful distortion of what happened in the Ruhr, where all the weight of the movement and nine-tenths of its success fell to the unorganised workers. But what are you to do with

the social-democrats, when there are Communists in our own ranks who continue to regard the unorganised workers as strike-breakers, for which reason the trade unions are forced to pay them strike pay during a strike so as to prevent strike-breaking. These comrades do not see that it is the trade unions which are doing the strike-breaking now, or, rather, it is the trade union machinery and aristocratic higher ranks, whilst the unorganised are doing the striking. By comparison with the situation fifteen to twenty years ago the picture is completely inverted.

There is also the diametrically contrary error. From the strike-breaking tactics pursued by the trade union upper ranks certain comrades draw the conclusion that the workers organised in the trade unions are reactionaries and strike-breakers. This is the other extreme, and it is no less erroneous. As you can see from the fact that the unorganised are more active than the organised, and that part of the organised are acting as strike-breakers, these comrades draw two conclusions: first, that the trade unions are good for nothing whatever, and second, that it is necessary to organise new trade unions out of the unorganised workers. These are the over-simplified deductions which they draw from the undoubted fact that the unorganised are at the present time more revolutionary than the organised workers.

Such deductions are too hasty, too lightly come to; they are not thoroughly thought out, they are superficial.

Finally, besides the fact of the growth of our influence and the fact of the enormous activity of the unorganised workers, it is necessary in addition to emphasise the fact of the masses' distrust of our Red trade unions, a distrust which is extremely clearly expressed in Czecho-Slovakia. Despite the existence of a strong upward movement among the textile workers, they joined in the strike very irresolutely, openly declaring their distrust in our trade unions. This applies not only to Czecho-Slovakia but to France. The workers see no difference between our and the reformist trade unions, and they say so openly. They support us because we are Communists, *i.e.*, they are for the Comintern and the U.S.S.R., for our policy, but not for our art and not for our

endurance in economic struggles. Is there any sense in our organising new trade unions if we cannot manage the old ones, and if they are no better than the reformist trade unions? Our strength is not equal to that work at present.

These, comrades, are the chief facts which we have to keep in mind in order to achieve a sound consideration of the problem of organising the unorganised and the organisation of new trade unions. We have already seen a tendency to organise new parallel trade unions. That tendency found quite clear expression at the International Conference. I have already said that at the conference definite proposals for the organisation of new trade unions were made. One of these proposals consisted in the suggestion of setting up an organisation of the expelled workers, on a trade union model, with membership dues and strike pay during a strike, etc. These organisations are to be attached to the trade union opposition.

For the purpose of receiving and distributing the contributions of the expelled workers, in each district a revision commission consisting of a committee of five is to be formed; of these five three are to be representatives of the expelled, and two are to be representatives of the opposition inside the trade unions. This fund is to be disposed of district by district, first, for the struggle to obtain the re-admission of those expelled from the free trade unions, secondly, for the vigorous support of the activity of the revolutionary trade union opposition during any militant situation, and also in extraordinary cases for assistance to the expelled during strikes and lock-outs. Inasmuch as the number of expelled workers is very small, only some hundreds altogether, this proposal has little practical value. Much more important is the proposal concerning the organisation of the trade union opposition, which I consider a much more dangerous affair. It is proposed to organise an organisation of expelled workers in conjunction with the trade union opposition in order that the expelled workers should aid in the latter's attacks. But in practice the situation may be the converse. The committees of the expelled workers' organisation may prove to be elemental nuclei for new unions, and may drag

the trade union opposition after them, especially those elements which would not be averse to leaving the unions. Such moods are to be found among the workers, especially under the influence of expulsion. Although this does not constitute the chief danger at the present time, which is rather that of a legalistic attitude towards the trade unions, none the less it is necessary to take this danger also into consideration.

One must adopt a critical approach to the question of organising the expelled workers. It is impossible to get round the problem because it is a burning question on which we have so far failed to find a correct political line, we have so far not defined a clear and exact political slogan. It is highly characteristic that the whole setting of the problem regarding the organisation of expelled workers arises from a certain view that it is necessary to place these expelled workers in their previous trade union conditions, that it is necessary to create a trade union basis for them. We cannot give them a genuine trade union, but we can give them something in the nature of such a trade union basis, with membership contributions, etc., and we must give them this. You see that the task is formulated in a narrowly trade union fashion. All this great problem is narrowed down to a petty trade union problem, one which none the less leads to great political consequences, inasmuch as it is the beginning of the organisation of new trade unions, the beginning of the split. The second feature is that the question of organising the expelled workers is raised panic-ally. They have taken fright at the expulsion of a few hundred workers and at Ulrich's threats to expel tens and hundreds of thousands. They have taken fright at this. Moreover, one may say that half, if not three-quarters, of the irresolution in carrying through the new tactics during the elections to the factory committees is to be explained by the fear of expulsion.

(Voice from the hall : Which side is afraid?)

Our officials are afraid.

(Vasiliev : Afraid of the struggle against social-democracy.)

The question is raised in a panic. I have already said that there is no justification for

thinking that the social-democrats will proceed to such measures as the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of workers at the present time. We have some justification for thinking that they will not resort to such a measure. They are not altogether comfortable even inside their own organisations. They expelled Niederkirchen. And what was the result? Niederkirchen immediately summoned all the officials with opposition tendencies and organised a committee of them.

(Voice from the hall : They organised a new trade union.)

We'll see later whether it is a trade union or not. From Niederkirchen's example we see what our sound tactic must be. What was decided at this conference? First and foremost they passed the decision not to sign any pledge. That kind of decision can be come to only given the condition that there is a mass movement against pledges, against expulsions, provided that the refusal to subscribe to pledges has a mass nature, provided the unorganised can be drawn into the struggle against pledges and expulsions. Can this be done? It can. We can organise part of the unorganised for this struggle. The trade unions would appear to be a strike-breakers' organisation, an organisation hostile to the unorganised. The enormous majority of the unorganised, especially such as have already been in trade unions and have left them, regard the trade unions as reactionary organisations. Can we confront the unorganised masses with the task of entering these unions, of winning them, etc., at the present moment, and in conjunction with that task raise the question of a struggle against pledges and against expulsion from the unions? We confronted the unorganised with the task of entering the unions, of winning the unions from below during the Ruhr campaign. We do not renounce this method. We must link up the struggle for the return of the expelled and against expulsions with the general struggle for the conquest of the trade unions, and we must set up temporary mass organs corresponding to this struggle. Such organs have already been indicated at the conference which was organised by Niederkirchen. They are not setting up a new union, they are organising a committee for struggle to obtain the return of the ex-

pelled workers, a committee which has to develop a mass campaign. I shall deal more definitely later on with the manner in which the unorganised workers are to be drawn in. But at the moment it is necessary to emphasise the enormous difference in the manner in which the question of struggle against expulsions is raised. So far the question has been raised in a narrowly trade union sense, and it is necessary to raise it in a political fashion. This involves linking up the struggle on behalf of the expelled with the task of struggle for the conquest of the trade unions. (It is to the point to say that those comrades who have stood for the organisation of new unions get themselves into very contradictory positions when, on the one hand, they organise the expelled as a new union, and, on the other, they add that the basic task of this organisation is the struggle for return to the old unions.) The slogan of "Back to the unions" is a narrow one, and consequently it is politically inadequate and incorrect. The task is set as a narrow one, as the task of the expelled themselves without the mobilisation of the masses. Meantime it is necessary to set this task as that of all the workers, both the organised and the unorganised, who are fighting the reactionary trade union hierarchy. The slogan that is politically true would be such as : "We shall achieve the return of the expelled from the trade unions by driving out the trade union hierarchy which is responsible for the expulsion of workers from the unions," or "the hierarchy is throwing our comrades out of the unions, we will throw the hierarchy out of the unions." That is a political slogan which is close to our previous slogans.

None the less this is insufficient. We have to find other definite slogans which will effect a broader organisation of the masses. In my opinion the struggle for proletarian democracy in the trade unions, the struggle against their Fascisation, could form such a slogan at the present moment. At a time when the trade union hierarchy is violating trade union democracy and is introducing Fascism into them it is necessary to put forward the slogan of democratisation of the trade union rules. The workers must be called upon to break up the rules by extensive demonstrations, to change them summarily. Many unorganised workers

say they will not join the unions because their rules are bad and undemocratic. At the present time the social-democrats frequently jeer at our comrades' demonstrations on behalf of democracy. They say: "See what fine Communists, who are in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. and preach democracy at home!" In our agitation we must counterpose proletarian trade union democracy to bourgeois democracy. In this regard a number of social-democratic survivals still exist among our comrades, despite the lapse of ten years since Lenin dealt with this question.

Kreibich: They say one must not talk of democracy at all.)

They either say nothing about democracy whatever, or else in practice they fall into the error of adopting bourgeois democracy. Many Communists still do not realise that bourgeois democracy is a delusion, since it is democracy for the minority governing and exploiting the people masses, and that for the proletariat the sole democracy is proletarian democracy. The present time, when bourgeois democracy is passing through a fascist degeneration, is the right moment to raise the slogan of changes in the rules, of democratising the rules, and for linking up this slogan with the task of struggling against expulsions, of definitely indicating what clauses of the rules have to be changed and in what sense. Thus we can raise the political issue of expulsions on a broad basis to the masses, thus we can draw the unorganised masses into the struggle against expulsions from the trade unions, against the introduction of fascism into the unions, and so on.

Of course this problem is very closely bound up with the question of pledges. They are essentially one and the same political problem. What is a pledge? A pledge is an addition to the rules. Membership of the union is open to anyone who not only carries out the rules but also subscribes to the pledge. We must link up the struggle against pledges with the struggle for changes in the rules, with the struggle for the expulsion of the hierarchy from the unions, with the struggle for the conquest of the unions.

I turn now to consider certain of Comrade

Lozovsky's arguments. On the question of the unorganised entering the unions he said in his speech: "I consider that this is an incorrect slogan, which distorts our line, and gives nothing in return; it deludes the masses, and for us ourselves it is a diversion and not a way out. . . . When we accuse the reformist trade union bureaucracy of carrying on negotiations behind the workers' backs, of organising strike-breaking activities, of demanding compulsory arbitration, and when simultaneously we tell the workers to join these unions, every unorganised worker must regard us as lunatics."

It is not difficult to see that all Comrade Lozovsky's argument is built up on a certain modification of the real slogan of entry into the trade unions: "Join the reformist unions in order to win them, to take possession of them, to throw the trade union hierarchy out of them!" Comrade Lozovsky rejects the task of conquering the trade unions (no matter how angry Comrade Lozovsky gets we shall maintain this so long as he does not change his position) and so instead of a sound slogan he makes of it meaningless nonsense.

And now for the second quotation, which in my view explains a good deal, and which puts comrade Lozovsky's position on the trade union question in a new light. Lozovsky raises a query in regard to those workers who were organised in the Ruhr. Part of them joined the party (1,500 new members, whilst the International Red Aid made 4,000) Lozovsky asks: "Where are the rest? What has happened to the remaining tens of thousands of workers? According to Comrade Piatnitsky's theory they are not to be organised, because organising them would mean occupying our selves with the 'organisation of the unorganised, instead of 'working in the enterprises.' Then what are we to do in regard to the unorganised? We shall wait another three or four years, until there is a new strike, or lock-out, when they will again follow our lead. Then after the new conflict we shall lose them again for several years, and so on. But is this not rather organisational and political Malthusianism? This is Malthusianism, this is hanging back from an active policy, and it means that we are swimming with the current." Comrade Lozovsky raises the question

in a quite abstract manner; we have trade unions, and we have the unorganised; and they embark upon a struggle quite outside space or time, outside historical development. Then three or four years later they embark upon another struggle, and then again. In a word, this story can go on for ever. What has happened to the prospects of a new revolutionary rise with its vast class battles? They have evaporated one knows not where.

Why has the question of organising new trade unions been raised at this particular juncture? Why only recently was Comrade Lozovsky preaching the idea of organising new unions in a position of "cultured isolation," whilst now he is beginning to have followers? Undoubtedly this is in close connection with the mass attacks of the proletariat which are everywhere to be observed. On the eve of a new revolutionary rise, for the Comintern and its sections these mass attacks involve the necessity of taking on their leadership more energetically. The definite form of organisation of the leadership was indicated in broad outline in the decisions of the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. We are testing that form out in practice in organising Committees of Struggle (strike committees of various kinds, committees for struggle against expulsions, committees for the struggle for proletarian democracy, etc.). In certain places, where the Communists are passive, the unorganised workers are themselves elementally setting about this work. There are cases in which the unorganised themselves organised militant committees without the aid of the Communists.

(Voice from the hall: That happened in the Ruhr.)

It happened in the Ruhr and in certain other places. It is true that these elementally organised committees of struggle fall into the hands of the reformists. That is a danger which we still have not taken sufficiently into account. So far the reformists cling to the trade unions in the old way and have not taken to entering the Committees of Struggle. But it is possible that when they see that it is a serious movement they will come into them.

(Voice from the hall: They're already beginning to hitch themselves on.)

That will be a very serious struggle. The question of the organisation of the leadership of mass attacks is now the basic problem. But the error which is being committed in regard to this question consists in taking the old organisational forms and endeavouring to adapt them to the new situation, without understanding either the dimensions, or the severity, or the resistance and political nature of the present class struggles, nor even their tendency of development. They consider it like this: Once these struggles have begun as economic struggles, then consequently it is necessary to set up economic organisations which shall direct these struggles. Comrade Lozovsky reproached Comrade Piatnitsky with not seeing the new element. But Lozovsky himself does not see the new element, namely that the economic struggles are also political struggles and that in the Committees of Struggle we have organisations of a new type, which unite both the economic and the political struggle. The trade unions are the organs of the economic struggle of the proletariat. They cannot direct the political struggle, which of course by no means connotes that they have to be neutral. Politically they will adhere to one or another party. If the economic strike develops into a political struggle, the leadership will pass to the political party either directly, or through special organs thrown up and elected by the masses themselves, organs of a Soviet type, which none the less cannot become soviets without a broad mass rise and without a directly revolutionary situation.

There was such a type of organisation in Russia in 1914, in Ekaterinoslav for instance, where during strikes the masses themselves chose their deputies. These were the rudiment of Soviets of Workers' Deputies. In the present-day concentration of capital attacking the proletariat is found the condition ensuring that the proletariat itself should advance over a wide front, and should set up such organisations as can carry it not only through narrowly economic struggles such as the trade unions have hitherto directed, but through broader class battles which take on a directly political nature, and in the course of their development inevitably become transformed in revolutionary battles. To fail to understand this, to reduce the whole question to one of trade unions, is

to fail to understand the meaning of the Committees of Struggle, to fail to understand all the new and enormous problem of leadership, to fail to understand that some kind of new organs are necessary which shall in part be reminiscent of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, and which shall play the role of a preliminary school for the Soviets, which shall be the embryos of the soviets. What is the nature of the similarity which exists between the situation in Russia in 1904 and the present situation in Germany? It consists in the fact that at that time there was in Russia an extraordinarily broad mass movement of the workers for an improvement in the situation of the proletariat and for the overthrow of the autocracy. Now we find a similar broad mass movement in Germany, in which a single class front of the proletariat is being established, whilst the impulse to this unification of the proletariat is coming from the capitalist class, which is acting in a united front against the proletariat. The proletariat is beginning to sweep away the barriers which exist between its various divisions. But here we have the beginning of an enormous difference from the situation in 1904. That difference consists in the fact that the Russian proletariat had almost no internal partitions to sweep away. There were only the Mensheviks, who had a certain influence with the working class, whilst the S.R.'s were linked up with only the most backward elements of the working class. But in Europe we have a system, one which has developed over centuries of dividing the workers into a number of separate detachments. That is the difference. And so, although those organs of leadership which were set up in the Ruhr are to some extent reminiscent of our strike committees of 1904, they are essentially new organs, for before them lies a new task, the task of breaking down all the barriers dividing the workers, the task of setting up a united front of the proletariat for broad mass movements, which can embrace whole spheres of industry and in the last resort can take in all the proletariat. To come to this task with the footrules in the possession of the comrades working in the trade unions, to say we shall create new revolutionary trade unions leading the entire proletariat, is to fail to understand the tasks confronting us. It

is to confuse the trade unions with the Soviets, to confuse the various forms of organisation of the proletariat and the broad masses of the toilers.

In 1905 there were in the Bolshevik Party also comrades who confused the trade unions and the fighting organisations in their own peculiar fashion. They preached the rending and destruction of the trade unions from within, so as to create fighting militia in their stead. We resolutely struggled against any such tendency. Why? Because this is an organisation of a different kind. To confuse fighting militia with the trade unions is surely impermissible for a Bolshevik. Only the ultra-left wing burlblers could confuse such distinctive forms of organisation. The fighting militia are for the revolutionary workers, for the leading strata of the proletariat, for the advance guard; the trade unions are for the more backward elements, which exist even in the most revolutionary times. The same applies to the Committees of Struggle.

We must work for the most backward workers to enter the trade unions, for them to be organised for the economic struggle. But as the strata are now instinctively entering the arena of political struggles, should we drive them into the narrow forms which Comrade Lozovsky proposes? That would mean to fail to understand the task. The organisations embracing the broad strata of unorganised workers in their mass attacks cannot be permanent organisations. They are created in the moment of struggle and for the purpose of that struggle.

(Voice from the hall: But afterwards what?)

I am asked, "What then?" I answer that question with the question, do you really think, comrades, that it is possible to organise all the proletariat to the last man or even the majority of the proletariat under capitalism? Only in one circumstance can that happen in capitalism; that is immediately on the eve of the fall of capitalism, during a general strike which is passing into armed insurrection. To the question what is to be done with the others I reply that our influence over the proletariat is safeguarded not only by our creating new trade unions (if that is at all possible or permissible) but by our first being able to show the masses that there are

other forms of organisation adapted to their revolutionary attacks (the masses are seeking new forms of leadership, as our experience showed during the last struggles) and secondly if we succeed in drawing the most revolutionary elements thrown up by the unorganised workers into the party and our mass organisations. Thus we shall be establishing tens of thousands of new threads connecting us with the masses, increasing our influence with the masses, and making it possible for us swiftly to mobilise the masses and swiftly to organise the corresponding organs of struggle at the necessary moment. One could answer the question of what is to happen to the rest by a very simple example. There is a time of war and a time of peace. In peace time the soldiers are dispersed to their homes, in war-time they are mobilised, whilst in peace time trial mobilisations are carried out in order to train the soldiers in mobilisation. This is, of course, only an analogy, and like all analogies it has sound and unsound features. I want to underline the side of the analogy in which, when the broad masses rise for struggle, we organise them correspondingly in the "war-time army."

(Voice from the hall : And in peace time?)

In peace time they do not rise, or they carry on sectional economic struggles under the leadership of the trade unions. Of course, we cannot at any given moment give them the order to mobilise as one would an army. We can mobilise the masses only at a moment of developing struggle. We cannot set up such trade unions as would mobilise the entire proletariat for the struggle at the moment of revolution. Such unions do not and could not exist. What is the point of thinking out and inventing new organisational forms when practice has provided us with splendid patterns (in the Ruhr, and partly in Czecho-Slovakia) of new organisations of the proletariat for its political struggle, for its mass attacks?

It is necessary to understand these new forms as forms of organisation of the unorganised, as forms specific to the particular level of development of finance capital that we have at the moment in Germany, in the United States, and in France. These are peculiar organisations of a temporary character. They

could not be otherwise. Only after they had been transformed into Soviets as organs of revolt would they have a more protracted existence. The peculiarity and the novelty of the circumstances in which they develop will undoubtedly set their impress upon these organs, will enrich them with new features. Consequently it is necessary to give attentive study to the new experience of organising the broad masses in their attacks.

I draw near to my close. Certain comrades have the idea that if we organise the trade union opposition (the sole definite form of organisation of new unions, for the financial committees of which comrade Lozovsky spoke, are a somewhat fantastic enterprise) this will be the organ with whose aid we shall lead the proletariat into the revolutionary battles, into insurrection. I have already pointed out how unsound is such an understanding of the problem, I have pointed out its danger, I have pointed out that it leads to a swift split of the unions. Meantime our task is by no means to withdraw from the unions. We stand on the basis of the previous decisions concerning the conquest of the trade unions from within. We shall achieve this task both by means of the trade union opposition and by drawing new members into the unions during the mass attacks of the proletariat. We already have a practical example of how to carry out the conquest of the trade unions. The last campaign for election of the factory committees in Germany has shown that we are stronger in the enterprises than in the trade unions. What is the conclusion to be drawn from this? We have more than once underlined the conclusion, through a number of decisions as to the necessity of strengthening the work in the enterprises, and the conquest of the trade unions from below. This has been reiterated so many times that no one wants to listen to it any more. The task now consists in getting the comrades to understand that an enormous intensification of work in the enterprises is the very fundamental link which we must hang on to at the moment, in order to drag the entire chain to our side. There is no other way of conquering the trade unions at the present time. Comrade Piatnitsky is right in emphasising the task of entering the enterprises in his speech. The German C.P. has passed

a striking decision in regard to the organisation of the revolutionary active element in the enterprises.

An enormous intensification of work in the enterprises, and the concentration of the forces of the Party there involve the necessity of our making the central Party task arising out of the whole situation the organisation of nuclei in the factories and works where they do not already exist, and the consolidation of extension of the old nuclei and their attraction of new members. This is not a simple repetition of the previous formula. The very task of organising party nuclei has changed in connection with the new rise of the workers' movement, in connection with the growth and extension of our influence, and especially in connection with the Communist Parties' penetration into the large factories and works, in connection with the fact that the rise of the workers' movement every day confronts us with the practical task of organising various kinds of fighting committees, elected by the workers at the enterprises.

Our first and chief task is to raise the work in the factory and works nuclei to an unprecedented level. But those who propose that we should occupy ourselves with the organisation of the trade union opposition and thus resolve our new problems are in reality taking us off the main task.

(Vasiliev : Hear, hear.)

In reality they are drawing us into subsidiary, secondary work.

(Vasiliev : Secondary.)

Whilst, like the C.C. of the Party, the nucleus is a political organ, embracing all political questions on the restricted scale of the given enterprise, the Communist fractions of the trade unions have only narrow, one-sided tasks to perform. The trade union fraction cannot be a basic organ for the conquest of political influence among the proletariat, or even for the conquest of the trade unions. It cannot be a basic organisation. It is a subsidiary organ, by means of which co-ordinating our activity we assist the nucleus at the works to win the active element and so on. Meantime the nucleus at the works, where there are both organised and unorganised workers, must direct their joint struggle for

definite tasks which are set at the given enterprise, which are thrown up by the whole course of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in connection with rationalisation and so on. The chief task with which we are confronted to-day is not the organisation of new trade unions, but first the development of new forms of organisation of the proletariat for its mass attack, in the form of committees of struggle and the study of that experience, secondly, the creation of new nuclei at the factories and works and the consolidation of the old, and, thirdly, the intensification of work for the further conquest of the existing trade unions, in conjunction with the growth of our influence at the works.

## II.—COMRADE ULBRICHT'S SPEECH

At the Sixth World Congress an analysis of the "third period" was made, in the course of which special emphasis was laid upon the contradictions of capitalism and the world-wide struggle.

The experiences of the various sections of the Comintern, however, have not yet sufficed to enable us to deal thoroughly with those problems of strike strategy which are connected with the present sharpening of the class struggle. It is a task of the E.C.C.I. Plenum to make concrete this portion of the resolutions of the Sixth World Congress on the basis of the experience of the last few months and to bring them to the knowledge of the Party membership.

I wish to deal with the following questions : (1) the development of our trade union tactics, (2) methods of leading the revolutionary struggle, (3) the struggle against the splitting policy of the reformists, (4) the question of the unorganised workers.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR TRADE UNION TACTICS

In the first period of this struggle after the war we were guided by the slogans "Class struggle or co-partnership" and "Moscow or Amsterdam." At that time it was necessary to work out the principles of the revolutionary class struggle and its relation to strike strategy, and to convince the masses of the Party membership and the workers in general

of the necessity of a struggle to capture the trade unions. In this first stage, under pressure of the revolutionary workers, the trade unions were still carrying on active struggle. In spite of the sabotage of the leadership the branches, and even some of the districts, carried on an economic struggle, although in general they were endeavouring to avoid the breaking-up of the capitalist system. The revolutionary pressure of the workers was still strong, and the trade union apparatus—from the Central Committee down to District Committees—had not yet become so centralised and so inclined to an economic truce as it has become since the relative stabilisation.

After the defeat of 1923, during the intensive rationalisation, when wages were reduced and the working day lengthened, the workers still carried on partial offensives with meagre success. In these offensives the unorganised workers played a subordinate part. They were less capable of resistance than were the organised. It was necessary, therefore, to make every effort to strengthen Communist influence over the trade union membership and to avoid isolation. The chief task at that time was the struggle against ultra-left tendencies, against sectarianism, against neglect of revolutionary trade union work, and against a defeatist frame of mind. In this period of retreat, when the working-class movement was on a downward curve, our Party comrades were compelled to lay special stress on the reverses which, in most cases, had been brought about by the reformists. The German C.P. and the Comintern carried on a struggle for trade union unity, on both a national and international scale, with reference to the class-coalition tendencies of the bureaucracy and their splitting policy. The insufficient fighting experience of our Party, the pessimistic feeling in the organisations, and the difficulties of the struggle in this period of brutal rationalisation, caused our Party's trade union work to be weakly carried out, more or less under the slogan of "Throw out the trade union fakirs."

As a result of the intense exploitation of the workers through rationalisation a crisis appeared in 1927, and simultaneously the gradual increase in activity of the working

class. In the meantime, however, the situation in the working-class movement had altered. As a result of stabilisation the trade unions had drifted towards social-pacifism. While up till 1923 the local leadership of the trade unions had yielded to the pressure of the rank and file, later on the linking-up of the trade union apparatus with that of capitalist industry and that of the State had become a fact. The trade unions had developed more and more into constituent parts of capitalist economy and government. This found its theoretical sanction in the so-called theory of "Industrial Democracy," and in the resolutions of the Kiel Congress of the social-democrats. No longer, under pressure of the workers, did the trade unions place themselves at the head of movements in order to betray them; they now hindered the very earliest development of such movements. Only in exceptional cases did they now lead certain petty struggles and then always to strangle them. Faced by this situation, the principal task of the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade union elements became the independent organisation of the struggle against the trinity of trust-capital, the capitalist State and the reformists. The character of the class struggle, then, at the beginning of the third period, in 1927-1928, threw up the question of the independent leadership of the economic struggle of the workers against the pacifist policy of the reformists. The internal Party differences with the right and the conciliators centred principally around the questions of strike strategy and the Party work within the trade unions.

#### METHODS OF LEADING THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

The principle obstacles in our struggle for strike leadership are trade union constitutionalism and respect for the rules of the reformists and capitalist law. Reformism acts as a liaison between capitalist legality and the trade union constitution. This, of course, is because the reformists exercise their activities only within the framework of capitalist law. Submission to reformist trade union rules implies the support of industrial peace and of capitalist economic and political

policies. The trade union legalistic conception appears in the German C.P. in the "trade union" tendency. Certain comrades believe that trade union policy must in itself necessarily be a policy of class struggle. They don't realise that there are two trade union policies: reformism or revolutionary class struggle. In the struggle against the policy of industrial peace and splitting a tendency often appears to formulate these questions as being "neutral" politically. Our comrades often take a purely defensive attitude, and state in resolutions, "We are against the splitting policy, and demand that the trade union leadership cease its practice." They ignore the political aspect, and in such resolutions take no positive stand for our revolutionary class-line. With regard to this tendency we must always insist that the question should not be stated from this purely formal and organisational standpoint, but that the struggle should be carried on as a political campaign against reformism and on behalf of our revolutionary programme of trade union tactics. This ideological struggle is a necessary preliminary to overcoming the constitutional attitude and to the preparation of the workers for unofficial struggles.

Our task, therefore, in this third period is to secure the class unity of the proletariat in the struggle. We must overcome the division of the workers brought about by the reformists, and lead both organised and unorganised labour forward to the struggle. We must develop the fighting capacity of the workers on the widest possible working-class basis, and in every way must strive to build up organs of struggle in connection with any conflict that arises. These organs of struggle—strike committees, councils of action, workers' defence committees, workers' delegate conferences, women's conferences, unemployed committees, etc.—are at present the typical forms through which will be realised the class unity of the workers. The policy of the united front thus becomes exclusively the policy of the united front from below.

These methods of unofficial leadership, breaking through trade union constitutionalism, naturally imply a tremendous intensification of the struggle between the revolutionary workers and the agents of capitalism within

the trade unions. But it will be precisely in the measure of our success among the masses, as a result of our trade union and strike tactics, that we shall be able to unite the workers under the leadership of the trade union opposition despite all repressive attempts by the reformists. The carrying out of these tactics should not result in a weakening of our work within the trade unions, but in a decided strengthening. It would be incorrect to look upon the unofficial leadership as being merely centres for the economic struggle of the workers, and to consider them as starting-points for the creation of new unions. For this unofficial leadership in its very essence must be an organ of political as well as of economic struggle. We must not forget that in the present situation the economic struggle is of the greatest political significance, and in many cases can be heightened into a declared political struggle.

The prominent role of the unofficial united front centres of the workers imposes the strengthening of our work in all mass organisations. The growth of our influence over the masses in the preparation and leadership of the struggle is dependent upon the strength of those organisations which sympathise with us and upon the strength of the revolutionary opposition in the other organisations. Our educational work within the mass organisations therefore is an important preparation for independent leadership in political and industrial conflicts.

Under the changed conditions of the struggle the question of relief must be construed otherwise than in the traditional trade union manner. For the successful maintenance of a strike the distinctive question is not the old one of relief but of the correct strategy and tactics. Whatever relief is necessary, in order to save the strikers from starvation, must be obtained through the most extended solidarity. In those cases where the carrying-on of a strike has been tactically correct, and when the workers are convinced of the necessity of the strike, a minimum of relief could always be raised. The organisation of relief should take place through common action between the W.I.R. and the leadership of the struggle. It is necessary to make it quite clear to the workers that they should support the W.I.R.

for political and economic reasons in order to support that mass organisation which can give assistance to the workers in the severest times of conflict. As a consequence of this a certain reorganisation of the W.I.R. should follow, so that the W.I.R. may be capable of this greater task.

#### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE SPLITTING POLICY OF THE REFORMISTS

I have already stated that our attitude towards trade union tactics should spring from the content of trade union policy and not from its organisational form. The struggle against the splitting policy of the reformists will only lead to an increase of our influence among the rank and file when we are able to explain that the exclusion of communists and the removal of all revolutionaries from official positions is definitely carried out in the interests of industrial peace and in order to prevent the workers carrying on struggles over questions of wages and hours. The reformists are desirous of having this question put from the formal and organisational standpoint. In opposition to this we must state the question in the following manner: For or against the increased wages demanded by the workers? For or against the shorter hours which the workers demand? For or against round-table conferences? For or against proletarian democracy in the trade unions? On this basis we can not only prove to the workers that the expulsion policy of the reformists is directed against the wage demands of the workers but we can also win over trade unionists to proposals for the exclusion of reformist leaders, social-democratic ministers, police chiefs and similar rabble.

As representatives of revolutionary trade union unity we must carry on the struggle for unity on the basis of the class-struggle, directed against the disruptive policies of the reformists. Wherever we have a substantial majority of the membership behind us and the leadership is in our hands, we must not capitulate to the disciplinary measures of the reformists. We must reply to any attempt to expel our leading officials or to take the leadership out of our hands with the widest activity of the rank and file. The membership should insist that the officials should not leave their posts. They should realise and

demonstrate that a surrender to the disciplinary measures of the reformists would mean the destruction of the organisation involved and the weakening of the fighting capacity of the workers.

The tactics of our party at the time of the defeat of the Königsberg railway trade unionists, although carried out with considerable hesitations, was correct. Likewise, given the destruction of the Scottish mine workers by the reformists, it is necessary to preserve the unity of those miners under our own leadership. However, it would be quite incorrect to draw a conclusion from this particular instance that we should divide the miners' organisation in other parts of Britain. On the contrary we should mobilise the workers all over the country to assist the Scottish miners in their struggle for trade union unity on the basis of the class struggle, and for the reinstatement of the expelled. Here it seems necessary in this connection to refer back to the resolution of the Second World Congress. When I say that, in spite of the expulsion policy of the reformists and the partial splitting of whole organisations, we should not go wholly over to the creation of separate organisations, I want to express that even where the tendency is in the direction of splitting, no secondary organisation should at present be formed as the embryo of a future trade union.

In some cases the reformists endeavour to secure formal sanction for the expulsion of revolutionary workers by insistence on a signed declaration. Some comrades are of the opinion that the question of signing the declaration depends upon the degree of mass support. However, we are of the opinion that at the present time, all declarations which embody the obligation of opposing the policies of the Communists, must not be signed. During the depression of the labour movement after 1923 some of us were forced to sign such declarations in order that our influence over the trade union members would not be lessened through loss of official positions. But now, in a period of increasing activity of the working-masses, the signing of these declarations means checking the revolutionary mobilisation of the masses and encourages the reformists to take even sterner measures against us.

In Germany, through following our tactics of unofficial leadership of the struggle and the presentation of revolutionary candidates for the factory committees, many of our comrades have been expelled from their unions. Naturally these comrades are carrying on a campaign for reinstatement. Some comrades said, "I cannot go around as a non-unionist. We should have the opportunity of being organised." We answer, "Well, organise in the W.I.R., in the Red Front and, if you are not already a member, join the Communist Party." But usually, behind the talk of "being unorganised" lies the question of relief. There are cases when comrades at first wished to decline their nomination as revolutionary candidates for the factory committees on the grounds that they would be expelled from their union and would in future receive no benefits in the case of strikes, lock-outs or unemployment. In a circular issued by one of the districts of the German C.P. a proposal is made for the creation of a relief organisation for the expelled. Serious as is the question of relief, it should not be used as the grounds for the formation of separate organisations. It is of interest to note that some comrades have sought to make the accomplishment of our revolutionary tactics on the factory committees dependent upon the settling of the question of relief. Here the opportunistic obstruction is obviously transformed into an ultra-left deviation. The real meaning of the proposals of such comrades is the formation of the germ of new unions in the guise of these relief organisations. We have at present no possibility of relief except through the W.I.R. It might be possible to give to expelled trade unionists the possibility of putting aside the equivalent of the trade union contributions which they formerly paid, as savings. This would not be the formation of a mutual relief organisation but merely facilities for the depositing of individual savings.

#### THE QUESTION OF THE UNORGANISED WORKERS

In my introductory remarks I already pointed out why the question of the unorganised has now become one of such extraordinary importance. In his article in the "Communist International," comrade Lozovsky writes that the question of the unorganised is the

most important problem of the period. That is incorrect. The most important problem of this period is the struggle of the Communist Party to obtain leadership in the struggles of the working-class. Whether, in the course of rallying the working masses, we lay more weight upon the unorganised or the organised depends upon the concrete situation. Comrade Lozovsky asks what has become of the unorganised whom we registered during the conflict in the Ruhr. And he draws the conclusion that we must found new organisations. Evidently comrade Lozovsky over-estimates the workers' capacity for organisation under capitalist conditions. His proposal arises from the separation of the organised and unorganised. The organised must stay in the trade unions and the unorganised must be comprised in the relief organisations. The proposal is in opposition to our general policy. The characteristic of our policy and tactics at the present time is the establishment of the class-front under the leadership of the Communist Party in the fight against the laws both of the trade unions and of the State. There are two forms in the conception of the organised and unorganised. One is the temporary organ of struggle such as strike committees, workers' conferences and so on. The other form is the working class mass organisation, such as trade unions, W.I.R., Red Front, etc. In the interests of our leadership of the struggle, and in our campaign against the attempt of the reformists to isolate us, we must strengthen both the opposition in the unions and the recruiting of sympathetic organisations. We know that under capitalist conditions the 100 per cent. organisation of the workers will never be possible. For that reason our most important problem is the realisation of proletarian democracy, bringing together the unorganised and organised workers for mutual discussion and decisions, and the development of the fighting powers of all workers through the creation of temporary organisational forms. We must increase our influence upon the vacillating workers of reformist tendencies through a strengthening of our opposition in the trade unions, but at the same time the revolutionary trade unionists together with the unorganised must use every means for the smashing of trade union constitutionalism and for the construction of a working-class front

under Communist leadership. The organisational capacity of the unorganised—the possibility of their inclusion in the workers' mass organisations—will become greater in proportion to the degree in which we are able to draw the unorganised into activity and responsible work through leading them in their struggles. That is the main question.

As opposed to this comrade Lozovsky has developed an inverted organisation-mania. He has declared—and this is I suppose, Rule I. of the new organisation:

“When you come to the average unorganised worker and say to him there has been a wholesale exclusion; you have come flying out of the factory; no-one has helped you. Let us organise a society. You will pay dues and will receive relief during the struggle—I believe that then the worker will enter into it.”

This forming of societies is nothing more than the transition towards the foundation of new unions. The result must be that no workers will be added to the opposition in the trade unions and that many will leave. My viewpoint is that the development in Germany has not reached that point when we can form new organisations on a mass basis. It is of course possible that, in the course of revolutionary mass-struggle, the trade union may play the part of a treacherous and Fascist organisation and that as a result the masses will refuse organisationally to support this reformist body; then the contradiction between the policy of the trade union leadership and of the overwhelming majority of the workers would lead to a split in the union. Then the question of the formation of class trade unions comes sharply to the fore. If comrades believe that through the creation of semi-trade union organisations they will bring about favourable conditions for such a situation, they are acting contrary to the previous resolutions of the Comintern. The formation of such societies can only lead to a weakening of our influence over the membership of the trade unions. This

is even more dangerous—even when the majority of the workers are unorganised but willing to fight—as the trade unionists are in a position seriously to hinder the carrying-on of the mass strike. For these reasons the unorganised should only be brought together through temporary fighting organisations and through sympathisers' organisations such as the W.I.R., Red Front, etc. The mustering of all our powers for the mobilisation of the unorganised and the organised for the formation of independent leadership of the struggle, co-ordinated work by the revolutionary workers within the unions, together with the unorganised, for the purpose of breaking down reformist trade union constitutionalism—that is our next step.

\* \* \* \*

To sum up: in my opinion three principal questions must be treated in the resolution which will be laid before the Plenum.

In the first part of the resolution the particular conditions of the struggle in the third period, the changes which have taken place within the trade union movement, as well as the part which the unorganised must play, should be analysed. In the second part the question of strike-strategy and tactics must be handled. In this connection the principal problem is the independent (unofficial) leadership of the mass-struggle and the development of specific organisational forms such as strike committees, councils of action, workers' defence bodies, delegate conferences and similar temporary bodies. In the third part of the resolution there should be a special reference to the work within the trade unions and also to the question of the mobilisation and organisation of the unorganised; in connection with this last point the question of the struggle against the reformist exclusionist and splitting tactics must be specially discussed. At the same time the question of the organisational form of trade union opposition must be settled. In my opinion these must be the chief points of the draft resolution.

# Problems of the Revolutionary Movement in India

P. Schubin

## THE CAPITALIST CRISIS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR COLONIES

THE intensification of antagonisms, both among the imperialists and within each imperialist country separately, which is characteristic of the third period of the crisis of post-war capitalism, cannot but have particularly clear expression in the colonies. The general crisis of the entire capitalist system, the characteristic feature of which is the growing lack of correspondence between capitalism's increasing productive forces and the shrinking markets, is forcing the question of the repartition of the world very insistently on the chief imperialist countries. The inequality in the development of capitalism is in turn making it possible for individual countries to achieve this redistribution by force of arms. One has but to mention the Anglo-American conflict in order to indicate what place colonies occupy in the economic, financial and military conflicts of the imperialists. At the same time the internal antagonisms to be found in all the more important capitalist countries, antagonisms arising on the basis of capitalism, cannot work towards any other solution than that of the repartitioning of the colonies or the transformation of new, still formally independent countries into lands of colonial serfdom.

As early as 1920, in his speech "On Concessions," Lenin summarised these radical antagonisms, which were, he said "traceable to profound economic causes." Warning against attempts to exploit dissensions of a petty and fortuitous nature, Lenin specified three basic conflicts: (1) that between the U.S.A. and Japan, (2) that between the U.S.A. and Britain, and (3) that between the Entente and Germany. He also indicated the tendency of development of these conflicts. Only now, nearly ten years later, is it possible for us fully to realise all the keen scientific prevision

which lies at the basis of this analysis. One of the problems which Lenin touched upon in his estimate of the sources of the basic antagonisms is concerned with the importance of colonies in the development of American imperialism.

"America has 110,000,000 inhabitants. It has no colonies whatever, although it is many times richer than Japan. Japan has seized China, where there is a population of 400,000,000, and the richest coal reserves in the world. How can such a position be maintained? It is absurd to think that the stronger capitalism will not deprive the weaker capitalism of all that the latter has stolen." "America is strong, everybody is indebted to her now, everybody is dependent on her, everybody is coming to hate her more and more, she steals from all, and she steals in very original fashion. She has no colonies. Britain came out of the war with enormous colonies; France did the same. Britain offered America a mandate for one of the stolen colonies—that is the language used to-day!—but she did not accept it."

It is now clear why American imperialism did not then attempt to satisfy its colonial appetite either by a "voluntary" Versailles agreement between the victors, or in the form of a benevolent gift or enforced purchase from the other colonial robbers united in the League of Nations. In the first place, at that time the United States had no need to hurry with the capture of colonial monopolies, because the situation after Versailles temporarily afforded it the possibility not only of plundering everybody, but of plundering in a very original fashion, without needing to possess colonies. Secondly, American imperialism was striving not for the sharing of the colonial booty, but for its capture, not for an extension of the Versailles Peace Treaty, but for a new, more decisive world war, with a view to "supple-

menting" and "correcting" the results of the war of 1914-1918. It was in connection with the Versailles peace and with one of its most characteristic results—*i.e.*, the fact that the strongest robber of all remained uninterested in the maintenance of the established division of the colonies—that Lenin saw the decisive factor, determining not only the chief object of dispute, but also the moment of the arrival of the coming war. "Thus we have before us the greatest State in the world, which in 1923 will have a fleet stronger than that of Britain, but this State is meeting with the growing hatred of the other capitalist countries. We must take this trend of circumstances into account. America cannot make its peace with the rest of Europe—that is a fact determined by history." The fact that Lenin mentions 1923 may give the impression of an error in fixing the moment of the beginning of the war. But there is no error here, for Lenin is giving the objective symptom of when one may expect the European - American, Anglo-American hatred and dissension to pass into open war: that moment will arrive when the United States "will have a fleet stronger than that of Britain." The chronological date is given approximately, and its exact fixation depends on technical factors (the speed of naval construction in the various imperialist countries), which still remain essentially uncertain, and were necessarily all the more uncertain in Moscow in 1920. A year later Lenin was groping for a more exact date. "Over this gold they are planning undoubtedly to murder 20,000,000 men and to maim another 60,000,000 somewhere about 1925, or possibly 1928, either in war between Britain and America or between Japan and America, or something along those lines." (Article: "On the Importance of Gold.") About 1928!—the very time when the United States openly raised, for official export, the question of the "stronger fleet," and whether America or Britain was with that stronger fleet's aid to rule the seas. It was then made clear that owing to the intrinsic antagonisms of capitalism in the United States the latter was already losing the possibility of plundering all the rest without the necessity to possess colonies.

In no country can the bourgeoisie find any other way out of the contradiction between the

extended possibilities of production and the contracted markets than by seizing new external markets for themselves. In the conditions prevailing under imperialism, in which the distribution of the world's surface between a handful of robbers has gone as far as it can, the seizure of new markets cannot be effected in any other way than by an armed struggle for colonies. In the conditions of post-war imperialism, with its extraordinarily intensified antagonisms, with its basic "injustice" of the centre of economic, finance, technical, and consequently of military power—the United States, being deprived of colonies whilst having extreme need of them—the war for colonies cannot but be on a world scale, cannot but be still more a "world war" than that of 1914-1918. For, being determined first and foremost by the Anglo-American conflict, the line of the chief front will traverse all the oceans and all the continents.

\* \* \* \*

One cannot help seeing the object which the bourgeoisie and its economists are pursuing in sounding a sudden alarm in connection with the decline in the number of employed workers. Its purpose is to prepare the masses for a war over the issue of the U.S.A.'s colonial power. In 1927 the Secretary of State for the U.S.A., James Davis, wrote an article in the magazine "Wall Street" entitled, "Does prosperity create unemployment?" which is, I think, the first official estimate of the phenomenon of an absolute decline in the number of employed workers. This article persistently and cleverly brings the reader to the idea that the sole way out of the situation which has arisen consists in the States' industry taking on itself the task of benefiting the backward peoples on a scale quite unprecedented. "It seems to me," the imperialist minister mildly remarks, "that there is a possibility of ensuring that our productive possibilities should not become a burden (in the sense of reducing the number of workers). That possibility consists in our directing our attention to the disposal of our surplus production abroad." After coquetting with the nobility of his pacifism, Davis suddenly reveals that "if the purchasing power in China were to be raised by ten dollars per annum a new market to the value of

4,000,000,000 dollars would thus be created, a sum approximately equal to our present export." It is true that it is not altogether excluded that other imperialist Powers may throw themselves into such a profitable business as "improving the living standards and raising the level of the backward peoples and nations." But Davis calms the fears of his reader with the remark: "A certain degree of specialisation exists among the various nations." "At the moment it is violated because the fear of war is forcing the various countries to think of self-support and of developing those spheres of production which it would be better to leave to others." How are we to ensure that every fox should know his own hole, and should not pretend to the role of saviour? If we are to believe Davis this is very easy of achievement! It is only necessary to remove the fear of war from the capitalist countries. And this in turn is not at all difficult to achieve. It is only necessary that American imperialism should be strong enough to deprive its competitors of the possibility, and consequently of the desire, for war! In a word, it is the old formula: "To ensure peace, prepare for war!" Of course, the American minister took China only as an example, one highly popular in 1927. For from this period also dates Manchester's dreams of the Chinese wearing their gowns an inch longer, which would enable the crisis in the British cotton industry to be overcome. If Davis had written his article in 1929, during the period of a further intensification of the Anglo-American conflict, it is not altogether off the cards that his Christian imagination would have carried him from China directly to India.

The so-called "policy of the open door," which was advantageous to American imperialism even after Versailles, when Europe was economically broken, is now unacceptable to it. For, on the one hand, its need of external markets is increasing, and, on the other, it is everywhere coming into conflict with trustified Europe, which is now producing cheaply and swiftly, and is intending to produce still more cheaply at the expense of the working class. American imperialism needs colonial monopoly in order to protect itself from any competition on the world market, to

a smaller extent than does its British brother. But, nevertheless, it has need of such a monopoly. "Open doors" in China no longer satisfy American imperialism. Its need is the extrusion of its rivals, Britain and Japan, and of seizing the strategic points in a "united" China, and the transformation of the Pacific Ocean into an "inland sea" of the United States. But the aggressive designs of American imperialism cannot rest even at this. The British colonial system cannot be administered any decisive blow so long as she dominates the Indian Ocean, with her possession of the strategic points on the line running to Australia through the Malayan Straits, and through India, Egypt, the Sudan, tropical Africa to the Union of South Africa. At the very centre of this arch is the "finest jewel in the English crown," India, with its inexhaustible material and human resources.

In the event of an Anglo-American war—and that war is inevitable unless it is averted by a prior proletarian revolution—the strategic plans of both opponents will include the struggle for India as one of their most important features. In the language of American imperialism the freedom of the seas connotes, first and foremost, the destruction of Britain's hegemony on the seas and the destruction of her colonial might. But neither the one nor the other can be achieved so long as Britain retains her monopolist rule over the Indian Ocean. The most effective method of bringing British imperialism to its knees is by dealing it a blow, or at least by menacing it with the danger of a serious blow in India. Already the shadow of the coming war gives rise to a spider-web of intrigues around India. The agents of American imperialism have long since gathered on the farther side not only of the Pacific, but also of the Indian Ocean, seizing spheres of influence and concessions (in certain instances not without the direct support of Germany) in Arabia, Abyssinia, Persia, etc.

America is aiming at India. Of course this does not mean that she will have any possibility of firing this mortal shot at Britain yet awhile.

\* \* \* \*

All the prospects for British imperialism are in no less, indeed are in still greater de-

gree than for American imperialism, bound up with the extension and consolidation of its colonial piracy. The stagnation in British industry is not being generally dispelled, despite the strongest of pressure on the workers' living standards, despite the birth-pangs of rationalisation which here and there are evincing themselves as the result of that pressure. British competitive ability on the world market is not improving. But even those partial successes which have been achieved in certain spheres of industry can be destroyed in an hour by a sudden jump in development in the corresponding spheres of the United States or even by a swift success in Germany. And such a success is not only possible but is even a prerequisite to the realisation of any of the variants of the old or a rejuvenated plan of reparations.

Only her colonial monopoly maintains Britain in her present position. That monopoly is the hoop which holds together the dry barrel-staves of the British Empire. One of the chief motives counteracting the centrifugal forces of the dominions consists in the possibility of participating in one way or another in the general colonial robbery carried out by White Britain at the expense of the coloured population of the colonies. Consequently the loss of India would involve not only the loss of one of the chief sources of the exploitation which rejuvenates decrepit British imperialism, but would also deprive the dominions of their chief reason for remaining within the Empire.

Whilst for the U.S.A. the seizure of India is the ultimate aim of their imperialist designs, for Britain the retention of India under her own iron heel is a prime condition of her existence.

So far we have confined ourselves to a consideration of the importance of the struggle for the colonies in the Anglo-American conflict. Naturally, that conflict does not exhaust and does not cover all the antagonisms of the imperialists; but it is their touchstone. The struggles between the U.S.A. and Japan, between Germany and the former Entente, within the Entente itself (between France and Italy) and so on, are in their turn directed towards the repartitioning of the earth, towards the redistribution and extension of the colonial

plunder. The antagonisms of the "third period" must have particular effect in the activation of imperialism's colonial policy, and first and foremost of the policy of Britain, still the strongest of the imperialist robbers, in her largest colony, India.

\* \* \* \*

In face of such a general increase of colonial aggression it is absurd to expect that even if she desired (which is out of the question in any case) Britain could allow any weakening of her economic and political monopoly in India. To yield to the dream and idea of the possibility of "decolonisation" (in any either open or hidden form) as a new policy of British imperialism in the conditions of the third period is to be inept as a man who dances at a funeral. For that matter it would appear that all except the completely hopeless "decolonisers" and "industrialisers" have already renounced their erroneous theories, and that not only from formal considerations.

None the less is it interesting to note those distortions in the summarisation of the general situation in India which result, and cannot but result in practice, from even the vestiges of the theory of "decolonisation" or of its pseudonym: "the British policy of industrialising India." In this regard one of the clauses in the political resolution adopted by the conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party is instructive, for it pays tribute, one must hope the last tribute, to the theory of industrialisation. But how does that party reconcile this tribute with the general situation which the Indian comrades cannot but notice, with the fact of the general attack of British imperialism in India along the whole line? A conventional "reconciliation" is achieved by declaring this imperialist aggression a temporary factor, a break in the general policy, an exception to the rule, so to speak. "The unexpected aggressiveness of imperialism," the resolution reads, "consequently does not connote a fundamental change in its policy in relation to the Indian bourgeoisie, but only a partial and temporary change. But its policy remains essentially the same."

What justification has the author of the resolution for not only asserting but even assuming that British imperialism will change or weaken in its aggressiveness in regard to

colonies generally, and in regard to India in particular? For the reasons which, as the resolution justly points out, condition that aggressiveness (the approach of war, Great Britain's continuing economic decline, the necessity of resorting to non-economic pressure in consequence of the weakening of the economic factors) are none of them tending towards a decline in their force. And why, in face of the maintenance of and even increase in the causes, should the consequences, i.e., the aggressiveness of British imperialism, which is expressed first and foremost in the defence of its economic and political annexations, disappear or "be sucked out"? The author of the resolution does not even ask himself this question.

None the less, the manner in which the question is raised in the resolution quoted is favourably distinguished from the abstract approach of the apologists of "decolonisation" by the fact that the Indian comrades do not separate concessions in the economic sphere from concessions in the political sphere, for they know that in colonial conditions they are inseparably connected. The superiority of such a formulation of the issue over the attempts to sunder the economic liberalism of imperialism in the colonies from its political liberalism (to separate economic from political decolonisation) consists in the circumstance that the actual course of events more easily disproves and destroys it. Without any risk of error one can declare that in this resolution we have the last little cloud of a storm that has cleared, and moreover a cloud which itself has been blown aside.

#### THE NEW RISE IN INDIA AND THE CHINESE EXPERIENCE

But the "third period" connotes not only an increase in the objective antagonisms of the imperialist system, but also a rise in the revolutionary activity of the exploited and oppressed on the basis of that increase. In the capitalist countries this process takes expression in the revolutionising of the working class. In an intensification and extension of the economic struggle, in new forms of leadership of that struggle, in the counter-offensive and offensive character of that struggle in the ranks of the participants, despite the enor-

mous increase in the strength of the employers' organisations.

In the colonies this process is preparing a new round of colonial wars and revolts. A number of objective conditions are working to ensure that this new round will most probably have its beginning in India. First and foremost among these conditions is the circumstance that the national revolutionary movement in India, the first wave of which was broken owing to the treachery of the bourgeoisie in 1922, has now succeeded in recovering from the blows then administered, and in assembling its forces, purging its ranks, regrouping and reconstructing itself, has succeeded in determining its own master, and in recognising its class enemies.

One of the chief facts determining the character of the new rise of the national revolutionary movement in India is the experience of the Chinese revolution. All the forces participating in the struggle on both sides of the barricades have learned a considerable amount from the Chinese lesson. British imperialism has never ruled in India except with the aid of the most shameful terror and contemptible bribery. And now, not only because of the objective reasons above-mentioned, but also under the influence of the lessons of revolutionary development in China, it regards the display of any concession even to the bourgeois opposition as too risky, for it is afraid that such compliance might set in motion all the avalanche of the national revolution. The more severely the antagonism between the necessity of developing productive forces and the colonial pressure has its effect in India, the greater will be British imperialism's justification for fearing that any weakening of the military and administrative pressure will lead to the break-up of the entire system.

The swift war-period transference of capitalist production to India, the existence of comparatively few, but technically highly organised enterprises in the country, a sprinkling of individual centres in a backward pre-capitalist economy, have already proved to be a source of the greatest danger to Britain's economic and political hegemony. The struggle against a more or less normal industrial development of the country, the ruthless distortion of its economy, the opposition to India's independent entry into the world market, the

support and development of backward, pre-capitalist elements in the cities, and even more in the countryside, all constitute the traditional policy of British imperialism and are all being given a new impulse at the present time.

This it is which determines the extraordinarily limited nature of the concessions to the native bourgeoisie which imperialism can make, even if by so doing it could count on ransoming itself from a national revolution, even if it could achieve a real disarming of the toilers at such a price. But the experience of the Chinese revolution has unmasked the role of the native bourgeoisie in the colonies to such an extent that its authority among the masses has fallen considerably, indeed to such an extent that its role as the channel of imperialist influence with the national revolutionary movement is becoming more and more insignificant. Its corruption for the benefit of imperialism is no longer worth much consideration. This by no means connotes that the possibility of the bourgeois opposition attaching itself in one form or another to the national revolution is excluded in all and every colony and semi-colony, and at every stage of development. The resolution of this question depends in each separate case on the definite situation and the corresponding distribution of forces.

But so far as India is concerned one can definitely assert that not only the imperialist but also the native bourgeoisie has changed from what it was before the Chinese revolution. Possibly there is no better indication of the degeneration of bourgeois nationalism in India (to whose tail, as we know, considerable sections of the intelligentsia continue to cling) than the fact that the present feudal-bourgeois-terrorist regime of China, established by imperialism against the workers' and peasants' revolution and involving the maintenance of the imperialist slavery in a new form, is regarded by the Indian bourgeois parties as a victory for the Chinese revolution. But this same fact finally determines the attitude of the bourgeoisie to the workers' and peasants' movement in India itself. The period of the patriarchal, sentimental, hypocritical attitude of the bourgeoisie to the workers' movement, during which the employers threw widely advertised but miserable

crumbs to the children of the strikers, and when the same employers obtained certain ameliorations for native industry by the agency of the strikes, has passed in India, never to return.

Of course, even in the past the bourgeoisie sought to head the emancipation movement only with a view to beheading it. Of course, even then, in its economic policy the bourgeoisie acted as the class enemy of the proletariat, and, as it had never severed its connections with the landowners, as the class enemy of the peasantry also. But in the tactical realm this hostility to the interests of the toilers was stifled under and lightened by a complete system of "primitive" theories, in so far as the bourgeoisie could count on exploiting the workers' and peasants' movement as a basis of support in its own negotiations and agreements with imperialism.

The present period has as its characteristic the fact that the bourgeoisie are now more afraid of the working class than they are of imperialist oppression. Canton is to them more terrifying than London. This explains not only their cowardice in regard to imperialism, but also their extraordinary resolution in the task of struggling against the workers' and peasants' movements. The relationship between imperialism and the native bourgeoisie at the present time is determined by the circumstance that the first-named is strengthening its machinery of oppression, and neither wants nor can make concessions, whilst the second is increasingly ready to seize on any form of imperialist oppression in order to put up a resistance to the workers. This explains why within the course of a single year the Indian bourgeoisie, which has not received any concessions whatever from imperialism, but on the contrary has been continually humiliated and treated offhandedly by it, without even getting a smell of power in return, has reached the point of becoming the open ally of imperialism.

Of course, neither the Swarajists nor the Liberals are themselves firing on the workers as yet, but it is only for the simple reason that so far imperialism has not confided in them to that extent, has not allowed them to hold the rifle; and even the guard of honour of the National Congress, commanded by one

of the leaders of the Independence League, the Fascist Subash Bose, was armed only with bamboo canes. Unlike the Chinese bourgeoisie, not having the possibility of itself doing the shooting and hanging, the Indian bourgeoisie is for its part doing everything possible to assist imperialism in its handling of the working class. The fact that the Indian bourgeoisie has not so far itself acted as executioner ought to delude nobody. It is imperialism's batman.

But the proletariat also has assimilated the lesson of the Chinese revolution, and that lesson is helping the toilers of India to understand and to exploit the lessons of their own defeats in 1919 and 1922. As we know, at that time the bourgeoisie succeeded in breaking off and damming the national revolutionary movement at the preliminary stage of development, even before the working class had succeeded in acting as an independent force. Owing to the poor differentiation of forces in the nationalist camp the treachery of the bourgeoisie was masked to a certain extent—the latter was successful in combining both the violator and the victim in one. The man chiefly responsible for the betrayal of 1922, Gandhi, has for many years been clever enough to maintain his authority by himself posing as a martyr, partly owing to the fact that after his summons to complete capitulation to British imperialism he continued to find himself shut away in a British prison.

The years of intense reaction which followed the first wave were exploited by the British government with exceptional artistry in order to isolate the Indian movement from international experience. Watchdogs of British imperialism, the most well trained and pernicious in the world, are watching all the roads leading to India, barring access to all who might assist in the growth of the class-consciousness of the proletariat. The colonial prison bars outside conducted to a bestial frenzy of terror within, which tore up and annihilated the shoots of the revolutionary movement at their first appearance. In order to suppress the least attempts of the peasant movement British imperialism has at its disposal throughout the countryside a widely ramified apparatus of repression, which has roots in the very lowest and remotest groups, an apparatus such as

even Tsarism in Russia never had, not to speak of imperialism in China. This political isolation is the chief reason why not only the peasantry but the proletariat of India also have till recently assimilated the experience of their own past defeats slowly. The Chinese revolution proved to be a turning point in this regard also. British imperialism had no resources which could hide from the proletariat of India the flame lit by the Chinese revolution throughout the East. The new rise of the movement, which had its beginning early in 1927, began under a new banner unfolded by the proletariat of China.

#### THE TREACHERY OF BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM

The new attack of British imperialism had as one of its first open expressions the appointment of the Simon Commission, the composition and the program of which left no doubt that British imperialism was renouncing the policy of agreement with the native bourgeoisie, and would demand of it an out and out capitulation. For the Indian bourgeoisie this involved the destruction of their hopes of an extension of their rights under a new constitution and of reward for their moderate and faithful conduct under the old constitution. The Labour Party categorically announced that in the event of MacDonald coming to power governmental policy in India would remain unchanged. MacDonald pledged himself in advance to carry out all that Baldwin should decide. The Labour Party and the General Council showed that they would not allow even a shadow of interference on the part of "third persons" in the domestic dispute between the conservatives and the "loyal opposition"; on the other hand they demanded the completely unrestricted right of British imperialism to interfere in all India's business.

Bourgeois nationalism sought to answer the attack of British imperialism with a protest "by legal and peaceful methods" and by the demand for the Simon Commission to be transformed into a round-table conference, with the participation of representatives of India's possessing classes. If British imperialism had had any intention of combining terror with bribery the "cheap" offer made by the Swarajists with a view to agreement would have attracted it. It was quite an easy matter

to come to an agreement with the National Congress. They had only to offer the simulation of some sort of concession to the bourgeoisie, which was ready to accept not only promises as the reality, but even any equivocal hint, which carried no obligation whatever with it, as a real promise. But British imperialism has need not of agreement but of destruction; and public abuse of the impotence of Indian bourgeois nationalism constituted part of the program of that destruction.

It was in such a situation that at the end of 1927 the National Congress in Madras announced India's complete independence as its aim; they at once added to this that the achievement of the new aim was only by the old, i.e., the legal and peaceful methods. Having proclaimed the slogan of independence the National Congress thus crossed the Rubicon. It was its last weapon, which had either immediately to come into action, or else must reveal its complete impotence. The latter proved to be the case. The congress endeavoured to strengthen the demand for independence by threats against the two most sensitive spots of British imperialism: a declaration of the impossibility of allowing a war with Soviet Russia, and the organisation of a Hartal, a mass solemn protest against the Simon Commission.

The first menace was completely stultified by the fact that not long before the Madras conference there were unequivocal indications in the Indian national press that the Swarajists were intending to make the question of attitude to the U.S.S.R. a subject of bargaining with British imperialism. The most definite and exact formulation of this not merely shameful and cowardly, but openly stupid policy was provided in one of the leading articles of the "Forward," which said that the national movement could not undertake any obligations in the event of a war against the U.S.S.R. so long as its interests were not satisfied. Thus the national bourgeoisie offered the London government its right and obligation to defend the great republic of labour in exchange for a brass farthing. But no purchasers put in any appearance.

During the organisation of the campaign against the Simon Commission bourgeois nationalism concentrated all its efforts on ren-

dering any independent demonstration of the masses impossible; and also on ensuring that the movement should not penetrate into the villages even in an emasculated form. For they realised that here the least spark might evoke an outbreak of revolution, the consequences of which the bourgeoisie fears no less than does the government.

The bourgeoisie's demand for independence was answered by British imperialism with open ridicule. The London "Nation" wrote that India was trying in vain to talk in the language of Ireland; would any Indian bourgeoisie ever really dare to demand the recall of the British troops from the country? Who more than the Indian bourgeoisie itself would suffer from the anarchy that was possible in such an event? In these words there was not only a reminder of the civilising role of British repression in India, but also an unconcealed threat to provoke that anarchy "in the event of anything happening."

Within the space of one short year bourgeois nationalism has without a struggle lost everything that remained to it from the former far from glorious times. There is no necessity to deal with the various steps in this fall. It is sufficient to say that imperialism has succeeded in forcing the bourgeoisie openly to act as the betrayer of the nationalist movement without granting it any compensation, and thus has caused it to eliminate itself even in the capacity of a loyal opposition.

Nor shall we stop to deal with the constitution adopted by the last Calcutta national congress, which represents the next, but, of course, not the last step in the fall of bourgeois nationalism. The "Unity" which constitutes the chief aim and "justification" of this program was achieved in no very complex fashion. The Swarajists achieved it by their acceptance of the program of the Federation of Liberals—an organisation which openly expresses the interests of large-scale and usury capital, which did not even take part in the Congress, and has never even played at opposition to British imperialism. The slogan of independence remained somewhere outside the doors, since through the lips of its president the Federation has declared that it is against independence not only for tactical reasons but on principle, and "does not even understand

how honest advocates of the dominion can allow any slogan of independence."

Nehru's platform goes even farther: he takes on himself the defence of the interests of the feudal landowners and usurers, although in their turn these latter refuse to support his platform. By proclaiming the inviolability of all forms of private ownership, the Nehru constitution provides for the preservation of the entire system of landed proprietorship, and offers the usurers the munificent present of being bought out by the government. In other words the same tax-paying peasant is to pay all his indebtedness, plus all the inordinate interest which has grown on top of it. It is true that the constitution promises the toilers "democratic freedom," . . . in the circumstance of the maintenance of the entire machinery of State repression in the hands of the bourgeois-feudal-imperialist bloc.

None the less, imperialism has deprived bourgeois nationalism of the doubtful satisfaction of toying with democratic rattles. By confronting the Swarajists with the fact of a terrorist attack on the hitherto legally existing mass workers' and peasants' organisations imperialism has obtained their practical participation in and concealment of these crimes. As for the Swarajists' allies on the right, inspired by the British officials these have even shown some initiative, "demanding" of the Government the annihilation of the Communists, the break-up of the workers' movement and the introduction of martial law into the country. The "democratic freedom" of the Indian bourgeoisie has thus even in its cradle succeeded in showing not only its wolfs' talons but its ass's ears.

It is necessary to note that even before the "constitution" betrayed its nature in practice it met with a fitting estimate even among the radical petty bourgeoisie. Not only the workers' and peasants' party stigmatised the constitution as an act of miserable treachery, but even the youth conference dissociated itself from it. Nehru's report showed that the Indian bourgeoisie is no longer capable of expounding, even on paper, a reformist program which could lead the masses up the garden.

Thus the "fathers" and leaders of the national congress have degenerated so far as to be no longer capable of pretending to the function of mask to British imperialism.

Naturally this is not to be taken as meaning that bourgeois nationalism is renouncing once for all its attempts to hide its co-operation with imperialism behind more or less out-worn opposition phrases. It is not altogether beyond the bounds of possibility that in other circumstances these delusive phrases will be decked out in fresh trimmings. But imperialism itself does not reject a certain dose of hypocrisy, and that even in its most open and cynical forms. The important factor which determines the place which bourgeois nationalism occupies in the present struggle, is not its playing at opposition, it is rather that it pins its hopes not to agreement with the bourgeoisie—agreement still presumes more or less equal parties, or at the very least parties pretending to equality—but to bribes from imperialism, which bribes are to be earned only by direct participation in the suppression of the revolution. To have any illusions whatever that the bourgeoisie would again even temporarily incline to the side of revolution would imply failure to see the new element which has now arisen in the distribution of forces in India.

The role which the "fathers" formerly played in the national movement is now, according to the designs of the national bourgeoisie, to be played by the "children." The place of Motilal Nehru is now to be occupied by his son, the place of the Swarajist party is to be taken by the Independence League, headed by the Swarajists, but of a more left wing tendency; the place of the National Congress is to be taken by its opposition. But this play with its rough distribution of roles between "fathers" and "children," between the majority of the National Congress and its minority, between the Swarajists and the Independence League betrayed its nature in the country at its very first move.

It is true that only quite recently comrade Roy expressed in print the opinion that "the national revolutionary party (into which the Independence League must be transformed) must unite the majority of the nation under its banner" (*Forward Annual*, 1928, pp. 57-8.) It is true that in an article devoted to an estimate of the All-Indian conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, comrade Roy reproached it with adopting a too cautious attitude to the Independence League, confusing it with the Swarajist leaders of the

National Congress, not proposing a united front to it, and so on. (Inprecorr, No. 6, p. 94, British edition.) But this time comrade Roy's erroneous point of view found no response in India itself. The workers' and peasants' conference considered the program and practice of the League and decided not to enter it, but to unmask it as a superficial intelligentsia organisation, which in parts had already displayed Fascist tendencies. At the same time the conference provided for a resolute and consequential criticism with a view to splitting off from the League those elements of the petty bourgeois revolutionary wing which can still be of some importance at the present stage of the movement's development.

One has but to make a simple comparison of the National Congresses held this year and last (the Calcutta and the Madras Congresses) to be at once convinced of the extent to which the "children" have already been infected with the ancient impotence of their "fathers." As is well known, at the Calcutta congress the left wing, the majority of which are adherents of the League, had almost half the votes at their disposal, which afforded some justification for certain credulous ones to raise the possibility of a split in the National Congress as the result of a swift growth in its opposition section. But in reality the situation at the National Congress was such that the left-wingers achieved the maintenance of the old positions; whilst Motilal Nehru, the official leader of bourgeois nationalism (who not for nothing was carried to the congress in a silver chariot, and not for nothing was saluted with cannon hired from British imperialism) openly broke with the Madras congress decision for complete independence, and in accordance with the constitution he had drawn up, called on the congress to be satisfied with dominion status within the confines of the British Empire. It is characteristic of the "radicalism" of the left wing that it did not even make a pretence of fidelity to the decisions of the previous year's congress, but only confirmed a compromising formula which had been accepted unanimously only two or three months previously by a conference of all the bourgeois parties, including the extreme right.

But Swarajism is declining so swiftly that

this recently unanimously adopted formula now provides a platform for the left wing opposition. But the matter will not rest here; the process of the political decay of bourgeois nationalism is approaching its consummation, and is moving at such a pace that the resolution of the Calcutta congress is already unacceptable to the "fathers" and is being handed over to the children for their "radical" amusement. Whilst agreeing to dominion status, this resolution none the less makes the proviso that if this demand is not granted by the British Government within one year, the National Congress will recognise all limits as passed and will refuse to be satisfied with anything less than complete independence, obtaining this by struggle, the practice of the system of "non-co-operation," non-payment of taxes, etc. At the congress the opposition voted against this resolution; Nehru senior, aided by Gandhi, summoned specially in order to organise the betrayal, dragged it up again, arguing that it provided the only salvation for the country. But the decorations adorning the congress hall had hardly been taken down when the roles were sharply changed. The defenders of the resolution both in spirit and in letter now proved to be the leaders of the League. Its founders, Motilal Nehru and Gandhi, came forward in the role of revisionists correcting the resolution. In answer to the cynical jeers of the British press of all shades of opinion over the "ultimatum" presented by the National Congress, Gandhi and Motilal Nehru hastened the very day after the adoption of the resolution to explain that the resolution contained no ultimatum and no fixed period whatever. Gandhi declared that he by no means demanded of the British Government that it should even promise to confer dominion status within a year. It was sufficient "if it only displayed the desire to meet India's wishes halfway." Motilal Nehru explained that the phrase "too late" used in the resolution had to be understood in the sense that it was "late for psychological influence," and as on the other hand "psychological influence" was not to be determined by the calendar, the 1930 mentioned in the resolution had only a symbolic significance.

Thus for the authors of the resolution all that is left of the formula which they had

built up is the renunciation of the demand for independence. In all the rest they are essentially against the decision of the Calcutta congress. But on the other hand the leaders of the opposition prove to be ardent advocates of that decision. If to this be added the circumstance that the younger Nehru will not lose any opportunity of protesting his fidelity to the congress, and his readiness to dissolve the League, if only the Swarajists announce themselves in favour of independence, the nature of the new League is clear enough.

The revolutionary crisis in India is so extreme that even at the beginning of the rise of the wave the Indian bourgeoisie is starting where the Chinese bourgeoisie left off.

#### THE STRIKE MOVEMENT

The press has already dealt with the facts which witness to the development of activity among the proletariat during the last eighteen months, to the growth in its class-consciousness and organisation, to its continually growing importance in the national revolutionary movement. We confine ourselves to pointing out the most important of these facts.

First of all is the growth in the strike movement and its militant character. The rise in the strike wave during the past year exceeds the greatest rise in the previous stage of the revolution (1921-22). The strikes are distinguished by great persistence and resolution, self-sacrifice and class solidarity. Considered from the formal aspect, the series of recent strikes might be regarded as purely defensive, since they had very definitely as their aim the repulse of the continually growing pressure of the imperialist and native bourgeoisie. But regarded from the aspect of the nature of the struggle, the activity of the working masses, and the character of the leadership, it is impossible not to note that they are increasingly permeated with the quality of workers' attacks.

The same has to be said of the results of the strikes. If one only judges by the superficial symptoms, by the direct economic results, one would rather have to regard them as defeats, for in the majority of instances the strikers' demands remained ungranted, and the employers' appetites have not been appeased as the result of the strike struggle.

But if we take into account the more important feature, i.e., the influence which the strike struggle has had on the raising of the fighting ability of the proletariat, on its organisation, and on drawing new workers into the movement, we can boldly declare that the whole movement is proceeding on the basis of a rise of the class struggle of the proletariat.

The immediate cause of this successive wave of strikes consists in the introduction of capitalist rationalisation into India, and its introduction in a situation of harsh colonial exploitation. The basic feature of capitalist rationalisation—the maximum exploitation of past labour incorporated in the means and equipment of production, at the cost chiefly of an intensification of living labour and an imperceptible exhaustion of the worker's vital forces—cannot but take on particularly monstrous and tortuous forms in the colonies. The characteristic feature of Indian rationalisation is that it forces a worker to work who is in a state of chronic under-nourishment, clothed in rags, and without living-quarters either for himself or for his family. In other words, it combines the perfected methods of organisation of labour with barbarous methods of obtaining the surplus product. Thus rationalisation carries capitalist production in the colonies to the extreme limits of monstrosity.

In the textile industry the employers are demanding that the workers shall mind three looms instead of two, whilst retaining the old machines and methods of production. In the railway workshops the same form of rationalisation begins by throwing a large number of workers on to the streets, without affording them any hope of finding a new place in production. The railway companies are preparing for the same operation throughout transport generally, only on a much larger scale. In the mining industry the perfection of technique is combined with female labour underground in intolerable conditions. Everywhere rationalisation is being introduced either in face of a standstill in development or even in places of a decline in production. The unemployment evoked by this industrialisation meets halfway the growing wave of pauperisation coming from the villages. Imperialism and its politicians are throwing the ruined

peasantry either into the ranks of the agricultural slaves or into those of the urban coolies. In both cases it delivers millions to the care of its close colleagues, death, famine and disease.

Despite all this, the strikes of the past year have been carried on in the form of a development of the proletariat's tendency to attack. The number of days lost over the latest period exceeds the previous maximum: the number of strikers per enterprise is growing; the wave-like development of the struggle, inevitable under conditions in which each strike reduces the workers to the last degree of exhaustion, none the less retains its general tendency to take a rising curve. Such a curve leads to a general strike as the steadily maturing task of the present period.

A general strike as a unification of the struggle now going on in all the most important spheres of industry, as a resistance to the attempts of the imperialists to shatter the organisations of the proletariat and to deprive them of their ability to struggle, is already in the air in India. Even at the Trades Union Congress the reformist bureaucrats spoke of the necessity of replying with a general strike if the government did not stop shooting down the workers. Naturally in the eyes of the reformists a general strike means a struggle "with folded hands," a form of passive resistance. The masses which have already passed through the strike struggle have quite a different conception of the character and meaning of a general strike. The extensive organisational preparatory work which is being carried on by the textile workers of Bombay, the organisation of left-wing trade unions, the collection of a strike fund, the selection of the best workers for the defence divisions, show that they regard the general strike as one of the higher forms of class struggle.

#### THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The second factor witnessing to the offensive character of the strike movement is the appearance and the development of trade unions during the course of that struggle. According to the statistics of the official Bombay journal, the "Labour Gazette," in the

Bombay presidency alone the number of workers organised in trade unions during the last quarter of 1928 rose from 117,000 to 198,000, *i.e.*, approximately 69 per cent. If we take the unions which have their administrative centres in Bombay, *i.e.*, the largest unions, the growth proves to be still more considerable, being from 84,000 to 160,000, or 89 per cent. The nature of this growth is elucidated still more clearly if one takes into account the fact that it is being accomplished through the appearance, development, and consolidation of the left-wing unions. The "Labour Gazette" considers it necessary to emphasise this fact with unconcealed alarm. "There is observable a striking growth of members of the union, 'Girni Kanigar' (the 'Red Flag' textile union), the membership of which rose from 324 in the third quarter to 54,000 on December 1st. At the moment of writing (January, 1929), according to the latest reports available, its membership has risen to 65,000."

In order to get a sound estimate of these figures it has to be borne in mind that in previous textile strikes the reformist trade union bureaucrats have had a monopoly, uncontrolledly and unhinderedly "directing," in other words, sabotaging and betraying the workers. At the present time the reformist textile workers' union, whose president is Joshi (first violin in the General Council, owing to his being the "representative" of the Bombay textile workers), and whose general secretary is the hardened strike-breaker Bakhhal (who recently travelled around Europe, and even looked in at Moscow), has a membership of 6,740. Thus among the Bombay textile workers the reformists have been completely shattered within a period of a few months, and, what is of even greater importance, they have been shattered in the course of a strike struggle, as the result of pressure from below and the organisation of the vast masses unorganised by the strike committees. Is it necessary to add that both the government and the employers have done everything to support the reformist union, refusing to "recognise" the strike unless it was headed by such "generally recognised" leaders as Joshi, refusing to carry on negotiations except with the participation of these same reformist

leaders, whilst simultaneously the governmental machinery and the employers have done all they could to shatter the left-wing union? But the activity of the masses has made way for itself through all these obstacles.

The fact that the left wing unions have grown out of a strike struggle determines the nature of their organisation and activity. The fundamental weakness of the unions in India as in other colonial countries has consisted in the fact that they were built from the top down, headed by "come-overs," lawyers, bourgeois politicians, who sought to subject to their protection not one but several union organisations. These self-appointed agents of the workers' interests represented the masses in arbitration commissions, in negotiation with the employers, in relations with the government institutions and so on, thus combining a profitable profession with the advantages of a social-political career.

Mr. Purcell realised that this attachment of their persons to the workers constituted the "vulnerable spot" of the trade union bureaucrat Swarajists, and directed his blows against that spot with the object of wresting the unions out of their hands and subordinating them to the British social-imperialists. The delegation of the British General Council, which appeared in India simultaneously with the Simon commission, attempted to conceal their plans for the annexation of the slogan (extraordinarily popular among the Indian toilers) of struggle against the intelligentsia who had attached themselves to the movement while having nothing whatever in common with the working class, by the slogan of struggle against the outsiders. The Bombay textile workers showed the workers how to drive out the outsiders by organising a mass left wing union, not according to the system laid down by Purcell and European reformism, but in struggle against it, in struggle on two fronts: against bourgeois nationalism and against social-imperialism. There is every reason to reckon that at the present time the "Girni Kanigar" not only has deep roots among and commands the sympathy of the masses, but that it also has an organisational basis in the enterprises, that it is operating on the basis of elected factory committees. It is for this reason that neither the govern-

mental terror nor the intrigues of reformism can now succeed in pulling up the roots of the left wing union and regaining their domination over the textile workers.

Of the other left wing unions one has to note the railway workers' union of the Great Indian Railway (the G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union), which has 41,000 members, and the union on another railway (the B.B. and C.I. Railway Employees' Union) which has about 5,000 members. It has also to be borne in mind that the "Labour Gazette's" figures only deal with the registered unions. Thus the growth of the left wing trade union movement and the particularly swift growth of the movement in the Bombay presidency is not open to doubt.

In Bengal the tempo of development of the trade union movement lags behind the objective possibilities. The chief reason for this is that in Bengal the leaders of the left-wing voluntarily share their influence with the reformists to an even greater extent than in Bombay, instead of resolutely driving them out. This "Tolstoyanism" of the leaders is in Bengal accompanied by a passivity on the part of the left-wing unions in carrying on the strike struggle. A clear expression of this passivity is provided by the "neutral" attitude of the Calcutta union of jute workers to the heavy and protracted struggle of the Boria workers, as the result of which the reformist union attached itself to the strike. Bengal also shares the weakness common to all the Indian trade union movement, *i.e.*, the almost complete non-existence of work in the reformist unions. All these organisational defects could be eliminated without special labour if the Communists were to arrange their work on sound lines.

As in Bombay so in Bengal, and indeed throughout India, it is indubitable that the objective conditions are already present, given the existence of a strong demand for the development of a class trade union movement, for the organisation and consolidation of the already existing left-wing unions, for their reorganisation on the production principle, and for the realisation of workers' democracy. The conditions are ripe in India for the creation in the immediate future of unions which would be genuinely militant organs of the proletariat.

It would be unsound to explain the comparative swift growth of the left-wing trade union movement in India by the circumstances that the proletariat of the colonies is immune from the reformist infection. That is not so. Of course, the most malignant, stubborn and dangerous forms of reformism are to be found in the imperialist countries, where owing to the super-profits obtained through the imperialist plunder the bourgeoisie is placed in a privileged position, and thus corrupts the upper ranks of the workers and directly bribes the leaders of those upper ranks. In the colonies and semi-colonies the method of exploiting the working class is such that the imperialist bourgeoisie does not wish, indeed, has no need of guaranteeing a minimum tolerable standard of existence to any strata of the native workers whatever, whilst the native bourgeoisie for its part is unable to make any such guarantee even if it wished. Thus reformism is deprived of its chief source of support. None the less, the existence of reformism in the colonies and semi-colonies is a fact which it would be dangerous to ignore. Reformism exerts its influence on the working class to a varying degree at different stages of the national emancipation movement, and given different dispositions and inter-relationships of the struggling forces. But in all cases it reflects the influence and the specific importance of bourgeois nationalism in the country.

"Everywhere throughout the world the proletariat, which in any capitalist society is bound with the petty bourgeoisie by thousands of communicating threads, has lived through to the period of formation of labour parties, the period of more or less protracted and persistent intellectual political subjection to the bourgeoisie. This phenomenon, common to all capitalist countries, has taken on various forms in various countries, in dependence on their historical and economic peculiarities." (Lenin, "Marxism and Liquidatorism," Vol. XII, Part 2, p. 481.)

Even in the colonies and semi-colonies in which capitalist production has already been implanted, the historic and economic conditions are not the same as those in the foremost capitalist countries, nor are they even the same for all the colonies and semi-colonies. The communicating threads connecting the

working class with the petty bourgeoisie, with the home-worker and artisan who are gradually being ruined, and with the landless peasantry, are stronger in the colonies, and at the incipient stages of development this fact cannot but manifest itself in the great backwardness and inertia of the workers. Only in the course of the struggle will the proletariat break these threads, emancipating themselves and at the same time emancipating all the toilers from serfdom to the bourgeoisie.

But whilst in the local organisations the reformist trade union bureaucrats are already being eliminated by the pressure of the workers, the central machinery of the unions remains in practice entirely in their hands. The several representatives of the workers' and peasants' parties who are in the General Council play the role of hostages in it; they humbly submit to the decisions of the majority, and by the fact of their peaceable cohabitation damp down the struggle which is being carried on against the trade union bureaucrats in the rank and file. This is the only true explanation of the fact that the growth of the proletariat's class consciousness and of the class unions was not reflected in the least in the decisions of the Trades Union Congress held last December. Not only so, but the decisions of this Congress are a step backward by comparison with those of the previous year—which is one more summary proof of the fact that the evolution of the trade union bureaucrats repeats the evolution of the bourgeoisie in the National Congress down to the last details.

The only radical gesture made by the Trades Union Congress consisted in its decision to join the League Against Imperialism. But one has yet to see whether the General Council will in practice carry out their most elementary obligations as a member of the League, or whether they will sabotage the workers' struggle against the break-up of the workers' and peasants' parties. The arrest of the League Against Imperialism's representative at the Congress, comrade Johnson, an arrest of a frankly provocative character, put the right-wingers of the Congress in a position in which they did not dare to vote against joining the League. This in turn got the younger Nehru out of a difficult position, for as a mem-

ber of the League he could not vote against membership, whilst at the same time he did not want to spoil his relationships with the right-wingers, by whose votes he had been elected president of the General Council.

One could regard the decision of the Congress to demand of British imperialism not dominion status, and not even independence, but the proclamation of a socialist constitution for India, as a left-wing gesture; however, the Congress entrusted the advocacy of this decision at the Conference of all Indian parties to its president, Dutt, who in his opening words had defended the slogan of dominion status with all his powers.

All the decisions of the Congress on the question of establishing international connections were directed towards a *rapprochement* with international reformism, for whom the poisoning of the colonial movement is now, as we know, the chief task. Unfortunately the reformist bandits met with no effective opposition whatever from the left-wing. Thus in its fears of a "fiasco" the left-wing withdrew its proposal for membership of the Profintern (R.I.L.U.), contenting itself with the compensation which the right-wingers granted in the form of refraining from putting forward the proposal to join Amsterdam. But the very next day the right-wingers united with the "centre" to pass by an insignificant majority a decision to send a delegation to the Geneva International Labour Bureau, and also to participate in the Pan-Asiatic Conference organised by Japanese imperialism with the aid of its social-democrats and the Kuomintang executioners.

The left-wing adopted the same tactics of passivity and with no less harmful results on questions of internal policy, allowing the Congress to avoid even raising the problem of the coming heavy economic struggles, of preparation for them and consideration of their further development. The greeting sent by the Bombay textile workers is a repetition of the official greetings from outside well-wishers which the National Congress customarily sends. We have already noted above that in the hands of the bureaucrats of the Congress the general strike acquired the character of playing at passive resistance.

How is this weak influence of the left-wing opposition in the work of the Congress to be explained? By the fact, of course, that a considerable section of the new left-wing unions had no representation at the Congress, owing to packing and to "constitutional points." The bureaucratic machine of the Indian reformists has adopted the science of "preparing" the Congress in all its perfection from its British colleagues. Despite all the packing, the left-wing was able to collect almost half the votes, as the voting in the election for the chairman of the General Council showed. The railwayman Kulkarni, the candidate of the left-wingers, obtained 29 votes against the 36 obtained by Nehru. The essence of the matter lies in the passivity of the left-wing, in their neutral tactics. The left-wing did not fight to get a majority before the Congress, and did not exploit their positions at the Congress itself. They made no attempt to unmask the treachery of the reformists, a treachery which had a worthy crown in the Congress decision. They did not exploit the activity of the masses in order to put up a resolute struggle against the reformists for possession of the General Council machinery. They preferred not struggle but an amicable sharing of the places in the Executive Committee, whilst allowing the reformists to do the opposition down in the most ridiculous fashion.

But for their part the left wing did not raise the issue of preparation for the general strike with all the seriousness which it warranted. And all these serious, impermissible errors were committed despite the fact that among the left wing opposition at the congress were comrades who enjoy the confidence of the advance guard of the workers. What is the chief reason for this passivity? It is that the workers' and peasants' parties cannot be organisers of the left wing of the trade unions, either by their social composition, or by their principles of organisation, or by the character of their activity. Only the Communist Party can resolve this task.

The same weakness in the left wing was revealed at the railway workers' conference, with the essential proviso that the resolution which it had put forward concerning the strike issue was of a much more business-like and practi-

cal nature. The resolution demanded that the railway companies should be given a definite time-limit (15th February) within which to reply to the conditions long since put forward by the workers and so far ignored by the employers. The federation was to assemble on Feb. 15th to consider the employers' reply, and if it proved to be unsatisfactory it was to fix a date for a general railway strike. In preparation for the strike the resolution proposed the beginning of an agitation immediately for 100 per cent. membership of railwaymen in the unions, the organisation of strike committees in the chief centres, the assurance of their centralised direction and the immediate opening of a strike fund. This proposal, put forward by comrade Bradley, was rejected by only an insignificant majority; to such an extent has the question of a general strike developed. And yet the left wing agreed to this vote, and submitted to the strike-breaking decision, which afforded the railway robbers the opportunity of attacking the proletariat at the moment most advantageous to themselves and of depriving the workers of the possibility of preparing for a counter-attack. The left wing did not transfer the question of preparing a general strike of railway workers to the masses for consideration.

But whilst the left wing opposition retain their blind fidelity to the "constitution of the General Council," the reformists take a different attitude: immediately after the congress they opened a campaign for the exclusion of all left elements from the trade unions. This campaign was headed by Kirk, Shiva Rao and others, who are entirely without importance in the trade union movement, but behind whom is the entire machinery of imperialist oppression. But now it is quite evident that these reformists' counter-revolutionary declarations in the national press were in preparation for the terrorist attack on the workers' and peasants' parties. A preparation which was of no consequence, for these gentlemen's articles breathe the police spirit to an even greater extent than the writings of a Citrine or Thomas.

The break-up of the legal mass organisations, the criminal law against the unions which imperialism is forcing through the miserable legislative assembly to the sound of

the crack of its whips—all witness to the fact that very soon now the left wing in the unions will have to withstand the united pressure of the imperialists, the bourgeois nationalists and the reformists. Very little time is left in which to make preparations for resistance. It is necessary to retrieve what has been lost. That can be achieved only provided the tactic of superficial negotiations and combinations is at once revoked, and provided the left wing leadership turns all its energy, all its authority to preparing and organising the mass activities of the proletariat.

#### POLITICAL DEMONSTRATIONS

Finally, the third indication of the increase in the role of the proletariat in the national revolutionary movement is the increasingly definite nature of the strikes and demonstrations of the workers. Owing to the ruthless manner in which imperialism dealt with the strikers, even previously the workers came directly into conflict with the machinery of State repression. But previously the sectional, local conflicts with the police and at times with the military were not united by any political slogans. At the present moment the political character of the strikes is developing further owing to the fact that it is also directed against the native bourgeoisie, and is thus compelling bourgeois nationalism to abandon the position of hypocritical neutrality and to identify itself openly with the employers.

At the end of 1927 there were two such small, yet characteristic strikes: in Calcutta, where the street-cleaners struck against the Swarajist municipality, and in Bombay, where the municipal workers declared a strike and secured the re-employment of the workers who had been discharged for their participation in the demonstration against the Simon Commission. During the year following the political character of the strikes has widely extended. In February a general strike of Bombay workers was carried out under the slogan of winning the streets for the workers and against the government of pogromists. Only quite recently strikes have been proclaimed in various towns which have as their demand the release of the arrested leaders of the workers' and peasants' party.

A number of workers' demonstrations in the

main centres, sometimes breaking out elementally, sometimes organised in connection with definite events, have been carried out under the slogan of Soviets. This is quite a new phenomenon for India. Until the beginning of the present rise the workers dissolved into general demonstrations organised by the bourgeois nationalist parties. But now, even when they participate in a general campaign, as the one against the Simon Commission, for instance, the proletariat organises its separate columns, arranges its own march routes (as happened in Calcutta in January) and marches under its own slogans, directed not only against the imperialist but against the native bourgeoisie. Even in the very general, propagandist form in which it exists in India at the moment, the slogan of Soviets already connotes not only a struggle against imperialism, not merely a renunciation of the reactionary ideas of Nehru senior, but also the unmasking of Nehru junior, who promises all the blessings of socialism without a revolutionary struggle.

In order to be convinced of the extent to which the proletariat has already outgrown the noisy and wordy petty bourgeois intelligentsia, one has but to compare its class demonstrations with the civic demonstrations which are now occurring in a number of towns. Even the finest of these demonstrations—that of the students in Allahabad against the arrest of Joshi, the secretary of the workers' and peasants' party of the United Provinces—also suffered from its civic lack of discrimination. Whilst demonstrating in defence of the workers' and peasants' party, the radical students, the "flower of the revolutionary intelligentsia" simultaneously very willingly applauded the younger Nehru. The spectacle of the demonstration was the solemn participation of the wives of the older and younger Nehru in the burning of European cloth, which still more emphasised the patriarchally sentimental character of the whole proceedings. There cannot be any question of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia making any claims over the proletariat to the leadership of the national revolutionary struggle. That section which does not submit to the hegemony of the proletariat will be immediately thrown by the course of events into the camp of the counter-revolution.

#### THE PEASANTS' MOVEMENT

The experience of the Chinese revolution summarily showed what decisive importance, especially for the colonies, attaches to the alliance of the workers' revolution with the peasants' insurrection. The consciousness of this necessity is now clear at least to the advance guard of the Indian proletariat. The proletariat of the colonies feels its obligations as organiser and leader of the peasantry more keenly than that of the capitalist countries. But the importance of the workers' and peasants' bloc and its danger to imperialism has since the Chinese experience become clearer than ever before. British imperialism's plan in India is determined by this fact: and that plan is to hasten the shattering of the workers' movement before the extensive peasant reserves succeed in coming into action.

The peasant movement in India has not yet broken loose; the scattered outbreaks of peasant demonstrations are ruthlessly and swiftly suppressed by British imperialism. But the fact that the peasant movement has lagged behind in activity does not permit one to draw the conclusion that it will fall under the influence of bourgeois nationalism. The fact that the peasant movement cannot develop in present conditions otherwise than in the form of revolutionary activities, the arbitrary seizure of the land, the mass refusal to pay rent, taxes, debts, etc., excludes the possibility of the bourgeois intelligentsia having any at all serious influence in the villages. Of course all this applies only provided that the proletariat and its party does not let slip the moment for developing the agrarian revolution in the country. The objective conditions favourable to proletarian influence in the villages are already present. The slowness in the development of the peasant movement at the present time is to be explained not only by the bestial terror, but especially by the fact that the peasantry have become convinced of the ineffectiveness of the old methods of struggle of 1919-22, and realise the necessity of passing to more complex and higher methods of revolutionary activity. And in the conditions of colonial oppression such a transference demands that sparks from the revolutionary conflagration which has started up in the towns should fly to the villages.

The measures which British imperialism is taking against the development of the peasantry consist not in concessions to the peasantry but in an intensification of the terrorist regime. Of course, in the event of the shattering of the workers' movement (and imperialism is basing all its hopes on this) a further attack on the peasantry will become inevitable. There will be a mass expropriation of the land of its weaker sections in the interests of the development of capitalist agriculture; and tens of millions will suffer a hungry death. But it does not follow that because in the event of the suppression of the working class the situation of the peasantry would become yet more intolerable, therefore the slackened tempo of the peasant movement at the present time is to be explained by any weakening of the crisis in the Indian countryside.

The toilers' retaliation that the organisation of a workers' and peasants' bloc is an indispensable condition of victory has found expression in the growing influence of the workers' and peasants' party. This growth in influence is indicative of the trend of the peasantry towards the organisation of its forces. None the less, the workers' and peasants' party, with its dual composition based on the "equality of classes," is not the form of bloc which will guarantee the leading role of the proletariat and consequently a popular settlement of the agrarian revolution. And again, despite the fact that certain of them only recently called themselves peasant-workers' parties, and still partially retain this character, the workers' and peasants' parties are not in any condition to raise the peasantry. This inability arises not only from the circumstance that their agrarian program is abridged, deprived of definiteness, confused, that it does not take into consideration the process of class differentiation which is going on in the villages. All these defects would unquestionably have a fatal influence on the further stages of development of the peasant movement, by increasing the danger of the influence of the kulak elements, and of the bourgeoisie through them. But for the present preparatory stage of the swing, the negative side of the workers' and peasants' parties still makes its presence felt not so much in these defects, but, much more important, in the circumstance that the workers' and peasants' parties have even

proved incapable of overcoming the Swarajist philanthropic approach to the work in the villages, incapable of turning to the organisation of the revolutionary activities of the peasantry.

In view of the amount of combustible material in the Indian villages—reserves which cannot but be increased—a circumstance of no great importance in itself can cause an outbreak of the mass peasant movement. In order to guide that outbreak it is necessary to organise the peasants, and, of course, the poor peasants first and foremost, into revolutionary unions and committees. In view of the variety of agrarian relationships in the Indian countryside and the consequent heterogeneity of the sectional demands of the peasantry in various areas, local peasants' unions, growing up in the course of the struggle and directing that struggle, cannot have a single platform; they cannot be homogeneous in their organisation. At the given stage of the struggle, and in view of the still surviving passivity of the peasantry, the work of prime importance is not even the propaganda among the peasant masses of the entire program of our measures after the seizure of power, but rather their organisation under the influence of the proletariat for a genuinely revolutionary struggle against British imperialism, feudalism and bourgeois reaction. In the conditions of the present revolutionary crisis, in the course of that struggle the peasantry will swiftly pass from sectional demands to a developed program of agrarian revolution, to the nationalisation of all the land.

#### THE POSITION OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

British imperialism is carrying on a frenzied struggle against the emancipation of India. The higher the revolutionary wave rises, the more desperately will imperialism hang on to its richest booty. Britain has never yet paused before any methods of suppressing India's least attempts to emancipate herself. But never before has the independence of India threatened the capitalist system of Great Britain, its very existence, with such a blow as it does at the present time. The mobilisation of all the forces which British imperialism has at its disposal in the home country, in the colonies, in the dominions—naval, air and

land forces on the one hand, and political, economic financial on the other, against the Indian revolution—is a foregone conclusion. The struggle of the British Government against the Indian revolution will truly be a struggle for life and death.

At the same time, it would be the height of frivolity to under-estimate the enormous dimensions of those resources for destruction which British imperialism has at its disposal against the Indian revolution. Britain's economic and technical backwardness has not yet undermined her naval and military might. The fact that the United States will overtake and is already overtaking, Britain's war forces must not hide the other just as undoubted fact that there is a simultaneously occurring, further frenzied growth of the world war machine of British imperialism, especially in that section of it the direct purpose of which is the "defence," *i.e.*, the enslavement, of India, (the Singapore base, the incessant increase of the fleet in the Indian Ocean, the vigorous development of the air fleet in India, the vast plans for organising "peaceful" aviation in India, in circumstances which ensure British imperialism the possibility of transforming it into war aviation at one stroke, the incessant perfecting of the Indian army, the mechanisation of its transport, its re-equipment, etc.) All this system of war measures is not only directed towards holding India under external bars, "defending" it from the encroachment of any competing imperialism, but it can at any moment be directed to the maintenance of "order" inside this monstrous prison which is India. And to this purpose also is directed the entire British system of diplomatic intrigue, provocations, petty wars, assassinations and open organised attacks which envelop India in an ever-denser cloud. (The counter-revolutionary war in Afghanistan with a view to capturing the country through the mediation of one or other of the crowned mercenaries, the extending seizure of positions in Persia, the activity in Arabia, etc.) Thus isolating India on all sides, surrounding it with a dead zone of British domination, imperialism is facilitating the possibility of flinging itself on the Indian revolution with all the strength of its war machinery.

The second base of British domination is its positions inside the country, both State administrative and economic positions. India is a colony: not a semi-colony, not simply a dependent country, but a colony in the most perfect form, *i.e.*, a country where the rule of the conqueror directly and immediately dominates the people, concentrating into its hands all the machinery of State oppression from top to bottom, controlling, subordinating, and suppressing all the functions of social life, reserving to itself an unrestricted monopoly in this sphere. This factor of the unrestricted monopoly of the colonial autocracy is rarely allowed to slip from view, for the very reason that such a despotic power on the part of the conqueror is a savage anachronism when applied to a country with a population of three hundred millions, with capitalist production, with large-scale concentrated enterprises, with a developed network of railways, with enormous natural riches, with a grown-up class-conscious proletariat, with a certain achievement of bourgeois culture, etc. This savage anachronism, which is an inexhaustible source of the vital motive forces of the Indian revolution, witnesses none the less to the still maintained might, depth and ramification of the machinery of imperialist oppression and to the variety of the levers with the aid of which it suppresses, subjects and deforms the life of the country. In this regard one has but to compare present-day India even with China in order to see all the extent of the slavery of India. Only the direct blows of the organised Chinese revolution compelled the imperialists competing in China to unite their war operations in Shanghai, to put the fleet under a general command, to disembark a joint expeditionary force, to surround themselves with barbed wire, and so on, so as to establish a war base safeguarded against all surprise and for the purpose of attack against the Chinese revolution. But even operating on this base, imperialism could move its military forces directly only along the main waterways, and, with definite limitations, over the railways. The direct war aid which it could afford the Chinese counter-revolution off the track of these roads, in the heart of the country, in the ocean of villages, could not immediately be considerable. Herein was one of the chief

reasons why the agrarian revolution in China could accumulate its forces for a definite period, could develop and grow, even although at the same time the forces of the imperialist counter-revolution were being formed in the central town points, with the fleet and the Shanghai arsenal of imperialism as their operating base. In India, British imperialism already possesses a number of military bases in various central, strategically important points, whilst these were created in Shanghai only at the moment of the height of the revolutionary battles. Not having to share its rule with any other imperialism, and consequently not having to overcome the inevitable competition which would otherwise result, the British war staff is systematically working on its plan for the suppression of the revolution in India, modifying it in accordance with the growth and the redistribution of revolutionary forces, establishing the chief bases for its struggle both in the native principalities and in British India, stretching its threads across the whole country, penetrating into its utmost depths, even into the villages. A peasant rising in India cannot develop away from contact with the imperialist forces; it will come to a hand-to-hand struggle with them from its first step.

The machinery of open repression is not exhausted with the pincers by the aid of which imperialism is strangling India. Together with political annexation, colonial oppression also presumes economic annexation, which develops out of the first, fusing with it and strengthening it. From the aspect of economic annexation the positions of British imperialism in India are exceptionally strong, despite the circumstance that India's economy is more developed than that of any other colony, and to a certain extent owing to that very development. It is superfluous to remind the reader that British financial capital has not only subjected to itself the entire banking system in India, and not only all its external trade, but through the compradore bourgeoisie, through the wholesale merchants it finds its way to the tiniest roots of economic life, enveloping, subjecting and exploiting the countryside in manifold ways. Being the largest landowner in the country, and directly extorting rent from approximately one-fourth of the peasant population, through its agents,

the zemindars of various shades, imperialism holds in its hand the economic threads of all the remaining agricultural economy. Its positions in the industrial sphere are still stronger (transport, mining industry, jute and in part metal-working). But even those spheres of industry in which native capital predominates cannot but find themselves in subjection to finance capital, which dominates the whole country. The strength of Britain's colonial monopoly is, inter alia, revealed by the fact that all the attempts of Indian capital to operate with the aid of the United States finance capital come up against very serious obstacles. Naturally one cannot deny that American capital is penetrating into India, partly openly, partly through the Japanese banks; but the extent of this penetration is quite insignificant by comparison with the "trend" which both the two factors reveal: both by the Indian bourgeoisie, which counts on weakening the British monopoly by this means, and by American imperialism, for whom the extension of their economic positions in India would be a weapon in the struggle against Britain.

The military and economic might of Britain determines the circle of her social allies in the country. These are first and foremost the despots of the native principalities, the ruling princes, whose fates are directly and immediately bound up with the fate of the British imperialists. Then there are the landowners and all the elements interested in one way or another in the maintenance of the pre-capitalist forms of exploitation in the countryside. Nor must one underestimate the role which the compradore bourgeoisie plays openly or secretly in India as a buttress for imperialism. The fact that out of seven provincial legislative councils only one (in the central provinces) stood by the position of boycotting the Simon Commission, is very significant. As for the other legislative councils, part of them pronounced in favour of co-operation from the very beginning, whilst the others which had pronounced in favour of a boycott did not stand by this quite harmless position, so strong in the legislative councils is that group of feudalists and section of the bourgeoisie on whose unreserved support imperialism can count in all its policy.

On the question of the industrial bourgeoisie

we have already noted the growing speed of its decline. In the struggle with the workers' and peasants' movement—and that movement continues to determine the content and the character of the national revolution in India—imperialism has every justification for regarding the bourgeoisie as its instrument, and will either extricate it or leave it in such a situation, confronted with such accomplished facts as to force its line of conduct to correspond with the government's plans.

#### THE FORCES OF THE REVOLUTION AND THE METHODS OF ORGANISING THEM

The struggle against British imperialism therefore demands the greatest exertion of effort of all the toilers and oppressed in India, demands not a single victorious battle, but a series of class conflicts which will gradually extend the positions of the revolution, unloose its forces, increase their organisation, and lead the movement to increasingly developed methods of struggle. Only an alliance between the workers' revolution and the peasant struggle can develop the revolutionary energy which is necessary in order to overthrow British imperialism. The Indian revolution will conquer only under the leadership of the proletariat.

The industrial proletariat of India is not numerically large, but none the less it exceeds the number of the proletariat of China. The concentration of industry is leading to the concentration of the proletariat in the most important points. Hence arises the possibility of organising the striking forces of the revolution in the decisive town centres. The youth, the insufficient political experience, and the poor organisation of the Indian workers are compensated for in practice by their revolutionary self-sacrifice, their activity, endurance, ability to carry on through protracted conflicts and in conditions of the utmost deprivation. How swiftly the class growth of the proletariat in India has proceeded during the past 12 to 15 months has been shown above. The proletariat has passed from sectional, separate strikes under the formal "leadership" of the reformist strike-breakers, to a combination of mass strikes with political demonstrations, to a discussion of the question of preparing for a general strike in the more

important centres of industry. From a state in which they were a more or less dependent appendage to the National Congress the proletariat is passing to the slogan of soviets. The experience of the strike struggle and of the political demonstrations is bringing the proletarian advance-guard, the Bombay workers, to a realisation of the necessity of extending the struggle and to the first steps in this sphere—steps still uncertain, it is true, but already extraordinarily noteworthy, such as the overcoming of the dominant theory and practice in India of "non-resistance" and the formation of divisions for workers' defence. It is also necessary to take into account the circumstance that in all cases the transfer to higher forms of struggle is evoked by the initiative of the masses, which invariably move before the leaders. It is further necessary to take into account the circumstance that the left wing leadership is in turn developing in conditions of almost complete mechanical isolation from the international revolutionary experience, which hitherto has been able to react only after considerable delay on the swift tempo of development of the movement in India. In such conditions the road laid down by the workers' advance-guard of recent days particularly emphasises the growth in the forces of the revolution.

The industrial proletariat is being joined by the workers of the large plantations, whose importance in the task of safeguarding the leadership of the working class over the peasantry may grow swiftly. Together with them are coming the dozens of millions of agricultural workers and coolies who are held in a state of semi-slavery and chronic unemployment, and so represent an enormous reserve of elemental hatred for imperialism and its native allies.

The great majority of the 175 millions of the peasantry cannot follow the proletariat, cannot form the numerically chief forces in the revolutionary bloc of the workers, peasants and city poor against the bloc of imperialists, landowners and treacherous bourgeoisie. Despite the fact that in certain areas, which are of particular strategic importance to imperialism either from the aspect of the coming war or that of the struggle against revolution, separate sections of the affluent peasantry are receiving or may in the future receive bribes

from the government, one cannot from this draw the deduction that British imperialism is in a condition to take any way whatever leading to reforms in the countryside without intensifying the unbearably heavy situation of the main peasant masses and without increasing the revolutionary crisis in the country. Now that the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Agriculture have been published, there is less doubt than ever that British imperialism has and can have no other plans for resolving the crisis in the countryside and its associated crisis of the internal market than those based on the literal annihilation of millions of peasantry. Imperialism may postpone its "reforms," realising that they will evoke an outbreak of the revolutionary forces which have accumulated in the villages. But so long as imperialism remains imperialism it can find no other ways of reform in India but this. Hence there is every justification for considering that the peasant attacks will not keep waiting long.

Finally, at the present stage of the struggle we have to take into account as possible allies of the proletariat the lower strata of the petty bourgeoisie and their intelligentsia, which, however, have hitherto been exploited by the Swarajists, and also by the Independence League, for the organisation of nationalist demonstrations, Hartals, etc., whenever bourgeois nationalism seeks to show that the "people" are behind it.

At its present stage the struggle against imperialism makes possible and necessary the joint revolutionary activity of the proletariat with all the toilers and oppressed, with the entire nation, with the exception of the feudal bourgeois upper groups. But it goes without saying that in order to safeguard the leading role of the proletariat during the accomplishment of this national task, it is necessary first and foremost that a theoretically, politically and organisationally independent Communist Party should be in existence. During all its manoeuvres both inside the worker-peasant bloc and outside it, in its unmasking of the bourgeois nationalism, in its criticism of the unstable petty bourgeois allies, and in still greater measure in its leadership of the peasant struggle, the C.P. must remain the organisation of the special class of the proletariat, the most consistent and most

revolutionary class in the country. Under no conditions whatever, from no conceptions of a united front should it bind its own hands in the work of propagating its views, in the work of winning the finest elements of the working class to the side of Communism, in the work of mobilising the industrial agricultural workers under the banner of the class struggle, in the work of destroying the highly dangerous petty bourgeois illusions as to the possibility of overthrowing imperialism without opposing to it the forces of the revolution. Only by concentrating against the compromising bourgeoisie, by systematically and unswervingly unmasking the true character of its miserable playing at opposition, by pointing out the bonds which exist not only between the bourgeoisie, but also between considerable sections of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia and the feudal system of landownership, only by criticising the vacillation and instability of its allies, will the C.P. emancipate the toiling masses from the influence of bourgeois nationalism, will it teach them to depend only on their own organised forces, will it teach them to raise the practical question of the revolution in all its exceptional difficulty and harsh necessity.

Do the objective conditions for the creation of a mass C.P. already exist in India? Everything we have said above on the swift growth of class consciousness among the vast masses of the proletariat is an answer to that question. Can one deny the existence of an incipient process of forming Communist elements in the workers' movement, the existence of Communist groups and a growth not only of their ideological but of their organisational influence? In my view, we cannot. But at the same time there is no doubt that the condition of the organised Communist movement in India is extremely backward, and that it is a question of life and death to retrieve the lost ground. In the conditions now established time will not wait. The Indian Communists are risking the likelihood of their falling into a torrent of great events in a disintegrated and impotent state, they are risking the likelihood of losing the game for the proletariat at the present stage of the struggle.

One of the chief reasons for this backwardness in the organisation of the C.P. in India

consists in the fact that the young Indian proletariat has to carry on a struggle against British imperialism, the most experienced and the most astute of all imperialisms in the work of suppressing and disintegrating revolutionary forces; and furthermore, it has to carry on that struggle almost alone. In the struggle against the Indian Communist movement the British Government is applying the entire system of rationalised methods known to the European and American secret police. Together with penal servitude for those who are merely suspected of Communism, together with death sentences, the British Government has sought to poison the revolutionary movement by other methods, by simulating the possibility of the Communist Party of India having a legal existence. This "Communist Party of India," which existed legally on paper, and in which together with honest revolutionary elements were also petty bourgeoisie confusionists, and openly suspect elements, by its utter impotence, passivity, and complete severance from the mass struggle could only give the workers the impression that the organisation of a Communist Party in India is quite impossible. The fact that the legal Communist Party neither lives nor dies has led to the theory that its destiny is to "occupy an empty place," whilst the struggle of the workers and peasants has to go on independently of the C.P., outside it and under the leadership of other party organisations. And in these circumstances the worker-peasant parties which were at first connected with the left wing of the National Congress afterwards began to acquire the sympathy of the workers and peasants seeking organisational forms for their struggle.

The increase in the activity of the masses, and particularly of the working class, cannot but be reflected in the development of the Worker-Peasant parties also. On comparing the decisions of the conferences of the Worker-Peasant Parties held in December, 1927 and 1928, the character and also the rate of their development is clear beyond all doubt. The practical activity of these parties has changed still more considerably. Hence arises the present attack being made by British imperialism along the whole line against the worker-peasant parties. But in exact accordance with

the growth of the movement and the development of the positive activity of the worker-peasant parties, its negative sides, as a party of dual elements, began to be revealed in practice, and that not only in the sense of the dangers which the mixing of the working class and the peasantry in one party may bring in the future, but also in the sense of the harm which it is already bringing now, by hiding the Communist Party, by taking its place, by conducing to the spread of the most dangerous illusion that the absence of a Communist Party can be compensated for by the activity of the worker-peasant parties. Thus India also, albeit in a different form from other colonial countries, has already revealed the tendency to "re-dye the pseudo-Communist revolutionary emancipation movements in backward countries in the hue of Communism," a tendency against which Lenin warned us that it was necessary to wage a resolute struggle ten years ago at the Second Congress of the Comintern.

Without prejudging the question of what forms of mass workers' and mass peasants' organisations are most expedient in the present period in India, one may nevertheless remark that the left wing trade union movement, and the factory committees selected at delegate meetings of the workers, constitute a base for such a mass workers' organisation. The existence of a Communist Party and its fractions in all organisations, and in the unions first and foremost, its struggle for the exploitation of all the legal possibilities, will ensure the leading role of the Communists. It is inexpedient artificially to unite the peasant committees and unions, which are the elemental organisational forms of the peasant movement and which develop in the process of the peasantry's active demonstrations on the basis of their sectional demands, into an all-Indian organisation, for reasons which we have already stated. The carriers of the Communist influence into the local peasant organisations are the industrial workers, who in India remain connected with the countryside to a considerable extent, and many of whom return to the villages during a strike, and also the plantation workers. The workers-peasants' bloc might take the organisational form of workers-peasants' committees, elected at local conferences from repre-

sentatives of the workers' organisations and the peasants' unions. Here also the centre of attention should be concentrated on ensuring that these committees are an expression of a militant alliance, that their programme should contain the clearly formulated demands of the current struggle, that they should enrol their leading ranks from workers and peasants thrown up by the masses in the course of that struggle. The most dangerous phenomenon in India is the endeavour of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia, with its philanthropic attitude to the peasantry, with its interest in land rent, to exploit the enforced stagnation of the peasantry in order to claim to represent it in all organisations. In the organisation of the worker-peasant committees a maximum of suspicion of these intelligentsia upper groups, and an endeavour to establish direct connections with the peasant masses is obligatory. In all these organisations, whatever their forms, the proletariat is to act as an independent force. Its party is not to be mixed or blended with others. It will address itself to the masses in its own name and through the medium of its Communist Party.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIES OF THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

The Indian revolution can be victorious only under the leadership of the proletariat and as part of the world proletarian revolution. A blow inflicted on British imperialism in India is a blow to all the capitalist world. The proletariat of India has allies not only inside the country. Its tasks are of an international character; its allies on the world scale are the international proletariat and the colonial revolutions of all the oppressed peoples. The nearest and immediate allies of the Indian revolution in their joint struggle against British imperialism are the British proletariat and the Chinese revolution.

After long years of study of the Irish question, and on the basis of the experience of the national movement in Ireland, Marx wrote: "A decisive blow to the ruling classes of Britain can be inflicted not in England, but only in Ireland, and it would be of decisive importance to the workers' movement of the whole world." (Marx: letter to Danielson, 19th February, 1881.) During the decades

which have passed since Marx wrote these lines the situation throughout the world and in Britain first and foremost has changed profoundly. The Irish insurrection took place at a moment when the European insurrection of the proletariat had not matured. On the other hand, at the moment of the insurrection, British imperialism had at its disposal adequate resources not only to suppress that rising by armed force, but also to resolve the revolutionary crisis in Ireland and in the countryside first and foremost by reformist methods.

At the present moment the positions of the British bourgeoisie are incomparably more vulnerable in Britain itself, than they were before and during the first years of the war. The influence of those perverted by super profit of the bribed lieutenants of the bourgeoisie, and the bribed lieutenants of the bourgeoisie, and is becoming an enormous revolutionary force. On the other hand the blow which the Indian revolution will administer to British imperialism is certainly not weaker than the blow which it avoided in Ireland: the distance separating Bombay and Calcutta from London is only enormous geographically. A revolutionary conflagration in India is a conflagration in the chief stronghold of British reaction. The developing revolutionary blows of the British proletariat and the Indian revolution, combined, albeit not entirely coinciding in point of time, will settle accounts with British imperialism.

In these combined blows an extraordinarily important role will be played by the reciprocal action of the Chinese and Indian revolutions. We have above noted one of the manifestations of this reciprocal action: the class growth of the Indian proletariat on the lessons of the Chinese revolution. There is no doubt whatever that in its turn the Indian revolution will evoke new strength in and a new outbreak of the Chinese movement. The worker and peasant movement of China was suppressed not so much by the forces of the Chinese bourgeoisie and gentry, as by the forces of world imperialism, among which the British and Japanese played the decisive role. Any weakening of the positions of British imperialism in India will bring alleviation to the Chinese revolution also. Any success achieved by the proletariat in Bombay or Calcutta is

providing direct support to the proletariat of Shanghai and Wuhan.

The difficulties confronting the Indian revolution are extraordinarily great. A systematic, deliberate struggle, waged without illusions, but also without pessimism, against these difficulties along all the long road is possible only provided the revolutionary advance guard of the proletariat, its Communist Party, keeps before it the main tasks confronting the colonial revolution, with a view to overthrowing imperialism and annihilating its political and economic annexations. As a section of the Comintern, the C.P. of India must elucidate, must agitate, and in the course of the struggle must gradually lead the masses to the realisation of their tasks, and then to the struggle for their accomplishment in the developed form in which they are formulated in the program of the Communist International.

The proletariat is already acting as the most active force in the national revolution. It is already head and shoulders above not only its opponents, but also its petty bourgeois allies. Acting as an independent class force, building up its own Communist Party, the

proletariat, and only the proletariat, is in a condition to mobilise the peasant and petty bourgeois masses for the struggle to drive out imperialism and to pull up the roots of its economic power.

The already developing wave of proletarian economic strikes, the proletariat's political demonstrations, and the co-ordination of strikes with demonstrations have revealed all the strength of the revolutionary energy in the proletariat; but also all the unpreparedness of the organisation and the leadership. Even if this wave were temporarily to ebb, it would profoundly disturb the people's consciousness, would give the peasantry a mass revolutionary education. In the conditions of India to-day it would inevitably be followed by a further wave of still greater dimensions and might. The course of the revolutionary development places the general strike on the agenda of the revolutionary struggle. Among the tasks of the Communists during the present period are the preparation and organisation of the general strike, and also the propaganda of the necessity for the political strikes to develop still further. Without this, India cannot be free.

## Social-Fascism in Germany

IN Germany, where the discussion and practical application of the decisions of the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern has given rise to great disputes within the Communist Party, to a great deal of renegacy and to serious vacillations, those very decisions are being most clearly justified by the actual course of events. This is no contradiction in terms, but a logical state of affairs, for it is because the German problems dealt with by the Congress are so acute that the Communist attitude towards them has been accompanied by such lively encounters.

The programme of the Comintern contains the following (Section 2, paragraph 3) :

“The epoch of imperialism, the sharpening of the class struggle and the growth of the elements of civil war—particularly after the imperialist war—led to the bankruptcy of parliamentarism. Hence, the adoption of ‘new’ methods and forms of administration (for example, the system of inner cabinets, the formation of oligarchical groups acting behind the scenes, the deterioration and falsification of the function of ‘popular representations,’ the restriction and annulment of ‘democratic liberties,’ etc.).”

At least one paper every day contains articles on the crisis in, the decline or bankruptcy of parliamentarism, and discussion on “new” methods and forms of government. Herman Müller’s “Cabinet of Personalities,” indicated the change from discussion to practical usage, and, up to the present, the Müller government is still not the parliamentary coalition government desired. When it was about to reach that state, the Centre thwarted the design by charging the social-democrats with full responsibility for the reactionary deeds of that government and with the desire to conclude a concordat with Rome, etc.

The curtains behind the Müller Government are so thin, that it does not require much effort to see the oligarchic groups working behind them, particularly when Hilferding is submitting his estimates. The limitations on, and abolition of “democratic liberties” were not nearly so fashionable in the bourgeois-bloc

coalition government as at present; to the prohibition of all street demonstrations there has now been added a censorship of books and the drama—a censorship which does not exist in the Constitution.

The fourth section, paragraph 23 of the Sixth World Congress thesis on “The International Situation and the Tasks of the C.I.” runs as follows:

“It must be borne in mind, however, that these new coalition governments in which social-democrats are directly participating, cannot and will not be a mere repetition of previous combinations. This particularly applies to foreign politics generally, and to war politics in particular. Social-democratic leadership will play an immeasurably more treacherous role in the present period than it did in all previous stages of development.”

If one compares this paragraph with the activity of German social-democrats in the present governmental coalition, one is forced to assume that Müller, Severing, Grzesinski and Co. have been won over by the famous red rouble to demonstrate the correctness of the Sixth World Congress theses.

The armaments and military policy has never been so strongly emphasised in Germany since the fall of the monarchy as during the existence of this government. The operation of the arbitration system and the “social” measures of this government affects the working class in a worse fashion than that of the bourgeois bloc government. Speaking of the budget of the social-democratic Finance Minister, Hilferding, even the social-democratic paper “Zwickau Volksblatt” had to admit that it is worse than that of the purely bourgeois coalition. It writes:

“The budget which Hilferding presented does not differ in its distribution of the burden of taxation, from that previously passed by the bourgeois bloc government. The burden on the masses is just as great . . . the percentage falling on them even greater. The budget which the present government is presenting to

the Reichstag and the nation is an unsocial budget."

Besides social policy and taxation, the political reaction, the limitation on "democratic liberties" can also be laid at the door of the social-democratic members of the government.

And now to place as it were, the crown on all that has been done by Severing, Zorgiebel and Grzesinski, the Prussian Minister for the Interior has published an official threat to dissolve the Communist Party and the Red Front Fighters' League. It is true that these two bodies are not mentioned by name: he merely says that "I shall combat radical organisations with all the means at my disposal," and "I shall not hesitate about such unions and associations" which "have the form of political parties." But, of course, the social-democratic Minister—as indeed has often been admitted—will take no steps against the "Steel Helmets," working more and more in conjunction with the "Reichsbanner" and of whose honorary presidents Hindenburg is an intimate political colleague.

These facts indicate two parallel phenomena: discussion among and threats from the right wing of the bourgeoisie, that a dictatorship is necessary and in sight; and the gradual, actual realisation of this dictatorship by the social-democratic leaders who at the same time, in opposition to that right wing, play the part of defenders of democracy and parliamentarianism.

The real origin of these facts lies in the growing contradictions within partially stabilised capitalism generally, and German capitalism in particular. The internal contradictions of stabilisation threaten to lead to a serious crisis more easily in Germany than elsewhere, because of its burden of reparations and its great indebtedness abroad. In the last six months, for example, production has fallen by 6 per cent.; it is sinking slowly but uninterruptedly. But, due to rationalisation, unemployment is increasing more rapidly than production is decreasing. The figure of three million unemployed or on short time has already been passed. The actual standard of living of the worker is going down and the taxation of the worker is rising locally, nationally, and in the Federal States. But still the rate of profit demanded by finance capital is not nearly reached, and bankruptcy follows

bankruptcy. Finance capital is openly preaching the necessity for further wage reductions and has even threatened the possibility of inflation in order to increase exports. This is accompanied by Hilferding's budget, which reduces the taxes of the possessing classes and increases the fiscal burden of the workers. Politically, in spite of its "dismaying," the German bourgeois republic is being drawn more and more into imperialist policy, and, therefore, it must arm to prepare for war." The class struggle is intensifying, and the revolutionary mass movement grouped around the Party grows greater and greater.

In such a situation, the political question amounts simply to this: what form of government will best assure the actual control of the State by finance capital, and defeat and suppress the resistance of the workers to finance capital's home and foreign policy? This is actually a dispute as to the best way of introducing the dictatorship of finance capital, and the "crisis of parliamentarianism," for the bourgeoisie, consists in this, that the old system of coalition governments and parties does not provide sufficient guarantees that the interests of finance capital will be safeguarded and its plans fulfilled. Stresemann exposed the character of the political crisis in his speech on February 26 to the Central Committee of the German Populist Party, with a candour which is surprising for him, when he said:

"If things continue as they are, we are confronted by the trusts on one hand and by millions of employees and workers on the other. Social hostility is growing . . . this policy must not be continued if we wish to avoid falling into the abyss . . . We must try to reform parliamentary government. . . . If the parties themselves were to make such reform impossible, then 'res venit ad triarios'—and responsible persons would find the courage to rule, i.e., to take over the leadership."

A week later the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" appeared with an article on "The Hour of the President" in which the following occurred:

"It seems to us that the time has come for the constitutional head to make a decision. It might have been imagined that after the 13th March, the President would set up a Cabinet of 'personalities' under a strong and tried

leader. . . . The floods have risen high, and mighty waves threaten to break over the embankment, annihilating life and hope. In this hour of need, the German people turns to that honourable and beloved form raised above the petty ambitions of parties, above all the hollow clatter of the daily struggle. The hour of the President is drawing nigh."

And, in the "Kölnische Zeitung" at the same time: "If we are not utterly mistaken, we are living in a new period similar to before 1848. Party crises are two a penny, and people chatter of new parties and dictatorship. Many of these rumours spread abroad without being in the least understood. But so much is certain, the rumours are not of peace, but of alarm. No longer, as in those old days, about the absolutism and incapacity of the princes, but about the barrenness of our parliamentary life, the irresponsibility of parties, the lack of discipline in our national economy. . . . The Government has too little power, the people has too little power; Cabinet and referendum have become the prisoners of an incapable parliament and party wrangles. What we need is a simplification of democracy as in America or England; greater independence, responsibility and length of life for the governments, stronger guarantees against the laxity of deputies, rationalisation of parliament. Will the parties, and chiefly the Liberal parties, really set about this job sincerely? Do they want to make Parliament more disciplined and more effective? The answer to these questions will decide their fate. Youth is hammering on the party doors. They have their own ideas, and are not inclined to deny them in favour of the present system."

It would, however, be incorrect to conclude from this, that Germany is directly faced with the establishment of a Fascist government à la Mussolini. Even fascist methods are subject to the changes of time and circumstances, i.e., to the development of capitalism, and are adapted to the economic and political situation of the country in question. The great change that has taken place is the growth of fascism within social-democracy, and in German social democracy particularly the German capitalists have found a strong support with increasingly definite fascist tendencies. And Germany shows, more clearly

than elsewhere, how correct our programme was in its description of the relations between bourgeoisie, social-democracy and fascism, and of the openly fascist role of the social-democrats. Facts seem to show that the German capitalists are getting ready for a bourgeois-social-democratic coalition with fascism. The behaviour of the S.D. leaders shows that they have received such a proposal from the bourgeoisie and are willing to accept it. Facts themselves show this. We have only to remember that it was Hermann Müller who, on Stresemann's recommendation—that particular confidant of the great capitalists—received Hindenburg's permission to form his "government of brains" without the constitutional parliamentary majority. The social-democratic ministers expressed the wish long before the "Allgemeine Zeitung" and "Kölnische Zeitung," to rise "above the petty ambitions of party," to drop the "irresponsibility of parties," and did so by utterly ignoring the decisions of their party and doing what they liked, or rather what the capitalists ordered them to do. At a meeting of the S.D.P. committee, Müller declared that no decision of the parliamentary fraction or the Party Congress could force him to vote against the armoured cruisers. Severing, at a parliamentary committee meeting, stated still more clearly:

"I am not dependent upon my Party . . . a minister should not be the slave of a party, and I shall subject myself to no party slavishly."

When the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" protests against the party executive putting up with such a "breach of discipline," it tries to hide from the workers the fact that the leaders of the S.D.P. are entirely in agreement with the attitude of their ministers, for they themselves adopt the same policy, and try at the same time to lessen the S.D.P.'s responsibility to the workers for that policy. This is nothing but one aspect of the S.D.P.'s preparation to take part in a dictatorship employing fascist methods. The social-democratic ministers are already offering themselves quite openly for the job. On 3rd March, Severing, at an Essen meeting celebrating the foundation of the Reichsbanner, said:

"If it should really come to pass that this country should be governed by Article 48

of the Weimar Constitution, I am not afraid of the responsibility, I place myself at the disposal of the republic."

The Weimar Constitution, as has been practically demonstrated by social-democratic-capitalist coalitions and President Ebert in 1923, constitutionally allows for the possibility of a bourgeois dictatorship, and the political ambitions of the social-democrats are now concentrated on proving to finance capital that it can very well set up its dictatorship without attacking the Weimar Constitution and the "foundations of democracy." German social-democracy not only established this Hindenburg republic—a counterpart of that famous republic with a Grand Duke at its head—it also drew up the most ideal constitution for the "freest democracy of the world," which allows for a dictatorship. When the Weimar Constitution was being formulated, that paragraph was included in order to enable the president to take extraordinary measures to save capitalist society, at that time crumbling at the base and cracking in every limb. At that time social-democracy and the petty bourgeois democratic parties were the assistants and allies of the capitalists. Since then great changes have taken place. Capitalism and bourgeois society have been temporarily stabilised, and finance capital now rules. The democratic parties are openly managed by the capitalists, while social-democracy and the reformist trade unions have become an integral part of capitalism and the State machine. Social-democracy is no longer merely a product of capitalist development and the helper-in-need of bourgeois society, it is a part creator of the capitalist society which arose from the ruins of the world war, of its organisation and its State; social-democracy is an essential constituent of capitalist society, and whenever that society is threatened by crisis and by the revolutionary struggles of the working class, the existence of social-democracy itself is threatened. It is not surprising therefore, that as it helped to rebuild and then to stabilise that society, social-democracy will help to defend it against any danger which threatens. The present situation in Germany is, simply, this; that on one hand, neither continued stabilisation nor defence of capitalist society is possible without the assistance of the social-democrats, and on the other,

social-democracy is bound for better or worse to capitalist society. That is why the S.D.P. is helping to prepare for the political dictatorship of finance capital, both within and without the Government. For apart from the State apparatus of power, the civil services, the Reichswehr and its subsidiary organisations, finance capital has also at its disposal various powerful mass organisations, the Stahlhelm with Hindenburg at the head, the Reichsbanner, supported by the social-democratic leadership and by the Prussian and national Governments. Thus, in every respect, a synthesis of social democracy and fascism is provided for the regime, in a political form, of the dictatorship of finance capital.

The social-democratic press contends that Grzesinski's "warning" is not directed solely against the Communists, using the excuse that it also refers to the national socialist handful organised outside the Stahlhelm. But they give the game away by their present virulent anti-Communist campaign. The Berlin "Vorwaerts" writes of the "rowdy mob" and old Schöpffin, who before the war grew grey in honour, and then white-haired in treachery, calls the Communists in the "Karlsruhe Volksfreund," the "lumpenproletariat," and "the rabble." The growth of the revolutionary mass movement recently, led by the C.P., has frightened not only the bourgeoisie, but the social-democrats, too. As bloodhound of the capitalist class, one of the chief jobs of the social-democrats is to fight the Communists, and the tone of their press towards the Communists is much more vulgar than that of the bourgeois press. Everything shows that the social-democrats have received the order from the capitalists—an order which, of course, coincides with their own wishes—to give the Communists a really decisive blow this time, before their movement attains the dangerous dimensions reached after the revolution and in 1923. The press is preparing "public opinion" for the campaign.

Both bourgeoisie and social-democracy are vitally interested in the defeat of the Communist movement. They are anxious to impoverish the masses still further, and definitely to direct their foreign policy along the road of imperialism and therefore of war. Connected with this is the tendency to join the imperial-

ist front against the Soviet Union. In such a situation the leftward swing of the masses constitutes a great danger. The influence of the Party on the masses is growing, the new line has been well received by them and has already had considerable success; wage struggles are developing; reformist treachery is becoming more difficult, the masses of unorganised workers are taking up the fight and the Communists threaten the social-democratic position in the trade unions and particularly in the factories. The greatest success of the Communists is in the large factories, so vital to German capitalism. The social-democratic and trade union bureaucracy has taken up the struggle in this sphere, as is shown by mass exclusions of revolutionaries from the trade unions and other organisations. The social-democratic ministers' use of the State machine is another aspect of this struggle, of its extension and intensification. The S.D. leaders are using newer and sharper methods in their fight against the Communists; their final weapon will be a combination of bourgeoisie and social fascism, wherein the parties behind the mass organisation, while supplying the "personalities" will themselves unobtrusively withdraw. Social-democratic slander and virulence is, however, more than mere slander and virulence; it has political significance and hides a political plan. The S.D. leaders wish to paint the finance capital dictatorship—in reality the fight of capital and the labour aristocracy against the proletariat—as the struggle of the "real," "honest," "orderly," or organised working class against the "lumpen proletariat," i.e., against the "non-class conscious" unorganised workers. To this extent social-democratic slander is ideological preparation for the dictatorship.

In face of such facts, which are obvious to all, the attempt to deny that Grzesinski's threat is directed solely against the Communists is as deceitful as it is ridiculous. The "left" social democrats are, of course, the most zealous in the matter. The "Leipziger Volkszeitung" shows that the attitude of these heroes towards the threatening fascist dictatorship will be as disgraceful as it has been towards the prohibition of demonstrations and the heroism of the social-democratic police generally. But even the "left" German social democrats seem anxious to prove the correct-

ness of the Sixth World Congress of the C.I. in its thesis on the international situation. The same section quoted above states:

"It is necessary also to bear in mind—particularly in view of the coalition policy practised by social-democracy and the evolution of its official upper stratum—the possibility of a growth in the so-called "left wing" of social-democracy, which deceives the workers by methods more subtle and, therefore, more dangerous to the cause of the proletarian revolution."

The "lefts" in the German S.D.P. are today more active than ever before. They "criticise" all the minute ailments of their party, and under mass pressure at least partially admit some very bitter truths. Take, for example, the following from the "Klassenkampf," of March 1st:

"The contention that the presence of social-democrats in the government is a sure protection against fascism is refuted by an investigation into the political development of recent years, which shows that fascist tendencies have more chance of growing when socialists take part in the government."

And the "Plauener Volkszeitung" writes:

"However grotesque it may sound, it is today a historical fact that coalition is the way to fascism."

All such criticism and chatter, however, has but one purpose, to pacify the masses with the illusion that the opposition in the S.D.P. will prevent any really serious degeneration of reformism, and that, therefore, they—the masses—have no need to rebel against the party. The job of the "lefts" generally is to say, in revolutionary words, the same as the right, and certainly to do the same. They write on the danger of preparing for fascism by coalition, but they keep silent on the readiness of the social-democratic leaders to take part in a dictatorship using fascist methods. In the event of a dictatorship supported, or even politically directed, by the social-democrats, their job will be to restrain the masses, at any cost, from fighting seriously against that regime. We have only to remember their shameful attitude in October, 1923. And, if the worst comes, and the masses can no longer be held within the S.D.P. these

most dangerous traitors to the working class will again come forward as a "left" body, in order to prevent the masses, disillusioned in and bitter against the S.D.P. from going over to the camp of revolution of the Communist Party. That is, they will try to save social democracy at a time when the workers' cause demands its complete extinction. But whatever they may do, these "left" social-democrats will in the grave times coming be a most serious danger to the revolutionary workers' movement of Germany.

The sudden accentuation of the German situation coincides with an intensification of capitalism's fight against the Communist Parties in France (where it is expressly taken as one step in the preparation for war) and in Switzerland, where social-democrats and fascists work as colleagues in Government bodies. In Austria, however, Austro-Marxism, working alongside the bourgeoisie, the State machine and the fascists against the Communists, is making great progress. Viewed thus internationally, the present social-fascist danger in Germany and the struggle of the German section of the C.I. against that danger, is of great importance, chiefly as a sign of the accentuation of internal contradictions, of the crisis and the international strain in capitalism, as an indication of war and of great revolutionary struggles.

But the German Communist Party of to-day is not the young, inexperienced and weak Party of 1919-20, nor is it as it was in 1923, burdened with a tremendous load of opportunism. It has grown, it has shaken off its weak elements "left" or "right," it has freed itself from opportunism, and has accumulated revolutionary experience. To-day the C.P.G. is a Bolshevik mass party with a much stronger revolutionary mass basis—particularly in the factories—than it had in the years from 1920 to 1924. The revolutionary decision and promptitude of the C.C.'s answer to Grzesinski's threat, the answer of the Communist leadership to those creatures of the bourgeoisie, shows how hard is the job that the social-democratic aspirants to dictatorship have undertaken. The successes of the Party in the last few weeks prove that their promise to fight is not an empty promise. The revolutionary workers of Germany understand the new tactics formulated at the Sixth World Congress of the C.I., they are following the C.P.G. in its thorough and consistent application of those tactics; they are answering the call of the Party, and that means that every sharpening of the struggle, every new fight, will bring the Party nearer to its leadership of the masses, and nearer to victory.

# The Revolt of the Liquidators in the Red Trade Unions of Czecho-Slovakia

Gustav Henrikovsky

**T**HE REVOLT of the liquidators in the Red trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia has been defeated by the Czecho-Slovakian revolutionary proletariat, which, under the leadership of the Communist Party, has with the utmost firmness suppressed these agents of capitalism within its own ranks. To-day the liquidators already represent only a part of the chemical workers' section, a dwindling minority of the textile section and a small fraction of the pottery workers, who in an overwhelming majority have placed themselves in opposition to the liquidation group of Hais, Sikora and Nadvornik. An absolute majority of the members of the following sections follows the present leadership of the International Labour Federation: Metal Workers, Miners, Glass Workers, State employees, Railwaymen, Leather Workers, the overwhelming majority of the Building Workers, 27,000 out of the 31,000 members of the Textile Workers, and also now a large part of the Chemical Workers, who until recently supported Hais. It was with the help of the police and the whole apparatus of the capitalist State that the usurpers of the liquidation group seized the machinery of the International Labour Federation.

The crisis in the I.L.F. is part of the same crisis which the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia is undergoing. The Red Day made the crisis evident; the elections to the local government bodies showed—notwithstanding the fact that the Party maintained its position—that the former Party line was almost entirely wrong and opportunist. This wrong opportunist line was revealed at its worst in relation to the economic struggles and to trade union politics.

The preparations for the last textile workers' strike and the wage struggles which were carried on in different branches of industry after the Sixth World Congress showed how

strong a hold the old social-democratic traditions and influences had upon the Party as well as upon the officials of the Red trade unions. The new Party leadership had to break down an incredibly broad rampart of social-democratic prejudices. Before all, the Party had to liquidate the former opportunist tactics in relation to wages policy. The Red trade unions systematically took part in negotiations until within a few months of the last Fifth Congress of the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia, even after the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the Sixth World Congress. In many sections of the I.L.F. the long-continued co-operation with reformist leaders in the so-called "Equal Representation Commissions" has meant in practice during recent years an abandonment of preparations for any struggle whatsoever. This has meant that in the agricultural workers section in Bohemia and Moravia no big strike movement has taken place since 1922, but the workers have become accustomed to learn yearly through the agricultural Equal Representation Commission what has been decided, without their being consulted, about their wages.

The chemical section in the most important industries—in the sugar, alcohol, cement and paper industries, etc.—has participated almost exclusively for years past in this kind of Equal Representation Commission, without any big struggle whatsoever. For example, two years ago in the paper industry the chemical section submitted to the behests of the majority of the Equal Representation Commission, which decided as a solution for the rapidly increasing hardships of the industry—to petition the government with reference to the raising of the export quota for the paper industry. The Red Wood-workers' Union has worked for years in these Equal Representation Commissions where it has

allowed itself to be out-voted by the reformist majority. The same holds good for the textile industry, and also for other sections.

At the same time, the Party had to rid itself of the idea that a struggle could not be initiated without the reformist unions, and in spite of their opposition. The majority of the leaders of the sections of the I.L.F. were of the opinion that the task of the Red unions consisted merely in exposing the fact that the reformist traitors were against the strike. In the joint Councils of Action they allowed themselves to be out-voted by the reformist agents. Many leaders of the Red unions considered also that it was only possible to initiate a strike when substantial strike funds were at the disposal of the particular section concerned before the strike took place.

It would be wrong to believe that the opportunist elements opposed the decisions of the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. during the popularisation of those decisions. On the contrary, throughout the whole C.P. of Czechoslovakia and the Red unions, not a single comrade (from Hais to the ultra-left Neurath) raised any protest against the adoption of the new line. The resistance of all the opportunist elements only began when we undertook the practical operation of the new line in the different sections and industries, and when we demanded the liquidation of the former opportunist tactics of negotiation.

This resistance showed itself in its worst form in the textile section during the preparatory work for the textile strike in North Bohemia.

The wage-movement of the textile workers involved 150,000 workers in the districts of Czechoslovakia in which the agreements had expired at the end of the previous year. The Party and the Red Unions from the beginning endeavoured to include within the scope of the struggle all the districts where agreements were concerned, and thus to make clear to the textile workers the necessity of conducting the existing wage-struggle on the broadest possible basis. Thus the Party line was directed towards the uniting of the wage-struggles in the Reichenberg, East Bohemia, Brünn, Ascher and North Bohemia districts, with the simultaneous mobilisation of the workers in all these districts for the struggle.

The first practical steps in this direction immediately brought the Party up against the strong opposition of some of the leaders of the Textile Section, with Sikora at their head. During the first phase, when the liquidation group had not the courage openly to oppose the line of the Party and the R.I.L.U., they declared that it was the textile workers and not they themselves who were against the new line, and that the textile workers could not understand how the struggle could be initiated in spite of the reformists, on the basis of democratically elected strike committees and independently of the amount in the strike funds. They also opposed with the utmost determination bringing into the forefront the question of rationalisation and the special demands of the women and young workers, not as mere propaganda, but as real demands, jointly with the demand for wage increases. Thus they were against terminating the Tenter Agreement which covered questions of rationalisation, at the same time as the wage agreement. The further we carried our preparatory steps, the stronger became the resistance and sabotage of the Right elements. At the same time as the workers had at a mass meeting declared in favour of the termination of the agreements and for the carrying on of the struggle, even against the will of the reformists, part of our Communist trade union department was agitating against the termination of the Tenter Agreement and against the struggle. The opportunist elements found active support in this part of our industrial department, which was recruited from among the most highly skilled workers. We have on many occasions witnessed the sad spectacle of members of our industrial department opposing Party speakers at meetings of the workers.

Further, on November 17th, at a time when the Party had already accomplished much preparatory work, Sikora, the secretary of the textile section in Sillein, in Slovakia, concluded an agreement with the employers on the basis of a sectional increase behind the backs of the section leadership at the Party centre and of the Sillein workers involved. This occurred at a time when the Party was carrying on a strenuous campaign against the reformist leaders on this question, and was exposing to the workers that the acceptance of

a sectional increase was a shameful betrayal. That was a direct stab in the back for the textile workers, which was terribly compromising for the Communist Party. Sikora's betrayal was naturally used to the utmost by the reformists in their fight against the preparatory work being carried on by the Communist Party and the Red trade unions.

In this situation, the Party leadership considered it impossible to initiate a fight in every district. Immediate preparations for a strike were therefore concentrated chiefly in the North Bohemian district. The meetings which had been held during January in the North and East Bohemia districts revealed an ever-increasing demand on the part of the workers for the struggle. In Brünn, two enterprises spontaneously declared a strike, and the same thing occurred in Königinhof and in Königgrätz. All these strikes were in connection with the question of rationalisation. On the eve of the North Bohemian strike, 700 workers in a concern in Úpice came out. Most of these strikes were suppressed by the secretary of the textile section, and in Úpice also they succeeded in throttling the strike. Three conferences of representatives of the concerns were called in North Bohemia and these declared in favour of the strike and the immediate taking up of the struggle.

On the first day of the North Bohemian struggle, the liquidation elements among the textile leaders publicly resigned their positions in the section and openly placed themselves in opposition to the strike. For example, the secretary of the textile section carried a resolution against making the strike a political struggle, in the Industrial Council in Běla during his stay there, being unsuccessful in getting through a resolution against the strike as a whole.

At the outbreak of the textile strike the increasing demand on the part of the workers in North Bohemia were confronted with a united front of the capitalist State, the employers, the reformist trade union bureaucracy and the reformist agents in our own ranks—namely, the liquidators.

The North Bohemian strike involved the following districts: Grottan, 1,600 workers out of 2,800 employed in 11 concerns, of which eight concerns were completely, and three

partly on strike; one concern took no part; Kratzan, 1,400 workers out of 3,100 struck in six concerns; Friedland, 1,900 workers in five concerns struck out of a total of 2,900 in six concerns, and the 900 workers in the remaining concern were preparing for the strike; Heinzdorf, 370 workers struck out of 2,300, and on the day of the outbreak the 1,000 odd workers employed in two other concerns decided to begin a strike; Reichenberg, the following took part in the strike: Kraus Hoffmann's, with 450 workers; Töltscher and Löwy's, with 160; the Mantner Textile Works at Grünwald, with 670 workers; Zimmermann's, of Habendorf, with 230; Preisder and Brandel's, with 210; Wagner's, with 160; only partial strikes occurred in the largest enterprises—C. Neumann's and I. Ginzkey's at Maffersdorf. Altogether, the number of workers involved in the strike on the day when the struggle broke out was 8,000 in the North Bohemian district, without Warnsdorf and Rumburg, which did not participate in the strike.

In this strike, for the first time in Czecho-Slovakia, a democratically elected strike leadership was created in all the enterprises and districts on strike, instead of the former strike committees which were composed of representatives of the bureaucracy of all the trade union organisations. The strike was carried on under the leadership of the Communist Party, in spite of the angry agitation of the whole bourgeois social-democratic press, in spite of the open organisation of strike-breakers by the reformist trade unions, and in spite of their efforts by means of corruption to induce the strikers to return to work. This strike showed the Czecho-Slovakian working class for the first time in actual practice, wherein lies the difference between reformist policy and revolutionary policy in the trade unions; it has convinced them that the Party really can and will fight.

But this strike has clearly exposed how deeply the social-democratic infection has penetrated among a section of our leading ranks, in the Party as well as in the unions. It is an unfortunate fact that the strike was very badly conducted in some of the concerns which had Communist works committees. In a number of concerns which had unitedly en-

tered upon the strike, not only the social-democratic but also some of the Communist works committee members openly opposed the strike and carried on strike-breaking activities. But the great mass of the Party membership was in favour of the strike, and the unorganised and unskilled workers threw themselves whole-heartedly into the struggle under its leadership.

The strike has also shown that the Communist Party, in spite of the great strides made towards the fundamental revision of its former wrong and opportunist policy, nevertheless still commits serious mistakes in the application of the new line. The Party did not, at the outset of the struggle, in its development of the wage movement, lay sufficient stress on the question of rationalisation. As a consequence, those demands which were directed against rationalisation were not sufficiently stressed, at the outset of the movement, as compared with the demands for a general wage increase and for the equalisation of wage rates (as between adult male workers and women and young workers). They were only used for agitational purposes, and therefore the real mobilisation for struggle was insufficient precisely among those classes of workers which were most severely exploited by rationalisation. No doubt the fact which we have already mentioned, that the leading ranks of the Party and the trade unions were based on the skilled classes of the textile proletariat and had insufficient contact with the main, unskilled mass of workers, had something to do with this. The second mistake occurred in the first phase of the preparations, when the Party, although right from the beginning of the struggle it had avoided the incorrect slogan of "Make the Leaders Fight" and had engaged in propaganda for a strong line against the social-democrats, nevertheless supported the agitation of the overwhelming majority of the officials who followed this slogan. In the North Bohemian district the leading trade union officials issued the slogan, "Compel the leaders to terminate the agreements." It is true that this was quickly abandoned, but this wrong conception of the reformist leaders enabled them more easily to stage their manoeuvres and to unite with the employers over the sectional increase. This wrong conception led also to the further fact that in the Reichenberg dis-

trict the Tenter Agreement was terminated only very late. Again, it was a mistake that the demonstrative character of the strike was insufficiently expressed. The putting forward of the demand for a general strike in the North Bohemian textile industry did not correspond to the stage of development of the struggle reached at that time. The insufficient experience of the Party in the carrying on of economic struggles on the basis of the new line also contributed to the fact that an error was committed in the ending of the struggle. This error becomes more obvious when we consider that, after the calling off of the fight, nearly 2,000 workers remained on strike for a further period of two or three weeks.

But in spite of these mistakes the North Bohemian strike provided the first proof of the actual putting into practice of the new revolutionary line of the Party and the trade unions in the field of economic struggle. It was therefore a step forward in the development of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia.

Even after the beginning of the actual fight the liquidation elements in the textile section, as well as in the chemical section, did their utmost to sabotage the struggle and to slander it after it had closed. In common with the social-democratic and bourgeois press they openly characterised it as a "putsch," which had "irresponsibly driven thousands of workers into striking." In order to justify their sabotage and treachery they explained that no strike situation existed, and that the North Bohemian struggle was a severe defeat, a second "Red Day." The Congress of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party, which took place immediately after the North Bohemian struggle, gave a definite answer to this. The Congress declared that while the "Red Day" exposed the error of the Party line and the isolation of the Party from the masses, and exposed the serious crisis in the C.P., the North Bohemian strike had proved the correctness of the Party line, and had demonstrated the growing connection between the Party and the masses. The North Bohemian struggle is an incentive to further fights, and, above all, to the wider development of the textile workers' struggle. The new Party leadership has shown in this

struggle its determination to carry out the line of the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and the Sixth World Congress in the face of all obstacles, even if some errors may be made in the other practical carrying out of this line. The history of the strike itself unanswerably rebuts the cry of the liquidators that no strike situation existed in North Bohemia.

The attitude which the North Bohemian textile workers adopted towards the campaign of slander of the social-democrats and liquidators is shown by the second general secretary of the textile section, comrade Franz Mai: "The strike did not produce any special organisational damage; with the exception of five concerns, it was possible everywhere to rebuild our apparatus after the end of the strike, in spite of the fact that officials remained outside. We had to rid the organisation of strike-breaking elements. Out of a number of cases, we can instance Jute's at Weigdorf, where 900 out of 1,000 workers came out, of whom only 350 were organised, and where after the strike about 300 of the unorganised workers were won for the organisation. At the Eisenschimmel Company there were 34 unorganised workers at the outbreak of the strike, of whom 26 have joined up. At Simon's in Heindorf 41 have joined out of 60; in the Reichenberg district members were lost in only one concern, while during the struggle we had to accept new entrants, even in concerns which were not participating in the strike, as well as members transferring from the reformist organisation. Similarly there is no fall in membership to announce in the Krazau and Grottau districts; the comrades there have also reported gains; but I cannot yet give the figures for this district. We have also to report an increase of membership, due to the strike, in the Niederland district (Warnsdorf and Rumburg), where no strike took place."

The campaign of slander was carried on by the liquidators with the object, above all, of ending the textile workers' struggle, of capitulating to the employers, and of subscribing to the treacherous social-democratic agreement over the sectional increase. And on the very day after the North Bohemian struggle these agents of the reformists completed their work.

While 2,000 North Bohemian workers were actually engaged in the struggle, Sikora stabbed them in the back for the second time and signed the agreement along with the reformists.

When the Party took up the fight with the utmost energy against this new betrayal, when the broadest masses of the textile workers had revolted against it, and when the liquidators were being driven more and more into a corner, they came out in open rebellion. Sikora issued a leaflet against the majority of the textile section, against the leadership of the I.L.F. and against the Communist Party, in which he declared that the North Bohemian strike was a misfortune because it had interrupted the growing approach towards unity between the Red textile organisation and the reformist trade union.

The Brünn Conference of Textile Workers, which took place three days after the ending of the strike, showed Sikora that his position was growing weaker and weaker, and that he was becoming more and more isolated in the textile section.

For this reason the liquidation elements in the textile section at once linked up with those of the chemical section in order to carry through the splitting of the I.L.F. as quickly as possible. Not only Sikora but also the followers of Hais, Nadvornik and Halik saw that the next Congress of the I.L.F., as well as the separate Sectional Congresses of the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia, were producing an overwhelming majority, and that they would represent only a dwindling minority at these Congresses. The result of the Party Congress showed them also that any speculations based on the breaking up of the Communist Party, which was proclaimed by the whole bourgeois press, were hopeless. The Fifth Congress of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia demonstrated the united adoption by the Party of the Comintern line. It was a manifestation of the unity and determination with which the Party, after heavy setbacks, was pursuing the whole process of regeneration.

Ever since October the liquidators in the I.L.F. had been making preparations for a split. But in November they had accepted a temporary compromise which had postponed

the split for a short time. None the less they prepared with all their strength for a definite break-away from the C.P. and from the Red unions. As the liquidationist secretary of the textile workers, Pocta, had alone declared, at a meeting of workers in Königgratz, the disruptionist activity of the liquidators was financed by the Trotskyist Kowanda-Ecer liquidation group in Brünn, which had been excluded from the Party three years ago. Immediately after the close of the textile workers' struggle in North Bohemia, Sikora sent a circular to the textile organisations in which he asked the membership to subscribe to the Brünn organ of the liquidators and to enter into "brotherly" relations with this group. To-day it is a well-known fact that on 10th of March, the very day on which Hais's followers carried out their revolt in the I.L.F., a conference took place in Prague of the excluded renegades, who reserved eleven seats for Hais's followers on the new executive.

It is known from the daily papers how the revolt was realised. But one thing must be stressed here. Although the loyal elements on the executive of the I.L.F. had an absolute majority, neither the leadership as a whole nor yet the Party leaders took advantage of all measures to deprive the renegade Hais of the constitutional rights which he still possessed after his removal from the leadership of the I.L.F. This was an error which made it possible for the renegade to capture the machinery of the I.L.F.

It is owing to great educational work of the Party which was carried on prior to Congress during the first practical application of the new Party line, that the revolutionary working class completely avoided the danger caused by the liquidators. An activity never before existent in the Party has been brought to light among the membership. A powerful wave of resistance overwhelmed the revolt of the renegades. Throughout the whole republic there took place great mass meetings which demonstrated their complete solidarity with the whole leadership and with the new C.C. of the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia. As reported in the "Rude Pravo" of the 20th of the month, the great majority of organisations in the chemical section, formerly the stronghold of the liquidators, placed them-

selves in opposition to the renegades. It can be seen that, during the course of the Congress campaign Hais's followers became isolated even in this section.

On the very first day of their offensive the liquidators openly revealed their character. They chose as their organ of publication the fascist Masaryk paper, "Lidorve Noviny." On the 15th of the month the Hais group declared in a communication to this paper: "The trade unionists who have seized the I.L.F. are also striving for the complete separation of the trade union movement from the Polbureau of the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia, and wish to place the whole Communist trade union movement on a more real foundation, so that it may not be led yet further astray by the irresponsible politicians of the C.P.

"The Executive of the I.L.F. declares that even to-day in the ranks of the Communists there are hundreds of disappointed workers who curse the political leadership of the Party because they have allowed themselves to be misled into various strikes and demonstrations. The new leadership declares its task to be to get rid of all this michievous activity." The leading slogans of the liquidation group are as follows: "Away from the Communist Party"; "Long Live the Independent Unions"; "Down with Politics in the Economic Struggle." Hais declared to the workers, after the revolt, that the situation was such that the unions must have at least two years' rest from strikes. The renegades state in their manifesto: "It is necessary that the policy and tactics of our organisation should be based on existing possibilities and on the actual circumstances, that we should come down from super-terrestrial heights to the bedrock of actual facts, in accordance with the fundamentals of strategy and tactics as taught by Lenin, above all in times of reaction, for the working class must reckon up the existing possibilities and its own resources as well as those of the enemy." The meaning of this renegade twaddle is clear—the complete liquidation of the class struggle. But it is worth noting that these renegades, like all the other deserters from the Party, claim to be the true "Leninists."

The liquidators' attack clearly revealed the true features of all opporunist elements in the

Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia. Comrade Bolen, of the Yilek Group, who was the leader of the agricultural workers' section, came out in opposition to the Communist Party at this critical time and declared his neutrality in the struggle against the liquidators. He did not fight against the renegades by so much as a single word, but began a struggle against the new Party centre, and, two weeks after Party congress demanded the calling of a new congress. In his declaration he strongly opposed Hais and his followers being termed liquidators and renegades, and the calling of the congress of the I.L.F. over the heads of Hais and Sikora. The "Rude Pravo" of the 22nd of the month reports that an overwhelming majority of the organisations in the agricultural workers' section objected strongly to the support given to the liquidators by Bolen.

The renegades are travelling over to the reformist camp. The close connection between the Hais group and the police is merely the outward sign of the united front of the liquidators with the capitalist State, the employers and the reformists. The sharper the confrontation of classes becomes in Czecho-Slovakia, the more clearly will the renegades reveal their true character.

The intensification of the whole capitalist crisis in Czecho-Slovakia, the terrific sharpening of the class war in town and country, the great development of rationalisation and the disillusionment of the masses are driving the Czecho-Slovakian capitalists ever further from the bourgeois-democratic over to the fascist method of government. This transition has

brought with it also new methods in the handling by the capitalists of the economic struggles of the working class. The last textile strike was remarkable for the drastic interference on the part of the State, which broke up meetings of workers without provocation, dissolved strike committees and resorted to great activity in order to protect strike-breakers. The reformist agents of the bourgeoisie, during the last strike, while propagating ideas of economic struggle, resorted to such open forms of strike-breaking as can but seldom be found in recent years in the annals of the Czecho-Slovakian class struggle. Whereas formerly the reformists in carrying on their strike-breaking tactics always took the trouble to disguise these by abuse of the employers, in the last textile strike they threw off all disguises. The tactics of the liquidation group did not differ by the least shade from those of the reformists.

Heavy tasks at present confront the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia. The Party stands firmly against the liquidators under the leadership of the new Central Committee. The main tasks of the Centre now, are to achieve the ideological and organisational consolidation of the Party, to complete the isolation of the liquidation group, to bring about the mobilisation of the widest possible proletarian united front from below in the coming big political and economic struggles, and to initiate a new revolutionary period in the history of the Czecho-Slovakian proletariat. We are certain that the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia will justify the hopes of the C.I., expressed in the second Open Letter to the Fifth Party Congress.

# After the Fifth Party Congress of the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia

**T**HE Fifth Party Congress of the Czecho-Slovakian Party, held from February 17 to 24 of this year, met after serious defeats. Its task was to overcome the crisis within the Party and to lay the foundation for future Party work, to open up a new period in its development.

The crisis within the Czech Party is one of the most severe in the recent history of any Party in the Comintern. "Red Day" indicated the great passivity of the Party, its failure to keep up with events, its inability, due to the passivity and opportunist political direction of the Party, to win over the masses and place itself at their head.

The Open Letter of the Comintern sent to the Party after the Sixth World Congress, pointing out the way in which this crisis could be overcome, led to a discussion which was at first concentrated mainly on an examination of the causes leading to the defeat of the "Red Day," but afterwards included all phases of Party policy and laid the basis for its organisational and ideological improvement. The great defect of this discussion was that it did not penetrate the mass of the Party membership sufficiently. Nevertheless, the Party Centre, the great majority of which after the Sixth World Congress accepted the policy of the Open Letter, and in which the left opposition obtained the leadership, succeeded in taking the first practical steps to apply the decisions of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress and the Sixth C.I. Congress. The Party Congress was, therefore, able to draw lessons both from its defeats and from the experiences of its first application of the new Party line to practical politics.

The Party Congress had to revise thoroughly the previous policy of the Czech C.P. It had to make a complete break with these social-democratic ideas which were expressed so glaringly in the decisions of the First Party Congress in 1923. The Fifth C.I. Congress and the Second Czech Party Congress,

effected great ideological changes in the Party and rejected the policy of the First Congress, although the ideas of the First Congress were only insufficiently refuted. This explains why social-democratic traditions became so prominent on the breakdown of Red Day. This explains why, on most important questions, the policy of the Party so obviously contradicted the decisions and policy of the International.

## THE PARTY AND THE TRADE UNIONS

The article on the "Liquidators in the Red Trade Unions of Czecho-Slovakia," dealt exhaustively with the opportunism of Party policy in industrial disputes and in the trade unions. This opportunism was equally evident in the Party policy with regard to the peasants, the national question, the co-operatives, and, above all, in an incorrect appreciation of the role of the Czech State and the third post-war period in Czecho-Slovakia.

The Fifth Party Congress had to make the position on all these important problems quite clear. The First Congress had defined the role of the Czecho-Slovakian State as follows (Resolution on the Versailles Treaty) :

"The advance of the French Army into the Ruhr, the economic separation of the Rhineland and the Ruhr district from Germany and the consequent practical annexation of these areas by France mean . . . in their effects, the annulment of the Versailles Peace Treaty . . . But the greatest dangers, economic and political, for small nations and particularly for Czecho-Slovakia, lie in the offensive of French capitalism, insatiably greedy for power. It has always been the fate of the small European nation to be a pawn in the game of the great imperialist Powers. The object of the Versailles Peace Treaty in this respect is so to organise the small nations that they shall become colonial spheres for the imperialist

robbers. . . . The destiny of the Czecho-Slovakian nation was . . . bound for life and death to that of French imperialism, and any change in the relative positions of the European Powers places the very existence of the nation at stake again."

In its essence, the first Congress declared that Czecho-Slovakia is a colony of West European imperialism (in this case of France) that France is a danger to the "Czecho-Slovakian nation" because it ignores the Versailles Treaty, and finally that any change in the European balance of power places the existence of the Czecho-Slovakian nation at stake. This false appreciation of the role of the Czecho-Slovakian State, this confusion with regard to its subordinate position to the European Powers and its so-called colonial dependence, this complete misunderstanding of the inner class relations of the State, has left a strong impress on the practical work of the Czecho-Slovakian C.P., and explains why the imperialist war danger, the fight against the capitalist war threatening the Soviet Union, against the arming of the Czech State and against its active participation in the anti-Soviet front has been so greatly misunderstood by the Party. The Czecho-Slovakian Communists necessarily underestimated the imperialist character of the Czech State and its preparations for war against the Soviet Union when they maintained that the greatest enemy of the Czech bourgeoisie was French imperialism and that Czecho-Slovakia was a colony.

The same idea was repeated at the Fourth Congress in 1927. In the political resolution the Congress declared:

"The greater the accentuation of the international imperialist crisis, the greater the Great Powers' feeling of danger in face of the rebellions of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, and the sharper the competitive struggle among the imperialist States for the continually decreasing spheres of exploitation, the greater is the danger threatening the economy and the very existence of the small States. They become the battleground of the Great Powers. They are but single pawns in the game of imperialism and trust capital. In particular the small States of central, east and south Europe are threatened by British imperialism."

As we can see, the Fourth Congress repeated the mistakes of the First Congress on the question of the Czecho-Slovakian State, but with this difference, that England has taken the place of France as the greatest enemy of the Czech State. As for future prospects, the Fourth Congress declared that the policy of the bourgeoisie would be directed towards slowing down industry and "as far as possible depriving the State of its industrial character." But in order to explain the war preparations of the Czech bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union, the political resolution of the same congress stated that the aggressiveness of the Czecho-Slovakian State towards the Soviet Republics was not a result of the development and interests of Czech capitalism, but only the result of the incorrect foreign policy of the bourgeoisie who

"have bound up the fate of Czecho-Slovakia with western imperialism, now in a state of decay and concerned only with its own salvation, and recently with England particularly."

#### INDUSTRY AND STABILISATION

This incorrect idea is closely associated with the false estimation of the development of capitalist stabilisation in Czecho-Slovakia and with opportunist conceptions of imperialism. The Congress statement that capitalist efforts will be directed towards "depriving the State of its industrial character," was based on the fact that at that time the capitalists in Slovakia and the Carpathian Ukraine were closing down many factories. But the authors of the resolution failed to take into consideration the most important fact that these concerns were re-established in other parts of Czecho-Slovakia, and in Hungary and other countries. They also overlooked the fact that this closing-down was one of the stabilisation measures adopted by the bourgeoisie who were anxious, apart from ousting the Magyar capitalists from their predominant industrial position in Slovakia, to establish the greatest possible concentration of industry in order that the machinery of production could be more profitably utilised.

It is of interest that the summing up of the situation in the Fourth Congress resolution to a certain extent contradicts the report made at

that time on the same subject, by comrade Hacken, who said:

"Czecho-Slovakian industry, even taking into account the decline in internal consumption, is increasingly directed to export. Taking the situation as a whole, the following contradictions are apparent . . . relative industrial over-production, fall in home consumption, rationalisation, the formation of cartels, trustification as the capitalist reply to the crisis, and the fall in prices (e.g., the European steel trust), great accumulation of capital in the banks, and the impossibility of procuring cheap credits."

The Czecho-Slovakian State therefore is characterised, not by the capitalists' renunciation of industrial expansion, but by their increasing anxiety to win new markets.

The resolution of the Mährisch-Ostrau District Committee, who supported the Yilek-Bolen group platform, repeats the same error of the colonial character of the Czecho-Slovakian State. These opportunist ideas on the capitalist State and its imperialist role, being insufficiently refuted, have resulted in pacifist and, to some extent, nationalist ideas being held in the Party, which became very obvious during the Party discussion on the Mährisch-Ostrau resolution. The incorrectness of the ideas contained in that resolution is closely connected with an equally incorrect understanding on the part of that group of the "third period" in Czecho-Slovakia. The Mährisch resolution and its first resolutions from Iglau and Prague maintained that "reconstruction is accompanied by very favourable economic and marketing conditions," and that, further, the third period means "the strengthening of capitalism, which is, however, not more stabilised than in the second period." Comrade Yilek spoke in the same strain at the Fifth Party Congress. In his article written two or three weeks before the Congress, he said:

"If the capitalist crisis were really to grow more acute, one would not be able to speak of the increasing depression of capitalism, for this depression is conditioned, on the one hand by the strengthening of capitalism, and on the other by the growth in its contradictions."

In this somewhat confused statement, com-

rade Yilek sticks closely to his earlier conception of the third period in Czecho-Slovakia. The same idea is expressed in the Yilek group's well known theory on the passivity of the masses. A mistake made in the early stages of Party discussion was that the struggle against this theory was not sufficiently connected with the struggle against the incorrect analysis of the general situation. The Fifth Congress utterly rejected the theory, and in doing so referred to the fact that in Czecho-Slovakia, as well as internationally, stabilisation is at present rather insecure, unstable, and fundamentally unsound, and that the future development of the capitalist crisis will give rise to greater and more bitter disputes. The Congress pointed out that both the internal and external contradictions are being accentuated, that class contradictions are coming to a head, that, as it were, a process of polarisation is taking place, rallying to the one side the bourgeoisie of all the nationalities in Czecho-Slovakia, under the leadership of Czech finance capital, and to the other all the forces of the working masses under the leadership of the C.P. Spontaneous strikes in various industries and the great discontent in agricultural areas prove that the masses are becoming more radical. That this radicalisation process was not expressed in any great mass movement was due not to the passivity of the masses, but to the passivity of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia.

#### MISTAKES IN LAND POLICY

A further consequence of the incorrect appreciation of the Czecho-Slovakian situation was the opportunist agricultural policy of the Party, which went so far that the same phenomena could be observed among the peasants as were referred to in the articles on the "Liquidators" about the town workers. In many cases the Communist policy in the villages did not differ greatly from that of the Agrarian Party. The previous Party centre ignored the process of differentiation going on in all parts of Czecho-Slovakia, and consequently the Party slogans expressed the Party attitude to the "whole countryside," overlooking the growing class struggle in the villages. The Fifth Party Congress rejected the incorrect slogans of "a just land reform"

and "compulsory leasing of all manorial and ecclesiastical lands to the peasants."

The Party demanded that the State agricultural council should institute elections for peasant committees on a general franchise, and that these committees, in collaboration with the large landowners and the State, should deal with the distribution of land and the height of rents. The Committees were to represent the whole of the village, that is, including the rich peasants, as against the State and the large landowners. In practice that would have meant that the mass of poor peasants would come under the political leadership of the rich peasants, and the committees would be a means of reconciliation with the capitalist State, and not an instrument whereby to revolutionise the peasant masses and to organise agricultural labourers and poor and middle peasants against the large landowners and the rich peasants. Both slogans, in practice, contradict the Communist slogan of expropriation of the large landowners without compensation. The former Party centre also put forward this demand in connection with the government's plan to nationalise forests:

"Expropriation without compensation of the forests of the large landowners and their transference to the State, county and parish in such a way as will ensure free access to the community and cheap wood and fuel for the poorer sections of the population."

This slogan was defended up to and during the congress by comrade Bolen. It is purely opportunist. The government brought in a bill for the nationalisation of forests, which are situated mostly in the border provinces, first from strategical interests, and secondly in accordance with its imperialist efforts to increase Czech strength in those areas. In such circumstances the Party should have exposed the imperialist basis of such nationalisation and should have demanded the transference of forests to the peasantry.

The same attitude was apparent in the former Executive's policy on fiscal questions. Comrade Bolen, in the program which he submitted to the centre before the Congress, suggested that the Party should demand the abolition of all direct and indirect taxes and their replacement by a single progressive in-

come tax. In such a form the slogan is unacceptable. It can be interpreted in an opportunist sense as an effort to find means whereby to establish the finances of the capitalist State on a sound basis, (efforts being made by the social-democrats). The Party should issue an unequivocal slogan for the complete freedom of the workers and poor peasants from any taxation.

It is no wonder that after the last local elections campaign various Party organisations began an agitation in favour of the peasant masses demanding the fulfilment of election promises from the Agrarian Party. The adoption of this peculiar cry of "Keep them to their word," was due to the fact that the comrades accepted the Agrarians' slogans as generally correct, that the difference they saw between the Communist and the Agrarian Parties consisted in this, that the Communists really want to put them into practice, while the others had neither the desire nor the intention of doing so.

The dangerous character of all these slogans is particularly clear in the present period of an intensified Fascist offensive in Czecho-Slovakia. The Party Congress emphasised this fact and declared that our job is not to send the peasants to the Agrarians with a demand for the fulfilment of election promises, but to expose the fascist character of their slogans, which must be met by revolutionary Communist slogans, expropriation of all manorial and ecclesiastical lands without compensation. The lying slogans of "community of interests," of "the solidarity of the whole village, including the large landowners and rich peasants," must be answered by the Communists with the call for a struggle of agricultural labourers, poor and middle peasants in alliance with the proletariat, against the capitalists, the large landowners and the rich peasants. Although the Congress thoroughly revised the opportunist agricultural policy of the Party, it failed to lay down with sufficient practical clarity our future work in this sphere. This work must be carried out by the new executive as soon as possible.

The Party's policy on the national question also showed that it had under-estimated the intensification of class contradictions, the

process of polarisation. In Slovakia, as in the Carpathian Ukraine, the comrades did not pay sufficient attention in their practical work to the differentiation proceeding in the country.

#### CLASS AGAINST CLASS

Based on capitalist stabilisation, the economic and political consolidation of the capitalists, large landowners and rich peasants of all nationalities, is proceeding apace. On one side are grouped, led by the Czech capitalists, the possessing classes of all nationalities, together with the wealthier peasants and the urban middle classes, and on the other the working masses of town and country, undergoing a process of radicalisation, led by the Communist Party. The consolidation referred to is particularly evident in the bourgeois camp in the strengthening of "activist tendencies" among the capitalists and the upper middle classes of the subject peoples, in their participation in the Government under the leadership of the Czech bourgeoisie.

The Party had not clearly grasped this, and consequently Party organisations in the "nationality" areas put forward slogans which directly contradict the Leninist policy on national questions. For example, in December, 1928, the Party in the Carpathian Ukraine adopted the slogans of "Carrying out the St. Germain Treaty" and "territorial autonomy." These same slogans were adopted during the local elections by all the petty bourgeois Ukrainian parties. The fact that it was possible for the Party to adopt such slogans after the Sixth World Congress is explained not only by its failure to understand the intensification of class contradictions, but to a greater extent by the fact that the attitude on this question maintained at the First Congress was not thoroughly rejected by the 1925 Congress.

The First Congress resolutions, particularly on the national question, were merely repetitions of the old social-democratic programme. Their basis was the so-called uniformity of "a Czecho-Slovakian nation," the fight against the irredentist national movement, and the demand for the utmost centralisation of the Czecho-Slovakian States with the exception of the Carpathian Ukraine, for whom the Congress demanded territorial autonomy. For

example the First Congress, referring to Slovakia, declared:

"The policy of the present rulers of the Republic towards Slovakia and the national minorities is also dangerous from the point of view of foreign policy. . . . A policy of suppressing the minorities is . . . likely to arouse and stimulate irredentist tendencies. Particularly dangerous, from the point of view of foreign policy, is the regime of the Czech rulers in Slovakia, where it loosens and weakens the associations uniting the Czech and Slovakian peoples, and promotes efforts at secession which, in critical situations might spread over the whole Czecho-Slovakian nation, particularly as Hungary, that centre of European counter-revolution, must be considered in this connection as a neighbouring State."

The resolution previously referred to on the Versailles Treaty also expresses the same idea:

". . . to win the workers of the national minorities by rejecting any policy of national oppression and by drawing them into the work of rebuilding the State, by forming a revolutionary alliance of all workers in all nations of the republic. . . .

". . . the exertion of all revolutionary forces of the working masses in Czecho-Slovakia and arousing the revolutionary spirit of the Czecho-Slovakian nation with the slogans of the political and socialist republic, put forward in the national revolution."

The main idea in these demands was to win the workers of the national minorities into working for the reconstruction of the State. This incorrect theory of "national community of interests" which was not thoroughly exposed, was responsible for the slogan put forward as recently as August, 1928, by the Party on the occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the foundation of the Czecho-Slovakian Republic, the slogan that "the independence of the Czecho-Slovakian nation is threatened by the capitalist participation in imperialist policy."

The real importance of the Fifth Party Congress was its final and complete break with these social-democratic ideas. The Congress declared that the "autonomy" slogan will remain the most important method of treachery

in the hands of the Slovakian, German and Ukrainian bourgeoisie within the Republic. The greater the consolidation among the capitalists of all nationalities, the more rapid the process of radicalisation among the workers, the more complicated is the treachery, the more deceitful the slogans put forward by the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties. The Congress emphasised particularly that the slogan of autonomy means propaganda in favour of the unity of the Czecho-Slovakian, the capitalist State, and the denial of the revolutionary principle of self-determination of peoples even to the point of secession. The autonomy slogan opposes the interests of all nationalities in Czecho-Slovakia. The subject peoples' revolutionary struggle for emancipation is one part of the workers' revolutionary struggle for the destruction of the capitalist State, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. As in the villages, so in the struggle for national emancipation, there are two hostile camps; in one, the capitalists, the landowners and rich peasants; in the other, the workers, the agricultural labourers, the poorer peasants.

#### THE FASCIST OFFENSIVE

Correct understanding of the third post-war period and the relation of classes in Czecho-Slovakia enabled the Party to form a true estimate of the dangers threatening the Czecho-Slovakian workers from the united front of the capitalists of all nationalities in Czecho-Slovakia, who are fully aware of the growth of internal and external contradictions, of the accentuation of the class struggle and the general crisis in Czecho-Slovakian capitalism. They are, therefore, intensifying the exploitation of the worker in town and country; they are, therefore, intensifying the fascist offensive against the working people. The fascist offensive, the rallying of fascist forces in Czecho-Slovakia—these were facts which the Congress had to consider most seriously in its formulation of Party policy. The State machine is being used in a fascist manner to an increasing extent. The capitalist attack on the political rights of the workers and peasants is growing from day to day, as is also the persecution of the Communist Party. The capitalists are mobilising large

numbers of the petty bourgeoisie into their military-fascist organisations; they are rallying their forces for a decisive blow against the workers, for the imperialist war on the Soviet Union. As class contradictions develop, as the war on the Soviet Union approaches nearer, so the possibility of a fascist coup d'etat grows more likely.

The Party Congress decisively rejected the opportunist idea that such a coup d'etat would mean the attack of the "right wing" of the bourgeoisie, the agrarians, on the "left wing" represented by Masaryk. The Congress also referred to the development in the process of the consolidation of the Czecho-Slovakian bourgeoisie, and to the growing domination of the entire national economy by finance capital. Finance capital, which directs the agrarian party, is coming more and more to support Masaryk, leaving it to him to organise and direct the fascist offensive and prepare for the fascist coup d'etat, which cannot, therefore be considered as expressing a process of differentiation within the bourgeoisie, but rather as an indication of their consolidation.

#### OPPORTUNISM IN THE PARTY

The logical result of these wrong ideas on almost all important questions, was the opportunist policy of the Party towards the social-democrats. This was most apparent in industrial struggles and local government matters. Before the Congress, there existed in most local government bodies so-called "socialist blocs," in which the Communists were in the position of reformist appendages. The Congress put an end to this fatal policy, and to the incorrect opinion, which was widely held in the Party, that reformists should be voted for in local governing bodies so long as they are workers.

Opportunist ideas as to the role of social-democracy, represented chiefly by comrade Neurath's group, were decisively rejected by the Congress, and, arising from this, the Congress demonstrated the falsity of the opinion that Trotskyism represents a left tendency in the Communist movement.

The Party decided its tactics on the basis of the Fourth R.I.L.U. and Sixth C.I. Congresses and drew up a detailed programme of action.

The Fifth Congress was a great step forward in the development of the Czecho-Slovakian Party. The members demonstrated their unanimous desire to overcome social-democratic ideas and traditions, and to carry out the Comintern policy. The new executive elected at the Congress is composed of the most progressive working class elements in the Party.

#### THE TASK BEFORE THE PARTY

The new executive, consisting mainly of fresh and young elements, took over the leadership of the Party in very difficult circumstances. During the Party discussion before the Congress, and at the Congress itself, the opportunist groups in the Party, the rights and the Trotskyists, who had formerly played a leading part in the Central Executive, were utterly defeated. But when one considers that discussion was not sufficiently widespread and deep among the membership, it is obvious that the consolidation of the Party, both in ideas and organisation, is the chief task awaiting the new leadership in the immediate future.

The extreme right elements in the Party, as was shown in the article on "Liquidators in the Red Trade Unions," have been stirring up rebellion against the Party and the new leadership in the red trade unions. The struggle against these liquidators has recently brought to light a new fact. That the two opportunist groups in the Party—led by Yilek and Neurath, which were completely isolated during the Party discussion, placed themselves at the head of this rebellion. This

action on their part confirms the Congress' condemnation of them as opportunist.

The Czecho-Slovakian Party is faced with great difficulties. The process of clarification encounters many obstacles from the officials (e.g., the adherence of a large number of members of Parliament to the liquidators' group). The quicker the Party carries out this process of Bolshevisation, the better for the development of the revolutionary movement in Czecho-Slovakia, the greater the chance of the Party standing firm in the case of an imperialist war.

The Party is being regenerated. Besides getting rid of its old social-democratic traditions, the Party must reform its organisation on the basis of factory groups, and change the officials in the Party as in the red trade unions—these tasks are of first class importance, and must be accomplished as quickly as possible. The new Central Committee will only be able to do this by drawing the whole Party membership into the work, by activating them, by consolidating their ideas and organisation.

In opposition to the Party there is the united bloc of all opportunist elements, from Hais and company, the liquidators, to Yilek, Bolen and Neurath, and the extremist Muna.

The unexampled activity and unanimity of the Party and the Red Trade Unions in their struggle against the splitting tactics of the liquidators and their followers, as shown in the decisions of the national and local conferences, are a guarantee that the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party will fulfil the hopes placed in it by the Communist International.

# Trotsky at the Tribune of Chamberlain

A. Martinov

WHEN it became known that the Soviet Government had decided to exile Trotsky from Russia for his anti-Soviet activities, innumerable meetings of Party and non-Party workers in the U.S.S.R. expressed their sympathy with this measure against Trotsky and demanded the most repressive steps in regard to the Trotskyists. However, certain comrades doubted the expediency of exile in particular, fearing that on finding himself outside Soviet Russia Trotsky would succeed at least for a time in developing schismatic work in the sections of the Comintern. Not a month passed before it became evident that the Soviet Government was more farseeing than the doubting comrades, that it had more correctly estimated the depth of Trotsky's fall and the degree to which this former revolutionary, who had earned himself the laurels of exile from the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat, had compromised himself in the eyes of the masses.

When the "left wing Communist" Trotsky found himself on the territory of a capitalist State, he began, not by consolidating his own "left wingers," not by an appeal to the proletariat against the right wing elements of the Communist Parties, but by an appeal to the bourgeoisie against the Soviet Government. When he appeared in Constantinople his first step was to declare to "His Excellency, Mr. President of the Turkish Republic," Kemal Pasha, that "At the gates of Constantinople I have the honour to inform you that it is not by my own choice that I have arrived at the Turkish frontier, and that I am crossing that frontier only by yielding to force. Please to receive my feelings of respect, Mr. President." His second step was to place a series of articles in the reactionary bourgeois press: in the British Conservative organ the "Daily Express," in the American capitalists' organ the "New York Times," and in other similar news-

papers—articles in which Trotsky told the readers of these reactionary papers how he was exiled from the U.S.S.R. and how he had been insulted by the "degenerate officialdom" of the Soviet Government.

When Trotsky was exiled from the U.S.S.R., the Party and non-Party workers of the Soviet Republic acclaimed the Soviet Government. When Trotsky crossed the frontier, the capitalist and social-democratic newspapers were crammed to overflowing with acclamation of Trotsky. Over Trotsky's exile two opposing fronts were drawn up; the proletariat and the Soviet regime on the one hand, and capitalist and social-democratic press and Trotsky on the other. It would have been difficult to find a worse punishment for Trotsky than to give him complete freedom to unmask himself. When he stood as nature made him before the world abroad, his true exchange value was at once established.

When Trotsky was still a revolutionary and in the ranks of the Bolshevik Party in 1920, he wrote:

"We are at war. We are fighting, not for life, but for death.

"The press is the weapon not of an abstract society, but of two irreconcilable, armed and battling camps. We destroy the press of the counter-revolution just as we destroy its consolidated positions, its stores, its communications, its reconnaissance. Do we deprive ourselves of the Cadet-Menshevik accusations of the corruption of the working class? Yet on the other hand we triumphantly destroy the bases of capitalist corruption." ("Terrorism and Communism.")

Now that Trotsky has been released from the control of the Bolshevik Party, now that he finds himself in "freedom," he is hastening to exploit that same press of the counter-revolution in order to "accuse the corruption" of the Soviet regime. On the pages of the Conservative organ he cites his letter to the-

Presidium of the Comintern, in which, in answer to the demand to cease his "political activity" (i.e. his anti-Soviet activity), he said: "If you have decided to continue along the road of governing an indignant people by violence, we can and we will continue to do our duty to the end." Thus, in the pages of a doubly reactionary Conservative newspaper, Trotsky lies about and slanders the Soviet Republic, representing the situation as though the people in that republic were indignant with a dominating regime of violence.

Chamberlain can shake Trotsky's hand now. "We are with you, sir. On the most vital question of the day we are of one mind, although we have a different way of expressing ourselves."

When Trotsky was still in the ranks of the Comintern, in his report to the Fourth Congress he spoke against the opportunist elements of the French Communist Party who were co-operating in the bourgeois press, and defended the E.C.C.I. resolution on the control of the press: "It is necessary, once and for all, to put an end to the conception of the press as the means for the exercise of journalistic talent. It is excellent when a journalist has talent, but the press is nothing other than a weapon of struggle. Take the resolutions (those of the E.C.C.I.)—which of them threatened the Party? Possibly the resolution on the control of the press, adopted on account of Fabre and Brisson, who have exploited the authority of their Party membership in order to further their own personal ends, so compromising the Party? Is it not high time to cease this habit of contributing to bourgeois newspapers which poison the masses? . . ." Now that Trotsky has found himself outside the ranks of the Comintern and freed from its restrictive control, he is himself pursuing his purely "personal ends," publishing articles in the bourgeois press in exchange for dollars of true mintage, in a press "poisoning the masses," and at that not in the bourgeois-democratic mass newspapers, as Fabre and Brisson did, but in doubly reactionary newspapers. And in these articles: "On my Exile," he describes himself and poses before a bourgeois audience, telling how he, a

"fettered prisoner," in Alma-Ata, wanted to hunt tigers, but did not succeed, as "high-power radio-stations sent inquiries across the ether as to Trotsky's whereabouts, whilst he was forced to amuse himself with playing chess with his son; how his dogs, Trotsky's pointers, were uneasy at the sight of so many strange people, the G.P.U. workers, and so on\*"

Trotsky's friends and adherents write in the "Fahne des Kommunismus" that "Trotsky's exile is equivalent to the execution of Robespierre and the ninth of Thermidor." But the "executed Robespierre" occupied himself with sport in Alma-Ata, is now comfortably writing feuilletons and boosting himself in the yellow bourgeois press, to the applause of all the social-democratic lackeys of the bourgeoisie, who are outvying one another in declaring: "You are ours now, you're our Trotsky now, although you're not ready to admit it yet!" What a miserable tragi-comic end to an apostate from the Communist Party!

---

\*When I wrote the present article, I had read only the first article published by Trotsky in the bourgeois press. In the following three articles he gives an up-to-date history of our party, written in the contemptible style of the sensational gutter-press. Of this party, numbering a million, which in ideological level and revolutionary experience stands higher than any other party in the world, of its struggles, of its intellectual life there is not one word in this "history"—save the mark! For Mr. Trotsky these things simply do not exist. For him the party is a crowd of dumb and mindless pawns, which can be put out as one likes. Why it should have happened that he, Trotsky, was unsuccessful in putting them out as he wished, why it should have been that they "put him out," remains untold. All his "history" amounts to a story of superficial combinations of alleged intrigues of Stalin and his innumerable agents against the talents of Trotsky, who was called to take the place of Lenin. After Lenin's illness, all the history of the party is for him summed up as the story of a widely ramified conspiracy against the hero Trotsky.

Tartarin of Tarascon, Ivan Alexandrovitch Khlestakov, and Popreshchin, from "Memoirs of a Lunatic," have been resurrected and reincarnated in the single personality of Leo Davidovitch Trotsky. Immortal Trinity!

## THE REVOLUTIONARY WAVE.

How was it possible? For there was a time when Trotsky's name was coupled with that of Lenin in every language under the sun. Yes, there was such a time. But even at that time an immense abyss separated the characters of the two men. One has but to point to one tiny feature, in which, as in a drop of water, all that chasm was reflected. Lenin always said: "we" estimated the situation thus and thus, "we" had put forward such and such a slogan, "we" had laid down a certain line of strategy. Lenin coined all his intellectual genius, all his unbridled energy, all his revolutionary enthusiasm without reserve into capital for his Party, for the revolutionary advance guard of the working class. Trotsky always said "I." For him the Party served merely as a pedestal, on which was raised his egotistic "I." Lenin was a great proletarian leader, Trotsky was an egotistical petty-bourgeois revolutionary, a temporary travelling companion of the proletariat.

When after the ebb of the revolutionary wave in 1848 the "left Communist" faction of Willich and Schapper split off from the Communist League, Marx wrote of these "left wing Communists": "The Communist League was no conspiratorial society, but a society which was secretly occupied with the organisation of a proletarian Party. . . . It goes without saying that such a secret society . . . presents little attraction to those gentlemen who on the one hand conceal their insignificance beneath the theatrical mantle of conspiracy, and on the other satisfy their limited ambition during the first day of the nearest revolution, for whom the matter of prime importance is to play a role at the given moment, to receive a share of the demagogic reward, and to be acclaimed by the democratic street-corner bawlers." (Marx: "Revelations of the Communist Trial in Cologne"; translated from the Russian text.) These words fit Trotsky when he drapes himself in the toga of a left wing Communist, as though they had been specially written of him.

Trotsky never occupied himself with the organisation of a Communist Party. He was brought to the surface on the crest of a revo-

lutionary wave, and fell together when that wave subsided, hastening to free himself from the party methods of "barrack-room discipline" and "satisfying his limited ambition during the first day of the nearest revolution." So was it in 1905, when, having for a brief moment headed the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, after the defeat of the revolution he plunged into the bog of the "liquidators." [Those who wished to "liquidate" the underground revolutionary work of the Party—Tr.]

So it was in the period of the October revolution also, when, having headed the Red Army during the civil war, his light very swiftly began to flicker and to smoke, when the brilliant period of the civil war which had brought him laurels was replaced by the N.E.P. period with its absence of any effects, when millions of nameless heroic proletarians began to struggle with hunger and ruin to construct socialism, restoring the demolished production brick by brick. When the revolutionary wave of 1917-21 began to ebb, distrust and pessimism crept into Trotsky's spirit more and more, and beginning from 1923, from the "scissors crisis," Trotsky never ceased croaking about the direct destruction of the revolution. And it is extraordinarily significant of Trotsky that his permanent revolt against the Party began, not with an appeal to the proletariat against an allegedly unendurable Party regime, but with an appeal to the student youth, the enormous majority of whom, at that time, were suburban intellectuals.

## TROTSKY AND THERMIDOR.

In his introduction to "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," Friedrich Engels established as "one of the laws of the development of bourgeois society" that the revolution has to be carried considerably beyond its immediate, direct, matured, and entirely bourgeois aims in order to ensure the real achievement of those aims, in order irrevocably to consolidate the minimum bourgeois conquests. In other words, "one of the laws of bourgeois society" is that every great bourgeois revolution directly ends in counter-revolution, which

takes back part of the revolutionary conquests. The October revolution did not submit to this law of the replacement of revolution by counter-revolution, but did not do so for the reason that it was not a bourgeois but a proletarian revolution, for the reason that it not only passed beyond the historically restricted bounds of a bourgeois revolution (that was temporarily achieved by other revolutions also), but that it also established the dictatorship of the proletariat, thus creating a stable basis for the construction of socialism.

From this it by no means follows that there are no Thermidor elements in the Soviet republic, that it is not threatened with the danger of a Thermidor degeneration and restoration. That danger will remain as long as it finds itself in a capitalist environment and as long as the roots of capitalism are not completely eradicated from the Soviet republic itself. But the difference between the October revolution and the great bourgeois revolutions consists in the fact that inasmuch as the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established in the Soviet republic, given a correct leadership it had, still has, and will continue to have sufficient power to enable it to overcome the Thermidor elements which are nourished by the petty bourgeois factors.

In order successfully to overcome these elements, it is necessary first and foremost from time to time to determine definitely who is the carrier of Thermidorism. On this very question the Trotskyists proved to be in a most miserable, a most ludicrous, a most comic situation. They are the loudest in shouting and bawling of Thermidor, they are everywhere rummaging and searching for Thermidor, and fail to realise that the most typical expression of Thermidor is themselves. They do not realise that if owing to any faulty leadership Thermidor had really arrived in the Soviet republic, the most appropriate figure to head it would have been Leo Trotsky. This is just because he has never been organically connected with the Party organisation, which he has arrogantly regarded as a collection of inarticulate officials, because in its time the revolutionary wave lifted him so high, making him a "hero

of the revolution," and because, feeling no obligation to Party discipline, he has so easily fallen when the revolutionary wave subsided. In reality, if one wishes to ascertain where the bacillus of Thermidorism has been nourished of recent years, one has but to compare what the C.P.S.U. is now doing with what the fragments of the Trotskyist opposition (which the Party shattered at the Fifteenth Congress) are now doing.

Basing itself on the vast majority of the working class of the Soviet republic, the C.P.S.U., with the greatest intensity of effort, is overcoming difficulties, industrialising the country, raising agriculture, developing collectivism in the villages, struggling with capitalist elements in urban and rural areas, struggling in the most determined fashion against all opportunist elements inside the Party, and first and foremost against the right-wingers and conciliators, who are prepared to make concessions to the kulaks and Nepmen, maintaining a similar struggle against the right-wing elements in all sections of the Comintern. And what are the Trotskyists doing? To the workers, who with great exertions are building socialism, they say: "You haven't the strength to finish the job. Your task is hopeless, or almost hopeless." Trotsky laments that the U.S.S.R. is now experiencing "Kerenskyism inside out," that the power in the Soviet republic is now slipping out of the hands of the proletariat and gradually passing into those of the bourgeoisie. And the German Trotskyists not only assert this "fact," but also supply a corresponding direct instruction. The manifesto issued by the Ruth-Fischer-Urbahns group on the eleventh anniversary of the Soviet republic reads: "It is necessary to retreat in full order. Lenin also had this possibility in mind. He noticed every embellishment, and in every situation found an unembellished balance. The retreat has to be in the direction of democratic dictatorship. If it is not executed in planned order, the counter-revolutionary influence will get the upper hand and destroy all the conquests of

1917." Is that not the purest of Thermidor programmes? We can congratulate the German Trotskyists. They literally say the same as Friedrich Adler. "As October has suffered bankruptcy, it is necessary at least to save February." And what are the Russian Trotskyists doing? They are striving to carry out this instruction in practice, they are appealing to the petty bourgeois intelligentsia and to the most backward elements of the proletariat, who have only just left the villages and have not yet been successfully educated in the factories and so are permeated with craft egotism and consumers' moods. They are calling upon the workers to strike, thus undermining socialist construction, and are suggesting that they should demand the introduction of secret voting, i.e., the application of the methods of bourgeois parliamentarism to the country of the proletarian dictatorship. Is this not an openly practical preparation for Thermidor? And is it not clear that Mr. Leo Trotsky, who is at the

head of all this honest campaign of the renegades, would have been the most suitable candidate for the Russian Buonaparte, if he had not lost his October aureole long since?

To the everlasting woe of Trotsky, he could not and cannot pass out of this "candidate stage," for the Soviet Government keenly watches all the machinations of its past and present petty bourgeois travelling companions and puts a timely end to this weed, clearing it to the side of its high road. Because of this, Trotsky has possibly acted more intelligently in ignoring his friends the ultra-left renegades of Communism since he found himself abroad, scorning their petty news-sheets, such as "Volkswille" and "Die Fahne des Kommunismus," and has knocked directly at the window of the great bourgeoisie, choosing the great capitalist press for his tribune. The dead rot swiftly. With such a swift evolution, Trotsky can reckon very soon on Hilferding interceding for him to be given the post of minister without portfolio.

---

PRINTED BY DORRIT PRESS (T.U.),  
68-70 LANT STREET, S.E.1, ENGLAND.

---



**COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**