

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 9. No. 2

10<sup>th</sup> January 1929

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX.  
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

## CONTENTS

Capitalist Stabilisation, Class Struggles of the Proletariat and the C. P. G. (Speech of Comrade Stalin at the Meeting of the E. C. C. I. Presidium held on December 19, 1928).

The Balkans.

Willi Schlämm: The Coup d'Etat in Yugoslavia.

J. E.: The Balance of the Elections in Roumania.

Politics.

Paul Braun: Parker Gilbert's Report and the Reparations Question.

J. B.: The Wave of Reaction in Egypt.

Against Imperialist war.

Text of the Note and the Proposal of Comrade Litvinov to the Polish Government.

The Labour Movement.

Paul Peschke: The Shipyard Workers' Strike in Hamburg.

Ann Stanley: New England — America's Militant Textile Centre.

Against the Right Danger.

The VIII. Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union against the Right.

The Politbureau of the C. P. of France Approves the Open Letter of the Comintern to the C. P. of Germany.

In the International.

From the Activity of the Political Secretariat of the E. C. C. I. (II).

In the Camp of our Enemies.

Sm.: The Finnish Social Democrats in Alliance with the White Guardists.

Proletarian Women's Movement.

Lene Overlach: The Fight of the German Women Textile Workers for Higher Wages.

## Capitalist Stabilisation, Class Struggles of the Proletariat, and the C. P. G.

Speech of Comrade **STALIN** at the Meeting of the **E. C. C. I. Presidium** held on **December 19, 1928**).

Comrades, in view of the fact that Comrade Molotov has already explained the point of view of the C. P. S. U. delegation, I have only a few remarks to make. I want to touch lightly upon three points that came out in the course of the debate. These points are — the problem of capitalist stabilisation; the problem of the proletarian class struggles that arise in connection with the precariousness of stabilisation; and the problem of the Communist Party of Germany.

It is with regret that I have to say that on all these three questions Comrades Humbert Droz and Serra have fallen into the mire of pusillanimous opportunism. It is true that, so far Comrade Humbert Droz has spoken only on formal questions. But I have in mind the speech on the question of principles he delivered at the meeting of the Politsecretariat of the E. C. C. I. at which the question of the Rights and conciliators in the Communist Party of Germany was discussed. I think that very speech represents the ideological foundation of the position the minority of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. took up at that meeting. I think therefore, that the speech on the question of principles that Comrade Humbert-Droz delivered at the meeting of the Politsecretariat of the E. C. C. I. must not be ignored. I said that Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra have fallen into the mire of pusillanimous opportunism. What does that mean? It

means that in addition to avowed opportunism, there is also tacit opportunism, which dares not display its real features. That is precisely the opportunism of conciliation with the Right deviation. Conciliation is pusillanimous opportunism. I repeat that, to my regret, I must declare that both these comrades have fallen into the mire of pusillanimous opportunism.

Permit me to demonstrate this by a few facts.

### 1. The Problem of Capitalist Stabilisation.

The Comintern proceeds from the assumption that present day capitalist stabilisation is a temporary, transient, precarious decaying sort of stabilisation that will break up more and more as the capitalist crisis develops. This does not in the least contradict the generally known fact about the growth of capitalist technique and rationalisation. Indeed, it is on the basis of this very growth of capitalist technique and rationalisation that the internal unsoundness and decay of stabilisation is developing. What did Humbert-Droz say in his speech at the Politsecretariat of the E. C. C. I.? He flatly denied that stabilisation was precarious and transient. He bluntly stated in his speech that "the VI. World Congress in fact condemned the loose and general description of stabilisation as: — decaying.

shaky, etc., stabilisation". He bluntly declared that the thesis of the VI. Congress regarding the Third Period does not say a word about stabilisation being precarious. Can Comrade Humbert-Droz contention be regarded as correct? No it cannot; because the VI. Congress of the Comintern said the very opposite to what Comrade Humbert-Droz said in his speech. In the paragraph on the Third Period, the VI. Congress of the Comintern stated:

"This period (i. e., the third period. J. S.) will inevitably lead — through the further development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation — to capitalist stabilisation becoming still more precarious and to the severe intensification of the general crisis of capitalism."

Did you hear that? — "capitalist stabilisation becoming more precarious". What does that mean? It means that stabilisation is already precarious and transient, that it will become still more precarious as a result of the conditions prevailing in the Third Period. And Comrade Humbert-Droz has the effrontery to sneer at everybody, including the German Party, who says that stabilisation is a precarious and decaying stabilisation, who says that the present struggle of the working class undermines and disintegrates capitalist stabilisation. Who is Comrade Humbert-Droz sneering at? Obviously he is sneering at the decisions of the VI. Congress.

It follows therefore, that Comrade Humbert-Droz, while ostensibly defending the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern, is actually revising them, and is thus siding into the opportunist conception of stabilisation.

That is how the matter stands in regard to the formal side of the question. Let us now examine the material aspect of the question. If present-day stabilisation cannot be described as precarious, decaying or transient, what kind of a stabilisation is it then? The only thing that can be said about it then is that it is durable, or at all events, that it is becoming more durable. But if capitalist stabilisation is becoming more durable, what is the use of talking about the crisis of world capitalism becoming more acute and profound? Obviously, this leaves no room for the accentuation of the capitalist crisis. Is it not clear, that Comrade Humbert-Droz has got himself entangled in his own contradictions?

To proceed. Lenin said that capitalist development under imperialism is a two-sided process — 1) the growth of capitalism in some countries, and 2) the decay of capitalism in other countries. Is this thesis correct? If it is correct, then obviously capitalist stabilisation can be nothing else, but decaying stabilisation.

Finally, I want to say a few words about a number of facts that are well-known to you all. For example, the desperate struggle the imperialist groups are carrying on among themselves for markets and for spheres for the export of capital. There is the frantic growth of armaments in the capitalist countries; the establishment of new military alliances and obvious preparations for new imperialist wars. There is the sharpening of the contradictions between two gigantic imperialisms, the U. S. A. and Great Britain, each of which is seeking to draw all other States into its respective orbit. Finally, there is the very existence of the Soviet Union; its growth and achievements in the spheres of construction, economics, in culture and politics. The very existence of the Soviet Union, quite apart from its growth, shatters and undermines the foundations of world capitalism. How can Marxians, Leninists, Communists maintain, after this, that capitalist stabilisation is not a precarious and decaying stabilisation, that it is not, year after year and day after day being shattered by the very process of development?

Do Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra realise the mess they have got into? The principal mistakes Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra make arise from this one mistake.

## 2. The Problem of the Proletarian Class Struggles.

Comrade Humbert-Droz also goes wrong on the question of the character and significance of the class struggles of the proletariat in capitalist countries. The conclusion to be drawn from Comrade Humbert-Droz' speech delivered at the meeting of the Polit-Secretariat is that the struggle of the working class, its spontaneous clashes with the capitalists, are in the main of a defensive character, that the leadership of the Communist Party in this struggle must be exercised merely within the

limits of the existing reformist unions. Is that conclusion right? No, it is not. To maintain this means to drag at the tail of events. Comrade Humbert-Droz forgets that the struggle of the working class is now proceeding on the basis of a precarious stabilisation, that the working class struggles not infrequently are in the nature of counter-attacks; a counter-offensive to the capitalist offensive and a direct offensive against the capitalists. Comrade Humbert-Droz sees nothing new in the recent struggles of the working class. He ignores such facts as the general strike in Lodz; the strikes for an improvement in conditions of labour in France, Czechoslovakia and Germany, the powerful mobilisation of the proletarian forces during the metal workers' lockout in Germany, etc., etc.

What do these and similar facts signify? They signify that in capitalist countries, the conditions precedent to a fresh revival of the labour movement are maturing. This is the new element that Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra fail to see, and which, of course, comrades who are in the habit of looking behind instead of ahead, can never see. What does looking behind instead of ahead mean? It means dragging at the tail of events; it means failing to see the new elements in events and being caught unawares. It means that the Communist Parties must abandon the leadership in the labour movement. This is exactly the point on which the leaders of the German Party came to grief in the revolutionary period of 1923. Therefore, those who do not wish to repeat the mistakes of 1923, must stimulate the thoughts of the Communists and call upon them to advance; they must prepare the masses for the impending battles, must take all measures to prevent the Communist Parties from dragging at the tail of events and the working class from being caught unawares.

It is very strange that Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra forget these things.

During the Ruhr struggles, the German Communists asserted that the unorganised workers were more revolutionary than the organised trade union members. Comrade Humbert-Droz waxes indignant over this, and declares that this is impossible. That is queer! Why is it impossible? There are about 1,000,000 workers in the Ruhr. Only about 200,000 of these are organised. The unions are led by bureaucratic reformists who have completely merged with the capitalist class. Is it surprising that the unorganised workers proved more revolutionary than the organised? Could it be otherwise? I could relate to you more "surprising" facts from the history of the Russian revolutionary movement. It often happened in Russia that the masses were more revolutionary than some of their Communist leaders. Every Russian Bolshevik knows this perfectly well. This is exactly why Lenin said that it was not only necessary to teach the masses, but also to learn from them. These facts must not surprise us. We should rather be surprised at the fact that Comrade Humbert-Droz does not understand these simple things that occur in the sphere of Bolshevik revolutionary practice.

The same may be said of Comrade Serra. He does not approve of the German Communists acting outside the existing unions and of their having broken down those limits in the struggle to organise the locked-out metal workers. He regards this as a violation of the resolution of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. He maintains that the R. I. L. U. instructed the Communists to work only within the unions. This is nonsense, comrades! The R. I. L. U. has not suggested anything of the sort.

(Lozovsky: Hear, hear!)

To say this means to doom the Communist Party to the role of a mere passive spectator in the class struggles of the proletariat. To maintain this means to bury the idea of the leading rôle of the Communist Party in the Labour Movement. It is the merit of the German Communists that they refused to be scared by the twaddle about "trade union limits", that they broke through those limits and organised the struggle of the unorganised against the will of the trade union bureaucrats. It is the merit of the German Communists that they sought and found new forms of struggle and of organising the unorganised workers. Perhaps, in doing so they made some minor mistakes. But new things are never accomplished without mistakes. It does not at all follow that because we must work in the reformist unions if they are really mass organisations, therefore we must confine our mass work to work in the reformist unions, that we must become slaves to the rules and regulations

of those unions. If the reformist leaders are merging with capitalism (see the resolutions of the VI. Congress of the C. I. and the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U.) and the working class is waging a struggle against capitalism, how can it be maintained that the working class struggle led by the Communist Party can be carried on without, to a certain extent, breaking through the limits of the existing reformist unions? Obviously, it cannot be maintained without dropping into opportunism. We can quite easily conceive of a situation in which it may be necessary to create parallel mass working class unions against the will of the trade union bureaucrats who have sold themselves to the capitalists. We have such a situation in the United States. It is quite possible for a similar situation to arise in Germany.

### 3. The Problem of the Communist Party of Germany.

Is the Communist Party of Germany to be or not to be an organised and consolidated organisation with iron discipline — that is the question, comrades? It is not merely a question of Rights or conciliators that is at stake, but the very existence of the Communist Party of Germany. The Communist Party of Germany exists. But inside the Communist Party of Germany there are two forces which are disintegrating the Party from within and are endangering its very existence. First, there is the Right faction, which is organising a new anti-Leninist Party within the Communist Party, with its own Central Committee and its own press and which day in and day out violates Party discipline. Secondly, there is the conciliatory group, which, by its vacillations, strengthens the Right faction. There is no need for me to prove here that the Right faction is breaking with Leninism; and is waging a desperate struggle against the Comintern. That has been proved long ago. Nor is there any need for me to prove that the conciliatory group violates the known decision of the VI. Congress concerning the systematic struggle against the conciliators. That also has been proved already. The situation in the German Party has reached the limit of toleration. The "state of affairs" in which the Rights poison the atmosphere with Social Democratic ideological rubbish and systematically violate the elementary principles of Party discipline, while the conciliators carry grist to the mill of the Rights must no longer be tolerated, for to do so would mean to turn against the Comintern and to violate the elementary demands of Leninism. A situation has arisen similar to that which we had in the C. P. S. U. (if not worse) in the last phase of the struggle against Trotskyism, when the Party and the Comintern were compelled to drive the Trotskyists out of their ranks. Everyone realises this now. But Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra do not see it, or pretend they do not see it. So much the worse for them. This means that they are ready to support both the Rights and the conciliators even at the risk of utterly disintegrating the Communist Party of Germany.

In arguing against the expulsion of the Rights, Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra refer to the decision of the VI. Congress about combating the Right tendencies by ideological means. Yes, the VI. Congress did pass such a decision. But these comrades forget that the decision of the VI. Congress does not say that the struggle of the Communist Parties against the Right danger must be confined to measures of an ideological character. Nothing of the kind! With reference to the measures for combating deviations from the Leninist line by ideological means, the VI. Congress of the Comintern, in its resolution on Comrade Bukharin's report declared that:

"This does not imply that discipline is to be relaxed; on the contrary, it implies the general tightening up of iron internal discipline, the absolute subordination of the minority to the majority, the absolute subordination of the minor organisations, as well as all the other Party organisations (parliamentary fractions, trade union fractions, the press, etc.) to the leading Party Centres."

Strange that Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra forget this thesis in the resolution of the VI. Congress of the Comintern. It is very strange that all conciliators, those who regard themselves conciliators as well as those who shun that name, systematically forget this important thesis in their reference to the resolution of the VI. Congress of the Communist International.

What are we to do if, instead of a general tightening up of iron discipline in the German Party, we get crying facts of deliberate violation of discipline, by the Rights and partly also by some of the conciliators? Can such a situation be tolerated any longer?

What are we to do if, instead of absolute subordination of the minor organisations, the trade union fractions and the Party press to the Central Committee, we get in the Communist Party of Germany crying facts of the gross violation of this demand of the VI. Congress of the Comintern by the Rights and partly also by some of the conciliators? Can such a situation be tolerated any longer?

You know the conditions of acceptance to the Comintern adopted at the II. Congress. I have in mind the 21 conditions. Point 1 in those conditions lays it down that:

"the periodical and non-periodical press and all Party publishing offices must be completely subordinated to the Central Committee of the Party, irrespective as to whether the Party as a whole at the time is legal or illegal."

You know that the Right faction has two newspapers. You know that these papers refuse absolutely to submit to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany. The question is: can such an outrage be tolerated any longer?

Point 12 of the 21 Conditions stipulates that the Party must be "organised in the most centralised fashion", that "iron discipline bordering on military discipline must prevail". You know that the Rights in the German Party refuse to recognise any kind of discipline, iron or any other, except their own factional discipline. The question is: can such an outrage be tolerated any longer?

Or you will say perhaps that the stipulations of the II. Congress of the Comintern are not binding on the Rights?

Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra cry out against alleged violation of the decisions of the Communist International. In the Rights we have real (and not alleged) violators of the fundamental principles of the Communist International. Why do they remain silent? Is it not because they, while ostensibly defending the decisions of the Comintern, want to defend the Rights and to have these decisions revised?

The statement Comrade Serra made is particularly interesting. He swears by his faith that he is against the Rights, against the conciliators, etc. But what conclusions does he draw from that? To fight the Rights and the conciliators? Not at all. He draws the extremely strange conclusion that the Polit-Bureau of the C. C. of the German Party must be reorganised! Try and think this out: the Politbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. G. is waging a determined struggle against the Right danger and the vacillations of the conciliators; Comrade Serra is in favour of combating the Rights and the conciliators; therefore, Comrade Serra proposes that the Rights and the conciliators be not interfered with, that the struggle against the Rights and conciliators be slackened and that the composition of the Politbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. G. be changed to suit the wishes of the conciliators. And this is called a "logical conclusion". I hope Comrade Serra will excuse me if I say that his arguments remind me of a provincial lawyer trying to prove that black is white. His line of argument is precisely what we call a lawyer's defence of opportunist elements.

Comrade Serra proposes to reorganise the Politbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. G., e. g. to remove some members and to replace them by others. Why does not Comrade Serra say clearly and frankly who these substitutes should be?

(Serra: Those whom the VI. Congress of the Comintern desired.)

But the VI. Congress did not propose that the conciliators be rehabilitated. On the contrary, it instructed us to wage a systematic struggle against conciliation. And precisely because the conciliators failed to carry out this instruction, the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. on Oct. 6, 1928, i. e., after the VI. Congress, passed the well known decision on the Rights and the conciliators. Comrade Serra wants to pose as the sole interpreter of the decisions of the VI. Congress. He has not by any means proved his claim to this. The interpreter of the decisions of the VI. Congress is the Executive Committee of the Comintern and its Presidium. I observe that Comrade Serra does not agree with the decision of the Presidium of the

E. C. C. I. of Oct. 6, although he has not stated so frankly. So much the worse for him.

What is the conclusion? There is but one conclusion — the attitude of Comrades Humbert-Droz and Serra to the question of the German Party is that of a pusillanimous lawyer's defence of the Rights against the C. P. G. and against the Comintern.

#### 4. The Rights in the C. P. G and in the C. P. S. U.

I learned today from several speeches delivered here that some German conciliators refer to the speech I delivered at the November Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on the question of the methods of combating the Right elements as a justification of their position. As you know I said in my speech (it has been published) that in the present phase of development of the struggle against the Right danger in the C. P. S. U., the principal method to be applied is that of an ideological struggle, which however does not preclude the application of organisational measures in individual cases. I substantiated my thesis by saying that the Rights in the C. P. S. U. have not yet become crystallised, that they do not constitute a group or a faction and have not yet violated, or failed to carry out, any of the decisions of the C. P. S. U. I said that if the Rights will resort to factional fighting and will commence to violate the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., they will be treated in the same way as the Trotskyists were treated in 1927. This, I think, is clear. Is it not silly after this to refer to my speech as an argument in favour of the Rights in Germany, where they have already commenced to employ factional methods of struggle and where they systematically violate the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. G., or as an argument in favour of the conciliators in Germany, where they have not yet dissociated themselves from the Right faction and where, it seems, they do not intend to do so? I think that anything sillier than this would be difficult to find. Only those who have abandoned dialectical thinking can fail to understand the full depth of the difference that exists between the position of the Rights in the C. P. S. U. and the position of the Rights in the C. P. G.

After all, the Rights in the C. P. S. U. are not a faction and it is an incontrovertible fact that they loyally carry out the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. The German Rights, on the contrary, already have a faction, with a factional centre at its head, and systematically trample under foot the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. G. Is it not clear that the methods of combating the Rights at the present moment cannot be the same in these two Parties?

Furthermore, here in the U. S. S. R. we have not a social democracy as an organised and serious force to foster and stimulate the Right danger in the C. P. S. U. In Germany, on the contrary, there is side by side with the Communist Party, a more powerful and a fairly well organised Social Democratic Party which fosters the Right danger in the Communist Party of Germany and which utilises that danger as an objective channel through which to permeate our Party. Only the blind can fail to see the difference between the situation in the U. S. S. R. and that in Germany.

One more point. Our Party grew and became consolidated in desperate struggles against the Mensheviks, which struggles took the form of direct civil war against the Mensheviks which lasted for several years. Do not forget that in November 1917, we Bolsheviks, overthrew the Mensheviks and S.R.'s as the Left wing of the counter-revolutionary imperialist bourgeoisie. That, by the way, explains the strong traditions of hostility to avowed opportunism in the C. P. S. U., traditions that are not found in any other Communist Party in the world. It is sufficient to recall the fact that the Party workers in Moscow in a period of not more than two months, at one blow, as it were, straightened out the line of the Moscow Committee; it is sufficient to recall this to be able to understand how strong the traditions of hostility towards avowed opportunism are in our Party. Can we say the same of the German Party?

Probably you will agree with me that, much as we may regret it, we cannot say it. More than that, we cannot deny that the Communist Party of Germany has not yet by a long way freed itself from its Social Democratic traditions which foster the Right danger in the C. P. G.

These then are the conditions in Germany and the conditions in the U. S. S. R. The conditions are different in each case and necessitate different methods of struggle against the Right danger.

Only those who have lost the elementary understanding of Marxism can fail to understand this simple fact.

In the Commission of the November Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. charged with the drafting of the resolution, a group of comrades moved to extend the application of the fundamental points of the resolution to the other sections of the Comintern, including the German Section. We rejected that motion, and declared that the conditions of the struggle against the Right danger in the C. P. G. were cardinaly different from the conditions of the struggle in the C. P. S. U.

#### 5. The Draft of the Open Letter.

Two words concerning the draft resolutions submitted by the commissions of the E. C. C. I. Comrade Serra thinks that these draft resolutions are provincial in character. Why? Because, it appears, the draft of the Open Letter does not contain an analysis of the political situation that gave rise to the Right danger. This is ridiculous, comrades. We have such an analysis in the resolutions of the VI. Congress. Is it necessary to repeat it? I think there is no need for repetition. Properly speaking, we could limit ourselves to a short resolution on the Rights who systematically violate the decisions of the VI. Congress, and who, therefore, are liable to expulsion, and on the conciliators who refrain from combating the Rights and therefore deserve a serious warning. The reason we did not limit ourselves to a short resolution, is because we want to explain to the workers the nature of the Right tendency, to expose to them the real features of Brandler and Thalheimer, what they were in the past and what they are now, to show to the workers how long the Comintern and the C. P. S. U. had spared them in the hope that they would mend their ways, to show how long they have been tolerated in the ranks of the Communists and why such people can no longer be tolerated in the ranks of the Comintern. That is why the draft resolution is longer than might have been at first expected.

Comrade Molotov has already stated that the delegation of the C. P. S. U. is fully and wholeheartedly in favour of these draft resolutions. I can but repeat Comrade Molotov's statement. I would like to make only a few minor amendments.

(Comrade Stalin reads the amendments and hands them to the Presidium.)

*The above speech also appears in the current number of the "Communist International".*

*Editor.*

## THE BALKANS

### The Coup d'Etat in Yugoslavia.

By Willi Sch l a m m (Vienna).

During the night from 5th to 6th January King Alexander of Yugoslavia set aside the constitution and took all power into his own hands.

In a short royal decree it was stated:

"The King possesses all power in the country ... He issues the laws, he appoints the officials, the Prime Minister and Ministers, determines promotion in the army and commands the defensive forces ... The ministers are responsible solely to the king."

The new Ministerial Council which was at once appointed immediately proceeded to carry out the absolutist dictatorship. It proclaimed the "Law for the defence of the State" as the basis of the entire political system. In consequence, preventa-

live censorship was imposed upon the press, and public meetings of a political character as well as private conferences were forbidden. The press is not permitted to publish any comment on the formation of the government.

The establishment of an open dictatorship in Yugoslavia is an attempt to overcome the State crisis by means of unrestrained terror against the masses of the people. Generals Zivkovich and Hadnich, the two generals appointed to conduct the Ministry, belong to the "White Hand", the most reactionary officers' clique in the country. They rely before all on the military and the Serbian hegemonist officials.

Contrary to the reports in the bourgeois foreign press, Parliament is not to be closed temporarily, but a dictatorship for a long period is to be set up, as is expressly stated in the Manifesto of King Alexander.

The government crisis, however, which led to the coup d'état, started with the demonstrations at Zagreb early in December on the occasion of the ten-year anniversary of the inception of the Yugoslav State. At that time wildly excited Croatian masses, including students in particular but also numbers of workers, protested in the streets of Zagreb against the hegemony of the Serbs. The Croatian flag was hoisted on the Government buildings, where upon the authorities responded with a brutal assault, leaving two dead and many wounded in the streets.

The December demonstrations led to a fresh aggravation of the relations between Belgrade and Zagreb. Prime-Minister Koroshetz proceeded more and more drastically against the Croats, the provocative appointment of Maximovitch, an active colonel, as prefect of the Zagreb district, causing special embitterment.

This course did not only entail passionate resistance in Croatia; it was not without its effect even within the Belgrade Government parties. A "revolt" ensued on the part of the Democrats under the lead of Davidovitch, who had been participating in the Government. Davidovitch had slowly come to comprehend that his party would lose all its popularity if it continued to render services to the Koroshetz Cabinet. And since he counted on the likelihood of a speedy end to the Koroshetz Government and of new election at no distant date, he rather fancied himself in the rôle of a mediator between Belgrade and Zagreb. Thus the plenum of the Belgrade Parliamentary Democratic fraction resolved (at first against the adherents of the "Democratic" Foreign Minister Marinkovitch) to withdraw their support from the Koroshetz Government. Shortly afterwards, the Central Committee unanimously confirmed the cancellation of the Coalition agreement.

On the December 30th the Government resigned, quite openly explaining its procedure as due to the irreconcilable differences of opinion which had ensued among the Government parties in regard to the attitude towards Croatia.

The underlying reason of this development, however, must be sought elsewhere. It may be attributed to a systematic intervention of both the British and the French Government. Quite a short time ago the British Minister Kennard visited Zagreb, while at the same time the French Minister Dard was negotiating in Belgrade. Both had been instructed by their respective Governments to work in the two political centres in the direction of a speedy solution of the Serbo-Croatian difference, if necessary with the menace of a financial boycott in the case of non-compliance. British capital has at all times been in close relations with Zagreb, whereas the French interests favoured Belgrade, so that this distribution of rôles came as a matter of course.

In the first days of January there took place the negotiations between the King and the leaders of the late government and the Opposition parties. The result was the coup d'état.

The coup d'état has been carried out with the direct agreement of the French government and with at least the approval of the British government. This is demonstrated by the fact that Marinkovitch, the former Foreign Minister, remains in the government of the dictatorship, by which it is intended to demonstrate that the foreign policy of the late government will be continued. Already before the demission of the Koroshetz government the British and French Ambassadors in Yugo-

slavia, on behalf of their governments, insisted on the most rapid possible solution of the State crisis. Great Britain and France gave it to be understood that they are bound to attach the greatest importance to the most rapid establishment of "internal order" in Yugoslavia, because only under this condition can Yugoslavia be regarded as a reliable partner in the Balkan front against the Soviet Union. When it became evident, by the demission of the Koroshetz government, that, in view of the feeling of the masses in Croatia, the difficulties of an understanding with Zagreb are still too great, the imperialist advisors to the King recommended that this resistance be overcome by a dictatorship.

At the same time the Serbian bourgeoisie, in view of the constant threat on the side of Italy, requires a form of government which, in the event of war, can break with ruthless brutality the resistance of the working masses.

The leaders of the peasant-democratic coalition seem to have been won for the plan of the dictatorship already at their audience with the King, which took place the previous week. As a preliminary price the Croats were granted four seats in the new Cabinet of the dictatorship, which, it is true, were given not to prominent Party leaders but to intermediaries people.

The military dictatorship is directed with full sharpness solely against the working masses, whose resistance to the intended submission to the Belgrade hegemonists is to be broken, the more so as the capitulation policy of the Croat leaders was leading to the formation of a broad basis for the revolutionising of wide masses under the leadership of the workers and peasants' bloc. One of the immediate effects of the establishment of the dictatorship is to assist the leaders of the peasant-democratic coalition by enabling them to desert the masses of the people. On the other hand Matchek and Pribitchevitch helped to prepare the dictatorship by concentrating their policy upon the person of the King, and it will be their task in the first decisive days of the dictatorship to keep the Croatian masses quiet by representing the abolition of the Constitution as a success for the Croats.

In this shameful deception they are receiving the help of the Yugoslavian social democracy, which represents the severe crisis as being a "squabb'e between the bourgeois parties" and recommends the proletariat to remain completely passive. It will depend precisely upon the action of the working masses whether the dictatorship will be able to carry out and realise its policy without opposition, a policy which is directed equally against the working population in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union.

The immediate developments will depend to no small extent upon the courage and the determination of the Yugoslavian revolutionaries, who must endeavour to mobilise the working masses for the counter-attack. In any event the struggle of the Yugoslavian workers' and peasants' bloc has entered that phase in which it must be directed with all sharpness against the traitors in the peasant-democratic coalition and the Yugoslavian social democracy.

The establishment of the dictatorship in Yugoslavia accelerates the preparations for war against the Soviet Union. Its further effects may very soon confront the Communist Parties of the other countries with very serious tasks.

## The First Measures of the Dictatorship in Yugoslavia.

The establishment of the absolute dictatorship of King Alexander Karageorjevitch in Yugoslavia was announced by a proclamation of the king on January 6th. In this proclamation Parliamentarism is rejected as being a "hindrance to any fruitful work of the State" and it is decreed that the "Constitution of the kingdom of June 18th, 1921, is no longer in force". Parliament is at the same time dissolved.

The measures for the consolidation of the dictatorship then followed one after another. At first there were promulgated four laws which determine the authority of the king and the absolutist administration of the State.

The first law hands over the whole legislative and executive power to the king. It is divided into 21 paragraphs which contain the detailed provisions.

By means of the second law, for the "defence of the realm", all parties which are organised on a national or religious basis are dissolved. Further, all public meetings of political parties are to be declared impermissible (even private ones) unless they are specially permitted by the government. This law will soon put an end to the joy of the Croatian opposition over the coup d'état which found expression in the articles and declarations of Matchek and his friends; for by virtue of this law the Croatian Peasant Party and the Mohammedan Party in Bosnia and Herzegovina are being dissolved.

The third law completely abolishes the liberty of the Press. It establishes a preventive censorship and makes the author, the editor, the publisher, the owner of the printing works and the distributor jointly responsible for the publication of an article. The Minister for the Interior can forbid the publication of a newspaper altogether.

The fourth law concerns the administration in the provinces and municipalities. The municipal councils are dissolved, the burgomasters are removed from office. In Belgrade, Zagreb and Laibach they are appointed by the king; in the other municipalities by the governor of the province. The work of the provincial diets is entrusted to State commissioners.

On the strength of these laws the king has all power in the country. He issues all the laws, and the Ministers are responsible only to him. He is unlimited autocrat, both politically and militarily.

The government which has been appointed under the new State law, at whose head there sits such a brutal militarist as the commander of the guards, General Zivkovich, is preparing four further laws. The first will establish a Special court for the "Defence of the State", which in actual fact will be an exceptional court against the working masses. The second law subordinates the judges and their judgments to the orders of the sovereign dictator. The two other laws provide equal measures for the two supreme courts.

With this the government has taken up the work for the "establishment of law and order".

## The Balance of the Elections in Roumania.

By J. E. (Bucharest).

On December 12th there were Parliamentary elections in Roumania, the outcome of which is of the very greatest importance for the Roumanian working class.

The results recorded permit of three significant inferences: 1. The pronounced defeat of the Bratianu Party, hitherto in office; 2. the victory of the National-Zaranist Party; and 3. the united front of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat led by the Communist Party.

The defeat of the Liberal Party, which had for ten years ruled the country unrestrictedly, was a natural outcome of its entire system of government, characterised by White terrorism, an incredible exploitation of the broad masses of workers and peasants, the violent suppression of the national minorities, and a policy of predatory economy.

The signal defeat of this party, which obtained hardly six per cent. of the total number of votes, was at the same time the victory of the National-Zaranist Party, the only bourgeois party opposing the dictatorship of Bratianu, and this party it is which has now acceded to power.

There is a widespread impression that in the Balkan countries the government party of the moment invariably attains a majority, and this opinion is in keeping with facts. The government parties generally take all the necessary steps to ensure their victory at the elections, such as the forging of lists, the theft of ballot boxes, and the changing of ballot papers.

These methods the Maniu Government did not employ. The election it instituted was "free" and "Democratic", quite on the "democratic" lines of the West-European States. That is to say, the bourgeois parties had full liberty of agitation, and the entire terrorism and all the power of the reactionary election-laws were directed against the workers, against their one and only revolutionary organisation, against the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc, and against the Communist Party.

The "victory" of the National-Zaranist Party, which obtained roughly 80 per cent. of all the votes cast proves that there are still powerful "democratic" illusions among the broad masses. These illusions, strengthened by demagogic slogans and promises on the part of the National-Zaranist Party, induced even the working population, including the peasants in particular, to give their votes to the new Government.

In his lengthy oppositional struggle against the Liberal Party, Maniu managed by clever manoeuvres and "Left" phraseology to gain the adherence of the broad classes of the population.

The Social Democrats played into the hands of the party now in office, whose main ally they were in the task of hoodwinking the masses. Their jubilation in regard to the new era, the new epoch of "democracy" and "liberty", was directed towards diverting the attention of the workers from their real class interests and towards strengthening the illusions aroused by the National-Zaranists.

It was only the Communist Party that endeavoured to expose the lies of the National-Zaranists and to point out the right way to the masses. The Party, however, is forbidden in Roumania and obliged to work in a condition of illegality. Its place was taken during the elections by the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc, the revolutionary united-front organisation of all workers.

The number of votes polled by the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc amounts to roughly 40,000. In reality it is considerably greater. In districts in which — as a result of terrorism or for want of organisational connections — there was no possibility of putting up separate lists of candidates, the adherents of the Bloc were instructed to make their ballot papers invalid by simply writing on them "Down with Terrorism". The number of votes spoiled was 53,000, a very great proportion of which total may be attributed to this slogan. But even if we count only the fully valid votes, we may see that the Bloc gained an accretion of 10,000 votes over the result at the last elections, where it polled 30,000. But all these numbers fail to give a proper conception of the influence of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc on the working masses of Roumania. The "democratic" Maniu Government conducted the elections on the basis of the most reactionary of all electoral systems, created during the Bratianu administration. According to this law the new register of electors comes into force in the first month of each year. Thus the elections were carried out on the basis of lists prepared in January 1928 under the rule of the Liberal Party. The manner in which the electorate used to be "sifted" by Bratianu and his clique is well known. A considerable portion of the working class could thus not take part in the elections at all.

The "democratic" Maniu Government which set up the slogan of "free elections", employed all means at its disposal to prevent the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc from getting into close touch with the working masses. While all the bourgeois parties, including the Social Democrats, the "Right-radical" Cuzists (Anti-Semites), and even the bitterest opponents of the National-Zaranist Party, the "Liberals", had complete freedom in their election agitation, the leaders of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc were exposed to constant persecution on the part of the Government and its organs, the "siguranta" and the gendarmes.

In spite of the decree regarding the abolition of the censorship and of the state of siege, the workers' press continued to be censored and the revolutionary workers to be brought before courts martial. The meeting of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc were prohibited, their candidates were arrested, their newspapers and election literature confiscated. In a number of towns the election lists of the Bloc were not

permitted at all by the authorities. In Bukovina this was done on the grounds that some of the signatures had been made in Ukrainian characters. The inhuman torturings practised by the *siguranza* continue to occur under the Maniu regime. At Buhusi a workman named Nikolai Nagy was arrested for distributing election literature of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc and tortured until he became insane. Election agitation in the country was made quite impossible by an unparalleled terrorism on the part of the gendarmes. Such agitators of the Bloc as visited the villages were arrested, brutally ill-treated, and drafted to the nearest town, where they were handed over to the *siguranza*.

So as definitely to gag the revolutionary labour movement, the Government invented a new "democratic" ruse. All the proprietors of printing-works and of premises suitable for meetings were summoned to appear before the *siguranza*, where they were instructed, with appropriate threats, to refuse the use of their works or premises for the printing of manifestos or the holding of assemblies of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc. The jubilation of the Social Democrats in regard to "democracy" and "liberty" and their dithyrambic praise of the "democratic" Maniu Government accompanied this campaign of the bourgeoisie against the working class.

It would be wholly wrong, however, to attribute the relative paucity of the votes cast for the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc to no other reason than the terrorism exercised by the Government. The fact must be admitted that the result is partly due to the mistakes committed by the Bloc itself.

A false estimation of the general situation in Roumania and an opportunistic attitude in regard to the bourgeois Opposition caused both the Communist Party and the Bloc on the occasion of former elections to form a united front with the bourgeois parties and even with the party of Averescu. Instead of issuing its own slogans, the Party adopted the demands of the bourgeoisie for "free elections" and a "people's constitution". The slogan of self-determination to the extent of actual secession was replaced by the demand for a "Federative Republic of the Workers and Peasants of Roumania".

These tactics weakened the Party and transferred it from the basis of the class struggle to that of compromises, a change which also found expression in the vacillating policy of the Party in the matter of the adherence of the United Trade Unions to the Amsterdam International, in the over-estimation of the possibilities of a fight against the White Terror by means of deputations to the Government, and in a number of mistakes in connection with the combination of illegal work with legal possibilities, a pronouncedly legalistic and liquidatory tendency.

Of late the Party has materially improved its line of action. The demands for an expropriation of land without compensation, for self-determination to the extent of secession, for an immediate complete disarmament and cessation of war-preparations against the Soviet Union, and for a government of the workers and peasants — all these are principles of a really revolutionary party of the masses, of a real Communist Party.

There was, however, not sufficient time to allow these slogans to strike root among the working masses. In the space of one month the Party was not able to make the masses understand that the same Workers' and Peasants' Bloc which had supported the National-Zarunist Party at the last elections and had not made any utterances in the meantime, was now ready to oppose that party to the utmost.

The sabotage, too, which was exercised by the opportunist wing of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc and in the United Trade Unions, was no small obstacle to the Party on its way to the winning of the masses. The petty-bourgeois ideology of this legalist-liquidatory group was most drastically apparent during the Cluj trials in the speeches of Koloman Müller, Rozvany, and others, who — contrary to the so-called "illegal group" with its stirring revolutionary oratory — repudiated the revolutionary class-struggle and assumed the standpoint of bourgeois "democracy". This group did all in its power to undermine the revolutionary aims of the Party, while most characteristically attempting to clothe its opportunism in "Left" phrases. It was the members of this group who, at the Congress of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc, spoke against taking part in the elections.

But in spite of all these difficulties, the Party recorded a series of successes. In the first place we may point to the extension of the united front. The Ukrainian Socialist Party, which hitherto belonged to the Union of Social Democratic Parties of Roumania, has now quitted this union and joined the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc. In its campaign for a general political amnesty, too, the Party has succeeded in gathering the broad mass of workers and intellectuals under its banner. This means that the Communist Party of Roumania has discovered the right way to win the masses.

The Maniu Government, which is nothing but an agent of foreign capital and a tool of Anglo-French imperialism in its war-preparations against the Soviet Union, will soon be forced to show its true face openly. Its own class interests and the pressure of the financially all-powerful Liberal Party will force it to forget its "radical" promises and to continue the policy of Bratianu, the policy of extreme exploitation, of the violation of minorities, of the White Terror, and so forth,

Politically, the Maniu Government stands for a concentration of all bourgeois forces against the workers. The task with which the C. P. of Roumania is confronted consists in the organisation of a defensive front of the workers and peasants against the offensive of the united bourgeoisie, in a revelation to the masses of the true class-nature of the National-Zarunist Party and of the new Government, and in an uninterrupted struggle for the daily interests of the workers, connected with final slogans, to unmask the falsehood and treachery of the National-Zarunists and of their allies, the Social-Democrats and to gain the adherence of the masses. At the same time, the Party must endeavour to wage a fierce fight against the opportunistic and liquidatory elements in its own ranks.

## POLITICS

### Parker Gilbert's Report and the Reparations Question.

By Paul Braun (Berlin).

The annual report published on New Year's Day by Parker Gilbert, Agent-General for German Reparations, is in a double sense a significant document. It appears at a moment when fresh struggles on the part of the German proletarian masses and fresh social conflicts cast their shadows before and on the eve of the negotiations regarding the final regulation of the Reparations question, which forms the very focus of the world-political differences of the present time.

Reduced to the shortest possible formula, the new annual report of Parker Gilbert affirms that in the course of last year the capitalist stabilisation in Germany reached such a degree of firmness and constancy that there could be no question of a reduction of the yearly Reparations payments established by the Dawes Plan, i. e. that a revision of the Dawes Plan was not to be considered.

Before arriving at this conclusion, the Agent-General for Reparations proceeds in his report to sing the praises of Germany's capital stabilisation in a tone which we are ordinarily accustomed to hear from none but the Social Democratic apologists of the said stabilisation. Inter alia, he says:

"Germany' production and commerce and the credit conditions in the country have acquired a character of greater constancy than at any time since the war. The general economic conditions have consolidated at a relatively high level. The volume of consumption in 1928 may be regarded as an impressive sign of the improved standard of living of the broad masses of the population. Normally and from the standpoint of experience hitherto made, there can be no possibility of the German budget not being able to render its normal contribution in the form of Reparations. The transfer of the German payments to the Reparations creditors has ensued regularly and without any disturbances to the German currency."

Parker Gilbert's thesis is doubly in keeping with the interests of the American financial capitalists. It affords a weighty pretext for a general and immediate offensive on the part of German trust capital on its own behalf and on that of the Dawes creditors against the German working class, while at the same time it is a starting-point for a new advance of the American imperialists against the European constellation of forces under British lead.

The Reparations Agent, representing international financial capital, attacks the "tendency to undue expenditure" and calls for "material retrenchments" and for the "increase of certain taxes in the interest of balancing the budget". He criticises the "augmentation of salaries and pensions to civil servants" and demands a "wise financial policy" for the German railways, by which he means a renunciation by the Government of its right of interference with the extortionate tariffs of the Dawes railway-management, the maintenance of the ten-hour day, and the consistent refusal of any increase in wages.

Furthermore, he demands for the coming financial year a new regulation of the financial settlement between the German Republic and its component provinces, entailing a restriction of the expenditure of the provinces and municipalities and an abolition of the last remnant of communal self-administration. This demand means nothing but an unscrupulous cutting down of social services, unemployment relief, tenants' protection, poor relief, and emergency measures.

And to crown this unparalleled programme of spoliation, the representative of international financial capital finally declares — with a cynicism which is all the more frivolous as being in crass contradiction to the more than optimistic description of the German economic situation — that there are "undoubtedly still sources of taxation which might be tapped in a case of emergency".

Thus the new annual report of the Reparations Agent is a signal to the German working class of a tremendous accentuation of the class struggle, of a trial of strength between capital and the working class which will put the social struggles of the last few years altogether into the shade as regards both size and far-reaching effect.

At the same time, the report of Parker Gilbert is a link in the chain of continually growing political differences which have become apparent in connection with the Reparations question. British imperialism has set itself the task of founding, on the basis of its alliance with France, a European bloc against the Soviet Union and against the imperialism of the United States. The "final regulation" of the Reparations question, as envisaged by the imperialists of France and Great Britain, is intended not only to manoeuvre Germany into the war-bloc against the Soviet Union but at the same time to destroy the present Dawes system, in which America plays the leading part, and to replace it by a new Reparations system in which Great Britain will play the part of arbiter between France and Germany.

On the other hand, the American imperialists attempted in the summer of last year to use the Kellogg agreement as a means of smashing the European system of power led by Great Britain and anchored in the League of Nations and to substitute therefor a universal American system. Parker Gilbert's report represents a flat rejection of the Anglo-French Reparations policy and a further step of the United States on the path of increased "interference" in European affairs.

The apparent concession made to the French imperialists in the recognition of Germany's ability to pay, is nothing but a fresh attempt to drive a wedge between France and Great Britain. The simultaneous aggravation of the differences between France and Germany, meanwhile, completely frustrates the success of the prospective Reparations negotiations as desired by Great Britain.

Thus the report of the Reparations Agent marks the opening of a new phase in the imperialist struggle for world-hegemony.

## The Wave of Reaction in Egypt.

J. B. (Jerusalem).

As was to be foreseen, the realisation of the various reforms in Egypt projected by Mohammed Pasha Mahmud is proceeding with extreme slowness. Not a single one of the numerous promises to the workers, the peasants, industry etc. with which Mahmud was so lavish after his taking over of the government, shows any signs of being fulfilled. Everywhere "difficulties", "delays", "disturbances" are reported — and meanwhile the position of the population continues to remain critical and the situation of the country grows visibly more desperate.

In order to cope with this state of affairs the Mahmud Government is energetically resorting to measures to maintain order. The freedom of the press is already completely abolished in Egypt. Of the great number of Wafdist and other Opposition papers there is only one — a daily paper appearing in Cairo — which has not yet been completely suppressed, although even this paper has already received two warnings, so that Mahmud, by making use of the Press Law dating from the year 1881, which has been restored by him, can now suppress it at any moment. All other Wafd papers appearing in Cairo and Alexandria — the daily papers and also the weekly and monthly journals — have been suppressed one after the other. The Wafd is thereby deprived of every possibility of legally voicing its opinions.

In order to frustrate the effect of the speeches delivered by the Wafd leaders in the various towns, the police are endeavouring to destroy the right of assembly. Most of the meetings called by the Wafd are prohibited and the organisers called to account.

So far as the Wafd seeks to substitute legal activity by illegal actions, the Government replies with fresh repressions: the disseminators of appeals by the Wafd are arrested and brought to trial; Wafdist students are expelled from the educational establishments (a fact which recently resulted in a protest strike of students in Cairo); in Mansourah eighty peasants who had taken part in a reception in honour of the Wafd president, Nehas Pasha, were arrested and brutally beaten by the police.

Mahmud now wishes to aim a blow at the leaders of the Wafd. He is seeking to do this by introducing disciplinary proceedings against Nehas Pasha and some other Wafdist leaders, for which purpose use is again being made of the Prince Seif-ed-Din affair, which was already put forward as a pretext for the overthrow of the Nehas Government.

The resistance of the Wafd to the acts of violence on the part of the reactionary government is completely passive. The leaders of the Wafd have the greatest fear of any revolutionary steps, of a mobilisation of the mass movement, and are confining themselves to more or less eloquent protests, to holding farcical parliamentary sessions in private houses (the proposal made by one of the more radical members of the Wafd to hold such a "parliamentary session" in the parliament buildings in spite of the military guard has of course not been carried out, as this could only have led to an open collision with the forces of the government, whose authority the Wafd leaders, in spite of all their loud talk, do not wish to violate. The Wafd is setting all its hopes on a change of government in Great Britain. Nehas Pasha and the secretary of the Wafd, Makram Ebend, hope to be able to arrive at an understanding with MacDonald or Lloyd George as Mahmud did with Austen Chamberlain.

As such an attitude cannot of course arouse any enthusiasm among the masses, a weakening of the influence of the Wafd is to be observed in many districts. At the same time the revolutionising of the masses in the towns, before all of the workers, is proceeding at a very rapid pace. Mohammed Mahmud Pasha is therefore directing his attention to preventing completely any revolutionary propaganda or enlightenment activity being conducted among the workers.

With this object in view the Police and Spv apparatus is being enlarged and there is a particularly intensive promotion of the activity of the so-called "Department for Combating Communism" at the Ministry of the Interior, which is mainly

run by White Russian Emigrants. Mahmud Pasha, just like his predecessor, wishes by persecuting the Communists to win favour with the English and at the same time to counteract the growing revolutionary current among the workers.

The arrest of four alleged "foreign Communists" and the big advertisement which the British press gave the "Guardians of law and order" in Egypt in connection with this event (with the dishing up of the usual legends regarding the "eyes of Moscow", "secret conspiracies", "special agents", etc.) was to mark the beginning of the attack upon the workers. The result, however, was a miserable fiasco: the "slayers of Communism" were not even able to gather sufficient evidence to stage a trial, and the "dangerous conspirators", after being held under arrest for a few days, were simply deported without the public being given any information regarding the results of the investigation which had been so painstakingly conducted.

The Mahmud Government must not hope that its reactionary measures will prove of any value in preventing the growth of discontent with this dictatorship which has to rely on the support of British bayonets.

## AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

### Text of the Note and the Proposal of Comrade Litvinov to the Polish Government.

On December 29th, Comrade Litvinov handed the following Note to Patek, the Polish Minister at Moscow.

Sir,

On August 24th, 1926, the Government of the Soviet Union by means of the Soviet representative at Warsaw handed the Government of the Polish Republic the draft of an agreement of non-aggression. This step on the part of the Soviet Government was the outcome of previous negotiations which had taken place between the two States upon the initiative of the Soviet Government. It was at the same time the expression of that foreign political line which has constantly been pursued by the Soviet Government in its relations with other countries and in keeping with which it initiated its proposals of disarmament, first at the Moscow Conference convoked in 1922 and subsequently in the preparatory Commission on Disarmament in the League of Nations.

The Soviet Government regards a general disarmament as the most effective guarantee for the maintenance of peace. At the same time, however, it regards treaties of non-aggression as a serious factor which may well contribute to preventing military conflicts between individual States.

The Soviet Government is bound to establish that the negotiations with the Polish Government in regard to the conclusion of such a treaty though initiated several years ago, are not advancing at all, in spite of serious attempts on the part of the Soviet Government to arrive at an understanding. The Soviet Government is fully aware of the significance which would attend the conclusion of a treaty of non-aggression in the interest of a consolidation and development of the relations between the Soviet Union and Poland, regrets the non-success of its endeavours, and again declares itself as willing as ever to sign such a treaty of non-aggression with the Polish Government.

While the negotiations regarding the conclusion of an agreement of non-aggression between Poland and the Soviet Union have remained futile, the Polish Government, in answer to an invitation to take part in the Kellogg Agreement a multilateral treaty on the renunciation of war as an instrument of national politics, signed this agreement, in concert with other States, in Paris, on August 27th, 1928. The Government of the Soviet Union likewise joined in this agreement.

When the Soviet Government had received the invitation to take part in the Kellogg Pact it pointed out in a Note to the French Government that the said agreement failed to include

an obligation of disarmament, which is the most essential element of any guarantee of peace; it also drew attention to the fact that the stipulation contained in the Agreement in regard to a prohibition of war is both inadequate and vague, and to various other features which tend to weaken the effect of the Agreement. The Soviet Government is still of opinion that this Agreement does not afford such guarantees for a non-violation of peace as would have resulted from the various agreements suggested by the Soviet Government in regard to non-aggression and non-participation in hostile groupings.

Considering, however, that the Paris (Kellogg) Agreement imposed various obligations of a peaceful character upon its participants, the Soviet Union joined this agreement, without hesitation. Since it takes all its actions directed towards the ensurance of peace very seriously, it would have been glad to see the agreement come into force as soon as possible, quite particularly with reference to the relations between the Soviet Union and the States immediately adjoining it.

Unfortunately the coming-into-force of the Paris Agreement was made dependent (in Art. 3) on its ratification by at least 14 States. During the four months which have elapsed since the day on which the agreement was signed, not one of these 14 States effected the ratification. This fact entails the fear that the agreement will long continue to be a mere document committing no one to anything. Apparently it is not possible for the agreement to come into force even between two individual States at an earlier date, unless a particular supplementary clause is added to it and separately signed.

In view of the fact that the ensurance of peace in the East of Europe is a matter of prime importance and that Poland, one of the countries bordering on the Soviet Union, is a signatory to this agreement, the Soviet Government here-with approaches the Polish Government with the suggestion to sign the enclosed protocol. According to this protocol, the Paris Agreement in regard to a renunciation of war would come into force between the Soviet Union and Poland as soon as the said States have ratified it, independent of the conditions laid down in Art. 3 of the said Agreement. By signing the above-mentioned protocol, the Polish Government would naturally incur the moral obligation of effecting as speedily as possible both the ratification of the Paris Agreement and that of the protocol itself. As regards the Soviet Union, its adherence to the Paris Agreement has already been ratified by the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee.

The Soviet Government begs to draw your particular attention to Art. 4 of the protocol, which enables any other State having joined in or in future joining in the Paris Agreement to sign this protocol. The Soviet Government is convinced that a realisation of its suggestion — for the time being as regards the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union — will considerably promote the stabilisation of peace in the East of Europe.

The Government of the Soviet Union trusts its present suggestion may meet with the support of the Polish Government, seeing that the latter, having already signed the multilateral Paris Agreement, to which the Soviet Union was likewise party, can have no possible objection to the speedy realisation of the agreement as between the two States.

The Soviet Government takes the opportunity to inform the Polish Government that it is at the same time making a similar suggestion to the Republic of Lithuania, the only one of the Baltic States to join in the Paris Agreement. If it does not at the same time appeal with the same suggestion to Finland, Esthonia, and Latvia, it is only because these States have not yet formally joined in the Paris Agreement. The Soviet Republic, however, reserves to itself the right of applying to these States as soon as they have effected their accession to the Paris Agreement.

I beg you, Sir, to bring the above to the notice of your Government and to accept the assurance of my profound respect.

Moscow, December 29th, 1928.

(signed) Litvinov

Deputy Commissary for Foreign Affairs.

### DRAFT OF A PROTOCOL.

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and the President of the Polish Republic, animated by the desire to strengthen the good neighbourly relations between the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and Poland and as soon as possible to put into operation the Agreement signed in Paris on August 27th, 1928, in regard to the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, have resolved to realise the said intentions by the present protocol. To this end,

the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republic has appointed ..... (names) and the President of the Polish Republic has appointed ..... (names) who upon the exchange of their legally recognised credentials have agreed as follows:

#### I.

The Agreement signed in Paris on August 21th, 1928, in regard to a renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, copy of which is subjoined to the present protocol as an inseparable part thereof, comes into operation between the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and Poland upon the ratification of the said Paris Agreement of 1928 by the competent legislative bodies of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and of Poland.

#### II.

The present protocol is subject to ratification by the competent legislative bodies of the Union of Socialist Republics and of Poland according to their respective constitutional laws. The present protocol comes into force between the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and Poland on the day of the exchange of ratification documents, which exchange is to take place at ..... (place) ..... within a week of the ratification by the respective parties.

#### III.

The Paris Agreement of 1928 is to be put into operation between the two contracting parties on the basis of the present protocol in the following manner:

When by virtue of Art. 2 of the present protocol, the latter has come into operation and when the legislative bodies of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and of Poland have ratified the Paris Agreement of 1928, the two contracting parties shall inform one another of these accomplished facts through diplomatic channels.

The time of arrival of the second of the said communications shall be considered as the time at which the Paris Agreement comes into force in the relations between the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and Poland.

#### IV.

It is open to the governments of all countries to join in this protocol. Such accession must be notified to the Government of ..... which will inform all the other parties to the present protocol of all subsequent accessions thereto. From the moment of arrival of the said declaration of accession, the present protocol will come into operation in the relations between the acceding State and all other participants in the present protocol.

#### V.

The coming-into-force of the Paris Agreement on the basis of the present protocol in the mutual relations among the newly acceding States and all other participants in the present protocol shall be effected in the following manner:

When according to Art. 4 of the present protocol the accession of an additional country has been effected and the legislative body (or bodies) of the said country have ratified the Paris Agreement of 1928, the Government of the newly acceding country shall immediately by diplomatic channels give information thereof to the Government of ..... which

will in turn inform all the other participants of the present protocol thereof.

The Paris Agreement of 1928 shall be deemed to come into force in the relations of the newly acceding State and of all other participants on the day on which the Government of ..... receives the relative notification.

#### VI.

The coming-into-force of the Paris Agreement of 1928 as provided by the present protocol, in the relations among the participants in the present protocol, is independent of the coming into force of the Paris Agreement of 1928 as expressed in Art. 3 of the said agreement.

In confirmation of the above, the plenipotentiary representatives above enumerated have set their hands and seals to the present protocol.

Executed in duplicate on ..... (date).

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Shipyard Workers' Strike in Hamburg.

By Paul Peschke (Berlin).

More than 45,000 shipyard workers have been on strike for 14 weeks. This is all the more significant as this is the first time the shipyard workers have been on strike since 1924. After the political defeat of the German workers by the white dictatorship in 1923 they followed, with the aid of social democratic trade union leaders their economic defeat by the ever increased application of arbitration. Just as the Ruhr metal workers, the shipyard workers in 1924, after long weeks of struggle, were betrayed by the union leaders in the interests of capitalist reconstruction. The eight hour day was lost. Their wages were depressed to the lowest level. The shipyard workers left their trade union in thousands. Nevertheless their fighting spirit was not broken. It was only slowly, that they succeeded, in a constant fight against the trade union bureaucracy, which advocated industrial peace, and against the arbitration system, in improving their wages. It was only in March 1928 that, on a ballot vote, they rejected almost unanimously a 3 and 5 Pfennigs increase granted by arbitration award. In spite of this, after the award had been declared binding, they were compelled by the union leaders to remain at work. They still had to work 52 hours a week. Their wages are among the lowest paid in Germany, and amounted up to the outbreak of the strike in Hamburg, at the very highest, to 77 to 87 Pfennigs an hour, in the shipyards on the North sea to 74 to 80 Pfennigs, and in the Baltic shipyards to even less. The wages of unskilled workers range between 60 and 70 Pfennigs.

The fluctuation of the workers in the shipyards is consequently exceedingly great. At every opportunity they turn to the industries which pay better wages. In October their determination to take up the fight for better working conditions became so strong that the bureaucracy was no longer able to prevent the fight. An arbitration award granting a 4 Pfennig increase was unanimously rejected. The demands of the Opposition for uniform rates of wages (with the abolition of the three different rates of pay according to the different districts) amounting to 1.20, 1.15 and 1.10 Marks for skilled workers, semi-skilled and unskilled workers respectively, were unanimously supported by the shipyard workers so that the negotiating Committee had to consider them. The negotiating committee, however, demanded one mark as the highest wage and allowed two local classes to exist. There is no doubt that the reformists had the intention to wear down the resistance of the workers by a prolonged struggle. They did nothing to bring together the unorganised, who in Hamburg, the main centre of the fight, comprise about 65 per cent. of the strikers, in order to prevent them being driven by hunger to act as blacklegs. They allowed the clerks, engineers, foremen and ap-

prentices to perform strikebreaking work. They permitted the employers to employ hundreds of emergency workers, with whose aid they were able to carry out the most urgent work. They even allowed the Deutsche Dock in Kiel 150 workers in order, during the strike, to complete a ship belonging to the admiralty.

The rapid intervention of the Opposition caused a Shop Stewards' decision to be carried through which prevented this trade union blacklegging in the service of the social-democratic armoured cruiser policy. The reformists isolated the shipyard workers and even prevented the Hamburg metal workers, whose collective agreement expired on the 31st of December, from joining in the struggle. The strike of the dock workers, initiated by the Opposition and which was intended to support the shipyard workers and enforce a rapid granting of the demands of both groups, was crushed by armed bands of strike-breakers who were organised by the S. P. leaders and supported by the police of the social democrat Schönfelder.

The tactics of the revolutionary trade union opposition, who rallied the unorganised round their own committees of action, and by means of mass pressure, forced the authorities to grant them unemployment relief, alone prevented the reformists from throttling the strike at a time suitable to them. The reformists did not venture to recommend the workers, after 12 weeks of struggle, to accept the new arbitration award pronounced by Herr Grabain, the arbitrator who had been appointed by Wissell. This award is supposed to provide for a wage increase of 5 pfennigs as against the 4 pfennigs granted by the first award. But this is only a trick. Because at the same time it abolishes the remuneration of overtime at the rate of 1 pfennig above the ordinary time rates. The working hours are reduced from 52 to 50, but at the same time the award provides that wages are to be paid outside working time, so that the shortening of the work time is thereby again abolished and and at the same time a reduction of wages is put through.

The workers, on a ballot vote, rejected this arbitration award by a more than 90 per cent. majority. The subsequent negotiations with the employers, who likewise rejected the award, have been broken off without any result being achieved. The employers, who have calculated their losses in the fight at more than 12 million, know that the social democratic minister for Labour, Herr Wissell, will come to their rescue by a declaration making the award binding. Herr Wissell refused to make the first award binding because both parties, the employers and the workers, rejected it.

The same situation prevails at the present time. Nevertheless Wissell has pronounced the award to be binding; a sign of the hopelessness of the social democratic trade union policy, which faced with the militant workers on the one hand and the demands of the social democratic coalition policy on the other, capitulates in this way to the employers. They wish to force the workers to submit to arbitration and to capitulate to the employers. Whatever the result of the fight may be it has shown that the German working class is inspired by a tremendous fighting spirit which the reformists threaten to destroy by their tactics in favour of the employers. Under revolutionary leadership with revolutionary fighting methods, the German working class would be in a position to force through their demands without delay. It is the task of the oppositional trade unionists to build up this leadership in close contact with the working masses.

## New England — America's Militant Textile Centre.

By Ann Stanley.

Lawrence Mass was the scene of the first great heroic struggle between the mill operators and the Textile workers. Nine years ago after a sixteen week struggle, the 48 hour week was established in Lawrence and this in spite of the \$ 100 000 the city spent trying to break the strike by police terrorism. During the Lawrence strike mounted police ruled the town. Two strikers, a man and a woman were killed, many maimed for life and hundreds were brutally beaten up.

The fight in Passaic, New Jersey, is still fresh in our minds. Two years ago during a long drawn out struggle of many months, the Passaic Textile workers waged a terrific struggle; facing police brutality, tear bombs and fire hose attacks, to carry on their strike. In this strike the authorities went so far as to beat up reporters and break cameras of daily bourgeois papers to prevent the news and pictures of their brutalities being printed. The American Federation of Labour having consistently sabotaged the strike; tried to discredit its Communist leader, A. Weisbord; interfered with relief work, sold out the strike. However, the strike accomplished one task — forced the recognition of the union.

This year New Bedford filled the press of the country with stories of police brutality and strikers solidarity for over five months. Wholesale arrests were made mounting well into 800 by the close of the strike. Men, women and children were beaten. One child was driven into the river at Fall River, Mass. by mounted police and drowned. John Porter, militant young leader of the strike and a soldier was arrested early in the struggle for his activity and faced a 99 years sentence on various charges. Due to the huge protest throughout the country that the Young Communist League of America, of which Porter was a member, raised — this sentence was reduced to two and a half years of hard labour in an army prison. Children were badly beaten in school for voicing solidarity with the strikers.

A few weeks ago the A. F. of L. sold out this strike too.

In the beginning of the strike the reactionaries tried to stave off the strike vote. In Fall River, Mass., through their machinations the vote to strike was defeated by 11 votes. In New Bedford, on the contrary, the strikers have chosen an opportune time for voting and as a result an honest vote was taken overwhelmingly in favour of the strike. Soon after the strike was called the officials of the Textile Council of New Bedford joined the American Federation of Labour and thus strengthened their reactionary forces. Throughout the strike the A. F. of L. tried to maintain "nice" relations with the employers by carrying on a "peaceful" strike.

The mill owners were not necessarily perturbed over the strike. The mills could stand a few days rest with no serious deflation of profits. There was serious danger of over production. A strike would tend to level it down a bit and they were confident that after a short "vacation" the workers would be led back to them by the faithful A. F. of L. — led back to the 10% reduction in wages, back to their unlimited hours of work, back to their rotten open shop conditions and intensified speed up plan.

The first days of the strike were of holiday tempo indeed — the local bourgeois papers praised the quietness of the situation — even soft soaped the strikers by appearing to side with them in some demands — the police cooperated in a fine spirit, giving the strikers a permit, endorsed by the chief of police, to solicit funds for the strike. The A. F. of L. seemed satisfied that no real struggle would ensue. No picket lines were organised. The unorganised workers that had left the mill's along with the skilled union men and women were left leaderless — no attempts being made to organise them.

Then the Socialist Party remembered that a few thousand textile votes would not come in amiss in the presidential elections and sent a few of their preachers into the field.

Norman Thomas, nominee of the S. P. for president, came to New Bedford and his meeting was well advertised in the Capitalist press, carrying his pictures on the front page and urging the workers to attend his meeting.

August Claessens, Alfred Baker Lewis and other socialists also invaded the field in the first month of the strike, and tried to help the Mill barons and the A. F. of L. in its task of ignoring the ten and fourteen hour day that was prevalent in the mills, the very low average wage of adult and especially of young workers, who form 40% of the force in the mills, the 10 000 women putting in the same time and labour yet receiving lower wages, the thousands of unemployed due to rationalisation and the more than 20,000 unorganised in the mills.

No doubt had the strike been left in the hands of the labour fakers and the Socialist Party, the workers would have returned to the mills defeated without even putting up a fight. The great majority of the workers were without former strike experience.

Then the Textile Mills Committee, militant left wing organisation of textile workers organised at the initiative of the Communist Party of America, came to the fore. Being originally instrumental in leading the workers from the mills, the T. M. C. leaders, foremost among them A. Weisbord, Communist leader of the Passaic strike, organised picket lines, drawing in not only the unorganised strikers but A. F. of L. own union members much to their chagrin. The workers spirits quickly rallied again. The T. M. C. organised into the New Bedford Textile Workers Union. Giant mass meetings were held and the struggle was on.

The A. F. of L. officials, locally and nationally, immediately began to attack the T. M. C. and its leaders. The mill barons and their press reporters showed the iron hand in the velvet glove and began their strike breaking manoeuvres in earnest. The chief of police turned his force on the pickets, the sympathising major called out the guards, hundreds of strikers were jailed and thousands beaten up in an attempt to terrorise the workers. The Socialist Party picked up its "bibles" and "hymn books" and left the field hastily. The Workers International Relief organised the relief and the strikers, with a militant leadership at their head, gave the mill barons a battle that shook New England.

In the later part of July several thousand textile workers in Fall River joined in the strike swelling the ranks to 30,000 men, women and children.

Besides demanding the revoking of the 10% increase — 40 hour 5 day week and no speed up, recognition of the union, etc.

The strikers rallied to the new union — many belonging to the A. F. of L. left its ranks and joined in with the militant union calling the A. F. of L. officials "yellow scabs" for their strike breaking attempts. Even the members of the A. F. of L. union followed the leadership of the New Bedford Textile Union to the growing despair of Batty, the reactionary leader of the A. F. of L. Time and again in spite of Batty's attempts to lead his members off the picket line, the A. F. of L. members remained in the lines with the other strikers. On one occasion after Batty had failed to keep his men off of an all night demonstration, he felt called upon to offer public apologies to the police and the Mill barons — saying he had done his best to dissuade them and winning the assurance of the chief of police that his (Batty's) cooperation with the police was much appreciated.

The strike was beginning to lengthen out intermittently long for the purses of the mill owners. Hiring of police and other gangsters was expensive — the Fall River strike was an unexpected additional expense — Production was falling off, profits were getting affected. Frenzied attempts were made to bring the strike to a close. Batty began propagandising his union of skilled workers. The 10% reduction was made a 5% reduction, and an alternative of the Friedler speed up system was offered instead of the cut.

Although the details of the Friedler plan have not been made public, the Specialisation Plan introduced in the National Spun Silk Company is a good example of what may be expected by the workers if the above plan goes into effect. The Specialisation Plan included the following:

- Highly intensified speed up
- Solid shifts without a break for dinner
- Reduced wages

Open shop and substitution of a company union for the existing union.

Twelve looms instead of the four or six looms per weaver.

And this is the plan the A. F. of L. is willing to ban off on its members in order to maintain "nice" relations with the employers! Maybe Batty, seeing the decrease of the A. F. of L. Textile union looming on the horizon is betting on the formation of the company union and a soft job therein in return for his faithfulness to the employers.

Shortly after October 1st the A. F. of L. membership voted down a return to the mills at a 5% reduction. Sentiment was high in the ranks of the A. F. of L. union against going back defeated. Batty pronounced the vote void for reasons best known

to himself and a few days later another vote was taken in favour of Batty's proposal and the A. F. of L. men were ordered back to the mills at the 5% reduction.

The offensive against the T. M. C. strikers was now doubled — nothing stood in the way of Batty's strike breaking now that the strike was unlawful. Police terrorism doubled overnight — new arrests were made, Jack Rubenstein, Y. C. L. member and one of the most militant of the young leaders of the strike was arrested again and beaten badly.

But the A. F. of L. sell out had broken the back of the strike and after almost a week of battling the terrific onslaught of the mill barons the T. M. C. dissolved the strike committee and the workers went back to the mills — temporarily defeated.

This latest sell out of the A. F. of L. has further disclosed its treacherous strike breaking policy to the workers. The new textile union formed in N. Y. on September 20th, of which the New Bedford Textile Union is a part, has shown the workers that they must look to the militant leadership of the new union and of men like A. Weisbord and Beats for real guidance on clear cut class struggle lines.

Labour struggles are growing in the textile industry all over America. Patterson New Jersey threatens to be the scene of another fierce struggle. Signs of dissatisfaction are cropping up in the south where organisation of workers in any industry is practically nil and where the new union is reaching its tentacles. Small strikes are constantly taking place. In Kenosha Wisc. the Allen A. Hosiery Mills have been out almost a year and are still fighting. Connecticut and Penna. carpet weaving plants have carried on strikes more or less successfully. Bigelow-Hartford Carpet Co. of New Haven, Conn. is instrumental in introducing the "New Departure" plan, which resolves itself into the organisation of company unions to fight discontent among the textile workers.

The struggle between militant labour and the reactionary A. F. of L. is sharpening in America in the textile industry, as well as in the coal fields with the new miners union fighting the remnants of the Lewis Machine. In every field and every industry where rationalisation is intensifying the exploitation of the American worker, strikes are taking place, the old reactionary unions are being replaced by new militant unions and in unorganised fields workers organisations are springing up, usually under the leadership of the Communists and the left wing.

## FIGHT AGAINST THE RIGHT DANGER

### The VIII. Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union against the Right.

#### Resolution on the Report of the U.S.S.R. Trade Union Delegation in the R.I.L.U.

Having heard the report of Comrade Lozovsky on the work of the U. S. S. R. Trade Union Delegation in the Red International of Labour Unions, the work of the R. I. L. U. itself and the condition of the world trade union movement, the Eighth Trade Union Congress, noting the growth of the influence of the R. I. L. U. in the capitalist countries and especially in the Pacific countries and in Latin America, resolves:

1. To endorse fully and completely the political line and organisational work of the Red International of Labour Unions and its policy of winning over the broad masses of the members in the reformist unions and capturing these unions and forming and strengthening organisationally trade union opposition within the reformist unions, and by developing the activities of the Independent Revolutionary Unions in countries with divided trade union movements, the policy being to capture the reformist unions, transferring them in accordance with the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress decision, into the revolutionary trade unions and thus completely liquidate the reformist trade union organisations.

2. The period between the Seventh and Eighth Congress is characterised by a considerable advance of capitalist rationalisation at the expense of the working class, a growth of political and economic reaction, the enactment of anti-trade union laws in a whole series of countries, compulsory arbitration, the complete transformation of the trade union bureaucracy into an instrument of capitalist exploitation, the fact that new ranks of the workers are taking a conscious interest in international affairs, the growth of the working class and the trade unions in a whole series of colonial and semi-colonial countries, the increased activity of the workers at large, the ever-growing intensification of class struggles (lockouts, strikes, risings, etc.), the drawing into the movement of new masses of unskilled workers, women and juniors, which marks the growing tension in inter-class relations and the beginning of a new rise in the world labour movement, which is proceeding parallelly with the rapid economic growth of the U. S. S. R. and is undermining capitalist stabilisation.

3. The Eighth Congress stresses its complete solidarity with all the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress decisions and especially its policy of intensifying the struggle against the Amsterdamites and to lead independently the economic struggle irrespective of and despite the wishes of the reformist trade union bureaucracy which is today a part of the bourgeois State and the Employers' Associations. The fact that the officialdom of the Amsterdam trade unions has now become part of the bourgeois State apparatus has led to the reformist trade unions playing an open scab role in all economic struggles, which places before the revolutionary wing of the trade union movement as one of the most important tasks of the day the problem of independently guiding economic struggles.

4. Congress notes with gratification that the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress laid down not only a correct political line, but also a correct organisational policy, having placed before the vanguard of the world trade union movement as a practical task the formation of strike committees, anti-lockout committees and other militant organs, elected on a democratic basis, to guide the economic struggles. This is one of the best ways of getting the broad masses of workers affected by the disputes to participate actively in the struggle for their political and economic demands.

5. In view of the success of capitalist rationalisation, which is decreasing the absolute and relative number of skilled workers in industry, semi-skilled and unskilled workers, women and juniors are beginning to play an exceptionally important role in the industrial process. These categories of the workers are extremely poorly organised, for the reformist trade unions are giving their chief attention to the labour aristocracy, whose narrow craft interests are represented and defended by the reformist trade union bureaucracy. The facts show that not infrequently these categories of the workers play a stupendous role in the struggle against the employers. The organisation of the millions of unorganised workers therefore becomes especially important in the present day situation.

6. The winning over of the new masses of the workers for the class struggle and their organisation cannot but be extremely varied in character, dependent on the conditions in the given country, and the character and degree to which the workers are organised in the given industry. The revolutionary wing of the world trade union movement must keep in view the stupendous importance of drawing new contingents of workers and women workers into the present and impending class struggles, and of organising them, using the old forms of organisation and seeking new forms and methods of drawing the broadest masses of unorganised workers into the organised struggle against capital. Congress charges the U. S. S. R. Trade Union Delegation in the R. I. L. U. to give this question special attention.

7. The Eighth Congress condemns in no uncertain voice all the opponents of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress, who counterpoise an intensification of the struggle against the Amsterdamites with the policy of capitulating to them, condemning unity from the bottom-up, and who urge the tactic of jostling the reformist leaders to the Left instead of winning over the broad masses of members in the trade unions and capturing these unions. Especially detrimental, deserving complete condemnation, are the moves of these elements against the formation of strike committees, against the trade union Oppositions independently

guiding the economic struggles, and their purely Social-Democratic approach to the problem of organisation of unorganised and to the work of drawing these new masses of the workers into the active struggle against the bourgeoisie.

8. The Eighth Congress categorically condemns those members of the trade union Opposition in Germany, who, together with the Social-Democrats, are opposing the policy and tactics of the R. I. L. U., demoralising the working masses when the struggle is at its height (Ruhr) with their propaganda and agitation against strike committees, against the organisation of the unorganised workers drawn into the strike committees, urging instead of independent leadership the tactic of bringing pressure to bear on the trade union bureaucracy, thus sowing the illusion that the Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy is still able to fight for working class interests. These views are foreign and hostile to the interests of the working class throughout the world and to the whole position of the Soviet trade union movement.

9. The Eighth Congress approves the participation of the Soviet C. C. T. U. in the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Conference and in the Pan-Pacific Secretariat formed, and charges the incoming Soviet C. C. T. U. to maintain close connections with the trade union movement in the Pacific countries and especially with the trade union movement of China. The working class in China is struggling under truly appalling conditions and the Soviet C. C. T. U. must therefore continue to give every support, both moral and material, to the working class and the trade unions of China.

10. Congress directs the attention of the whole international proletariat to the continued disruptive activities of the Amsterdam International and its sections, who continue to expel revolutionary workers from the unions, ousting in union with the employers progressive workers from the enterprises, and creating parallel unions wherever the reformists find themselves in the minority, pursuing this provocative policy under the slogans of "peace in industry" and "industrial democracy" and compulsory arbitration in order to bring capitalism back to economic health and strengthen the power of the bourgeoisie.

11. The Eighth Congress is gratified to note that the defects and shortcomings of the R. I. L. U. and its sections were thoroughly subjected to self-criticism at the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress, which mapped out practical ways and means of eliminating political and organisational defects in the revolutionary trade union movement. Congress charges the U. S. S. R. Trade Union Delegation in the R. I. L. U. to make efforts to improve the central apparatus of the Red International of Labour Unions and to set up the closest possible connections between the Soviet Trade Unions and the revolutionary trade unions of other countries. Special attention must be given the vertical connections (according to industry) of the Soviet Unions which make it imperative to strengthen and develop the organisational work of the International Committees for Propaganda and Action so that each Committee shall really become an organising and leading centre for the trade unions in all countries of the given industry.

12. The Eighth Congress considers that the world revolutionary trade union movement as represented by the Red International of Labour Unions must still continue to struggle for trade union unity and achieve unity on the basis of the class struggle. The more ruthless the revolutionary trade union movement struggles against international reformism, the more stubborn its work to weld together its ranks both inside the reformist unions and in the independent revolutionary unions, the more it will lead the economic struggles despite the wishes of the reformists and the more resolutely it will struggle in its own ranks against a constitutional attitude to the trade union bureaucracy, against making a fetish of the trade union bodies and against all tendencies leading to social democracy and the Amsterdam International, the quicker will the revolutionary trade union movement achieve unity. No concessions must be made to reformist tendencies, whether confessed or concealed, in the ranks of the Red International of Labour Unions. The stronger the revolutionary trade union movement will be ideologically and organisationally, the sooner will real and not formal international trade union unity be achieved.

13. The Eighth Congress places on record that the Red International of Labour Unions and the Soviet C. C. T. U. fulfilled its duty of international solidarity during the economic disputes between Labour and Capital that occurred in the

various countries during the period under report. Congress charges the Soviet C. C. T. U. Delegation in the R. I. L. U. to continue to react timely and responsibly to all disputes in the world labour movement, mobilising the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. to demonstrate their international working class solidarity during all serious economic and political movements of the working class in the capitalist countries.

14. Congress considers the task of educating the working masses of the U. S. S. R. in the international spirit to be especially important at the present time. Congress therefore charges the Soviet C. C. T. U. to reinforce its work of popularising the R. I. L. U. decisions and informing the working masses of the U. S. S. R. of the position of the working class in the capitalist countries and of all events in the international labour movement by taking up international questions in the trade union press, arranging various reports on international subjects and by making wider circulation of international literature, especially R. I. L. U. papers, and by developing trade union cultural-educational activities through the circles, schools, and so on.

15. The Eighth Trade Union Congress, representing the strongest section of the Red International of Labour Unions, charges the incoming Soviet C. C. T. U. to give every support to the R. I. L. U. in its work, for the Red International of Labour Unions is the only militant international working class federation organised in the economic field, struggling throughout the world for the same great aims and objects for which International Communism is fighting. Congress urges the workers throughout the world to weld their ranks closer together around the R. I. L. U. and jointly struggle against the coming war and to set up the Dictatorship of the Proletariat the world over.

## The Politbureau of the C. P. of France Approves the Open Letter of the Comintern to the C. P. of Germany.

1. The Polit-Bureau of the C. C. supports without any reservation the Open Letter of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. to the members of the C. P. of Germany.

2. In the present period of economic and political consolidation of the bourgeoisie, but also of extreme development of contradictions on an extended basis, the pressure of the enemies of the working class evokes with many members of the Communist Parties a departure from the correct positions corresponding to the international experience of the proletarian struggle, as well as from the decisions of the Congresses of the C. I.

3. The return to social-democratic ideology, which characterises the Right deviation, has assumed a particularly pronounced form within the C. P. G. Under the leadership of Brandler and Thalheimer, whose views have been repeatedly and severely condemned since the V. Congress, the Right are conducting an unheard-of faction fight against the C. C., against the majority of the C. P. G. and against the line of the VI. Congress.

The Polit-Bureau of the C. C. of the C. P. of France approves the Open Letter of the C. I. to the C. P. G. and the expulsion from the ranks of the C. I. of all those who persist in their fractional activity.

4. In their fight against the Right deviations the Communist Parties come across "conciliatory" elements, who are playing a particularly active role in Germany. While the Rights condemn the whole line of the VI. Congress as "ultra-Left" and regard the "tactical turn" of the Communist International as an abandonment of the tactics of the united front, as a break with the masses, the conciliators make out as if they accept the correct policy laid down by the VI Congress, but at the same time make "reservations", especially regarding the inner Party course. In "words" they are against the Rights, but in "deeds" they support them against the correct line of the C. I. In this way they justify themselves in regard to that part of the political Theses which lays down that "the Right deviations are particularly dangerous and the fight against

them must be put into the forefront. This implies a systematic struggle against a conciliatory attitude towards Right wing tendencies within the Communist Parties."

5. The Polit-Bureau of the C. C. directs the attention of the Party members to the international importance of the Open Letter of the C. I. to the C. P. of Germany. It confirms its agreement with the C. I. in condemning the opportunist deviation and also the ambiguous and equally opportunist attitude, which consists in denying the Right danger or a temptation to minimise its importance, and which in the C. P. of France has assumed the serious form of resistance to the correct line of the VI Congress of the C. I.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### From the Activity of the Political Secretariat of the E. C. C. I.

#### II.

#### The Korean Question.

Further, the Korean question was dealt with by the Political Secretariat, appropriate drafts of resolutions being submitted by the East Secretariat and adopted by the Political Secretariat.

The resolution begins with a detailed representation of the economic and social conditions of Korea. It is pointed out that all the key positions of the Korean economic life are in the hands of Japanese finance capital. Not only are the most important positions of industry and of transport controlled by Japanese imperialism, but Japanese imperialism is also strongly rooted in the sphere of agriculture. Korea, with its agricultural products and its raw materials, is serving as a hinterland for Japanese imperialism.

The resolution further points out that the development both of the extractive as also of the finishing industry is stagnating whilst the export of agricultural produce and the import of industrial articles are greatly increasing. But the development of agriculture, the extension of the area under cultivation, the construction of irrigation works etc., as well as a few minor agrarian reforms, have not brought about an improvement in the conditions of the Korean population; on the contrary, all improvements in agriculture were accompanied by a simultaneous increased exploitation of the population. Thus Korea constitutes a typical colonial country, serving Japanese imperialism as an agrarian and raw material basis; and precisely in this respect is the importance of Korea continually increasing.

But not only the economic forms of exploitation, but also the extra-economic measures like taxes, duties, revenues from State monopolies etc. play a great role for Japanese imperialism in its exploitation of Korea.

Also from the strategical point of view Korea is of great importance for Japanese imperialism. For this country, along with the Kwantung Peninsula, represents the most important jumping off ground of Japanese imperialism on the Asiatic Continent.

The resolution then goes on to deal in detail with the conditions of the agricultural population which comprises eighty per cent. of the total population. The forms of the cultivation of the soil are for the greater part of a pre-capitalist kind. "Revenue in kind, serfdom, semi-feudal relations between land owner and the tenant, as well as forms of oppression and methods of exploitation characterise the conditions of tenancy". In this way the overwhelming majority of the agricultural population is exploited by a thin strata of rent receivers. The lot of the independent peasants is not much better as in many cases they are not even able to keep their undertakings up to the old level.

The central figure of the social strata in the village is undoubtedly the poor peasant. At the same time the impoverishment of the greater bulk of the peasantry is proceeding on ever larger scale.

The industrial proletariat in Korea is a numerically very weak section which to a great extent is connected with the village.

By reason of these facts any revolutionary movement in Korea will be directed not only against the Korean feudalism.

"The revolution in Korea cannot be anything else but an agrarian revolution. Thus the overthrow of imperialism and the revolutionary solution of the agrarian question is the objectively historical chief purport of the revolution in Korea... In this sense the Korean revolution is a bourgeois-democratic revolution."

The resolution then deals with the political importance of the working class, which, together with the toiling peasantry and the city petty bourgeoisie, must necessarily become the driving force of the revolution. The bourgeoisie represents in the best case a national-reformist opposition to Japanese imperialism.

In accordance therewith the national emancipation movement is closely connected with the class struggle of the proletariat, and is directed "both against the imperialists and the feudal landowners as well as against the national bourgeoisie".

"The proletariat of the colonial countries, in alliance with the broadest masses of the peasantry, enters the political arena as an independent object of politics, which is still confronted by the task of securing its hegemony in the revolution."

The resolution further points out that the proletariat can solve this task only if the Communists in Korea will know how, in their work, to connect the agrarian question with the national revolution. The agrarian question itself can only be solved by the confiscation of the land belonging to the big landowners.

Only the unchaining of the agrarian revolution creates the pre-condition for the victory of the whole national emancipation struggle, just as, on the other hand, the defeats of the revolutionary movement in the years 1919 and 1920 are to be explained by the insufficient connection between the national emancipation struggle and the agrarian revolution.

It is therefore the most important task of the Party and of the whole working class, to bring the peasantry under its leadership by applying those slogans and demands which are comprehensible and adapted to it.

The resolution further deals with the governmental forms of Japanese imperialism in Korea, which have not even shared power with one or the other of the possessing classes in Korea. In order to secure its power in the future, Japanese imperialism is already undertaking attempts to draw over to its side certain sections of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia and to include them in the apparatus of the occupation authorities. In this connection far-seeing representatives of Japanese imperialism also recognise the necessity of carrying out partial reforms in Korea, as is it impossible to settle all social conflicts and tensions solely by police methods or by methods of force.

But simultaneously with the attempt to draw to its side parts of the bourgeoisie and of the intelligentsia, Japanese imperialism is intensifying the terror against the Communists and the Left nationalists. The workers' and peasants' movement, which is based on the class struggle, is practically outside of the law. The reprisals against their press are being increased. But the approachment of Japanese imperialism to the native landowners is showing its effect upon considerable portions of the intelligentsia which is playing an important role in the nationalist movement.

"One must reckon with the possibility of a strengthening of the national-reformist tendencies in their ranks, which will obliterate their revolutionary character and will attempt to convert them into organs of a loyal opposition."

These tendencies are bound to increase the more the Communists are removed, by the most varied methods, from the national-revolutionary movement.

The resolution further deals with the fundamental lines of the Korean Communist Movement in the present period, which must consist in consolidating the proletarian-revolutionary movement and in securing absolute independence towards the movements of the national-revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie. At

the same time the strengthening of the national-revolutionary movement and the maintenance of its class character is a most important task. In order to enable the Party to fulfil its organisational task it is necessary to liquidate the year-long fractional struggle. There is then pointed out the way in which these fractional struggles must be overcome: in this respect the improvement of the social structure of the Party plays a great role, e. g. the winning of industrial workers and members of the poorest peasantry for the ranks of the Communist movement.

Closely connected with the mass work which is accordingly necessary for the Communist Party is the work in the factories and in the trade unions. Of no less importance is the work both in the peasants organisations and in the old and new national-revolutionary mass organisations. Hence a much greater development of the whole propaganda and agitation is necessary.

The resolution then deals specially with the working methods in the national-revolutionary movement and the special conditions of a political activity which must be conducted illegally.

But all this whole work can only be carried out if at the same time the Korean Communists succeed in achieving a Bolshevik consolidation of their ranks.

The concrete conditions of the work of the Communists in the trade unions are further dealt with in detail, and in this connection the daily work of the Party is mentioned.

"The most important feature of work is the concentration of attention upon the question of the practical requirements of the movement, which raises also great and general problems."

The relations of the Communists to the national revolutionary movements are once more dealt with exhaustively and special stress is laid upon the necessity of the absolute independence of the revolutionary labour movement.

The resolution then deals with the conditions of the daily political struggle and its linking up with the Communist programme. In the daily struggles the partial demands of the working class must be set up, for instance, among others, recognition and extension of the rights of the trade unions as well as of the rights of the workers' organisations, demands in the sphere of workers' protection etc.

The resolution deals equally thoroughly with the partial demands and slogans which must be set up for the peasantry.

The comprehensive resolution concludes with an appeal to the Korean Communists to take up a really energetic struggle against the imperialist policy and the militarist interventions of Japan, to fight against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union, and with the call to find means and ways to lead the mass movement into the arena of the open political struggle.

## IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

### The Finnish Social Democrats in Alliance with the White Guardists.

By Sm.

In the discussion in the Finnish Diet on the interpellation which brought about the overthrow of the agrarian government, the agrarian leaders, in their anger and annoyance, made sensational revelations regarding the activity of the social democratic government which was in office last year. The agrarian leader Hanula declared that the appointment of State officials and the matters of the (white guardist) defence corps ought to be regarded as two separate things. But the social democratic government departed from this principle. In June last year the social democratic Minister of the Interior Puro, addressed to all the heads of the various provinces a circular which states:

"In engaging fresh police in future only such are to be accepted who have either completed their term of service in the army or have undergone a thorough training in the defence corps. In particular must the heads of the provinces make it quite clear to the police authorities in the rural districts that these conditions are to be strictly observed when engaging police officers."

It would seem that the social democratic admirer of the blood-stained Finnish white-guardists was afraid that his orders might be forgotten, so that in a fresh communication, dated 7th of December, he again reminded his forgetful subordinates to carry them out. These revelations, which were not refuted from any side, are characteristic of the reactionary spirit prevailing in the social democracy. In this case the social democrats have not smoothed the way for reaction merely out of cowardice and the desire to compromise. Here it is confirmed from authoritative quarters that the social democrats are more cringing towards reaction than are their bourgeois rivals and that, in their capacity as Ministers, they give preference to the members of an organisation which, in the year 1918, with the help of Ludendorff, cruelly murdered 400,000 revolutionary Finnish workers.

## PROLETARIAN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

### The Fight of the German Women Textile Workers for Higher Wages.

By Lene Overlach (Berlin).

The Christmas present made by the official arbitrators to the mill-girls was decisions whereby the starvation wages now prevailing are to obtain for a further year or two. Of all the branches of German industry, the textile industry pays the worst wages, in spite of the fact that there is scarcely any other branch of industry in which the working hours are so long: According to statistics published by the A. D. G. B. (German General Federation of Trade Unions.) 51 per cent. of all workers in Germany work more than 48 hours a week, while in the textile industry 77 per cent. put in more than 48 hours per week.

The textile barons should not, however, count with too great certainty upon the submissiveness and docility of the mill-girls. The great mass of the mill-girls, who have been rather passive up to now, are beginning to stir. The economic situation is exasperating them, and the opposition in the German textile union is assuming the task, even though feebly and unsystematically, of directing into proper channels the indignation of the mill-girls on account of the low wages, the speeding up system and the endless annoyances in the mills. They are working to recruit the girls into the union and are trying to attract them to the opposition.

On the left bank of the Lower Rhine the textile mill-girls have already been in action. They attended the meetings, participated in demonstrations and in trade-union gatherings. It was also the works where women were employed that were the first to start the fight again when the employers tried after work had been resumed to reduce the women's wages. The attempt of the employers to make a successful attack for the further reduction of the starvation wages, particularly in regard to women's work, was unsuccessful in nearly every case.

Among the mill-girls in Erzgebirge-Vogtland there is great indignation owing to the declaration rendering binding the disgraceful arbitration award, according only 10 per cent. of the textile workers a minimum wage increase of 3 to 6 pennings. Even though it was impossible one week before Christmas to get the women out to fight against this award, this by no means signifies that the mill-girls will tolerate the starvation wages indefinitely.

The fighting spirit of the mill-girls was recently given expression at a non-party conference of the textile mill-girls, which was held in Chemnitz just before Christmas. This was attended by 25 delegates from 12 mills, including 3 big mills. The girls spoke about their conditions, and these reports of non-party mill hands furnish an interesting insight into the circumstances obtaining in the textile mills and also an indication of the feeling among the mill-girls.

The wages of the mill-girls are so low that the unemployment benefit for one family with four children is greater than the wage of a married textile worker. For instance, in West Saxony a girl in a spinning mill earns 74.40 marks a month, while the unemployment benefit amounts to 102 marks.

The wage of a skilled worker, according to official calculations, is 36.82 marks per week, that of a skilled workwoman 26.90 marks, while according to the official computation an unskilled worker gets 30.86 marks and an unskilled workwoman 21.60 marks.

The figures given by the mill-girls themselves are however, very different from the foregoing. They say that there are mill-girls of over twenty years of age who are in receipt of wages of 32 to 34 pennig (about 4d.) per hour. A delegate from Wolkenburg spoke of weekly wages of 12 to 15 marks (12/- to 15/-) for weavers. A maximum of 24 marks per week is achieved by skilled workers only. The delegate continued:

"If I work until my back is breaking and until I am so tired in the evening that I have not the energy to think to light the fire, I can earn as much as 30 marks a week. But my employer lets me work only three days a week at this wage and during the other three days I have to do the dirtiest of work for wages paid according to time.

In a stocking factory the girls were obliged, under threat of dismissal, to suffer a wage cut from 6 to 4 pennig per dozen. The delegate stated that she had done everything possible to get the mill-girls to fight. She herself succeeded in continuing at the rate of 6 pennig per dozen, as she is a skilled worker.

The delegate from a textile mill in Thalheim reported fresh efforts towards rationalisation. Several girls were put to work on a new sewing machine, with which one girl can put out as much as eight girls on the old type of machine. On the new machines the girls can earn from 80 to 90 marks per week, but after eight hours of work they are completely exhausted. Doctors declare that the girls cannot stand this work for 18 months without being totally ruined in health. The delegate entertained no illusions in regard to this murder system. She said: "Gradually the other girls will be put to work on these machines and then a wage cut is to be expected. For this reason we are fighting hard against working eight hours a day on these murder machines. When such machines, which constitute technical progress, have to be operated, the working day should be reduced to four hours."

From several other reports it appeared that several active, class-conscious elements in the mills where women are employed are trying their utmost, and at the danger of losing their jobs, to shake their work mates out of their sullen indignation and lead them on to a purposeful, organised fight, a task which they have already accomplished in several mills. The opposition must recognise their important political role of winning the confidence of the millions of working women by valiantly championing their interests, so that they may be able to lead them into the fight.

The non-party district conferences of working women provide an approach to the working women, which should culminate in the early part of this year in the Congress of the Working Women of Germany. At all conferences held up to the present, the non-party working women have received with enthusiasm the idea of a national congress. At these conferences the women delegates are furnished with the political equipment which they need for the fight in the mill. Forearmed with concrete, practical instructions, they will return to the mills, where they will in time become functionaries such as the opposition needs for the mass mobilisation of the working women. Comprehension of the significance of the question and the drawing of the proper conclusions therefrom will mean that the Party will successfully attract further strength of working women to the economic fight and thus to the fight for the overthrow of capitalism.