

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 9. No. 9

22nd February 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, Schloßbach 212, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

- D. Manuilsky:** The Discussion in the German Communist Party.
- Politics.**
J. R.: The Revision of the Constitution in Poland.
J. B.: The Conflict between Great Britain and Iraq.
Jack Carney: The Future of Irish Labour.
- The Labour Movement.**
F. Emrich: The Struggle in the Textile Industry in Saxony and Thuringia.
- Fascism.**
Willi Münzenberg: The Forthcoming Anti-Fascist Congress in Berlin.
 Extension of the Anti-Fascist Front.
- The White Terror.**
 A New Court-Martial Sentence of the "Democratic" Roumanian Government.
 To the Rescue of Comrade Kahana!
- In the Colonies.**
M. N. Roy: The Bourgeoisie and National Revolution in India.
- Union of Soviet Republics.**
Uchanov: The Progress of the Communal Economy of Moscow.
A. Lunatcharsky: The Struggle for the Alliance of Science with Labour.
- Ten Years of the Comintern.**
G. Zinoviev: The Birth of the Communist International.
L. A.: Some Experiences of the Armed Class Struggle.
- In the Camp of Social Democracy.**
P. Friedländer: Two Meetings of the II. International in London.
- Obituary.**
Josef Skrypa.
J. B. Askew.

The Discussion in the German Communist Party.

By D. Manuilsky.

It is the intention of this article to deal with two questions. The first of these questions is the international importance of the problems which the present discussion in the German Communist Party has brought to the fore. The members of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International paid no attention to this side of the question in their speeches in the session of the Presidium in which the text of the Open Letter to the German Communist Party was discussed. The second of these questions is that of the stabilisation of capitalism, for this question is of extreme importance for all sections of the Comintern. A detailed discussion of this question will create clarity and will show clearly the revisionist character of the attempts to interpret the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern as though the capitalist stabilisation were permanent, final and capable of being maintained. Such a discussion will arm us ideologically for the coming revolutionary struggles and show every member of our Communist World Party the necessity for a merciless struggle against the opportunist epidemic.

1. The International Significance of the Open Letter of the E.C.C.I. to the German Communist Party.

The Open Letter of the E.C.C.I. to the German C.P. in connection with the attack of the German right-wingers upon the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern is of the greatest international importance. Next to the C.P. of the Soviet Union, the German C.P. is the strongest mass-party of the Comintern. This mass-character of the German C.P. goes hand in hand with its fighting capacity. As far as the German C.P. is concerned, there exists no disproportion between the two elements of bolshevism, the mass-character and the fighting capacity, something which cannot be said for instance of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia. The German C.P. was born in the fire of the revolution. It grew and became strong in the bloody struggles against the white guardist bands of Noske, it was hardened in the civil war and in heavy defeats which contributed to its strength and experience. This circumstance distinguishes the German C.P. from all other sections of the

Comintern in Western Europe, which have not gone through such a bitter period of revolution and civil war.

The lessons learned by the C.P. of Germany in the most important stages of its development are in some respects no less important for the other Western European sections of the Comintern than the experiences of the C.P. of the Soviet Union. It must be borne in mind that the German C.P. is a party fighting for the seizure of power in a highly-developed capitalist country possessing the strongest social democracy and the best trained reformism in the world. For these reasons the conditions under which the C.P. of Germany is fighting are more typical for the Western European communist movement than were the conditions under which the C.P. of the Soviet Union fought before the November Revolution. The tremendous experience gained by the C.P. of the Soviet Union in the building up of Socialism will acquire immediate and practical significance for the sections of the Comintern in Western Europe only after the seizure of power. To-day the most important tasks which face these sections are those which are connected with the preparatory work for the revolution, or in other words, the immediate tasks which face the C. P. of Germany: the question of the winning of the masses, the leadership of the mass-struggle, the work of the Communists in the trades unions, the emancipation of the working masses from the yoke of the social democracy, the question of organising the unorganised workers, etc.

For these reasons it is no fortuitous circumstance that the German C.P. is always ahead of the other sections of the Comintern in Western Europe in putting forward new questions and new tasks for discussion. What seems to many comrades to be a "precipitate" tendency to deal with differences of opinion in the most important questions arising in the practise of the communist movement, or a "mechanical" extension of the discussion into other sections of the Comintern, is in reality nothing but the logical consequence of the leading role which the German C.P. plays to an increasing extent in the communist movement of Western Europe.

There is nothing fortuitous about the circumstance that it is invariably two parties, the C.P. of the Soviet Union, the party of the victorious proletarian revolution, and the C.P. of Germany, the party of the civil war, which systematically take the initiative at all international congresses and at all the sessions of the E.C.C.I. in order to secure a clear and definite treatment of all the most important questions of the communist movement. To interpret this circumstance as an unhealthy expression of "Comintern" policy, as an attempt to jockey this or that group of comrades into accepting the dominant opinions in the Comintern, means to replace a considered and Marxist analysis of the most important events in the ideological life of the Comintern with considerations of a more or less philistine nature.

When these circumstances are taken into consideration, the differences of opinion in the German C.P., between the Central Committee of the latter Party and the right-wingers and the group of conciliators, no longer appear as matters of purely internal interest for the German Party. On the contrary, they are seen to be matters of such importance for the communist movement that without absolute clarity concerning them there can be no healthy ideological life in the Communist Parties of Western Europe. The question of the character of capitalist stabilisation, the question of the estimation of the role of reformism, the estimation of the speed of the process of radicalisation amongst the workers, the problem of the united front tactic under the present circumstances, the attitude of the parties to the opportunist slogans of the transformation period (the slogan of the control of production, which is based upon the fascist slogan of the social democracy, the slogan of "economic democracy"), the problem of consolidating the Communist Parties without at the same time obscuring the ideological differences of opinion, all these questions are of urgent and immediate importance for the German C. P. and for all other sections of the Comintern in Western Europe.

The discussion at the IX. Plenary Session of the E. C. C. I. concerning the new electoral tactics to be adopted in Great Britain and France was also practically based upon these questions. This became still clearer at the last plenary session of the Central Committee of the French C. P. when comrade Renaud Jean represented a standpoint with regard to the stabilisation

of capitalism, to the speed of the process of radicalisation amongst the workers and concerning our attitude to the "left-wing" social democracy, which approximated to the standpoint of the German right-wing group. Similarly, tendencies are to be observed in the French C.P. in the question of the "Committees of Action" and the united front tactic, approximating to the standpoint of the group of conciliators around Ewert in the German C.P. In a whole number of parties we can meet with remnants of long exploded Brandlerist ideas concerning the present role of the social democracy, for instance in Czechoslovakia in the instructions given by the "ultra-Left" Comrade Neurath to the local organisations of the Party in connection with the elections. In these peculiar instructions Comrade Neurath gives the following analysis of the relation of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia to the social democracy in the question of the application of the united front tactic:

"Every attempt of the C. P. Cz. to win not only the socialist and non-party workers for the extension of the mass-struggles, but also to interest the socialist leaders in these revolutionary struggles, met with the resistance of these leaders who fight against any attempt to turn the parliamentary oppositional struggle into a revolutionary mass-struggle of the exploited masses of the population."

This one quotation is sufficient to show that there are still comrades in the ranks of the Comintern who attempt, after the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, to "interest the socialist leaders" in revolutionary struggles, and who believe that the treacherous parliamentary policy of the social democrats is a "parliamentary oppositional struggle", and that all that is wrong is that the social democrats refuse to go further and "turn the parliamentary oppositional struggle into a revolutionary mass-struggle". The instructions also contained other gems of a similar nature.

The wavering attitude of the Political Bureau of the Swiss C. P. must also be reckoned to these remnants of Brandlerism. In an official document addressed to the E. C. C. I. referring to the "German Question", the Polbureau adopted an attitude approximately half-way between the position of the Brandlerist right-wing and that of the Ewert group of conciliators. It often happens that these important questions in the practice of the parties are raised in connection with perfectly fortuitous or quite incidental matters. It is quite clear that the "German question" is becoming the crystallising point for all the tendencies inside the Comintern after the Sixth World Congress. Those tendencies which were in a more or less embryonic stage at the Sixth Congress, are ripening to-day to the extent of fractional platforms, i. e., the platform of the right-wingers around Brandler and the platform of the conciliators around Ewert. This is the new element in the life of the Comintern since the Sixth World Congress, and all sections of the C. I. must take it into consideration. No single section of the C. I. may remain indifferent to the discussion in the German C. P., for the open rebellion against the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern and the Fourth Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions on the part of the German right-wingers, and the peculiar interpretation given to these decisions by the group of the conciliators around Ewert in their platform, raise the discussion in the German C.P. to a matter of the utmost international importance. To-day it is more necessary than ever to obtain ideological clarity. Only widespread enlightenment work and the thorough discussion of the questions raised in the discussion in the German C.P. can raise the ideological level of the membership of all sections of the Comintern. This is all the more necessary because to-day the sections have to deal with a bad heritage from a past period in the development of the Comintern which, had it been disposed of in the past by the sections, would have saved them the present repetition of the right-wing errors. We refer in particular to Radek's utterances at the third and especially at the fourth congress of the C. I. concerning the questions of the workers government and of the control of production, which unfortunately received no effective rebuttal at the time and were responsible for the later errors of the right-wing group in the C. I. The definition given by Radek of the workers government was closely related to the definition advanced by Brandler at the Leipzig Party Congress. Radek's definition contained the idea of "a coalition of all working class parties" and the idea that the workers government was a stage towards the dictatorship of the pro-

letariat ("the ante-room"), and also the belief that the workers could force the social democratic leaders to conduct a revolutionary policy. The same is true of the slogan for the control of production. The interpretation Radek gave to this slogan at the time differs in nothing from the standpoint which is now defended by the Brandler group*). Later on Radek defended the same ideas in the collected material relating to the programme of the Comintern. This circle of ideas is closely connected with the whole Brandler theory of "development into the revolution", which is represented in another form by the social democratic theory of the development into socialism via democracy. This lesson, which is connected with history of right-wing deviations, must be kept in mind in order to mobilise our sections for the liquidation of those deviations from the line mapped out by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. In the period of the rising new revolutionary wave, in the period of coming bitter collisions between the workers and the capitalists, vigilance with regard to these deviations and theoretical intolerance towards them are a prerequisite for the bolshevisation of the sections of the C.I. and for their preparation for the great role which they will be called upon to play.

The circumstance that the right-wing deviation and the conciliatory attitude towards it in the Western European sections of the C. I. have developed mostly in Germany, leading to a right-wing crisis in the German C. P., and the circumstances that these related tendencies in Germany have developed into a sort of ideological centre towards which all other ideologically related tendencies in the Western European sections of the C. I. orientate themselves, are also to be explained by the special conditions under which the communist movement in Germany has developed. The German C. P. has to work in a country possessing the strongest and best organised social democracy, a social democracy which is more closely connected with the bourgeois State apparatus than any other. The pressure exerted by this social democracy, which has the whole weight of the economic and political apparatus of the bourgeoisie behind it, upon those elements in the German C. P. which are least capable of resisting in a revolutionary sense, is not less than the pressure exerted by the petty-bourgeois elements in the Soviet Union.

In countries like Austria, the pressure of the social democracy, which is numerically strong and powerful, upon the Communist Party, which is numerically weak, leads to a peculiar form of **Austro-Marxism** within our own ranks, producing a pessimistic estimation of the role of the Communist Party which condemns our Party to follow in the wake of the social democracy and allots to it the modest propagandist tasks of an exclusive circle, instead of the tasks of a revolutionary independent Communist Party (the group around Comrade Schlamm is the chief representative of this tendency). In a working class movement like that in Germany, where a bitter struggle is constantly proceeding between our Party and the social democracy for the leadership of the working masses, the penetration of our influence into the ranks of the social democratic workers has its counterpart in the penetration of social democratic influence into our own ranks. Although we have in the group

*) At the Fourth Congress of the Comintern, Karl Radek made the following statement: "In my opinion we must declare openly and clearly during the struggle for the united front, that if the social democratic working masses force their leaders to break with the bourgeoisie, then we will be prepared to take part in a workers government upon the one condition that this government is an organ of the class-struggle... What is the relation of this tactic to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the civil war? The relation is the same as the relation between the ante-room leading into the main hall and the main hall itself". Referring to the slogan of the control of production, Karl Radek declared: "Our main slogan is that of the control of production. This slogan is necessary for the following reasons: it gives the workers a prospect, the prospect of economic reconstruction, it gives them a way out of the chaos... The Communist Parties must therefore put forward this slogan of the control of production, not only from time to time in an article or at a congress, but permanently. This slogan must become the central point of their movement."

"Einheit" ("Unity") in Germany a weapon for extending our influence to the best elements in the ranks of the social democratic workers, the social democrats have in the Brandler-Thalheimer group also a weapon for carrying demoralisation into the communist ranks. The Brandler-Thalheimer group has become nothing more nor less than a left-wing social democratic group within the ranks of the German C. P.

The second reason which formed the basis for the attack of the right-wing in Germany, lies in the objective conditions of the development of German capitalism in recent years. We know that Germany, which lay prostrate after the lost war, has lifted itself up under the conditions of the Versailles Treaty and the Dawes plan literally from ruin and enslavement. It would be absurd to deny that during the course of recent years German capitalism has made certain progress. There is not a country in Europe which has recovered so quickly from the consequences of the world war as Germany has recovered despite the reparations and the naked robbery of the Entente. Only the progress made by rationalisation in the industries of the United States can compare with the rationalisation of Germany's industries. It is no exaggeration to say that the favourable situation of German capitalism in recent years has determined the whole situation of the European economic system. This situation of German capitalism was above all calculated to awaken an illusion in Germany of the permanence of capitalist stabilisation. The German social democracy fastened upon this illusion, which formed the basis of the whole policy of the trade union bureaucracy, and represented the starting point of all Hilferding's theories of "economic democracy". It is therefore not at all surprising that a section of the German communists has become entangled in this idea, that this section sees the capitalist stabilisation as the characteristic of the "Third Period". The illusions concerning the estimation of the capitalist stabilisation are closely connected with pacifist illusions with regard to international relations. Whoever attempts to base the policy of the working class upon the assumption that capitalism has finally stabilised itself again, must certainly underestimate the significance of the intensifying international antagonisms which are leading the capitalist world with inexorable logic to a new war. Germany is a country where these pacifist illusions are nourished by the peculiar situation of German imperialism in the general system of the imperialist States. German imperialism has an economic basis at its disposal which is not inferior to that possessed by the imperialist countries which were victorious in the world war. Despite the limitations imposed by the Versailles Treaty and the Dawes plan, the growth of German industry in recent years has broadened this basis and faces German capitalism to an increasing extent with the question of markets and the question of colonies as sources of raw materials. The fulfilment of the Dawes plan by Germany is dependent upon the export possibilities of German capitalism. These needs of post-war German imperialism however, collide with the political framework of international relations established between Germany and the other imperialist States as a result of the fact that Germany lost the war (The occupation of the Rhineland, the Dawes screw, the limitation of armaments, the lack of colonies, etc.). This contradiction between the economic basis and the "political superstructure" causes German imperialism to use "pacifist" methods to cloak its plans to a much greater degree than any other of the imperialist powers. German imperialism acts in the League of Nations like the "pacific" wolf whose fangs have not yet developed sufficiently. This exceptional situation of German imperialism is exploited by the German social democracy in order to spread pacifist illusions amongst the German masses. If the German right-wingers around Brandler really believed in the prospect of a war, they would never have permitted themselves to come into such violent contradiction to the organised communist movement, which is the only force which is fighting against war. If the group of conciliators around Ewert did not underestimate the danger of war, they would oppose the right-wing deviation without hesitation, for the fight against the right-wing deviation means the fight against the pacifist lies of the social democracy and a fight to prepare the working class for active resistance to war.

The fourth and final factor which made possible and determined the open struggle of the right-wingers in Germany was the existence of the right-wing Brandler group as a result of the

historic situation in 1923*). This group, as a matter of fact, has never ceased to exist. It never capitulated before the decisions of the German Party congresses and the decisions of the E. C. C. I. and of the two congresses of the Comintern which have taken place in the meantime. In consequence of the wrong and deleterious policy of Ruth Fischer and Maslow, who replaced the ideological struggle against the opportunist opinions of Brandler by empty declamations against Brandlerism, this right-wing group around Brandler was never put out of action ideologically after its collapse in 1923. This group was never assuaged by the Party and remained latent, many elements concealing themselves for some time in the "legal" party opposition of Comrade Meyer. The present leadership in the German C. P. must do the work which was neglected by the Ruth Fischer-Maslow regime. The discussion of the questions which have taken place in the meantime. In consequence of the wrong overcome the right-wing deviation with the least possible loss. The discussion of these questions in the other sections of the Comintern will consolidate our ranks and will cause all party members to think over the tasks which are placed before the sections in the present stage of the development of the Comintern.

2. The Stabilisation of Capitalism.

The basic question of our differences with the right-wing elements and the group of conciliants in the ranks of the Comintern, is that of the character of the capitalist stabilisation. Upon the answer to this question depends the tactical attitude determined upon by the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern for the carrying out of the tasks facing the communist movement. The differences which have arisen in this question show that it is no longer sufficient to copy the decisions of the Sixth World Congresses word for word and incorporate them in resolutions at party congresses (See the resolution adopted by the congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain), but that it is necessary to return a positive answer to the question, what is the character of capitalist stabilisation.

In its analysis of the present stage of capitalist stabilisation, the Sixth World Congress of the C. I. mentioned two main factors of this stabilisation. The first was the fact that in recent years capitalism has exceeded its pre-war level of production in the most important industries and that world trade has also exceeded its pre-war level. In pointing out this fact, the Sixth Congress also stressed the importance of the technical progress made by the capitalist economic system (the progress of electrification and of the chemical industries etc.) which, to-

gether with the repulsing of the revolutionary wave of 1918-23 in Europe, made the question of capitalist rationalisation a practical proposition for the bourgeoisie. The formation of powerful concerns, trusts and syndicates has resulted in a strengthening of the process of the concentration of capital.

At the same time however, the Sixth Congress mentioned a second factor in its resolution, namely that all these elements of stabilisation simultaneously prepared the basis for the growth of antagonisms which would not only be deeper than those preceding the war, but even deeper and more enduring than those of the revolutionary post-war period. This second great factor of capitalist stabilisation is deliberately ignored by all the opportunists in their struggle for the revision of the decisions of the Sixth World Congress. The technical progress made by the capitalist economic system revolutionises the old conditions of production, founds new branches of industry, and causes crises and decay in a number of old branches of capitalist industry, for instance, the world crisis in the coal mining industry. Under the conditions of capitalist society, the technical "revolution" condemns millions of people to privations and impoverishment in the period where power is compelled to leave old and dying branches of industry to find employment in new and prosperous industries. The conditions of living of the working class are revolutionised, the old places of domicile have to be given up, peaceful and petty-bourgeois customs are broken down, etc. The capitalist rationalisation revolutionises class relations also (increased exploitation of the proletariat, the depression of its standard of living, and the continuous efforts of the capitalists to abolish the gains achieved by the workers in years of hard struggle, etc.). At the same time, the working class itself is structurally revolutionised. The aristocracy of labour loses its basis of existence and a tremendous permanent mass of unemployed workers is created, much larger than in the past.

The transfer of the main weight of the world economic system from Europe to the United States of America revolutionises the mutual relations of individual sections of this system and intensifies to a great extent the law of the unequal development of capitalism. This alteration revolutionises the relations between the capitalist Great Powers on the international field, as exemplified in the growing aggressiveness of U. S. A. imperialism and the developing world conflict for economic dominance between the U. S. A. and Great Britain, etc.

At the same time the growth of the productive forces of capitalism, which intensifies the problem of markets and demands an increasing supply of raw materials, revolutionises the relations of the Mother countries towards the colonies.

The increased exploitation of the colonies by imperialism produces a situation in which in case of new imperialist wars, the colonies will not only play the passive role of booty to be divided between the victorious countries, as in the world war of 1914/18, but also an active role of countries fighting for their emancipation from the yoke of imperialism altogether.

And finally, the growth of the elements of socialism in the economic system of the Soviet Union disorganises the system of world capitalism no less than all the other factors together in this situation. All these contradictions intensify the general crisis of capitalism to a far greater extent than did the contradictions which accumulated in former periods and which finally led to the revolutionary explosions in Europe in the years 1918/23. The new wave of revolution will be much more powerful than that of the years 1917/18, the years of the first attacks by the workers upon capitalist society; it will shake the foundations of the capitalist order much more powerfully and will lead to much more bitter conflicts than those which we have previously seen in the history of the international working class movement. The new wave of revolution will be greater in its extent because it will involve the giants of capitalism, Great Britain and the U. S. A. in the revolutionary crisis, it will bring the masses of the people in Asia and Africa into movement, and is already bringing them into movement. The world is approaching a new revolutionary crisis which will be not only of a European, but of a world character. The strikes of 1918/19, the revolutionary outbreaks in Germany and Austria-Hungary, the struggles of the Spartakists etc., will appear minuscule in comparison with the international struggles which

*) In the "International" of 15th December 1928, Comrade Lenz accuses the writer of these lines of having made a mistake in criticising the utterances of Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadse at the XV. congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, who pointed out the Brandlerist right-wing danger. There is, however, little virtue in intoning a funeral chant at a marriage feast, or singing a comic song at a burial. At the time of the XV. congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, the chief danger in Germany was represented by the Trotzkyist-Maslov group, at present happily allied to Brandler, but then manoeuvring under the cover of a pretended struggle against the right-wing danger, in order to detract the attention of the congress from the main danger. To-day, after the Sixth World congress of the C. I., the chief danger in Germany is represented by the right-wing Brandler group which is striving to detract the attention of the masses from the main danger by declaring that the policy of the Party is "ultra-left". The Brandler group is being supported in this by the group of conciliators around Ewert, just as Maslov received the misguided support of Comrade Lenz for his bankrupt strategy at the time of the XV. party congress. The logic of Comrade Lenz and the logic of Comrade Ewert are as alike as two peas. If it should happen that in one or two years time the main danger in the German C. P. becomes an "ultra-left" danger, then, with exactly the same justification as Comrade Lenz has at present for his accusation, Comrade Ewert might accuse the writer of these lines of attaching less importance to the ultra-left danger than to that of Brandlerism. This contention is fairly simple and it is to be hoped that Comrade Lenz will grasp it.

all our Communist Parties are approaching. This factor of the ripening contradictions is the "soul" of the "Third Period" spoken of in the resolution of the sixth congress. The stabilisation of capitalism referred to in the theses of the Sixth Congress can be interpreted only within the framework of this general crisis of capitalism and its basis.

It is because this stabilisation of capitalism has taken place under the conditions of a general crisis of capitalism, that the stabilisation can only be relative and partial. Those who deny the relativity and incompleteness of the present stage of capitalist stabilisation, as for instance Comrade Humbert-Droz and the representatives of the conciliators in Germany, only show that they regard the capitalist stabilisation, which in reality is only an episode of the general development of the crisis of capitalism, as an "entity in itself", torn out of relation with the background against which it is taking place.

The difference between the second and the third periods of the situation of capitalism in the post-war period is by no means that whereas the stabilisation of capitalism in the second period was relative and partial, it has become in the third period the organic and normal state of capitalism, that the capitalist system has experienced a **general convalescence**; the difference between these two periods is that in the third period the contradictions of the pre-war period and the crisis of capitalism which resulted from the world war, are reinforced, in consequence of the progress of the stabilisation, by new and gigantic contradictions which exceed all our expectations and all our previous experiences.

Although the stabilisation of capitalism disposed to a certain extent of the effects of the world war upon the capitalist economic system, it at the same time laid the basis for new contradictions which, in connection with the still unsolved contradictions from former periods, condition the relative and partial nature of the stabilisation no less in the third than in the second period.

The underestimation of the general crisis of capitalism represents the fundamental error of the group of conciliators and of Comrade Humbert-Droz. It is chiefly this error which joins them with the attitude of the right-wing Brandler group for which the whole post-war situation of capitalism is divided into two periods: the period of post-war crisis, and the period of stabilisation, i. e. of the consolidation and convalescence of capitalism.

The conciliatory revisionists of the decisions of the Sixth World Congress are only more afraid in the question of the stabilisation of capitalism than the Brandler group is; the former group cannot pluck up enough courage to follow their own standpoint to its logical conclusion. The conciliators wish to revise the decisions of the Sixth Congress under the pretence of defending them. In words this group recognises the general crisis of capitalism, the intensification of the contradictions and the "Third Period", but in deeds, in its tactical attitude, this group shows that it over-estimates the stabilisation of capitalism. In the history of the working class movement there are dozens of instances where the opportunist tendencies of this or that group of revolutionary Marxists had to be peeled out of assertions of loyalty to the fundamental principles of Marxism.

Not all revisionists possess the sorry courage of Bernstein in the Second International or of Brandler in the Third International. Comrade Humbert-Droz for instance, exposes his real attitude in the question of capitalist stabilisation only when he uses the collapse of the British General Strike and the defeat of the Chinese Revolution as arguments to prove that capitalism in 1928 was more consolidated than it was in 1926.

To see only a defeat of the proletariat and a consolidation of capitalist stabilisation in the British General Strike and in the Chinese Revolution, and to close one's eyes to the fact that these two great historical events resulted above all from the deep crisis of capitalism, means to adopt Brandler's estimation of the stabilisation of capitalism.

The "defeated" British General Strike and the "defeated" Chinese Revolution contributed in their effect as a whole in all phases of development far more to the general disorganisation of the capitalist system, than the defeat of the proletariat could contribute to the stabilisation of capitalism.

To extract alone the defeat of the working class from the whole tremendous significance of these events for the cause of the proletarian revolution, and to ignore in all social relations the revolutionary effects of the Chinese Revolution and the British General Strike, that means to cease to be a supporter of the Marxist dialectic and to replace the latter method of analysing important events by the impressionism of a man who lets himself be swayed by momentary considerations.

The question of the general crisis of capitalism and the question of the capitalist stabilisation will not be settled in connection with this or that isolated victory or isolated defeat of the proletariat, but in connection with a whole series of conditions in which a partial victory or a partial defeat of the proletariat cannot play the final role. Whoever connects the question of the stabilisation of capitalism, even when it only takes the character of an episode, with isolated "victories" of the bourgeoisie or defeats of the proletariat, replaces a serious Marxist economic analysis of the world situation by the policy of impressionism. The temporary defeat of the Chinese workers and peasants was a heavy blow to the whole international working class movement, and no less serious was the defeat of the British proletariat brought about by the betrayal of the General Strike. But the "victory" of the bourgeoisie could only be of an extremely relative and temporary character, because the bourgeoisie is a dying class doomed to decline by history. It would have been very different if the workers in Great Britain or the workers and peasants in China had won the victory, for then such a victory would have radically changed the face of the world. Such victories would have been the prelude to a final victory of the working class on an international scale, for the proletariat is the inevitable victor in the class-struggle with the bourgeoisie. How is it possible not to realise this fundamental difference in estimating the defeat of the workers in Great Britain and of the workers and peasants in China!

Why is it necessary to glorify the significance of the "victory" of the bourgeoisie in this way, if not to exaggerate the consolidation of capitalist stabilisation? The fact which our revisionists ignore, the fact that the British General Strike and the Chinese Revolution promoted the demoralisation of capitalism, is confirmed by the consequences which these events had for the education of the proletarian masses.

Are the prospects of an international revolution after the British General Strike and the Chinese Revolution greater despite the defeats or lesser in consequence of them? Have the working masses in China become more conscious and stronger in a revolutionary sense, have they attained a firmer discipline, have they approached nearer to the slogan of the formation of Soviets after the experiences of the National-Revolution and its Kuomintang period, than was the case in 1924/25? Has our young Chinese Communist Party become more experienced, has it developed from a group of intellectuals strongly under the influence of Sun Yat-senism into an illegal workers party tried in the struggle and rich in the experience of civil war? These factors of a subjective revolutionary character must also play a role in the estimation of the capitalist stabilisation.

If the logic of the conciliators is followed to its inevitable conclusion, then every revolutionary movement which does not result immediately in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletarian revolution, is a "defeat" of the proletariat which in its result strengthens the bourgeoisie. From the repulse of the first wave of the proletarian revolution in the years 1918/19 up to its final victory over capitalism, the proletariat has experienced and will continue to experience a series of gigantic struggles on various sections of the international front. It may suffer a series of defeats, but to draw the conclusion from these defeats that the bourgeoisie and capitalism will be strengthened in consequence, means to see history only from its reverse side and to minimise the revolutionary significance of these struggles. The logic of the conciliators should lead them to seek to diminish the revolutionary energy of the proletariat and to fight against any revolutionary activity on the part of the working class. The political school of the group around Maslow Ruth Fischer was prepared at any moment to proclaim every partial strike as the beginning of the end of the capitalist stabilisation. This school replaced serious analysis of the world economic system by an accumulation of phrases, declaring that the stabilisation had become still more relative, and still more

partial, and still more temporary. This impressionism of the "left-wing" has now its counterpart in the right-wing which exploits every strike which ends with a "victory" for capitalism, in order to declare that the stabilisation has become still more consolidated, still more permanent and is not rotten to the core, etc.

In the chain of such bourgeois "victories" there must inevitably come a moment when the quantitative becomes also the qualitative, when the conciliators must, unless they wish their arguments to be reduced to absurdity, come to the conclusion that the capitalist stabilisation has developed from a relative and partial one into the normal state of capitalism which has thus commenced a period of convalescence, that the world has developed from a period of the general crisis of capitalism into the epoch of "organised capitalism". Tendencies of this sort must inevitably lead to Hilsferding.

In dealing with the German question Comrade Humbert-Droz asks incredulously what the contention means that a war of the imperialists against the Soviet Union may open a revolutionary page in the history of the working class movement. For him such a war is obviously nothing but the expression of the political consolidation of the world reaction. In such a war he sees only the "victory" of capitalist stabilisation and the "disappearance" of all contradictions between the capitalist powers on the basis of a general struggle against the first workers State.

That this counter-revolutionary war would be nothing but a reflection of the general crisis of capitalism, that it would bring the class contradictions to boiling point, that it would release gigantic social conflicts in all countries, that it would awaken millions and millions of workers, that the defensive war of the Soviet Union against the imperialist powers must develop into an offensive of the revolutionary masses against capitalism all over the world, Comrade Humbert-Droz does not see. Such a war would be of its very nature a civil war right from the day of its outbreak, for the Soviet State was, is and always will be a crystallising point for insurrections of the workers. One must first have lost all belief in the working class, all belief in the possibility of the proletarian revolution, in order to believe that a war against the Soviet Union would be nothing but a system of operations carried out by regular armies with a peaceful capitalist Hinterland, as was the case in the world war of 1914-18. The standpoint of Humbert-Droz is particularly dangerous because it represents utter hopelessness. It is a sign of the times, it shows the depression of certain elements who have become bewildered in the face of the capitalist stabilisation and have lost all sense of proportion.

We communists do not want war, for we know that there is also another way leading to the international proletarian revolution, but if the capitalist world drags the working masses into a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union, we shall not stand aside and declare resignedly that the war represents the victory of capitalist stabilisation, but we shall do everything possible to make such a war the final end of the capitalist stabilisation. Let us take the example of the coup d'Etat in Yugoslavia. This coup, which has re-established absolute monarchy in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, is not merely the insane adventure of a mentally sick pervert who is striving to turn back the wheel of history. The coup was organised and carried out with the knowledge and assistance of the London and Paris Stock Exchanges. The coup also represents a section of the general "capitalist stabilisation", it is a part of the preparations for war, it aims at throttling the working class and suppressing the national minorities in the interests of Pan-Serbian imperialism. One can regard the Serbian monarchistic coup as a "victory" for international capitalism, re-shuffling the relation of forces in the Balkans to the advantage of the capitalist stabilisation. In reality, however, the coup d'Etat in Yugoslavia is the beginning of the civil war commenced by the governing classes against the working masses. Probably not more than a few months will pass before we witness a wave of peasant revolts in Croatia, Montenegro, Slovenia etc. It is fairly obvious that such a civil war cannot be counted to the elements making for capitalist stabilisation. This civil war is a sign of the general crisis of greedy Yugoslavian capitalism.

Whoever remembers the discussion which took place in the E. C. C. I. concerning the Polish question after the coup

d'Etat of Pilsudski, knows that our criticism of the position taken up by the group around Comrade Koshtcheva was based upon the fact that this group saw nothing else in Pilsudski's coup than an attempt at capitalist stabilisation with a resultant "Rain of Gold" from the United States to fructify the impoverished Polish economic system. The authors of the theses of the Polish minority group refused to see that Pilsudski's coup was a convulsion of Polish capitalism which signified the inner rottenness of the Polish economic system. At the time there seemed no other voices in the Comintern prepared to defend the position of Comrade Koshtcheva. To-day however, Comrade Humbert-Droz is attempting by his attitude towards the "Third Period", to generalise this error and to extend it from Poland over the whole international situation.

The contention of the conciliators in the German C. P., that the majority in the German Party reject the "Third Period" and that they wish to revise the decisions of the Sixth World Congress of the C. I. is nothing but an absurd attempt on the part of the conciliators to detract attention from their own errors.

It is true, a discussion did take place in the German delegation to the Sixth World Congress of the C. I. concerning the "Third Period", but this discussion was caused by the fact that the majority of the delegation feared that the idea of the "Third Period" might be interpreted in the way in which the conciliators actually do interpret it to-day. Of course, a deviation is theoretically possible which bases an estimation of the present situation of the world economic system solely upon the theses of the general crisis of capitalism and ignores the present stage of the stabilisation. It is a fact that the Weber group in Germany completely ignored the stabilisation when forming its political platform. The nature of this error is the same as that contained in Trotzky's theory of the Permanent Revolution. In both cases a line for the final victory of the proletariat is laid down without attention being paid to the concrete circumstances of the present period in which the struggle of the working class must take place. The result with elements like Weber was that, instead of a tactical line taking the present conditions into account without losing sight of the final aim, there was a schematic arrangement cloaked in revolutionary phraseology.

We must and do fight against such confusionists who ignore the existing situation in which the working class must fight, who fail to take into account such factors as the stabilisation of capitalism, who arbitrarily shorten the historical stages through which the working class must pass and give the workers empty declamation instead of the complicated strategy of the proletarian struggle, who imagine that capitalism can be abolished with revolutionary gestures. A hysterical line of this sort can do nothing but bring the workers the bitterness of defeat. An open offensive theory ignoring the real situation at the present time would do no more than nourish the defeatist attitude of the right-wingers and the conciliators. Although we must fight against such a deviation when it shows itself in our ranks, at the present time we must oppose with all the more ruthlessness the other deviation which has already taken form within our ranks and which can see no farther than the present day, which clings to the perspective of capitalist stabilisation like a prisoner chained to a wheel, which sees in every class collision only the expression of the offensive of capitalism, which underestimates the powers of resistance possessed by the working class, which underestimates the radicalisation of the working masses, and in this way threatens to disarm us ideologically in the face of reformism and the social democracy. The recent struggle in the Ruhr showed the danger of this deviation very clearly. In the Ruhr struggle this deviation exploited the passivity which remained to a certain extent in the ranks of the communists from a former period, in order to develop this passivity into a theory. It is impossible to abolish the remnants of this passivity without exposing the opportunist tendencies of the right-wingers and the conciliators.

The differences have not been fabricated, they have been placed on the agenda of the Comintern by the course of events. It would be unworthy of Communists to pursue a head-in-the-sand policy and remain in a comfortable "neutral" position, or wait inertly in order not to fall into the minority.

The answers must be given to the questions which have arisen, and they will be given.

POLITICS

The Revision of the Constitution in Poland.

By J. R. (Warsaw).

The so-called extra-party "Bloc for Collaboration with the Government" (B. B.), the leading exponent of Pilsudsky's Fascist government in the Polish Sejm, has brought in a Bill for the revision of the Polish Constitution.

The Bill, which replaces the 56 articles of the old constitution by 70 new articles, goes beyond a mere constitutional reform from the formal standpoint — it contains a new Constitution. The bourgeois democratic and parliamentary constitution passed in March, 1921, is to be substituted by a new one directed openly and expressly against parliamentary and democratic principles. In reality bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism have been dead since the coup d'état in May, 1926, and this new draft of a constitutional revision is merely the formal confirmation of an existing fact.

The Bill has been thrown in the face of the Sejm with a dictatorial gesture. The president of the B. B., Colonel Slavek, Pilsudski's chief agent (and like Pilsudski a one-time "socialist", quite according to the pattern of the Polish S. P.), made the following declaration to the representatives of the press: "Our Extra-Party Bloc controls over 30 per cent. of the votes in the Sejm, instead of the necessary 60 per cent. But in spite of this we want to push our Bill through on constitutional lines." Colonel Slavek does not doubt that the Bill will be passed; his sole anxiety is whether it will be possible to preserve the external form of the constitution in the process. Still, there is no need to stand much on ceremony with the gentlemen of the Sejm. "Nothing will be altered in this project", declares Colonel Slavek.

The draft constitution increases the powers of the President to a fantastic extent, and makes him the actual bearer of the fascist dictatorship.

The election of the President, hitherto carried out by the National Assembly, is now to be decided by plebiscite. But the "sovereign people" is not allowed to choose its own candidates, but must select one of two candidates, one nominated by the National Assembly, the other by the retiring President. In this manner the opposition is deprived of any possibility of putting up its own candidate.

The President is accorded the right of veto. This is a right of particular elasticity. If the President is so minded, he can postpone the sanctioning of laws passed by the Sejm till the next session (that is, for a year), and can make their repeated acceptance dependent on a qualified majority. But even when such a qualified majority has been attained, he can still refuse his sanction, and even dissolve the Sejm. In this manner the President, or the government, has the power to reject any law of which it disapproves.

The President may declare the Sejm to be dissolved as often as he deems it necessary, and is limited only by the grotesque proviso that he must not do it more than once "for the same reason".

Most important of all, the President is invested with full legislative powers. He can increase the already existing taxes and other dues by 10 per cent., and can put decrees into force on his own authority. A special clause entitles the President to act on his own judgment. The President is responsible to nobody. He can appoint such judges as he pleases, give officers their posts or remove them from the same, issue rules for the Sejm, etc. The responsibility of the ministers for the actions of the President is considerably lessened.

These extreme powers held by the President (that is, by the Fascist government) reduce the rôle played by the Sejm to a minimum, the more that the Bill includes a provision that the Sejm shall work under the strictest governmental control.

"General Suffrage" continues to exist. The Fascist government would gain nothing by creating a Census Sejm, which would probably only give an advantage to the opponents of the Fascist Government. No one, however, is allowed to vote before attaining 24 years of age. This excludes revolutionary youth from the poll. Soldiers are permitted to vote; the voting age being fixed at 24, this means that only the officers and non-commissioned officers take part in the elections.

The new constitution sets innumerable traps for the revolutionary deputies who succeed in getting into the Sejm in spite of all these difficulties, for the President of the Republic has the right to decide on the validity of contested elections. And since it is always possible to contest the rightfulness of any person's election, the president can declare it to be null and void. Every Sejm deputy must take an oath that he will serve solely the welfare of the whole Polish State. This is directed especially against the deputies of the subject nationalities, and of course against the communist and revolutionary peasant deputies, who are counted among the "elements hostile to the State". Failure to keep this oath can involve serious consequences. On the demand of the Marshal of the Sejm, or of one quarter of the number of deputies prescribed by the constitution, or on the order of the Minister of Justice, the "perjured" deputy can be brought before the tribunal and declared to have forfeited his seat. In order to be able to clear the oppositional groups in the Sejm out of the way the more successfully, the Bill demands that the submission of a Bill must be accompanied by the signatures of one-sixth of the total deputies, an interpellation by those of one-fifth, and a vote of no confidence by those of one-fourth.

The Sejm meets once a year for four months. Its chief task is to pass the budget, but the Sejm is not permitted to make any alterations beyond those proposed by the budget commission. If the Sejm has not settled the budget question within 2½ months, the budget is declared to be accepted.

A vote of confidence can be passed only by the absolute majority of the constitutional quorum of deputies, and even then not until the lapse of seven days after its submission (in order to give the government time to exercise pressure on the deputies). Should the vote of no confidence be passed, the President is entitled either to accept the resignation of the cabinet or to dissolve the Sejm.

Besides the Sejm, there is the Senate, one third of the members of which are elected by the government and two thirds by popular vote (lowest age limit: 30 years). In this way a guarantee is provided that the Senate, even more than hitherto, will be a stronghold of Fascist reaction and bureaucracy. The amendments by the Senate of Sejm enactments can be rejected by the Sejm only by a three-fifths majority.

The Fascist dictatorship has laid aside its parliamentary mask. This bureaucratic and anti-parliamentary constitution, directed against the workers, peasants, and oppressed nationalities, is the constitutional sanctioning of the existing Fascist rule.

The Communist Party of Poland calls upon the working masses to take up the struggle. But not in defence of a bourgeois democracy which does not really exist. The Polish C. P. exposes the hypocrisy of the social democrats and other opportunists, who call for the defence of "threatened democracy". The C. P. P. combats this constitution Bill as it combats the Fascist dictatorship, for one cannot be separated from the other.

The Fascist constitution is not only the expression of the ruling Fascist dictatorship. It is more than this: it means that the Fascist dictatorship has secured its foothold and is preparing to deal an even severer blow to the workers' movement, to the peasants and the oppressed nationalities. Therefore the C. P. P. does not regard the Fascist constitution as a purely formal alteration. For the Communist Party of Poland the new Fascist constitution Bill is the signal for an intensified struggle against the Fascist dictatorship, for the struggle for the workers' and peasants' government, for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Conflict between Great Britain and Iraq.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The relations between the governments of Great Britain and Iraq have become exceedingly strained during the last few weeks. A point has even been reached at which the government of Abdel Mühsin Beg Saadun — described in the London press as being the Iraq leader most friendly to the British — a government put into power by British aid and possessing at the same time the majority in the Parliament of Baghdad, has been obliged to resign. The formation of a new "parliamentary" government appears to be practically impossible.

Apart from the immediate causes which have led to the outbreak of this fresh conflict, and which are chiefly concerned with the signing of the financial and military agreements, the crisis is indubitably at bottom the result of the continuation of the British tendency, in the Arabian East, to liquidate the concessions made under the pressure of the revolutionary movement in the first post-war years, and to subject these countries as far as possible to direct British control.

The treaty between Great Britain and Iraq, however humiliating its conditions may be for the latter country, and however small the liberty of movement which it permits to the population of Iraq, still does not suffice to ensure for the British capitalists the certainty of an undisturbed exploitation of the natural wealth of the country, or for the British military authorities the possibility of transforming this land between the Euphrates and the Tigris into a strategical key position for the British Empire.

The fact that the concession of cotton plantations and the granting of privileges to electrification companies have aroused the same violent resistance on the part of the nationalist fraction in Parliament as did the oil concessions at one time, and the fact, on the other hand, that the strengthening of the military power between Great Britain and Iraq is bound to form an integral part of the programme of every Iraq government, is the cause of dissatisfaction to some British circles interested in Arabian politics. The conclusion is simply drawn that the agreement between Great Britain and Iraq was premature, and that now, instead of the promised "Forward to independence", it is a case of "Back to the mandate!".

The opportunist politicians of Iraq, who welcomed the agreement between Great Britain and Iraq as the first step towards independence, precisely as the opportunist politicians of Egypt welcomed the famous British declaration of independence of 28th February, 1922, will now have to admit that this treaty has been nothing more than a skilful British manoeuvre, and that Great Britain does not dream of "giving" Iraq its independence, but on the contrary has regarded the agreement as a provisional measure leading not to liberation, but to complete enslavement.

The finesse of this British manoeuvre becomes the more apparent when not only its inner political aim (damming back of the revolutionary wave by sham concessions) is revealed, but its foreign political purpose: The official "independence" of Iraq was necessary for Great Britain so long as the dispute over Mosul was still to be decided in British interests, and the British agents absolved from responsibility for the unrest in South Persia. A certain stabilisation having taken place in the foreign political situation, this façade becomes superfluous and Great Britain can take its old brutal stand in Iraq again.

This new course undoubtedly brings with it certain dangers for Great Britain: Great excitement prevails everywhere in Iraq, and the fact that even the most moderate and pro-British elements have not succeeded in arriving at an agreement with the British negotiators, may be taken to indicate that this time everything is at stake. The nationalist agitation has greatly increased, and the possibility of conflicts is imminent. The British High Commissioner is endeavouring to push forward the King of Iraq, Feisal, to the end that he may cover the British dictatorship after the manner of the puppet King Fuad in Egypt. Intensified terror against the nationalist elements, and military reinforcements, are to complete the task of securing law and order.

The critical situation in Iraq will doubtlessly find an echo in other parts of Arabia. It represents a new and serious complication during a period in which the problems arising in the adjacent countries are not even approximately solved: In Transjordan the boycott of the elections arranged by the British still continues; in Syria the dissolved Constitutional Assembly has not yet been permitted to meet again; on the frontier of North Arabia the raids of the Wahabite tribes are increasing.

The events in Iraq will be regarded as a fresh warning in the other Arabian countries — in the Mohammedan world already roused to a high pitch of excitement by the happenings in Afghanistan. They form still another object lesson showing that no faith can be placed in imperialist promises or treaties, and that the liberation of the Arabian peoples is not to be brought about by "peaceful negotiations", but only by the revolutionary rising of the people.

The Future of Irish Labour.

By Jack Carney

(Executive Secretary of the Irish Worker League).

The area under wheat, over the whole of Ireland, for the year 1928 declined by four thousand acres, or a total production decline of seven thousand tons. In the Irish Free State there were an additional four thousand acres put under wheat cultivation, yet the weight of grain harvested was by over thirty thousand tons less than 1927. In the North of Ireland the area under oats was reduced by two thousand five hundred acres, but the total crop increased by one thousand tons. There has been more barley sown, with the increase in area all over Ireland of eight thousand seven hundred acres, though production declined by two thousand seven hundred tons. We have a similar situation in regard to potatoes, the area under which, for the whole of Ireland, increased by one thousand six hundred acres, but the production declined by one hundred thousand tons.

The farms are composed of what are known as agricultural holdings. These holdings have been heavily mortgaged as a result of the severe decline in agriculture. This decline is due to the tremendous scale upon which agriculture is conducted in Canada, America and the Argentine, also the efficiency of Danish agriculture, in comparison to Irish agriculture. Any attempt to combat this decline in Irish agriculture by a continued resort to the old established methods is foredoomed to failure. The farmers are not in a position to meet their mortgages, consequently they are not in a position to buy the essential machinery.

The banks have been suing farmers for the money advanced to them. In all cases they have obtained court decrees, but they have been unable, on account of the poverty of the farmers, to obtain any return of monies loaned. Where farms have been put up for auction they have had to be withdrawn owing to lack of bids, again due to lack of money. The banks are now taking over the farms and putting the farmers into them as managers. In other words, the banks are going into the agricultural industry instead of loaning money to the farmers.

Henry Ford has decided to have all tractors for European countries made in Cork, Ireland. The new tractor-combine, together with the hydro-electrical power to be generated from the Shannon Scheme, where it is estimated there will be an excess of 155,000,000 horsepower within a short time, is going to change the whole face of Irish agriculture. The control of Irish farms by Irish banks, that is, by British finance capital, will mean mass production in Irish agriculture. Peasant proprietorship will receive its death blow.

The Shannon Scheme is also going to mean the decentralisation of industry and instead of the large industrial centres of Ireland being confined to the sea coast, the inland territories will be opened. Already a copper mine, with an immediate output of 4,000 tons, has been located in County Kerry. This opening up of the inland part of the country will mean the breaking down of the division between the town and country.

The major political parties view these changes in terms of commercial prosperity. They will battle against the workers in order through the bait of cheap labour to attract foreign capital. De Valera speaks in the euphonious language of "living a more simple life". Cosgrave is as direct in his opposition to the workers as Mussolini. The Irish Labour Party passes out from the political life of the Irish working class unhonoured and unsung. The opportunity for a real Workers' and Peasants' Party presents itself. This party will have to fight for the immediate needs of the masses and slowly restore the confidence of the masses. Betrayed and disillusioned, deluded with the idea that the gun is a substitute for education and organisation, misled by pseudo-Communists, the working-class of Ireland present a serious problem and the task of organising them into a Workers' and Peasants' Party is no light one.

Arising out of the recent dismissals of engine drivers and firemen on the Irish Free State Railways, a division has been created in the ranks of railway workers engaged in running the trains. The transfer of men from Dublin to Cork, Waterford and other cities and the consequent displacement of men from these cities has led to complete ostracism of the transferred workers. In the case of Cork it was found impossible to secure lodgings for the transferred men and when a hotel was secured, the windows of the hotel were smashed by the sympathisers and supporters of the dismissed men. The bungling attitude of the British trade union leaders, Cramp, Gore, and others of the British unions, has created a feeling of deep resentment in the minds of the Irish railway workers. A rank and file committee is already at work and is receiving widespread support from all sections of the railway workers. The objective of this committee is an Irish Railway Industrial Union.

The steady and consistent work of the elements ranged around the Workers Union of Ireland is bearing good results. The work of this militant section of the Irish workingclass has been rendered somewhat difficult by the failure of alleged Republicans ("Anti-Imperialists") to realise the necessity of welding the national struggle along with the class struggle. The fight of the employers, backed by the Government; the rationalisation of Irish industry; the bank control of Irish farms, together with the tremendous economic development that will come through the inauguration of the Shannon Scheme, will mean the welding together of the industrial and agricultural workers of Ireland. The Irish revolutionaries will be saved the problems of the U. S. S. R. in regard to the peasantry.

The future of the Irish workingclass and peasantry is none too rosy, but with a nation wide campaign among the industrial workers, on the lines of industrial organisation as against craft organisation, and a campaign of education among the peasantry, the success of the revolutionary movement in Ireland is assured.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Struggle in the Textile Industry in Saxony and Thuringia.

By F. Emerich (Berlin).

It is not by accident that precisely in the textile industry obstinate struggles have broken out in various countries, and that more are impending, for in the struggle for markets the cheapening of textile goods is of decisive importance for the textile capitalists of all countries. The German textile industry in particular is anxious to make up for diminished sales at home by capturing fresh markets abroad, in order that it may continue to swallow enormous profits.

As early as 1926 and 1927 the textile magnates of the different tariff districts formed "risk associations" and great "safety funds", in order to be ready for the struggle against the textile workers, and on 4th September, 1928, a meeting of the Employers' Union adopted the following decision:

"The representatives of the district and local unions affiliated to the Employers' Union of the German textile industry, met in full assembly today in Berlin, have dealt with the labour struggles which have broken out in various

districts. They see in the fresh wage demands put by the textile trade unions a deliberate intention of paving the way to a general rise in textile workers' wages all over the country, without consideration of the economic conditions. Recognising this, the whole German textile industry, with its head union, stands behind the attacked unions. These unions will apply all permissible means to pursue the struggle initiated by the trade unions until a conclusion is reached compatible with economic requirements, the only conclusion compatible with the permanent interests of the workers themselves."

The result of this characteristically capitalist decision was the lockout in M. Gladbach, 50,000 workers were thrown into the street. In spite of the violent protests of the locked out workers, the struggle was throttled by the bureaucrats of the reformist and Christian trade unions before any substantial success had been won. These trade union bureaucrats were anxious to prevent at any price the lock out, threatened by the employers, of 190,000 further textile workers.

The trade union leaders thought they could thereby also restrain the textile barons from further hostility. They were greatly mistaken. The employers continued, systematically, to give notice of termination of tariffs. By the end of 1928 700,000 textile workers were involved in a wages movement. In the district of the Saxon-Thuringian Weavers' Union, comprising about 35,000 workers, notice was given, under the pressure of the opposition, by the German Textile Workers' Union. The demands of the organisation were as follows: A wage increase of 15 pfennigs per hour for all men and women workers, and a 40 per cent advance on the hour wage for all piece workers.

The textile magnates of this district, on the command of the Employers' Union, categorically refused, in October 1928, to grant any wage increases whatever. The patience of the textile workers was finally exhausted by these months of provocative action on the part of the textile magnates. Some thousands of workers in the wool, carpet, and felt weaving mills, went on strike. The reformist trade union leaders believed that the laying idle of a few factories would force the employers to negotiations and concessions. But the reply given, on the orders of the Employers' Union, was the locking out of the textile factories affiliated to this organisation, first in Gera, and a few days later in the whole district. The highest wage for male weavers over 20 years of age is 62 pfennigs per hour, for female weavers 53.5. The workers of this district are organised to the extent of 65 per cent. in the German Textile Workers Union. Other organisations have practically no influence. Of the 35,000 fighting workers over 60 per cent. are women.

A campaign started by the opposition for the election of strike committees in encountering strong resistance from the reformists. The organisation has appointed the shop stewards as strike committees. Now that the situation is becoming acute (in Gera it has come to violent conflicts with the police, and the arbitration negotiations arranged by the National Ministry of Labour have proved abortive) the opposition will gain a greater amount of influence within the next few days, when it has become bolder, more energetic and self-reliant. The most important demands put forward by the revolutionary trade union opposition are as follows:

1. 15 pfennigs increase for all men and women workers;
2. 40 per cent. advance on hour wages for the piece workers;
3. tariff agreement to run indefinitely, subject to a month's notice to terminate same by either side;
4. election of workers' strike committees in the factory meetings;
5. relief to be given to locked out workers by the municipalities;
6. rejection of all interference on the part of the State arbitration authorities.

The fighting spirit of the workers is growing. It is now the task of the revolutionary trade union Opposition to indicate to the textile workers the way they should go. It is only by means of the election of the strike committees by the workers in the factories and by means of a more active leadership of the strike by these and the arousing of the unorganised that it will be possible to oppose to the capitalist machinations of the Saxon-Thuringian textile industry that united and determined fighting front of the workers which is necessary if the textile magnates are to be forced to their knees.

FASCISM

The Forthcoming Anti-Fascist Congress in Berlin.

By Willi Münzenberg (Berlin).

The First International Anti-Fascist Congress has been convened by the Committee for the Organisation of an Anti-Fascist Congress, under the Presidency of Henri Barbusse, for the 9th and 10th of March in Berlin. The Congress acquires particularly great importance precisely at the present time. In Italy, Poland, Lithuania and the Balkan countries the fascist regime oppresses more than 100 million people, robs the workers of their right of combination, either in trade unions or in their own political party, persecutes the revolutionary workers, imprisons them, deports them and foully murders hundreds of them. The fascist regime has raged in all countries with special terror and brutality against the revolutionary workers. In the course of the fascist dictatorship many thousand years' hard labour have been imposed; many hundreds have been banished, hundreds killed. Fascism has today become an international danger for the international working class.

The Congress which has been convened will take place at a time when the fight against fascism is a specially urgent and pressing task. In Yugoslavia King Alexander has carried out a fascist coup d'état, and his monarchist dictatorship is supported today by the fascist generals and the governmental means and methods of the fascist regime. Flanked and supported by Italian fascism and by the papacy, which is today closely allied with the fascist regime, the Austrian Government is promoting and supporting the development and strengthening of the Austrian fascist Heimwehr (Home defence) against the Austrian workers.

The fascist Heimwehr have heavy guns placed at their disposal from the State arsenals and now feel strong enough to hold a demonstration in the historical demonstration place of the Vienna working class.

In Switzerland, the Federal Council of the "most democratic Republic of the world", is refusing the right of asylum to emigrants expelled by Mussolini and tolerates all fascist machinations in the Italian portion of Switzerland.

In Great Britain the leading captains of industry and banking circles directly and indirectly support the fascist organisations.

Against this international alliance of the fascist dictators there must be set up the international fighting front of all anti-fascist forces. To set up this united common front of all anti-fascist forces is the first and foremost task of the forthcoming International Anti-Fascist Congress.

That this Congress is being called at an appropriate time is proved by the response which the Congress has evoked in all countries and in all anti-fascist circles. In almost all European countries broad anti-fascist committees and organisations have been formed which are carrying out a big campaign for the purpose of popularising the Congress and for the fight against fascism.

Particular activity is displayed by the anti-fascist committees and organisations in Austria, where alongside of Communists and non-party workers a strong group of social democrats is taking part in the anti-fascist campaign.

In Czechoslovakia sixty big demonstrations of the anti-fascist committees are taking place in the next few weeks.

In Great Britain there have already taken place mass meetings of anti-fascist committees in support of the Congress.

In France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, in all other countries broad anti-fascist committees are being formed or are already active.

But the convocation of the Anti-Fascist Congress has met with a response extending far beyond the European countries. A mass demonstration has just been held in New York. Further

demonstrations in support of the Anti-Fascist Congress are to be held in Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other big towns in America.

According to the reports at present to hand from the various countries there will be present at the Congress ten delegates from England, twenty from France, ten from Belgium, two from the United States, ten from the Balkan countries, fifteen from Poland, twenty-five to thirty from Italy, five from Spain, two from the Argentine, fifteen from Czechoslovakia, ten from Switzerland, ten from Austria, fifty from Germany etc.

Among the delegates who have been reported are workers who have been elected at big anti-fascist demonstrations, factory delegates, Communists, non-party workers, social democrats, Left democrats and intellectuals who are conducting a fight against fascism in their own country.

Eminent leaders and fighters in the anti-fascist movement have consented to deliver the chief reports at this Congress. Thus Henri Barbusse will speak on "Fascism Imperialism and the war danger." The well-known leader of the Italian peasants, Miglioli, is to speak on the position of the workers, the peasants and the intellectuals in the fascist countries. It is the task of all workers and all anti-fascist groups and circles to mobilise now in all countries all forces for the Congress and for a broad anti-fascist campaign.

In connection with the Congress there must take place in all countries big meetings and demonstrations against fascism, and when the delegates of the international anti-fascist front meet on the 10th March in Berlin, millions of workers in all countries must demonstrate under the slogans of the anti-Fascist Congress: Down with Fascism! "Up with the revolutionary united front against the fascist dictatorship!"

The Extension of the Anti-Fascist Front.

On 10th of February there took place in Vienna a Conference for the purpose of setting up an Anti-Fascist Committee. The Conference was attended by 78 delegates from Vienna and the provinces, representing 24 medium sized and big factories, 12 proletarian organisations and four district anti-Fascist Committees which had been already formed. The delegates present consisted of members of the Social Democratic Party, of the Communist Party and of non-party workers.

After the report on the development of Austrian and international fascism, the Conference elected from its midst an Anti-Fascist Committee in which all the factories and organisations which took part in the Conference are represented.

The newly founded anti-fascist Committee sets itself the task of organising the defensive front against fascism by mobilising the broadest working masses, by creating anti-fascist Committees in the factories and in the districts, as well as by rallying together all the anti-fascist forces in Austria.

The Conference welcomed with enthusiasm the founding of the International Anti-Fascist Committee under the leadership of Henri Barbusse and decided to affiliate to this Committee.

The Austrian Anti-Fascist Committee decided to send an Austrian delegation to the Anti-Fascist Congress to be held on 9th and 10th of March in Berlin.

The Conference finally adopted an appeal to the Austrian working class setting forth the tasks and aims of the Anti-Fascist movement.

THE WHITE TERROR

A New Court-Martial Sentence of the "Democratic" Roumanian Government.

Three months have passed since the National Zaranist Party took over the government. The result of these three months shows clearly and plainly the real class content of this party. Increase of all taxes by 20 per cent., doubled exploitation of the workers and peasants by unconditional submission to foreign capital, further ruin of agriculture, alignment in the Anti-Soviet front, and intensified terror against the working class.

It is precisely in this last respect that the National Zaranist Government has proved itself to be a consistent follower of the Bratianu regime. The number of trials of workers in the period of the elections by far exceeded the number of such trials during the time of the Bratianu government. In the three months of his Premiership Maniu has imposed over 100 years of imprisonment. The Galatz trial alone resulted in sentences amounting in all to 67 years imprisonment for revolutionary workers. The rehearing of the trial of Boris Stefanov was rejected, in spite of the fact that the Public Prosecutor was in favour of the annulment of the sentence. Bujor, in spite of the fact that he has been proved innocent, is still kept under arrest. Mania Ehrlich, the young Bessarabian martyr, was "pardoned" but shortly afterwards again arrested on the ground that she had been released by an "oversight".

The crown of all these acts of terror, however, is the arbitrary arrest of Comrade Dobrodgenanu-Gherea, one of the most eminent leaders of the C. P. of Roumania, and his condemnation to eight years' hard labour. This arrest proves again the lying character of all the demagogic catch-words and promises of the National Zaranist Party.

Comrade Dobrodgenanu-Gherea cannot be charged with a single crime. In the year 1924, when the Bratianu Government declared the Communist Party to be illegal and a state of siege was imposed over the whole country, Dobrodgenanu-Gherea was arrested along with a whole number of leading comrades. The only thing that could be brought against him was his articles in the organ of the Communist Party. After his flight he was condemned by a military court in his absence to ten years hard labour. Now he has been again arrested, this time by the "democratic" government, and, in spite of the abolition of the state of siege, handed over to the military court.

Immediately after his arrest Comrade Dobrodgenanu-Gherea went on hunger strike. In his letter to the workers of Roumania he explains the motives, which induced him to take this step.

"The Russian revolutionary movement", he writes, "was served by thousands who laid down their lives for it. In the most difficult moment of the fight, during the blackest days of reaction, some thought: Are we not shedding our blood in vain? What is the use of these sacrifices? Many, in thinking thus, have lost their faith in the victory of the revolution."

"The October, however, came. In its light we can see that not a single drop of blood was shed in vain. This blood fertilised the soil for the emancipation of the working class."

"My hunger-strike is not an individual but a collective act, because I am bound by my thoughts and my belief to the masses; because I have faith in and my sole hope is in their fight; because I thereby actively participate in this fight".

This letter shows the firm determination of Comrade Dobrodgenanu-Gherea to carry out to an end the revolutionary fight for the cause of the proletariat, even behind the prison walls. He will not be left alone in his fight. The Roumanian working class is on the side of its leader. The fight for the general political amnesty must be conducted with renewed energy. The international proletariat must also support its Roumanian brothers in this fight.

The Roumanian Red Aid has issued an appeal to the international proletariat, calling upon it to conduct in common the fight for the release of the proletarian class fighters from the prisons of Roumania.

This appeal must not remain unanswered! Organise mass actions in the factories! The International bourgeoisie, by its credits, supports the white terror in Roumania! The international proletariat must support by its solidarity action the fight of the Roumanian workers against the exploiters and oppressors!

To the Rescue of Comrade Kahana!

The International Bureau of the Union of Russian Revolutionary Writers and the Union of Proletarian Revolutionary Writers of Germany have addressed an appeal to all writers of the West, calling upon them to raise their voice in protest in order to rescue Comrade Moses Kahana.

The Hungarian proletarian revolutionary writer Moses Kahana has been pining for four years, under the most terrible conditions and cruel prison regime, in the Roumanian fortress of Doitana. During this time Comrade Kahana has become an invalid as a result of the cruelty of the prison regime. On the pretext that he was "attempting to escape" he was shot by the guard and so seriously wounded in the leg that it had to be amputated. Comrade Kahana lay for over six months in the prison hospital, where there was lacking even a minimum of hygiene and medical care.

As the time approached when he would have served his sentence, the Roumanian government framed up a new case against Comrade Kahana by accusing him of having led a Communist cell of the prisoners. As a matter of fact he simply gave instruction in reading and writing to his illiterate fellow prisoners.

The military court in Galatz condemned him to a further term of seven years imprisonment, which is tantamount to a sentence of death. For, as a result of the sufferings, deprivations, repeated hunger-strikes, operations and sickness, Comrade Kahana has lost so much strength that he could not stand such a long term of imprisonment. The appeal of the revolutionary writers of Russia and Germany therefore declares:

"We must hasten, for it is a question of rescuing a writer who is entombed alive".

IN THE COLONIES

The Bourgeoisie and National Revolution in India.

By M. N. Roy.

The speech of the British Viceroy in the Indian Legislative Assembly on January 28 indicates how imperialism plans to meet the situation in India. Evidently, imperialism has not failed to notice the radicalisation of the nationalist movement, and to focus its attention on the force causing his radicalisation imperialism recognises its most dangerous and determined enemy in the working class. Its tactics in the present situation as hinted by the Viceroy, is to point to the nationalist bourgeoisie the dangerousness of the situation, and ask their co-operation in meeting the common danger. The Viceroy was encouraged to put forth this policy of counter-revolutionary united front by the attitude of the nationalist bourgeoisie who are positively alarmed by the situation, and frankly express their disapproval of any revolutionary movement. The following quotations illustrate the situation.

Commenting upon the "critical situation in the country" as indicated by the events of the last twelve months, and by the Congress and Conferences during the closing week of the year, Bepin Chandra Pal writes:

"It is no longer possible to describe the Congress as a demonstration of mere middle class discontent... It can no longer be said that the educated classes in India have

no backing in their political struggle from the masses of the people... Indeed, it is at least doubtful whether the lead comes at all from the educated leaders or whether these leaders are not more or less helpless instruments in the hand of the awakened multitudes. Every one of the Congress leaders feels that the position in the movement entirely depends upon the favour of the crowd. No leader today dares to follow the lead of his reason or conscience, not even the Mahatma (Gandhi). Yet in 1920 Gandhi's word was law to the multitudes... The Leviathan has commenced to move...

"This was demonstrated by the invasion of the Congress by twenty thousand labourers. This was verification of the adage, 'coming events cast their shadow before'... On one of the banners of this procession of workmen was inscribed 'Long Live Independent Socialist Republic of India'... The time cannot be very far when the working classes, once aroused to the sense of their power to coerce the government of the country, will refuse to be exploited by the middle class politicians; 'Red' leaders will rise from among them who will have no respect for any law or order either economic, political or moral."

Pal presents this remarkably true and well-drawn picture of the situation not as something to be welcomed. He draws it as a warning not only to the nationalist bourgeoisie, but also to the petty bourgeois radicals who unconsciously are riding on the crest of the rising tide of revolution. An ex-Jacobin himself, Pal warns the Indian Jacobins not to play with fire. He reminds them what they are, and explains to them the dangerousness of the game they are playing. He writes:

"Neither the Congress leaders nor the Moslem leaders in their Khilafat Conference or their League, much less the leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha will bring about a revolution. Some of them may talk of Civil-disobedience and non-payment of taxes; but none of them is made of the stuff that creates revolutions... Yet all these people have been working for revolution, which, if and when it bursts, will make them its first victims. Once popular passion is roused, by them for their purpose, neither God nor man will be able to keep the angry multitudes non-violent."

Having pointed out the dangerous potentiality of the situation Pal, who is the foremost ideologist of bourgeois nationalism, appeals for a counter-revolutionary united front of all who would save India from the horrors of class struggle. He continues:

"And let the government know that should there be a revolutionary outburst under present conditions, they will not find it possible to grapple with it as easily as they grappled with a peaceful upheaval ten years ago. It behoves, therefore, both Indian and imperial statesmanship to take counsel together without delay, and find a way out of the crisis... The proceedings of the Congress and other gatherings of the last Christmas week in Calcutta offer a serious warning to both Indian and British statesmanship to settle their conflicts before it is too late, and the future completely passes out of their hands."

This is not a solitary voice. Pal, a clever and courageous political thinker as he is, only expresses the sentiments of the entire class he represents, frankly and logically. The objective importance of these views as indicating the role of the bourgeoisie in the national revolution, is fully appreciated, when the history of the man expressing them is known. Quarter of a century ago Pal was the leader of the radical left wing of the nationalist movement. At that time he occupied in the country a place analogous to that recently occupied by Gandhi. It was partially under his leadership that the National Congress, a quarter of a century ago, broke away from the monopoly of the Indian disciples of imperialist liberalism. Pal can be called the father of Indian Jacobinism, though it is long since he has betrayed his child. Indeed, he was a revolutionary, when the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie was still a revolutionary class. In view of these facts, Pal's views are particularly indicative.

But Pal is not alone. Similar views are expressed by an evergrowing number of spokesmen of the nationalist bourgeoisie. These views increase in volume and clearness in proportion as the revolutionary forces assert themselves on the

situation — in proportion as the working class appear on the political scene as an independent and dominant factor of the situation.

The Indian Liberal Federation represents that section of the nationalist bourgeoisie which broke away from the Congress when this, in 1920, adopted the tactics of Non-co-operation with the British government. It represents heavy industrial, trading and landowning interests. Last year, a considerable section of the Liberal Federation modified its attitude of co-operation with the government, and joined the movement for boycotting the Simon Commission. In the annual Conference of the Liberal Federation, which met at the same time as the National Congress, the President, Chimanlal Setalvad, said among other things:

"We are now passing through very momentous and anxious times, and it must be remembered by all those who are interested in the welfare of this country — and I include in that description not only ourselves, but also the British government who in the wisdom of Providence have been brought into partnership with us — that the time through which India is now passing is really very anxious. A mentality is growing which is absolutely impatient with the present state of things and which, if not guided in the proper channel, will swallow everything. The Communistic ideas and Socialism are the coming menace. If that mentality grows it will swallow Dominion Status, it will swallow Independence, it will swallow the present structure of society... The only way of preventing the spread of Socialism and Communism is for the authorities (British) to take a bold step and to concede at once what we have been asking for, namely, Dominion Status."

"We of the liberal faith have served the country all these years, and value and cherish British connection, and have stood by the government believing that British connection is good for both the countries. If our moderate counsels are not heeded, there are very troublesome times ahead with the growing discontent against the government and the present order of society."

The implication of this speech cannot be missed. Indian bourgeoisie offer imperialism their willing co-operation to combat the common enemy. The counter-revolutionary sentiment of the nationalist bourgeoisie is evident. Only they have no power to give practical expression to this sentiment. Therefore, they appeal to the imperialist overlords for some political power which they would wield for suppressing not only the working class, but also the national revolution. There is a favourable response to this appeal. While it is out of the question that full Dominion Status will be granted in the immediate future, it is practically certain that the native bourgeoisie will be given considerable power in the provincial government. This will very likely include the administration of police by Indian ministers. Even a large section of the British residents in India have recommended this measure. The object is to commandeer the services of the nationalist bourgeoisie in the counter-revolutionary combat against the working class and any other revolutionary movement.

The "Leader", an organ of the Liberal Federation, commented on the speech quoted above as follows:

"Communism and other undesirable forms of extremism are the result of the policy of economic exploitation and radical domination. Steps should be taken to stop the exploitation and misleading of the masses for revolutionary purpose... The liberals are opposed to revolutionary political methods. They have made it absolutely clear that they are not supporters of Communism. They are convinced that violence cannot solve any problem... Repressive policy will only aggravate political distemper, promote the purpose of the revolutionaries and destroy whatever influence the friends of British connection and lovers of peace have in the country, and let loose anarchy."

The journal further writes in the same article:

"Among the friends of the British we count Mahatma Gandhi and Pundit Motilal Nehru. We pray most fervently that British statesmen may in time realize the gravity of the situation, and by large-hearted and courageous statesmanship retrieve it before it is too late."

It should be noticed that the spokesmen of the bourgeoisie use Communism and other forms of extremism, by which they mean revolutionary nationalism, interchangeably. If it were only for Communism, this fright and hatred of the nationalist bourgeoisie would not be so remarkable; for, as bourgeoisie they must naturally hate and fear Communism. But, as it is, the object of their fear, hatred and attack is any kind or form of revolution. Spectre of Communism drives the Indian bourgeoisie into the arms of British imperialism, thus revealing them as enemies of national revolution.

The reference to Gandhi and Nehru as "friends of the British" is neither accidental nor an exaggeration. Had it been so, it should have been repudiated by the persons concerned. On the contrary, before and since the last meeting of the National Congress, both of them made statements which add a touch of authority to the reference made by the liberal journal. A few days after the National Congress had very reluctantly endorsed his compromise resolution on the question of British connection, Gandli categorically stated to the press: "My position is very clear. To me Dominion Status means independence. Others have been led, through suspicion of Britain's good faith, to make a distinction between the two." (The Englishman, Calcutta.) Here Gandhi makes a declaration of his belief in Britain's good faith. One cannot be a friend of the British without automatically being an enemy of the forces antagonistic to British domination. So, Gandhi also is opposed to national revolution, and will denounce any revolutionary struggle as Communist menace in a critical moment. As regards Motilal Nehru, there is less doubt on this score. The pseudo Danton of India will not need guillotine for political elimination, as soon as there will appear on the scene some real Jacobins.

But let us still see what the out-spoken representatives of the nationalist bourgeoisie have to say. The Moslem League, which adhered to the common nationalist platform embodied in the so-called Nehru Report, held its annual meeting simultaneously with the Congress, in opposition to the officially inspired All-India Moslem Conference. A Maharaja with considerable capital invested in industry was in the chair, and said the following:

"Severance of British connection is a hopelessly unworkable proposition. India's place in the British Commonwealth is a place of undeniable security. Her association with the British Commonwealth is a valuable asset, and it will be folly to destroy this precious connection. There is plenty of room for growth, development and expression of Indian nationalism within the orbit of connection with England."

Abdul Karim, who opened the meeting and proposed the capitalist Maharaja for the chair, said:

"For economic and cultural autonomy Dominion Status will give India all scope we need for the present. It will, therefore, be unwise to fritter away our limited national energy for the chimera of independence."

On the morrow of the annual meeting of the National Congress the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce met, for the first time in its history, in the presence of the Viceroy. The Chairman of the Federation, Jumradas Thakurdas, an industrial magnate of Bombay, discoursed on the atmosphere of threat to law and order, and appealed for legislation checking the revolutionary development of the labour movement. He was one of those, who had voted against the anti-Communist Public Safety Bill in the Legislative Assembly. He made a veiled apology for his action, and hinted that when the government brought up the Bill in the next parliamentary session, the representatives of the big bourgeoisie would vote for it. Obviously the intervening events testifying to a radicalisation of the nationalist movement essentially under the pressure of the independent revolutionary action of the working class, had forced change in the attitude of the nationalist bourgeoisie. They are now ready to give up the constitutional opposition to imperialist domination.

The feeling of the nationalist bourgeoisie are expressed from another side — a very extraordinary one. Reviewing the situation in the light of the latest developments the semi-official organ, "Pioneer" writes:

"Gandhi hopes to guide the revolutionaries into more sober and profitable paths, — to keep in check more serious developments. Or it may be that he is endeavouring to enable the British government to make some gestures, to inaugurate some policy, which will stay off an era of political chaos. Neither Gandhi, nor Motilal Nehru nor any other leader of the older generation wishes a revival of Non-co-operation. Neither Calcutta, nor Bombay can afford to face another period of non-co-operation, and if the threat becomes real, they will be the first to demand of the government of India a more peaceful solution. If the governors of India are wise, they will appreciate the position of the moderate politicians... The moderate men in this country know that if there is no alteration in the policy, their fate will be an unpleasant one... Let the Viceroy send for Gandhi, Motilal Nehru and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru (leader of the Liberal Federation) for consultation. If the Viceroy were able to announce to the Legislative Assembly his Majesty the King-Emperor's personal pledge that Dominion Status will be granted to India, there can be little doubt but that the widespread conservative elements will once more rally round the government. The benefit would be mutual and immediate. The revolutionary movement in the country will be isolated, and there will be a chance of keeping India in the British Commonwealth."

Calcutta and Bombay, that is, the commercial and industrial princes of those cities, speaking through the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce have clearly demonstrated their disapproval of any revolutionary movement, and have indicated the Viceroy their willingness to co-operate in the suppression of it. And the Viceroy in his speech opening the new session of the Legislative Assembly has re-iterated his Britanic Majesty's pledge to grant India self government. How soon, he did not say. But certainly not within a year. This he made quite clear. But on the strength of this pledge he trusted that the Assembly would pass the anti-Communist law and possibly other repressive measures directed against the radical elements of the nationalist movement. The nervousness of the nationalist bourgeoisie and their condemnation of any revolutionary movement have encouraged imperialism to plan repression of the revolutionary movement. And judged by their utterances, the nationalist bourgeoisie will support the government in this plan to prove their fitness to wield greater administrative responsibility.

While the big bourgeoisie are voluntarily offering their services to counter-revolution, the petty bourgeois radicals are afraid of the potentiality of the dynamics of the situation which drive them further than they want to go. A tendency to back-sliding is to be noticed in their ranks. Commenting on the resolution of the Congress the Englishman of Calcutta correctly observed:

"In India sanctions to enforce a national demand can mean one thing and only thing — revolution."

The organ of petty bourgeois radicalism, the "Forward" of Calcutta replied as follows:

"On a careful analysis of the apparently innocent word 'sanction' our contemporary has discovered that it is dangerous verbal dynamite capable of blowing up all law and order to pieces... The news will, of course, come to every Congressman as a surprise, for they are not aware that there has been any change in the Congress creed, or that the Congress has departed from its policy of non-violence." (Jan. 8.)

The next day Forward reverts to the subject and writes:

"Violence has been rightly ruled out by the Congress. The country has to devise an efficacious remedy on lines which may not bring it into conflict with the so-called laws of the country. That is the economic boycott." (Jan. 9.)

Again the day after: "When Congressmen talked of 'sanction', they could not mean anything more serious than pressure of public opinion, economic boycott or non-payment of taxes. Our contemporary had to admit that none of these suggested methods of enforcing submission from the British government should carry the implication of violence." (Jan. 10.)

This cowardly attitude of the petty bourgeois radicals is not altogether subjective. It is a reflex of the crystallization of counter-revolutionary sentiment among the big bourgeoisie. There cannot be any real Jacobinism except under the pressure of the masses. This condition for the bourgeois democratic revolution is maturing in India; but owing to the fact that it happens in an entirely different historical epoch, this condition does not make Jacobins out of the Indian bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it drives them into the camp of counter-revolution.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Progress of the Communal Economy of Moscow.

By Uchanov.

Our Party is pursuing a determined course towards the complete reconstruction of our backward technic and economy. We have at the same time set ourselves the task of developing agricultural productive forces on the basis of a reformation of our extremely backward agricultural technics, to be accomplished by extensive socialisation and by improving of the individual agricultural undertakings of the poor and middle peasantry. Our economic policy is directed towards strengthening every aspect of the socialist sector of our economy, and we are attacking the capitalist elements all along the line. Hand in hand with the reconstruction of our economy, we are proceeding uninterruptedly — in contradistinction to the capitalist countries — with the improvement of the material position of the working class and of all toilers.

What have we attained by means of this policy? First of all a general and considerable growth of our economy and especially of our industry. The rate of development of our industry is increasing from year to year. In the course of the economic year 1926/27 the production of our industry increased by 18 per cent., and in 1927/28 by 22.7 per cent. This rate has been made possible only with the aid of extensive capital investments. During the last three years (including the present economic year 1928/29), the capital freshly invested in the industry of the Soviet Union has amounted to 4 milliards of roubles.

The level of our technics is rising, even if not so rapidly as is actually necessary and as we might wish. The productivity of labour is also growing. In 1927/28 it increased by 14.5 per cent., and a further rise of 17 per cent. is to be attained in the present economic year.

Agriculture has also made progress during the last few years, although the speed of its development is insufficient. We must accelerate this development, in order to ensure our success in the continued rapid industrialisation of our economy. The rate at which our grain production develops is especially insufficient. For the purpose of accelerating the development of agriculture, we are giving support at the same time to the individual farms of the poor and middle peasants. We must, however, never forget that a radical improvement of agriculture, and its technical reformation, can be accomplished only on the basis of collectivisation, on the basis of the development of large-scale agricultural undertakings.

Everyone knows that our work, besides its great successes, reveals numerous faults. All these faults must be subjected to the severest self-criticism. This is the only way to remove them.

In our work we have adhered strictly to the class standpoint. In agriculture we have been chiefly interested in developing socialisation and giving aid to the village poor. We have promoted to a wide extent the building of workers' houses in the factory districts. The chief care of our communal economy has been to serve the working class districts and the working population, etc. This does not mean that no errors have been committed with respect to the class line in some individual cases, for instance in the distribution of agricultural credits and in the frequent failure to adhere strictly enough to the directive enacting that 70 to 80 per cent. at least of the newly erected houses should be occupied by workers, etc. Such errors must be corrected with the utmost energy.

We have set ourselves the task of the cultural revolution in its fullest extent. At the present time the cultural revolution is the most important link in the chain of our constructive work.

And now to the results of economic development in Moscow and the Moscow Gubernia.

During the past two years we have invested 970 million roubles in the various branches of economy. Of this sum 370 million roubles have fallen to industry. For the present economic year 1928/29 alone provision has been made for capital investments to the amount of 670 million roubles (260 million roubles for industry). These capital investments have been utilised as follows:

In the course of two years the production of the industry of Moscow and its environs has increased by 51 per cent. The industry controlled directly by the Moscow communal administration (Moscow Economic Council) has shown especially rapid progress: It has doubled its output in two years.

During the last economic year (1927/28), the production of those branches of industry (in the city and gubernia of Moscow) which are manufacturing means of production increased by 31.5 per cent., those manufacturing articles of consumption by 25.3 per cent. The capacity of the power stations has been increased by 30 per cent.

In spite of bad crops, the total agricultural production of our Gubernia has risen by 6 per cent., and the proportion of this output forming a commodity by 14 per cent. The area under cultivation has been increased by 4.6 per cent., 84 per cent of the total arable land is already being tilled on the multiple course system. In 1927/28 five times as much fertiliser was distributed as in the year before, but even this quantity failed to satisfy the whole demand of the peasant farms. The mechanisation of the peasant farms has made considerable progress.

The number of collective farms has more than doubled during the past two years (from 225 collective farms in 1925/26 to 476 in the economic year just elapsed). The socialised sector of agriculture will this year supply 12 per cent. of the commodity share of agricultural production, as compared with 6.7 per cent. last year. The number of workers employed in industry has increased by 55,000, and today totals almost half a million. During the last two years the average wages of the Moscow worker have risen by 21.5 per cent. In 1926/27 we expended 16 million roubles for unemployment benefit, in 1927/28 over 25 million roubles. In the course of the two years under report we spent 185 million roubles on the erection of dwelling houses, 148 million roubles of which were allotted to the city of Moscow. This enabled us to provide housing accommodation for 150,000 persons.

24 per cent. of the workers of Moscow are catered for by the communal kitchens. It is expected that this number will be increased to 35 per cent. in the current economic year. The newly erected mechanical large-scale central kitchens will play a great part in promoting this.

The public health service has also its successes to record. The clinics have served 30 per cent. more patients this year than last. The number of clinics has increased by 19 per cent., that of the hospitals by 12 per cent.

How is the task of developing the socialist sector being solved? In 1926 the share taken by private trade in the retail trade of Moscow was 33.5 per cent., in 1928 22 per cent., and in 1929 (see our preliminary estimate) it will be 17.9 per cent. 79.9 per cent. of the total production of the "census industry" (undertakings employing more than 16 workers) has been supplied by socialised industry.

It need not be said that here too there are weak spots. The degree of socialisation among the small and home industries is only 44 per cent.; this percentage is however double that of 1926 (22 per cent.).

The membership of our co-operative societies increased by 71 per cent. in the two years under report. The corresponding increase in the agricultural co-operatives was 67 per cent., in the productive co-operatives 87 per cent. Only 43 per cent. of the peasants farms, however, are organised in the co-operatives.

Taken all in all, the following general conclusion must be emphasised: Our economy is growing yearly, not by a few units per cent., but by dozens per cent. This is a distinct symptom of the colossal achievements of our socialist construction. The main tasks of industry in the immediate future are rationalisation and the reduction of the costs of production.

We shall introduce the seven-hour day this year in a number of undertakings, not only in textile factories, but in the metal, leather, tobacco, ready-made clothing, and other trades. In the course of the current year 25 per cent. of the workers employed in the State industry of our Gubernia will go over to the seven-hour day.

The proportion of our agricultural production reaching the market is still extremely small: from the peasant farms 18 per cent., from the collective undertakings 33 per cent., and from the Soviet farms 54 per cent. Horticulture is comparatively freely developed. It will be promoted in the current year by new Soviet fruit and vegetable gardens covering an area of 525 hectares.

The collective farms are accorded far-reaching support. It suffices to mention that in the current economic year 84 per cent. of the capital invested in collective farms has been covered by our credit system, and only 16 per cent. by the members of the collective undertakings themselves. We have granted credits to the village poor to the amount of about one million roubles, and have organised the commassation of 40,000 poor peasant farms free of cost.

The development of our commercial activities is characterised by the decline of the small trade centres by 18 per cent. (of the private sales centres by 30 per cent.), and by the 50 per cent. extension of the network of the co-operatives. In the course of the coming year nearly all working class districts will possess large and well equipped department stores.

We have taken up the reorganisation of bread production, our aim being to replace the small-scale undertaking by the mechanised large-scale one. In Moscow we have erected two new bread factories, and within a very short time two others now in course of construction will also be completed and set going. These factories will be able to meet more than one half of Moscow's bread requirements. Speculation in bread is being combated by the introduction of a control over bread production and flour distribution. This control has already been able to record considerable success, but it must be increased.

The population of Moscow has increased by 204,000 persons in two years. 156,000 of these have migrated from the country, or from other districts. This great increase in the Moscow population has had the effect of increasing local unemployment. Of the unemployed, places can be found fairly rapidly for the industrial workers, who form only 14 per cent. of the unemployed.

We are engaged at the present time in freeing the municipalised houses of Moscow from all non-working elements. The whole of the housing accommodation thus set free will be placed at the exclusive disposal of proletarians.

We are making rapid progress in combating illiteracy. During the last five years we have taught 200,000 adults to read and write. There are still about 150,000 illiterates in Moscow and its Gubernia, but these are for the most part new arrivals from other districts.

During the two years under report we have been able to stimulate our Soviets greatly. One of the main tasks of the further development of proletarian democracy must be the broadening and deepening of self-criticism. In this direction we must advance more courageously than hitherto.

The main line along which the Moscow district will develop is that of accelerated industrialisation. Besides this, we have another supremely important task in guiding the great masses of the peasantry more rapidly into the path of socialisation and in accomplishing the technical transformation of agriculture.

The working masses, to whom we now give an account of our progress, will now elect a new Moscow Soviet, which will take up the work with even greater energy, with even greater strenuousness, and doubtlessly with even greater success.

The Struggle for the Alliance of Science with Labour.

By A. Lunatcharsky.

In January of this year there took place the election of new members to the Scientific Academy, increasing the number of academicians from 40 to 80. The candidatures were considered and proposed with the active participation of the scientific workers and institutions of the Soviet Union. After the secret ballot among the old members, it was found that three candidates supported by the whole Soviet public, and chosen almost unanimously as candidates at the public preliminary ballot, had not received the necessary two-thirds majority at the final ballot, which was a secret one. These three candidates were: the philosophic researcher **Deborin**, well known to the workers both at home and abroad; the literary historian and philologist **Fritsche**; and the Marxist historian **Lukin**. The cause of the frustration of the election of these comrades is to be found in the anti-Soviet attitude of a section of the old members of the Academy, and great indignation has been aroused by the cowardly double game played by those academicians, who were unable, at the public ballot, to bring anything against the scientific services of Comrades **Deborin**, **Lukin**, and **Fritsche**, but made use of the secret ballot for an anti-Soviet manoeuvre. Scientific bodies of various kinds passed numerous resolutions demanding the correction of this blunder. An extraordinary session of the Academy, participated in by the newly elected members, decided to request the Soviet Government to agree to the election of the above three comrades by the Plenum of the Academy — without recourse to the preparatory procedure prescribed by the statutes. This agreement has already been given by the Council of People's Commissaries. The importance of this occurrence is shown in the following article by Comrade **Lunatcharsky**, taken from the "Isvestia". For technical reasons the article is here published in abbreviated form. Ed.

The Scientific Academy is the most conservative part of our cultural world. It is no secret that the tsarist government treated the Academy as an extremely privileged institution. It took great care that the Academy was not contaminated by the admission of members with too radical views.

The revolution, in taking over the human and other material belonging to the order which it destroyed, was exceedingly careful to destroy nothing unnecessarily. We saved everything which could possibly be saved. Often enough what we had saved seemed suspicious, seemed to conceal indubitably disagreeable elements within it, but we said: We shall put this in order later on. The time will come when we are stronger, and will be able to judge what we can take over entirely into the new life, and what we can only take over in part, or after considerable reform. It is better to throw away later what we do not require than to destroy now what we may still need.

With respect to Science the revolution was especially cautious. It is obvious that bourgeois science has been distorted in the interests of the bourgeoisie, and that it rejects such conclusions as Marxism, drawn from the total development of scientific thought. But for our times science without Marxism resembles the world view of the church when it rejected Galileo's teachings. It is simply a half-science. The proletariat cannot content itself with a science trimmed by bourgeois society to fit its own requirements. I repeat, however, that in this respect we proceeded very cautiously.

We granted the utmost freedom to the scientific workers; we were well aware that here nothing could be attained by force, but only by conviction. On the neutral territory of science we permitted scientific thought to go its own way, hoping that in time this way would merge into new channels under the influence of the stupendous force of attraction exercised by the Marxist way of thinking. We have waited. We have been patient. Lenin said: The worker has his own path to Socialism. The peasant arrives at Socialism along another path — that

of the co-operative; the agronomist and the physician have their own paths leading to the great road to Socialism; the scientist too will come to us, if he belongs to the type of the strong and sincere human being naturally impelled to replace uncertain and crippled half-truths by the unshakeable truth of the new view of life. It need not be said that when we observed in the scientific world a decided tendency against us, open strivings to injure us, to lure the vacillating masses by deception into the camp of the bourgeoisie or of reaction, and to influence our youth, we found ourselves obliged to take fairly strong measures.

The Soviet power found that the point had been reached when the Academy, which had received more support from the Soviet power than ever before, must be imparted a more living character, and must be transformed into a real centre for our science.

For this purpose it was necessary to renew its composition, to complement it by a number of new scientific forces, including those of Marxist science, and to establish a closer contact, as far as possible, with that immense scientific and cultural work which is going on in a country being renewed from the bottom upwards.

Undoubtedly the Academy contained a number of members who have informed themselves sufficiently on our work during the last decade, even if they have not arrived at a "hundred per cent" faith in our building up of Socialism. Among these people the measures taken for the revival and reanimation of the Academy found ready support. At the opposite pole, however, there gather the reactionary forces in the academy. They have not liked those academicians who are faithful to the Soviets, and have regarded them almost as traitors, but they have put up with this "treason", since it has supplied a certain guarantee for the continued existence of the academy, and has brought with it certain material advantages.

This situation has naturally been clearly understood by the government; it has been aware that among these 40 "immortals" class hatred is equally immortal, and often reveals a touch of monarchist colour. The government has been aware that sometimes a great scientific name and valuable purely scientific services may be combined with fossilized views, with the vanity of a scientific mandarin, and with an instinctive antipathy towards the revolution (an antipathy substantiated by a few cheap sophisms). The Soviet public demanded the energetic discussion and settlement of the question of an actual renewal of the Academy, transforming this into a living member of our society.

Thus the election of new academicians and the extension of the number of the members of the Academy was decided upon. The election was organised as publicly as possible. Every scientific and cultural force in the country represented its standpoint. The lists of candidates were drawn up in an atmosphere of widest publicity, and were examined, sifted, and proposed by the academy itself. The statutes gave the academicians the right of secret ballot. Careful preparatory work laid down the lines upon which the renewal of the Academy must be carried out if it was to be effective. The results of the voting in the separate sections left nothing to be wished for. The section of humanist sciences elected all candidates.

The adherents of "moderate academism" may perhaps object that the Academy showed every willingness, that at the last Plenary Session it elected by secret ballot, with an overwhelming majority, the candidates proposed to it, including even a number of Marxists. It reserved to itself only the very small liberty of frustrating the election of one philosopher, one philologist, and one historian. The statutes grant the Plenary Session the right of a final decision by secret ballot.

Such objections as these, by which even representatives of the "centre party" in the Academy attempt to hide the real significance of the above-mentioned facts, must be decisively rejected. The Academy should have realised that the Soviet public, the revolution, sets it very definite conditions. The Academy should have realised that it is being put to the test: to what extent is it capable of standing the somewhat difficult operation of Sovietisation; to what extent is this still possible at all without quite another type of reform — the reform which

raises the question: how can we build up our scientific world, from the socialist standpoint, without paying regard to any relics of the past which may still exist, but by shattering the whole structure of the past and erecting the edifice of Science according to an entirely new plan?

Does the Academy perhaps believe that the Communist Party, the Soviet power, and the people, have not the courage to set aside the Academy and to hand over its material goods to a differently organised scientific institution? Does it believe that its foreign friends are powerful enough to protect the Academy against the "designs" of the Soviet power by either immediate help or "authoritative protest"? Well, if the academicians do believe this, then they have played with fire, and I fear they will burn themselves severely.

The majority of the academicians — it may be replied — have shown themselves entirely loyal. All that was the matter was that the two-thirds majority was not reached. The Presidium of the Academy took immediate steps to avoid prejudicial consequences, etc.

Very true, there is something positive in this. The Academy has been the prey of inner schism brought about by the combined influence of the forces to which it has been exposed. There are some who believe in the Soviet public, and are ready to march forward with it shoulder to shoulder. Others have grasped that if they do not follow this example they will lose the game. But there have been quite a number of people who have come forward with open visor — their faces hidden only by the very transparent veil of various formal considerations — in opposition to the correction of the absurdities which have been committed.

To throw dust into the eyes of the Soviet public, to provoke a small scandal under cover of the secret ballot, to meet the Soviet public to the extent of 90 per cent, whilst retaining 10 per cent. as a field of action for their reactionary views — this has indubitably been the politically oppositional idea pursued by a very considerable section of the academicians.

These dignitaries of science have done no more than reject three candidates, and this only at the last secret ballot, entirely without responsibility, whereby some of them altered their standpoint again a few days later.

But every candidate proposed by public opinion is a necessary part of the future work of the Academy. Tact alone demanded that the Academy should comply with this categorical demand made by public opinion. The academicians have desired to oppose their formal right to liberty to the public opinion of the Soviet Union.

If they have done so, they will find themselves in contact with the flame of revolution, and this may lead to a very painful burn.

TEN YEARS OF THE COMINTERN

The Birth of the Communist International.

By G. Zinoviev.

The I International — the International Workingmen's Association led by Marx and Engels — was formed in 1847 and practically ceased to exist in 1872. Chartism in England, the events of 1848 on the Continent of Europe, particularly the events in Germany and France, the European crisis in the '50s, the Italian war, the Polish insurrection, the Crimean war, the emancipation of the peasants in Russia, the Austro-Prussian war, the Franco-Prussian war and the Commune of Paris — these were the principal historic events which prepared the ground for the formation of the I. International, which conditioned its birth, and which gave the contents of its activity in the course of nearly a decade. Chartism in England and the events of 1848 furnished a sort of prelude to the activity of the I. International; the Commune of Paris constituted its swan-song.

The **II. International** was born in 1889 and broke up in 1914. Having existed in its original shape exactly a quarter of a century. At its cradle was the German Social-Democracy which played in it the deciding role, properly speaking, during all those 25 years. The triumph of the Third Republic in France, the Bismarckian period in Germany, the Russo-Turkish war, the Anti-Socialist Law in Germany, the first stages of capitalist development in Russia, the Anglo-Boer war, the Boxer war, a series of local colonial wars, the Russo-Japanese war, the Russian revolution of 1905, the revolutionary movements in Turkey, Persia, and China, the Tripoli war, the Balkan wars which overshadowed the world war — such is the historic background upon which the II. International emerged and developed.

The gigantic and rapid ascendancy of the German Social-Democracy, and the vicissitudes of the first Russian revolution, these two facts have put their indelible seal upon the whole period of the II. International.

The gradual growth of opportunism in the German Social-Democracy served both as a symptom and as a factor of the gradual opportunistic degeneration of the II. International. The first Russian revolution, although it proved abortive, nevertheless laid the beginning to a profound differentiation within the II. International, having paved the way for the formation of a revolutionary wing within the II. International, for a split in the II. International, and therefore, to a certain extent, for the formation of the Communist International.

The ten year period of 1905-1914 may be conditionally put down as the "inception period" of the Comintern. Already the first Russian revolution in itself had unquestionably planted the seed of a genuine proletarian, militant International. The defeat of the first Russian revolution, and the consequent triumph of the world reaction, prevented this seed from rapidly thriving, nevertheless it was not lost, and it sprouted some ten years afterwards.

The year 1905 in Russia; the revolutionary events in China, Turkey, and Persia, connected in their turn quite closely with the events of 1905 in Russia; the local imperialist wars which constituted the prelude to the first imperialist world war; the world war itself with all its vicissitudes, notably the intensification of the national question, and the first spasmodic attempts of the colonial and semi-colonial countries to rise against their oppressors; the victory of the bourgeois revolution in Russia in February 1917 and the triumph of the great proletarian revolution in Russia in October of the same year; the overthrow of the monarchy in Germany and Austro-Hungary, which was accompanied by the first big insurgent movements of the proletariat nearly in all parts of Europe; the revolutionary events in Finland, in Hungary, in Turkey, and in the Balkans; the civil war during the progress of the proletarian revolution in Russia; the blockade of this proletarian revolution by European imperialism, and the successful struggle of the Russian workers against this blockade; the introduction of N. E. P. in Russia, and the big successes of socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. upon the basis of N. E. P.; the revolutionary events in Germany in 1919, 1921 and 1923; the General Strike in England; the gigantic revolutionary upheaval in China and the intervention of world imperialism with fire and sword against the Chinese revolution — these were the chief events which paved the way for the formation of the Comintern and which gave the contents of its work during the first decade.

The **Communist International** is the International Workingmen's Association of the epoch of imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions. This International Workingmen's Association stands fully and entirely upon the grounds of the teachings of Marx and Lenin from the very first day of its existence. The Communist International was born in the fire of the imperialist world war and of the triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

Imperialism became fully shaped towards the beginning of the current century. It will be considered in world history that the last stage of capitalism begins precisely with this period. This has also been the date of the beginning of the epoch of imperialist wars and of the rapid maturity of proletarian revolutions. Shortly before the outbreak of the world war in 1914 it had been declared to the world by the recog-

nised leaders of the II. International that the proletariat would reply to imperialist war by proletarian revolution. In a famous speech by August Bebel during the conflict in Morocco it was said:

"Behind the great world war stands the great world revolution. The twilight of the gods of the bourgeois system is approaching... one already perceives the knell of doom over the political and social order of the bourgeoisie."

And Otto Bauer wrote literally as follows in his "National Question" in 1908:

"No doubt, the future imperialist war will entail the revolutionary cataclysm. The world catastrophe of imperialism has certainly introduced the beginning of the world Socialist revolution."

Otto Bauer was not mistaken. The imperialist world war did introduce the beginning of the world socialist revolution. Yet Otto Bauer himself, and nearly all the other leaders of the II. International, when this historic hour struck, were not found in the camp of the revolution, but in the camp of the counter-revolution. These leaders had promised — and solemnly pledged themselves once again in the famous **Basle Manifesto** — that the II. International would place itself at the head of the revolution caused by the war. But since this did not happen, since the II. International turned out a miserable bankrupt, history was bound to raise another world organisation which would take upon itself to carry out the inevitable. This organisation was the **Comintern**.

The **hegemony of the international labour movement** which had originally belonged to England, and had subsequently gone over to France, was unquestionably in the hands of Germany, i. e. of the German Social-Democracy, during the epoch of the II. International. With the triumph of the Russian revolution and the formation of the Comintern the hegemony of the international labour movement went over to Russia — "of course, only for a short period" (Lenin). When the proletarian revolution will win in the leading countries of the world, Russia will become a "backward Soviet country" among a number of other, more developed Soviet countries.

In March 1919 the Comintern was formed. A few months after that historic event, one of its most remarkable and inspired speakers (at the Congress of Communist organisations of the peoples of the East), Lenin said:

"Needless to say, the final victory can be won only by the proletariat of all the advanced countries together, and we, the Russians, are starting the work which will be consolidated later on by the German, French, or English proletariat; nevertheless we see that they will not be victorious without the help of the toiling masses of the oppressed colonial peoples, and in the first place, of the peoples of the East. We should be aware of the fact that a single vanguard cannot accomplish the transition to Communism." (Lenin's Works, vol. XVI, p. 390.)

"It becomes quite clear — said Lenin in the same speech — that the Socialist revolution, which is approaching throughout the world, will under no circumstances be limited to the victory of the proletariat in each country over its respective bourgeoisie. The Socialist revolution will not be only and chiefly the struggle of the revolutionary proletariat against the bourgeoisie in each country; no, it will be the struggle of all the colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, of all the dependent countries against international imperialism." (Ibid. p. 383.)

Turning to the advanced proletarians of Europe and America, and at the same time to the hundreds of millions of the oppressed peoples of the East, Lenin told them already in 1919, amid the circumstances of the rapid victories of revolution, that the world revolution, "judging by the start, would continue for many years and would cost a great deal of labour". The Comintern celebrates today the first decade of its existence, having behind it a series of glorious victories, and also a series of severe defeats.

The triumph of the Socialist revolution in Russia and the formation of the Communist International are insolubly connected with each other. The new era will be counted by man-

kind from these world-historic events. The Comintern was born of war and revolution and it is one of its aims to prevent new imperialist wars with the help of new victorious proletarian revolutions.

"The emancipation of labour, being not a local nor a national, but a social problem, affects the interests of all countries in which the modern system of society prevails, and its solution requires the theoretical and practical collaboration of the more progressive countries", thus wrote Marx in the Statutes of the I. International.

— The Comintern, founded in March 1919 in the capital city of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republics, in the city of Moscow, solemnly declared before the whole world that it takes upon itself to continue and accomplish the great cause which had been started by the first International Workingmen's Association.

— The Comintern sets to itself the aim: to struggle with all means, even to take up arms, for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie and the creation of an international Soviet Republic, as the transition stage to the total abolition of the State.

— The Communist International considers the proletarian dictatorship to be the only means which affords the possibility to emancipate the human race from the horrors of capitalism, and the Communist International considers Soviet rule as the historically given form of this proletarian dictatorship.

These proud words, inspired by Lenin and pronounced on behalf of the Comintern by its II. World Congress (see first Comintern Statutes) will be carried into effect in spite of everything.

Some Experiences of the Armed Class Struggle.

By L. A.

During the ten years' existence of the Comintern the class struggle has assumed in the various countries its sharpest form, that of **armed insurrection**. We wish merely to recall a few of the most important episodes of these struggles: insurrections and Soviet Republics in **Munich and Hungary, 1919**, occupation of enterprises and estates in **North Italy, 1920**, Ruhr struggles, **1920, (Kapp-Putsch), March struggles in Central Germany, 1921**, insurrection in **Hamburg and Bulgaria, 1923**, insurrection in **Reval, 1924**, July-struggles in **Vienna, 1927**, struggles in **China, 1927—28**, (**Shanghai, Canton**).

Shortly before the formal establishment of the Comintern, mighty armed class struggles took place, such as the big victorious October insurrection in **Russia, 1917**, the civil war in **Finland, 1918**, the mutiny in the army and the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war in **Germany and Austria, 1918**, the January-struggles, **1919**, in **Berlin**. The leaders of Social-Democracy "repudiate" the armed class struggle. They are advocates of armed insurrection only in the countries of proletarian dictatorship (see Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia"), whereas in the capitalist countries they are for brutal suppression of the revolutionary mass movements (Ebert, Scheidemann, Noske). Sometimes the Left Social-Democrats pay even lip service to the proletarian revolution. But when it really comes to the struggle, and especially when the struggle ends in defeat for the struggling masses, they declare "that one should not have taken up arms". An eloquent example of this was given in the July days, **1927**, when the Austrian Left Social-Democrats who were certainly very "red" shortly before the struggle, condemned already in July, **1927**, the demolition of the High Court of Justice by the excited masses as a dastardly action, and hastened to dissociate themselves from the "incendiaries".

Class-conscious proletarians, Communists, take up a different attitude to armed class struggles. They cannot simply "repudiate" such struggles, because they are unavoidable historic phenomena which cannot be ordained or forbidden at will. They cannot desert the oppressed masses who are fighting for their rights at such a critical moment (in contradistinction to the social-democratic leaders who in such cases do not want to desert their own bourgeoisie). They cannot dissociate them-

selves from such struggles because this would mean cowardly betrayal of the cause of the international proletariat. They declare themselves for these struggles regardless of whether they end in victory or defeat, even if serious errors were committed in their leadership. They look upon the positive as well as the negative experiences of these struggles as a source from which lessons can be drawn for the future inevitable struggles.

This was exactly the attitudes of Marx and Engels to armed revolutionary struggles. They were not only enthusiastic believers in such struggles, they also thoroughly investigated the experience of these struggles. (See "Civil War in France", "The 18th Brumaire", "Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany"). At the same time, they did not neglect careful study of the practical questions of the carrying out of an armed insurrection. Theirs is the expression "art of insurrection". They elaborated the fundamental rules of this art, repeatedly quoted by Lenin. (See "Revolution and Counter-Revolution").

The doctrine of Marx and Engels on armed insurrection was further developed by Lenin, who was not only a great theorist of armed insurrection but also the leader and organiser of the great October insurrection. It is characteristic of Lenin's genius that he did not give his mind only to "high" political and strategical problems, to the "universal line" of the insurrection, but took a great interest in the smallest technical details of the preparation and carrying out of the insurrection and was a greater adept at this than anyone else. We merely draw attention to an instruction elaborated by him in October 1905 "on the tasks of the groups of the revolutionary army" in which he goes into the tasks, the equipment, the training etc. of the revolutionary "groups of three" and "groups of five", and also to the article "The Moscow Insurrection" in which he explains, among other matters, in great detail the methods of struggle for the army.

Lenin's numerous articles on this question are a reliable key to a proper understanding of the experiences of armed class struggles, but they cannot take the place of a careful study of these experiences themselves. It is a regrettable fact that so little is done by the Communist Parties for the investigation of the wealth of civil war experiences in the last decade. On the other hand, these experiences are busily studied in the camp of the bourgeoisie and utilised for its civil war preparations. There exists an extensive literature, especially in Germany, on struggle against "internal unrest". Everywhere detailed regulations are being worked out for the event of "internal unrest". We would like to mention here only the famous plan "Z", the plan of the French General Staff for the suppression of an eventual insurrection of the Paris population.

Although plan "Z" is already "obsolete" as a sensation, it is still very much alive because it hangs continually like a sword over the heads of the French workers. Moreover, it is not a purely French phenomenon, but a typical example of the civil war plans of the bourgeoisie throughout the world. Therefore there is every reason to make a careful study of plan "Z".

To put it briefly, this plan "Z" is: that in case of serious unrest in Paris when it seems hopeless to nip the rebellion in the bud, the government troops be for the time being withdrawn from Paris and concentrated in Versailles together with the reinforcements drawn from the various provincial garrisons, in order to reconquer Paris with the concentrated forces.

Thus, the French General Staff wants to repeat today the tactic applied by Monsieur Thiers in the slaughtering of the Paris Commune. That a similar plan exists for the "defence of Berlin" was admitted in 1926, at the arrest of several leading German fascists (Col. Luck and others). According to this plan the Reichswehr and the fascist leagues were to be removed from insurgent Berlin, to be concentrated in Potsdam for the purpose of reconquering Berlin from outside.

What is the meaning of the tactic that in a civil war the counter-revolutionaries are prepared to abandon towns and even whole regions to the insurgents? This is due to the fact that the reaction is, above all, afraid of direct contact between its soldiers and the insurgent masses. To quote the German General Löffler who has written a pamphlet on the experiences of the Reichswehr in the Ruhr struggle of 1920, "under the pressure of the growing excitement of a hostile working class population, hundreds of thousands strong, the troops sink into a morass".

Thus, this tactic is dictated, first and foremost, by concern for the reliability of the soldiers, by fear that the revolutionary "infection" will spread to the cannon fodder at the disposal of the counter-revolution. Within the framework of big concentrated forces, in a war with proper fronts against the strongholds of rebellion, it is easiest to isolate the soldiers from the revolutionary masses.

Suppression of an insurrection of Paris workers provided for in plan "Z", certainly explains the efforts of the French bourgeoisie to create a thoroughly reliable army (with the help of Paul Boncour and Co.). An army composed of patriotic, declassed and utterly unconscious (coloured) elements is to defend France against the "internal enemy".

The cases of fraternisation which took place this January between the French soldiers and the miners in Grand Combe show that the French bourgeoisie needs very much a reliable army. The government was compelled to substitute the conscripted forces who proved themselves unreliable by coloured troops.

The efforts of the bourgeoisie to create mercenary cadres on whom it can rely, not only in the case of proletarian insurrections, but also in the labour struggles, as blind tools against the working population, are an international phenomenon. This phenomenon can be very dangerous to the proletariat if it shows itself incapable of enlightening the professional soldiers, including the coloured troops, by suitable methods, and of shaking their confidence in the bourgeoisie.

The highest tactical principle of the counter-revolutionary side consists in not letting their forces be defeated singly, but to concentrate them, to form regular fronts against the insurgents, to liquidate one by one the various hotbeds of rebellion. Having "restored order" in one rebel centre, it will be possible to proceed against another with concentrated forces. This tactic is, no doubt, the most favourable to the bourgeoisie; it is bound to lead to the suppression of the insurrection if the insurgents do not succeed in preventing the concentration of the counter-revolutionary forces, in disorganising them already before their concentration, in neutralising them or drawing them to the side of the revolution, in disuniting and defeating the already concentrated troops. But this presupposes maximum activity on the part of the insurgents, from the beginning. They are lost if they do not assume a relentless offensive. "The defensive is the death of every armed uprising" (Marx).

It is said in plan "Z" that armed forces are to be drawn from the provincial garrisons to suppress an insurrection in Paris. Certainly, if the insurrection feared by the bourgeoisie is to become a repetition of the Paris Commune in the sense that it will be limited to the capital, that it will be impossible to extend the insurrection to the provinces, the insurrection in Paris will be a failure if the counter-revolution were really successful in employing also the provincial garrisons for the suppression of the insurrection. But if the insurrection takes place simultaneously in various parts of the country and if the insurgents, first and foremost in the provinces, succeed in getting the best of the armed forces of the counter-revolution in their own regions and then immediately make an energetic attack on other counter-revolutionary troops, the issue of the struggle will be different.

Such a simultaneous insurrection everywhere, when there will be no "Vendees where the counter-revolutionary forces can be concentrated undisturbed, can certainly only be visualised under the leadership of a revolutionary Party, well established among the masses not only in industrial districts but also in the countryside and among the rank and file of the army, and only if this Party has acquired the art of controlling the insurrection.

This is the most important lesson of the armed class struggles of the past decade.

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Two Meetings of the II. International in London.

By P. Friedländer (Berlin).

Two Conferences of the II. International have been held in London: On 8th and 9th of February there was a "Four Countries' Socialist Conference", and on 11th and 12th February a session of the Executive of the II. International.

The Four Countries Conference was a gathering of government socialists. MacDonald took the chair. The Conference was participated in by leaders of the English, French, German, and Belgian socialist parties. It resembled in character one of the customary ministerial conferences of these countries. A veil of secret diplomacy was spread over it. No report was issued on the debates, but merely an empty communiqué. According to this, "the problems of reparations and of the inter-allied debts, as also the question of the evacuation of the Rhine country" have been "examined", and the result of this examination is stated (precisely in the manner of the ministerial communiqué) to be that the social democratic statesmen "have unanimously agreed on the attitude to be adopted in the present circumstances". At the same time attention is drawn to the "general principles" laid down at former Four Countries' Conferences, and also at the last, which was held in Luxemburg. This last reference is clear enough. For, as subsequently became known, at the Four Countries' Conference held at Luxemburg the socialists, including the Germans, agreed on a decision in which the question of the evacuation of the Rhine country was bound up with financial payments in return on the part of Germany. They have therefore proved themselves to be the auxiliary troops of the imperialists. The practical policy pursued by the socialist leaders in the different countries, where they have stuck to their bourgeoisie, through thick and thin, has only served to emphasise this. The actual meaning of the London Conference is, therefore, solely that the social imperialists mutually leave one another a free hand to support the imperialist policy of their bourgeoisie, and thereby secure first of all the welding together of the war bloc against the Soviet Union.

The Four Countries' Conference was followed by the session of the Executive of the II. International. Its object was to furnish suitable accompanying music to the policy of the imperialist powers in the present period. A recent fresh appeal to the League of Nations aided them in this purpose. To the ex-prime minister MacDonald even this slight attempt at cloaking the imperialist policy of the II. International, customary as it is on the occasion of Executive meetings, appeared superfluous. Hence he demonstratively absented himself, although it too took place in London.

The question of disarmament was dealt with by the Dutch representative Albarda (in order to save the allies of the imperialist great powers from embarrassment the report is delivered by a Dutchman!) and a — telegram to the Secretariat of the League of Nations resolved upon, in which the expectation is expressed

"that the Preparatory Disarmament Commission of the League of Nations will speedily bring its labours to a successful conclusion".

In view of the obvious collapse of the efforts of the Disarmament Commission and the postponement of its meeting, as stigmatised in the eyes of the whole world by Comrade Litvinov in a letter to the president of the Disarmament Commission, London, at the time of the Lugano Conference, this expectation on the part of the heroes of the II. International bears the stamp of absurdity on the face of it, and is characteristic of the mendacity of their policy in the struggle against imperialism. In order to do something further, a "programme of action" was also decided upon. This included, among other things, an appeal to the socialist parties, likewise to send the above telegram to the Disarmament Commission. Further, the "drawing up of a joint plan of action in favour of disarmament, in touch with the Trade Union International". These cloaking over "plans" and "actions" of the II. International are only too familiar to us. Up to the present they have not prevented the Paul Boncours of all countries from acting as pacemakers of

armament and war preparations, and as promoters by every available means of the preparations for an intervention against the Soviet Union. It is further characteristic that the resolution on the disarmament question does not contain the slightest reference to the proposals made by the Soviet Union at Geneva, although even numerous bourgeois pacifist organisations have admitted these to be the only really serious disarmament proposals which have been made.

A similar demagogic but nevertheless extremely transparent manoeuvre was performed in the question of the rights of the "national minorities". Here again the speaker chosen was not a representative of the socialist parties of big imperialist countries in which the national minorities are held in subjugation, but the representative of Austria, Otto Bauer. The resolution which was passed of course carefully avoided any demand for full rights of self-determination for the national minorities. All that it demands is "protection under international law" for the national minorities, including thereby "democratic autonomy for national minorities settling in definite regions". This is a very elastic conception. The oppression of the national minorities is not combated by this, but masked. It is only a few days ago that the French socialists declared in the Chamber that the population of Alsace-Lorraine is already enjoying democratic administration, and were as indignant as the bourgeois parties at the demand for autonomy for Alsace. Therefore the resolution passed by the Executive of the International is equally careful to avoid any reference to Alsace-Lorraine, or to the national minorities held in thrall by Great Britain, and contents itself by referring to Italy. For the rest, it looks once more to the League of Nations for salvation, and desires this to form a special permanent organ for the "investigation of the grievances of the national minorities". How illusory and insincere this demand is has been demonstrated once more at the last meeting of the League of Nations at Lugano, where even a Stresemann, was obliged to admit the bankruptcy of the League of Nations in the question of the national minorities.

Finally, the meeting of the Executive of the II. International did not fail, in a document in support of the political prisoners, to agitate once again against the Soviet Union, and to grind out anew the old tirades about the political prisoners banished to Siberia and Central Asia. Whilst thousands and thousands of proletarian prisoners are perishing in the penal institutions of the bourgeoisie (these of course being "only" communists), the II. International directs its cross fire against the Workers' and Peasants' State, struggling in self-defence against counter-revolution from within and the attacks of the imperialists from without. To the bourgeoisie, in the present period of its increased war preparations, this attitude on the part of the socialist leaders is extremely welcome. These latest meetings of the II. International have furnished further proof that the bourgeoisie will not be disappointed in the hopes which it sets on the social imperialists.

OBITUARY

Josef Skrypa.

Josef Skrypa, a leading member of the Communist Party of West Ukraine and communist deputy in the Polish Sejm, died on 12th February in Prague, after an operation, at the age of scarcely 35. Comrade Skrypa's activity in the Sejm, and his courageous conduct at meetings, where he ruthlessly exposed the criminal policy of the Fascist government and its reformist lackeys, made him well known among the working masses.

Comrade Skrypa came over to the Communist Party from the ranks of the national emancipation movement of the Ukrainian masses. As elementary school teacher in the Chelm district he won the confidence of the small and middle peasants, who in West Ukraine have to bear the double yoke of social and of national oppression.

In 1922 the bloc of the National Minorities, after recording great victories in Volhynia, put up Comrade Skrypa as candidate for the Polish Sejm, to which he was then elected.

Working on a broader basis, Comrade Skrypa came to the conclusion that the national emancipation of the Ukrainian masses is closely bound up with social emancipation, and can only be realised by revolutionary struggle in collaboration with the proletariat of the whole of Poland.

At the beginning of 1924 Comrade Skrypa and three other Ukrainian deputies resigned from the Ukrainian Club and founded the Deputies' Club of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (U. S. D. P.), consisting of extremely revolutionary elements. But the Polish government scented danger and disbanded this club. A large number of its members and their four deputies went over to the Communist Party of West Ukraine at this time. They realised that it is only under the red banner of the Communist Party that a real struggle is possible against capitalism, against the occupation of West Ukraine by the Polish bourgeoisie.

On 7th November, 1924, the deputies of the U. S. D. P. joined with the communist Deputies Lanzutsky and Kroliviovski to form a communist fraction in the Polish Sejm, and this fraction speedily gained the confidence and adherence of the working masses of Poland. This was due to a great extent to Comrade Skrypa, whose self-sacrificing and unwearied activities everywhere, in the Sejm, in the workers' meetings, and at other public demonstrations, brought him into the foreground.

In spite of great suffering he worked on untiringly, and often went straight from bed to a meeting or demonstration. When the former Sejm was closed, Comrade Skrypa was obliged to leave the country. It was not given him to see the beloved scene of his revolutionary labours again, although he was elected to the new Sejm a few weeks before his death, in place of Comrade Sochacki.

The death of Comrade Skrypa creates a painful gap in the ranks of the Communist Party of Poland, in the Communist Party of West Ukraine, and in the Communist International.

J. B. Askew.

By the death of Comrade J. B. Askew, which took place recently, the revolutionary labour movement loses an old champion.

Comrade Askew came from a well-to-do British bourgeois family. The study of social sciences, above all of the theory of Marx and Engels, made him a socialist in his early years and caused him to join the most Left wing organisation of British socialism existing at that time. He had a thorough knowledge of historical materialism, which he endeavoured to popularise in a great number of articles and writings.

In the years before the war Comrade Askew lived for a long time in Germany, where he made a thorough investigation of the social democratic and trade union movement and wrote numerous articles and contributions for the socialist Press of Great Britain. As he had friendly relations with Rosa Luxemburg, Julian Marchlevsky and other Polish comrades, he also wrote a good deal for the social democratic organs of Poland and Lithuania. On the other hand he published reports in some Left organs of German social democracy on social conditions in Great Britain and the activity of the British socialist parties and trade unions. He also translated a number of Marxist articles and pamphlets from German into English.

Driven out of Germany by the outbreak of the world war, he conducted revolutionary propaganda in Great Britain, which resulted in his being arrested and later interned in a concentration camp.

He joined the Communist Party of Great Britain with great enthusiasm when it was founded. He went to the Soviet Union to be present at the ten years' celebration of the October revolution as the guest of the Society of Old Bolsheviks.

A true and reliable, eager and thorough-going promoter of the revolutionary movement of the world proletariat has been removed from the ranks of the Communist International by the death of Comrade J. B. Askew.