

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VI. No. 22.

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

TEN CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Bring the Decisions of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. to the Masses	833
Jugo-Slavia under the Lash	838
Bukharin's Theoretical Conclusions and the Political Conclusions drawn by the Comintern	843
"Organised Capitalism" in the Various Countries. By Heinz Neumann	848
Socialist Rivalry and the Trade Union Movement. By I.Rv.	858
The Revolutionary Outlook in Palestine	864
The Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and the British Party	871
The Results of August 1st in Czecho-Slovakia. By Paul Reimann	886
The First of August Struggle in Poland and its Lessons	890
Organisational Lessons of the First of August. By B.W.	897
A Marionette Show	902
Religion, Marxism, and the Second International	904

Bring the decisions of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. to the Masses

THE Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. finished its work about two months ago. Since then a number of Communist Parties have held full Executive meetings, where the decisions of the Tenth Plenum have been seriously considered in all their bearings. But in spite of this, the decisions of the last Plenum of the E.C.C.I. have not yet succeeded in penetrating to the masses of the Parties; the work of the Party organisations has not yet been readjusted from top to bottom with a view to the tasks laid down by the Plenum; no systematic control of the carrying into effect of the Tenth Plenum decisions has yet been established, nor have the main decisions been worked out in concrete form by all sections of the Comintern in accordance with the conditions in their respective countries—although this is now the decisive factor in the work of popularising the Tenth Plenum decisions among the masses. The winning by

the Communist Parties of the leading rôle in the working class movement, the establishment of their influence among the Trade Unions, the winning by them of control in strikes, their penetration into the large enterprises, the problem of mass political strikes, the creation of permanent Bolshevik Communist Parties everywhere in the colonies and above all in India, and finally, the struggle against imperialist war on the basis of the experience gained in the August 1st demonstrations—all these are gigantic tasks, to fulfil which the whole practical everyday activity of the Communist Parties should be directed. And it is of the greatest importance that the immense significance of the Tenth Plenum should be realised and considered by the masses, in order that through this the ground may be prepared for a change in the practical work of the Communist Parties.

THE situation when the Tenth Plenum took place was one of rising revolutionary activity in the working class movement of the world. This rising wave constitutes the essential feature of the "third period," characterised by the great loosening of the fabric of capitalist stabilisation. It leads to decisive struggles of the working class for proletarian dictatorship. And this was the determining factor in the situation which the Tenth Plenum had to consider. There was less of academic discussion at this Plenum than at any earlier Plenum. Its whole work was inspired by the rich revolutionary experience gained by the working class movement of the world in the year that had elapsed since the Sixth World Congress. The living experience of the workers' movement is the most inspiring of all books.

What were the new factors noted by the Tenth Plenum? What were the concrete forms in which the rising revolutionary wave had found expression?

First, in the five years' plan of Socialist construction of the first country in the world where a proletarian dictatorship has been set up. Second, in the fact of the continuous rise in the economic strike movement, arising from the further weakening of capitalist stabilisation and the worsening conditions of wide masses of the proletariat. Third, in the transformation which is now taking place of economic struggles into political (the May events in Berlin, and the August 1st demonstrations). And in the fourth place, parallel with the rise in working class activity throughout the world, the rise of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, with the active rôle played by the young working class of the colonies coming more and more into evidence.

THE five years' plan of Socialist construction—based on the rapid tempo of industrialisation of the U.S.S.R. and on the extension of collective agriculture—which is being carried through with tremendous enthusiasm by the working class of the Soviet Union, is the greatest achievement not only of the working masses of the Soviet Union, but of the whole international proletariat. The realisation of this plan is the most effective action possible in the whole attack of the

Soviet proletariat on the capitalist elements in the towns and in the villages. From this standpoint the five years' plan is the most important part of the world proletariat's attack on capitalism: it is in essence a plan for the destruction of capitalist stabilisation, a mighty plan of world revolution. It strengthens the Socialist basis of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., and in doing this it strengthens also the trenches for the revolutionary movement of the international proletariat. This plan should be the handbook of every Communist, arming him with facts in the struggle against the mean social-democratic slanders on Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.; it should be spread by the Communist Parties among the widest masses of the workers in every country; the achievements on the path to its realisation should be the object of systematic enlightenment in the Communist press, and should be most attentively studied by every factory group. It is only by this means that it will become a real mobilisation plan in the organisation of the workers of every country to support the country where the proletariat rules and Socialism is being victoriously built up. The working class can set it against social-fascism, as a war banner of the masses can be dispersed, and the capitalist essence of MacDonald's "Socialist construction" and of the German Social-Democrats' "economic democracy" can be exposed.

THE rise of the strike wave puts forward the Trade Union question in a very sharp form for the Communist Parties. The rise of the strike movement must inevitably strengthen the process of "fascisation" within the reformist trade union bureaucracy, it must inevitably hasten the tempo of its merging with the apparatus of the employers' organisations and of the capitalist State. But at the same time, it will deepen the impassable gulf between the reformist leaders of the trade unions and the wide masses of the workers. The rising strike wave will draw into action new millions of unorganised workers, who but a short time before were outside of the active class struggle. The question of how the Communists can win the working masses away from the influence of the reformists is not a

problem of the distant future, not something to be viewed in the perspective of the decisive struggle of the working class; it is a definite task for the Communist Parties not only in each strike, but in the whole of their future trade union work. The opening by the working class of its counter-attack against capitalism and its organisations must necessarily be accompanied by the development of the Communist offensive against international reformism in the trade union sphere.

From this standpoint—the offensive against trade union social-fascism—in accordance with the decisions of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the Communists in every country, in every trade union, in every trade union fraction, must review the methods of their trade union work. The fight against fossilisation, allowing our influence to remain static, bureaucratic self-satisfaction, opportunist passivity, narrow sectionalism, dragging at the tail of the reformists, trade union legalism—which is one of the forms of legal relation to the bourgeois State and the bourgeois legal system—this fight must permeate every pore of the Communists in their trade union activities. In accordance with the Tenth Plenum decisions, we must go forward with the utmost Bolshevik determination to the selection of our controlling cadres in the trade unions. In the process of the class struggle we must select the best young workers who have shown their revolutionary militancy, whom the strike wave has brought to the surface; we must teach our cadres in the fire of self-criticism, so as to make of them fighting leaders of the forces of labour; in the merciless fight against opportunism we can forge such cadres of trade union workers who will be able to respond to the demands made on them by the new rise of the revolutionary workers' movement. It is on these tasks that the attention of the Communist Parties should be concentrated in putting into force the trade union resolution of the Tenth Plenum.

THE transformation of economic struggles into political struggles requires a re-orientation of the Communist Parties themselves. The problem has only been stated: it has not yet been solved. The experience of the August 1st demonstrations

against war showed that the Party masses in the Comintern sections have not yet mastered the significance of the mass political strike as a weapon of working class struggle in a period of rising revolutionary spirit. But in this the Communists are expressing just that lack of confidence which is still dominant in the working class. We cannot overcome this lack of confidence unless we bring about a change on this question within our own ranks. But this work is not only ideological. It is not sufficient to adopt a few beautiful resolutions about a mass political strike, to write a number of pamphlets and articles throwing light on every aspect of this question. It is necessary in actual practice, in each economic conflict, to bring the working masses up to the problem of the mass political strike. From the lessons of the August 1st demonstrations we have learnt that almost all sections of the Comintern put forward the question of the mass political strike in a purely abstract form; they did not realise how to unite the fight against war with the actual demands of the working class, to add a number of powerful economic movements of the proletariat. From another standpoint, the experience of the first of August demonstrations showed the danger of separating the immediate economic demands from the fundamental political task of the struggle against imperialist war. In the fire of struggle during the coming months Communists must learn the science of closely weaving together the economic and the political in the class war.

THE intimate relationship between the economic and the political in the actual struggle has been mastered only by the young colonial proletariat, above all in India. In India, a country where the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been completed, the proletariat is already using methods of struggle which are typical of the proletarian revolution, methods such as the mass strike. The workers in the largest capitalist countries have a good deal to learn from the Bombay weavers and the workers in the Calcutta jute factories. The first task of the Communist Parties is to popularise by every possible means the important experience of the Indian workers in the development of mass strikes. And, secondly, in connection with this rôle of

the proletariat the Communist Parties must distinguish the new features in the development of the national-revolutionary movement in the colonies. The Chinese revolution stimulated everywhere the proletariat of the colonial countries, but at the same time it was a factor hastening the differentiation of the national-revolutionary movement. Last year witnessed almost everywhere in the colonies the going over of the native bourgeoisie into the camp of the counter-revolution, and the splitting up of the petty bourgeoisie with the desertion of the national-revolutionary movement by the upper sections of the nationalist intelligentsia, of the small traders in the towns, etc. The social basis of the national-revolutionary movement is moving exclusively in the direction of the workers, peasants, and poorer townspeople. These changes must necessarily affect the policy of the Communist Parties. The formation of independent Communist Parties in the colonies is the pre-condition for the further development of the national-revolutionary movement. Unless this condition is fulfilled, the movement will deteriorate and fall to pieces. The young Communist Parties of the colonial countries must work out in concrete form their tasks and slogans, within the limits of the general line of the Sixth Congress, in conformity with the new conditions; and this is an essential duty for Communists working in the colonies.

THE conjunction of the four new factors which have been enumerated above has enabled the Comintern to state, in a more decisive manner than ever before, the problem of the winning by the Communist Parties of a decisive rôle in the working class movement. However many forms the conditions may take, in which the Communist Parties have to fulfil this main task, it is necessary to emphasise that unless the Communists win the factories it is useless to talk of the Communist Parties' winning the majority of the working class. Herein lies the central point of the question. And it is here that we find heaped up the greatest mass of harmful opportunist prejudices among our comrades, and unless these are liquidated we cannot take a single step forward in putting into effect the decisions of the Tenth Plenum. Here in the first place a

complete change is necessary, unless our whole line on the winning over of the majority of the working class is to degenerate into futilities. Communists must direct their work towards the winning of the largest enterprises, where as a rule our influence is the weakest. We should mobilise for this task the most outstanding Party organisers, the most talented members of the Central Executive, transferring them to regular work in districts containing the largest factories. Communist Parties must work out a series of practical measures for winning over the decisive sections of the working class: the miners, engineers and metal workers, chemical workers, workers in the electrical and war industries. The first of August showed how little we have so far done in this connection. Almost everywhere the Communist Parties on the first of August competed with each other in their influence on the building workers. The Communist Parties must pay more attention now to the creation of what Lenin called "striking fists" in the most important strategic points of the class struggle, the possession of which will bring victory to the revolutionary party; and finally, within the largest factories the Communists must concentrate in the first place on the winning over of those basic sections which would paralyse the whole life of the factory when they struck.

WE shall not successfully solve the problem of winning the majority unless we pay the most careful attention to the problem of the young workers. The Young Communist organisations have rendered great services to the revolutionary workers' movement. Over a number of years they have produced the most active groups of front-line fighters, and have shown the greatest watchfulness against opportunist deviations. But disquieting symptoms have recently developed in the Young Communist organisations: a fall in their recruiting, a dropping membership, and a certain petrification of their organisations. The line indicated by the Tenth Plenum for the winning of the masses lays on the Young Communist organisations the obligation to carry out a most radical overhauling of all their methods of work. It is essential to create around the

Young Communist organisations wider non-party organisations in the form of clubs, educational societies, theatrical clubs, associations for sport, outings, etc. There have been a number of Y.C.I. decisions in this connection, but in fact these decisions have not been put into practice. To help the young Communist organisations to work out means of getting together young workers on a wider organisational basis is to carry out the decisions of the Tenth Plenum not in words but in deeds.

BY what means can we bring about the fulfilment of our central task—the winning of the leadership in the working class movement? By the utilisation, on a wider scale than before, of new forms of the tactics of a united working class front from below. The forms have been indicated by the experience of the international Communist movement; the application of this experience is an essential task of the Communist Parties. But this is not all. These forms are not sufficient; within the actual workers' movement they must be widened, mistakes must be corrected, defects removed. The Communist Parties must criticise themselves in a thoroughgoing way on their work in the formation of anti-war committees before the first of August. If the Communists had carried on regular, persistent work at the right time, these anti-war committees might be the widest associations of the workers in the factories. But in fact they cover only those sections of the proletariat which have always been under Communist influence. If, on the basis of such committees, we went forward to the organisation of an anti-war congress on a national scale, we should produce in fact only a purely Communist demonstration against war, instead of drawing into the fight new tens and hundreds of thousands of workers. It would be better to summon a conference of five or six of the largest factories, but representing a substantial majority of the workers, than to have a topheavy national congress without real representation of the wide masses of non-Party workers. The preparation for such a congress should go forward step by step, with the continuation on most energetic lines of the fight against war. The August 1st demonstration was not simply an episode, it was a concen-

trated blow struck at the war-makers, and this blow must be followed by others. The Warsaw proletariat, which, following on the August 1st demonstration, organised a demonstration in front of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in connection with the attack by Chinese white bandits on Russian territory in the Far East, and in front of the Roumanian Embassy in connection with the shootings at Jilava, gave a shining example of international solidarity to the whole world proletariat. This example should inspire imitation. To act as the Warsaw workers did is really to fight against war in accordance with the spirit of the Tenth Plenum decisions.

The sections of the Comintern will only be able to carry out all these tasks, if the fight against opportunist distortions of the Comintern line is put in the first line of the Parties' activities. The whole work of the Tenth Plenum was carried out under the banner of this fight. Without such a fight the Communist Parties will not be able to raise the fighting level within their ranks, to create a real Leninist unity within their organisations; they will not be able to draw the working masses away from the influence of social-democracy, which is completing the process of transformation into social-fascism. Those who at this time weaken the struggle against social-democracy and right opportunism within our own ranks are in fact pushing the Communist Parties into becoming sects in the world working class movement.

THE Plenum emphasised the new features which were noted in the development of opportunism — first, the going over both of the "conciliators" and of the cowardly opportunists, on all essential questions, to the Right; and secondly, in the deepening of opportunist errors, which are more and more taking shape in a definite systematised opportunist standpoint. The Plenum therefore laid down, with regard to the conciliators, three definite conditions, the non-fulfilment of which would lead to their expulsion from the Comintern. In this connection the Plenum passed a special resolution with regard to Bukharin's opportunist errors, and removed him and Humbert-Droz from mem-

bership of the presidium of E.C.C.I. It is the most urgent duty of every Communist to examine most carefully the errors of the right deviators on the basis of all the material presented, to draw the conclusions from the theoretical fight against the views of the representatives of Right opportunism internationally, and to examine the work of his own Party organisations from the standpoint of these lessons. The preparations for the August 1st demonstrations revealed in a num-

ber of places many unformed tendencies to opportunism, survivals of social-democracy within our own ranks. It is necessary to strike these down with hard and decisive blows, Bolshevik blows. We must give no quarter to this most loyal, most hidden opportunism!

The Tenth Plenum gave a clear, definite line to the Communist Parties. We, hundreds of thousands of Communists throughout the world, must give life to it by devoted and untiring work.

Jugo-Slavia under the Lash

EVERY day brings the most appalling news from Jugo-Slavia of further brutal murders, monstrous tortures in the darkness of police cells, and arrests of hundreds of workers and peasants suspected of Communism. Among the countries where the White Terror is rampant, in the ring of openly Fascist governments which encircle the South and East of capitalist Europe, Jugo-Slavia stands out as the foremost in brutal cruelty and in the widespread application of bloody repression. Military bands under General Jivkovich—the hero of the notorious “White Hand,” put in power by the “will” of the autocrat of the “United Kingdom”—Alexander Karageorgievich—in the interests of the big bourgeoisie and with the active support of “democratic” France and England—rule the country on the basis of a preventive civil war. For among all the Fascist dictatorships the Jugo-Slav dictatorship is the most unstable and is the most urgently menaced by a revolutionary upheaval.

The change to a dictatorship, proclaimed on January 6th, was to carry out three functions: the economic “sanitation” of the country, the creation of national unity through the fusion of all races in a single nation, and the strengthening of Jugo-Slavia’s international position. The balance sheet drawn up after eight months’ existence of the dictatorship shows clear and catastrophic failure on each of these three lines.

THE fundamental measure to achieve economic “sanitation” was to have been a large foreign loan—that golden rain, which none of the twenty-eight parliamentary

governments, unitedly at the helm of constitutional Jugo-Slavia had been able to bring to the capitalist enterprises of the country and to its consumptive treasury, was to play the rôle of a dowry for the young vigorous dictatorship. But in spite of all pilgrimages to the holy places of Western banking it was impossible to find sufficiently usurious terms on which the foreign banks might have decided to grant a loan to the Jivkovich Government. The interest of British capital in the timber industry, the most important branch of production in Jugo-Slavia, did not improve the position. The trade balance remains as before, very much on the wrong side. The introduction of the Young Plan brings with it a substantial lowering of the reparation payments received by Jugo-Slavia, while its pre-war debts, according to The Hague Tribunal decision, must be paid in gold. The attempts to issue an internal loan ended in a complete fiasco; the tax revenue is falling, and the number of bankruptcies is steadily mounting.

THE programme of uniting the “races” in a single nation, of nullifying the separatist or autonomist tendencies of the Croats, and surmounting the hostility between Zagreb and Belgrade, suffered complete defeat. More than ever before, the barracks called the Serbia-Croat-Slovene kingdom is creaking at every joint. The leaders of the Croat peasant party, who in January welcomed the change to a dictatorship and the king of the “united” country in the name of the “Croat nation,” have either been left isolated or have themselves fallen

into disgrace; never before has the hate of the Croat masses for Serbian centralism burned with so fierce a flame as now. In spite of the most stringent prohibitions, the anniversary of the murder of three peasant leaders was kept as a day of national mourning with eighty public demonstrations.

The promised visit of the king to Zagreb, the "second capital," has been several times postponed—the bridges of Zagreb are as dangerous for Alexander as the bridges of Serajevo were in 1914 for Francis-Ferdinand. The only remnants of the mirage of national unity are two or three renegades in the ministry who represent the Croat big bourgeoisie, and who were sent from Belgrade to Zagreb as executioner police-chiefs of Croat descent when the recent decree was issued for the introduction of a single orthography in the schools.

THE strengthening of the international position of Jugo-Slavia, turned into a Fascist State on the model of her great rival, Italy, was to have been achieved by: the long drawn-out frontier conflict with Bulgaria, feverish activity on the Albanian frontier, and especially the association of Jugo-Slavia with Rumania and Czechoslovakia in secret military agreements directed against Hungary and the U.S.S.R., and a close military alliance with Poland. The result of this international "strengthening" and the surrounding of Jugo-Slavia on every side with enemies has been the unrestrained growth of her military expenditure, and the impossibility, in spite of all attempts, to secure a foreign loan.

THE means adopted for the internal "consolidation" of the country, and against the rising revolt of the worker and peasant masses, has been a raging terror, becoming everywhere more intense, and taking the form of a permanent war carried out by the militarised State apparatus against the population and against the Communist Party, which marches at the head of the rebellious masses.

The first wave of mass arrests swept over the country immediately after the change in the form of the State and the establishment

of the dictatorship. The second wave was connected with the First of May demonstrations. According to the data of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Jugo-Slavia the number of arrested workers was 500 in Zagreb and 150 in the provinces, bringing the total number of arrested workers in Croatia alone up to 1,500. This number includes the workers imprisoned at Saraev, Broda, Belgrade, Nisha, Kumanov, Spleta, and Osiek. The overwhelming majority of the prisoners are workers, but there are also doctors, engineers, journalists and other sections of the intelligentsia.

The third wave of mass arrests was directed against the August 1st demonstrations. According to details published in the press, 300 workers were arrested at Saraev and 200 at Mostar. In connection with the mass distribution of Communist leaflets at one town, Vechnerek, and the districts around it, about 1,000 workers and peasants were arrested. Mass arrests of workers and students were also carried out in Osiek and in Dalmatia, where twelve selected workers were sent to the Zagreb torture-chambers. According to the bourgeois press (*Frankfurter Zeitung*, August 31st) the total number of arrests in Zagreb alone since the 6th of January numbers 3,000. According to the official police report, on the eve of the 1st of August, 102 arrests were made (in fact over 400 persons were arrested); thieves and other "minor" offenders had to be released from the prisons to make room for all the political prisoners arrested.

THE repression directed in the first place against the workers and peasants, against the Communists, has also reached the bourgeois "opposition." Newspaper editors, Zagreb lawyers (who refused to vote for the address to the Throne) have been arrested; the leader of the "independent democrats," Pribichevich, was sent into exile. A Croatian nationalist, the worker Shunich, who had killed a Serbian journalist who was the instigator of the murder of Radich, was sentenced to twenty years' penal servitude.

The hangmen, by means of the foulest tortures, force from the arrested workers who are suspected of being connected with Com-

unist or Young Communist Party organisations depositions denouncing comrades, revealing Party depôts, printing presses and secret rooms. The letters from comrades who have undergone these tortures contain details which freeze the blood—the driving of nails into the feet, systematic beating on the stomach with sandbags, etc. We cite the names of only a few who have undergone tortures and survived (we shall speak later of those who have been murdered): Mtar Trifuncvich, of Tuzl, an ex-member of parliament, secretary of the Bosnian Miners' Union, who as a result of his tortures is unable to stand upright; I. Krindel, of Zagreb, a well-known trade union worker in Croatia, formerly a man of outstanding strength and health, but now so worn that he is unrecognisable and is unable to walk without crutches; G. Bukovich, of Mostar, an ex-member of parliament and a known Communist—it is doubtful whether he will live; A. Butorach, a woman, of Zagreb, an E.C. member of the Textile Workers' Union: her hair was torn out by the roots, and it is not known whether she is still alive; V. Jokanovich, a lawyer of Sarajevo: his father, a priest, went to a banquet of Czecho-Slovakian members of parliament who were visiting Jugoslavia and made a protest there against the tortures which were being inflicted on his son in prison—after which he too was arrested; A. Bergman, a clerk; Kate Govorushich and her daughter Zorá; M. Petrovich; B. Nikat; G. Didier; D. Dmitrovich; Shalomon—these are the name of a few of the more well-known comrades who have been subjected to continuous tortures.

THE hangmen, of course, do not confine themselves to tortures. The most characteristic form of the Jugo-Slav terror is the systematic murder of the revolutionaries who have fallen into the hands of the Fascist Government.

Here is a list, which falls far short of being complete, of the comrades who have been foully murdered by the agents of the Jugo-Slav Premier and Minister for Home Affairs, General Jivkovich, on his instructions:—

Djuro Diakovich, organising secretary of the E.C. of the Communist Party of Jugo-

Slavia, and a substitute member of E.C.C.I.

Nicolai Gechimovich, secretary of the Jugo-Slavian section of the International Red Aid.

Both of these were arrested at the time of the wave of arrests in Zagreb, cruelly tortured, and then taken to the neighbourhood of a village on the Austrian frontier and murdered. The official finding of a Jugo-Slav Commission was that they had both been tortured so brutally before their murder that they could not have lived even if they had not been shot.

Márian Barun, a member of the District Committee of the Party at Sarajevo (Bosnia). She was arrested on July 30, before the August 1st demonstrations, and on the following day she was shot "while attempting to escape."

Benjamin Fintzi, a member of the Jugo-Slav Y.C.L., was arrested on the eve of August 1st at Mostar, for printing leaflets. He died under torture, after which his body was placed on the railway, so that a passing train would mutilate it beyond recognition.

Pavel Marganovich, member of the Y.C.L. and working for the E.C. of the Y.C.L. Seized during the mass arrests at Zagreb, he was subjected to months of torture, and died from his mutilations in the police prison at Zagreb in the middle of August. A medical commission found that he had suffered seven deathly mutilations, carried out with a blunt weapon.

Janko Mishich, organising secretary of the Y.C.L. E.C.

Mio Oreshki, political secretary of the Y.C.L. E.C.

N. Oreshki, member of the Y.C.L.

These three were surprised in their rooms on the night of August 26th, at Samobor, near Zagreb, and were shot by the police for showing resistance. Oreshki's wife was wounded and arrested, and thrown from a window, but she survived.

Neshich, a doctor, general secretary of the Government Red Cross, was arrested on August 25th in Belgrade, and charged with allowing his rooms to be used by Communists for meetings and the production of leaflets. After arrest he was thrown from the fifth floor of the police prison.

Gusnia Chengich, a journalist, arrested before August 1st on suspicion of having written Communist leaflets, was thrown from a window of the police prison.

At the end of August three political prisoners, whose names have not yet been established, were murdered in Zagreb prison.

There is evidence that in addition to the murders whose traces the police have not been able to conceal in spite of all efforts to provide a satisfactory setting for them, a large number of other still more brutal crimes have been carried out. Before and after the first of May certain comrades were arrested, and then disappeared without leaving any traces. In the middle of May a number of packets were found in the Belgrade Post Office and in a railway depôt, containing mutilated bodies without heads, arms or legs. The names of the victims and the murderers were not established, and the police court authorities made no investigations. At the same time in Zagreb also some dismembered bodies were recovered from the river, but their identity was not established, nor that of the criminals responsible. A still greater number of murders was carried out in more recent months on the Serbian and Bulgarian frontier.

THE Russian White Guards who have overrun Jugo-Slavia are some of the most reliable elements in the Fascist bands and participate actively in their crimes. All the most "sensitive" posts in the Government apparatus are filled by the White Guards. The Court Guards are organised by the experienced hands of St. Petersburg masters of such matters; the railway and frontier guards and the military espionage system are overrun by Russian emigrants. In the time of the decisive struggle with the working and peasant masses the Russian White Guards will play the most brutal part in the ranks of the Fascist pretorian guard. It is not without reason that, along with Mukden, Belgrade is the chief nest of the militant white guard emigrants; it is not without reason that Wrangel's body was brought from Brussels and buried in Belgrade with regal honours.

IN all these attacks of the Jugo-Slav Government, in all the persecutions carried out by the bloody Jivkovich on the working and peasant masses and on their revolutionary advance guard, the most abominable part is played by the Jugo-Slav social-fascists. Their official journal, published without hindrance in Belgrade, carries on a raging campaign against the Communists, justifying all the crimes of the Fascist hangmen. The trade unions under their control, which have fallen into insignificance now that all honest elements have left them, not only enjoy full freedom, but are active supporters of the government. Their officials get well paid posts in the government "labour exchanges," etc. Their representatives participate in all government commissions for worsening labour legislation, together with the employers' representatives. They defend all the government's measures directed against the workers, telling them that "it would be a mistake to expect the government to offer everything of the best to the workers." And they do not refrain from openly defending the murders carried out by the police hangmen.

One of the most abominable acts, not only of the Jugo-Slavian but of the international social-fascists, was the obituary notice—which bore the signature of I. Jakshovich, one of the Jugo-Slav social-democratic leaders—in the social-democratic journal *Glas Slobode* of May 16th, when the brutally mutilated body of our comrade Djuro Diakovich had been found. It was headed "A Symbolical End." The article concluded with the following words:—"Djuro Diakovich met his end at a time when in our working class movement the type of hero and knight of ruffianism suddenly disappeared and gave place to those who work with reason and calculation; at a time when many perished because they did not understand how to adapt themselves. Djuro Diakovich was one of the foremost among these. His gaze was directed not on the conditions and the people around him, but on a fixed point ahead."

Thus the social-democrats express their cynical satisfaction that police murders can achieve the "sudden disappearance" of revolutionary heroes, and by such means clear a

place for them, people who can "calculate" and "adapt themselves."

THE leading organs of international social-fascism, and especially the Berlin *Vorwaerts*, are silent on even the most abominable exploits of their Jugo-Slavian brothers. From time to time they shed a few crocodile tears over the victims of the Jugo-Slavian police, but in fact they support the ruffian government of Jugo-Slavian dictatorship. Hermann Windel, specialist in Jugo-Slav affairs and paid stenographer of all the Jugo-Slavian governments, continues to defend the interests of the Jugo-Slav fascist government in the pages of *Vorwaerts*; while Siegfried Jakobi, also on the *Vorwaerts* staff, appealing to the "left" social-democrats, visited Jugo-Slavia on behalf of the "Socialist International and German Social-Democracy," and plunged into the chauvinist and official Belgrade paper *Times* (August 22) with an ardent defence of the Jugo-Slav Government, praising its "cultural" work in Macedonia.

The hopeless position of the Jugo-Slav fascist dictatorship presses it on, on the one hand, to intensify its most brutal terror, rousing against it ever wider sections of the working population, and on the other hand, to seek salvation in provocative military adventures. Fascist Jugo-Slavia, whose relations with all its neighbours are acutely hostile, and which has entered into anti-Soviet military treaties with the States of the Little Entente, is at the present moment one of the chief danger-points for war in Europe.

OUR Communist Party of Jugo-Slavia, persecuted and driven deep underground, covered with heavy wounds, carrying on a death struggle with the enemy which is aiming at the physical annihilation of its leading cadres—the pride and flower of the Jugo-Slav proletariat—has been able, in spite of everything, to maintain its connections with the wide proletarian masses, to lead them into the struggle, to spread its influence through wide sections of the peasantry, to win undisputed leadership in the whole national liberation movement against

the detestable military-fascist dictatorship. In the recent period, especially in connection with August 1st, its agitation has succeeded in reaching the ranks of the army and in undermining this last prop of the oppressive tyranny.

Its most urgent task is now, more than ever before, to offer resistance to the attacks on its ranks, to organise mass self-defence against the murderers, not for a moment to lose its close and strong links with the masses, in order that when the time comes it can strike a deadly blow against the bloody fascist monsters.

IN this unprecedentedly heavy struggle of our brother Party the whole Jugo-Slav proletariat is entitled to reckon on the most active support from the whole Communist International, from all its sections, and from the whole revolutionary proletariat.

The campaign in defence of the Jugo-Slav proletariat, in defence of the Jugo-Slav Communist Party, an active campaign with all available forces against the orgy of white terror in Jugo-Slavia—must be developed on the widest possible front by all sections of the Comintern. It must be directed not only against those directly responsible for this white terror, against the government of bloody Jugo-Slav dictatorship, but against all those who are guilty of supporting this dictatorship. Again all capitalist governments—with the pseudo-Labour Government of MacDonald at the head—with whose support the fascist government of Jugo-Slavia is kept alive. Against the Russian White Guards, the pillars of the Jugo-Slav police. Against the social-fascist "international," the Jugo-Slav section of which offers victims to the murderers, and which as a whole, preparing everywhere the way for the fascist régime, supports it where it has already been enthroned.

Let there be not a single factory which does not raise the revolutionary protest of the proletariat against the brutalities of the Jugo-Slav terror! Let no opportunity be missed to strike a blow at the fascist Jugo-Slav dictatorship!

Bukharin's Theoretical Conclusions and the Political Conclusions drawn by the Comintern

"War beats down and breaks some, and strengthens and enlightens others—just as every crisis in the life of the individual or in the history of a nation. . . It is one thing to give earnest consideration to the cause and significance of imperialist war on the basis of the high development of capitalism. . . It is another thing to allow the war to crush one's thought, to stop examination and analysis under the weight of the terrible sensations and painful consequences or nature of war."*

IT was thus that Lenin characterised Bukharin and his friends in 1916 in his well-known controversy with him on the question of imperialist "economism" and the possibility of national wars in the imperialist epoch. Were Lenin alive to-day, he could not write otherwise with regard to the *present* line taken by Bukharin and his *present* friends. It is only under the weight of "terrible sensations" about the power of capitalist stabilisation, about the unconquerable strength of the capitalist trusts, only under the sensation of the "crushing or overburdening of human thought," that he is able, in face of the present upward surge of the international working class movement, in face of the sharpening crisis of partial capitalist stabilisation, to produce theories about an organised and planning capitalist economy—that he is able, in face of the brilliant results of the first year of the five-year period, to prate sadly about the deterioration of agriculture, about the breach with the peasantry, and to preach—as the highest wisdom of Leninism—caution, caution, always caution!

A WHOLE year has elapsed since the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. In this period almost in every section of the Communist International a bitter struggle has

*See Lenin's article "A Reply to P. Kievsky," published in the last July (1929) number of "The Proletarian Revolution."

been carried on against opportunism, Right deviations and the "conciliators"; and the ranks of the Communist advance guard have been extended and strengthened by the merciless exposure of opportunism. The sections of the Comintern came to the Tenth Plenum enriched by the experience of this new struggle, by the realisation of new tasks set before them by the crumbling "third period," and by the desire to solve the new practical problems before the working class movement. This fight against opportunism is far from being over. On the contrary, we have only completed the first stage of the fight, which has now been transferred to a higher plane. The significance of the Tenth Plenum lies in the concrete nature of the problems laid down for the sections of the Communist International. And in the first place, in the concrete nature of the task of cleansing the everyday practical work of the Communist Parties from the opportunist conservative fungus, from trailing along at the tail of events, from passivity. The international Communist movement must press forward at every point on its wide front to achieve decisive victory over Right deviations in their *practical* manifestations, mercilessly exposing them before the working masses when they shelter under the guise of loyalty and formal voting for the line of the Party and of the Comintern. The special danger of Right deviations is that they are propped up by inertia, laziness, fear of new methods of work, which undermine revolutionary initiative from within and start decomposition in our ranks. It was just for this reason that the Tenth Plenum, with all the severity of militant Bolshevism, put forward a number of direct and unambiguous questions to those conciliators, who in practice had served and are serving as standard-bearers within the Communist International for those open renegades who have been expelled from the ranks of the Comintern.

BUT this "concretisation" of the tasks laid down by the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. does not by any means signify the slightest damping down of the *ideological* fight with the Right deviators and conciliators. The new phase in the growth of deviation consists in the building up of its ideological, programmatic formulation. And because of this Bukharin came on to the stage. A number of Bukharin's pronouncements in recent months have shown, link by link, the growth of a whole system of programmatic theses, giving a fully adequate and complete theoretical basis for a platform, not only within the limits of the C.P.S.U., but on an international scale—a platform which is divergent from the programme of the Comintern. Beginning at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, and going on through the famous "Notes of an Economist" and "Lenin's political testament," Bukharin went down the slope to Neo-Hilferdingism, singing the praises of Trust organisation and State capitalist planning. This transition to a more definite ideological stage is the starting point for a new phase in the development of the Right deviation.

Already at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern that strange over-estimation of capitalist stabilisation, which he has put forward in his recent writings, was evident in embryonic form. In the first rough draft of the thesis on the world situation submitted by him, he had attempted to associate the "third period" with the growth of capitalist economy, blurring over the factors *adverse to* capitalist stabilisation. Hence the transference of the centre of gravity for the development of proletarian revolution to the future imperialist war. Hence also the conciliatory tendencies towards the Right, which showed themselves at the Sixth Congress especially clearly in his defence of the German conciliators and his demand for a "Coalition" Executive in the German Communist Party. The Sixth Congress made fundamental changes in the draft thesis prepared by Bukharin. But the Sixth Congress did not pass judgment then on this error of Bukharin's, because he (and those of the same mind) was still wavering and voted for the corrections made in his thesis by the Con-

gress. This was the "embryonic" stage of those cowardly-conciliatory tactics, which then continued throughout the year and resulted in a constant and deliberate blurring over of fundamental differences, representing them as being only of a tactical order, secondary, "minor," fully permissible and lawful within the framework of the single Bolshevik Party. In the memorandum of the conciliators to the recent German Party Congress at Wedding, it is stated clearly that their differences of opinion were not fundamental, but "of a merely tactical order." "We only estimate the present situation somewhat differently," the conciliators modestly declare in this document. This "different estimation" (anti-Party and anti-Comintern) was shown, among other things, in such trivialities as the question of the tempo of industrialisation in the U.S.S.R., the extension of collective agriculture, the forms of alliance between the workers and the peasantry in the reconstruction period, the relations to social-democracy, the problem of the unemployed, independent leadership in economic struggles, new tactics in the election of factory committees.

BUT it is not only that these are tactical problems of the first order of importance, in view of the present upward surge of the working class movement, on the correct solution of which literally depends the fate of the Communist International—and in Russia, the victorious building up of Socialism. Even in this first, initial stage of development of Right deviation, Bukharin, having gradually adopted the ideological inspiration of the Right-opportunist deviation, went forward step by step in fulfilment of the "theoretical law" of international opportunism as a whole.

The first documents were directed, with his theoretical acuteness, against the general line of the C.P.S.U. In "Notes of an Economist" he gives the theoretical justification for changing the tempo of industrialisation—against the line of the Fifteenth Congress of the Russian Party. In accordance with the actual testament of Lenin (not Bukharin's version), the basic feature of which is the demand made to the Communist advance guard—to get through the "tight places" of Soviet economy on the basis of the proletarian dictatorship,

and on the basis of working class power to equal and surpass the capitalist countries—the Party adopted and put into force the five years' plan. Already in 1918 Lenin, in his attacks on the Mensheviks (especially Sukhanov and Martov, who had criticised the October revolution from the standpoint of its being not in conformity with theory, of the slow tempo of the proletarian revolution in such a backward country as Russia), had dealt caustically with these learned people, who had followed only the formal letter, but not the spirit, of Marxist doctrine. Lenin wrote: "Having once established the preliminary proletarian revolution, we shall be able to take gigantic steps, and, by revolutionary measures, to overcome our economic and cultural backwardness." Eleven years later Bukharin, whether he likes it or not, is in fact repeating Sukhanov and Martov, putting to the front, to be the corner-stone of Soviet economic policy, a levelling down to the "tight places." What is this but the blackest pessimism, disbelief in the basic principle of Lenin's teaching, in the programme of October? In the first place, in the course of a single year reality has confounded all the gloomy forebodings of Bukharin and his friends. The achievements of the first year of the five-year period are already a guarantee that the next year will considerably surpass the provisional plan. But how long ago was it that Bukharin was poking fun at those who build an edifice out of future bricks!

THE Party on that occasion did not expose Bukharin, inasmuch as he was still wavering, and had not yet shown his stubborn determination to defend his opportunist views. At the November Plenum of the E.C. of the C.P.S.U., in spite of his having come out against the line of the Party, he voted for the theses of the joint Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the C.P.S.U. But very soon after this, Bukharin, with a courage worthy of a better cause, renewed and strengthened his attacks directly against the line of the C.P.S.U. Bukharin's next act showed a more complete deviation from Leninism; it concerned Lenin's political testament, *i.e.*, in Bukharin's own words, "the most able, the

most carefully-considered statement, the most thoroughly thought-out last instructions" of Vladimir Ilyich. It can be said with confidence that in the last two years there has been no more shameless falsification, no greater slander of Lenin than this work of Bukharin's. When the united Trotskyist opposition was carrying on its counter-revolutionary attack on the Party, it constantly declared as one of its main arguments that under Lenin such things would not have happened, that Lenin knew how to "keep together" people, and not "to drive them away," thus representing Lenin, the powerful revolutionary, the leader of the militant Bolshevik army, as a sentimental, weak old man, who "united" everyone, "pacified" everyone, and patted everyone on the head. In the document written by Bukharin, which he tried to impose on the Party and the Comintern as Lenin's political testament, again we have before us, instead of Lenin the revolutionary, whose greatest historical service was precisely that he placed in the hands of the proletarian advance-guard the powerful weapon of revolutionary implacability and initiative, we have before us some liberal professor, whose particular speciality was peaceful broadmindedness and the "cautious" direction of the proletarian dictatorship towards Socialism—"by moderate steps, along a timid zigzag." According to Bukharin it seems that Lenin taught his Bolshevik Guard nothing but "caution" in relation to the peasantry, "caution" in relation to the kulaks, "caution" in relation to the tempo of industrialisation. "The greatest caution," Bukharin proclaims, "in those points of policy which deal with the relations between the workers' State and the peasantry." "The greatest caution," in Bukharin's interpretation, is the infusion of kulaks into our co-operative system, the peaceful merging of the kulaks into Socialism. "And the day will come when the Kulak's grandson will be grateful"—for the "cautious" and delicate (Leninist, Comrade Bukharin?) way we handled his ancestors. This is not Leninism. It is a substitution of Leninism by a new Communist Bernstein-ism. The Leninist conception of the "period of education" is interpreted in the style of the Liberal professors. The whole period following the civil wars is

represented as a period of peaceful educational work. The Leninist conception of the democratic reserves of the proletarian revolution is treated as the union of the working class with the *whole* of the peasantry. Certainly Lenin was not speaking of the kulaks. Bukharin would put a stop to the process of eliminating the capitalist elements in the Soviet village.

AFTER this it is not surprising to find that Bukharin completes his own "political testament" by a most enormous theoretical blunder, calculated, when worked out, to become the starting-point for a new opportunist platform. "Our chief guarantee of Socialist construction," Bukharin declares, "lies in developing the most advantageous combination of class forces, which would ensure us the possibility of further Socialist construction. . . . To develop the combination of the 'proletarian revolution' with the 'peasant war' in a new form, this is now 'construction.'" The peasant war, according to Marx and Engels as well as Lenin, is the war of the *whole* peasantry, the agrarian revolution—bourgeois-democratic in its *content*. Bukharin wants to take us far back, to a historical epoch long gone by, when at the present time, in the epoch of collective farming and Soviet farming, in conditions of vigorous Socialist reconstruction of the Soviet village, he takes his point of departure from the "peasant war," *i.e.*, from the *general* peasant interests, as a further factor for the Socialist reorganisation of the Soviet village. Bukharin, it is true, speaks of some "new," "constructive" form of combining the "peasant war" with the proletarian revolution. But this new statement of Bukharin's only deepens the opportunist character of his whole formula. The union of the working class with the *whole* peasantry in a *constructive* form is absolutely unacceptable. The acceptance of such a formulation would mean at the same time acceptance of the theory of peaceful conversion of the kulak to Socialism. This new formulation of Bukharin's, indeed, bears a suspicious resemblance to the "constructive" Socialism of the European reformists, who also use as their point of departure the theory of gradualness, of the *general* national interests, of the peace-

ful transformation of capitalism into Socialism.

It was because of this that the Tenth Plenum resolution stated that "in his opposition to the line of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Bukharin had slipped into a Liberal interpretation of NEP, leading, under the slogan of liberating trade, to allowing the free development of the capitalist elements in the country, to abstention from crushing the criminal speculating kulak elements, to denying the necessity for individual taxation of the kulaks, and opposing the policy of the Party directed to intensifying the taxation of the capitalist elements of the country. . . . But this means that Comrade Bukharin has slipped into the policy of class alliance with the capitalist elements, substituting for the policy of proletarian class war against the kulaks the policy of 'transformation of the kulaks into Socialism.'"

UP to this point Bukharin's declarations only referred to the C.P.S.U. and Socialist construction. But in defending his opportunist standpoint these opportunist errors inevitably blossomed out into an *international* system: all the more so because, as we have seen, they were present in embryonic form already at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. It also followed because of the deep international significance of the problems of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. The man who underestimates the growth of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., the man who cannot see the immense pride and enthusiasm shown by the masses there, must inevitably underestimate the growth of revolutionary initiative among the working masses in capitalist countries, and the beginning of a new revolutionary wave. The man who approaches the kulak with timidity and "caution," and who attributes too much strength to the capitalist elements in the U.S.S.R., must inevitably overestimate the stabilisation of world capitalism. The one follows from the other. The one *makes the other more precise*. It is not an accident that, on the eve of the Tenth Plenum, almost simultaneously *here* Bukharin came out with his "organised economic chaos" (or to put it in another way, organised capitalism), while

there Serra came out with his full-blown criticism of the general line of the C.P.S.U., even up to the fateful question—in the style of Pontius Pilate—“What is a kulak?”

BUKHARIN'S recent article about “organised economic chaos” exhibited also the development of a Right opportunist deviation in questions of the international working class movement. If in his former articles Bukharin was undermining Lenin's political testament, in this one we have beyond question an effort to undermine the system of the Communist International. The part that Lenin played in creating the theoretical foundations of the Communist International is well known. And, in this work of Lenin's, the part played by such problems as imperialism and its contradictions is also well known. Lenin, as well as Bukharin, saw the growth of capitalist concentration, trusts and monopolies. Lenin's classical work on Imperialism opens with a description of this very process. But Lenin's powerful dialectics saw also at the same time the *other* side of this process—that these capitalist monopolies are *the highest expression of the internal and external contradictions* of the capitalist system. “It is just this fusion of its contradictory principles—competition and monopoly—that is the characteristic of imperialism,” Lenin wrote in 1917. After this, what is it but a *revision* of Leninism when Bukharin talks of the *smoothing over* of the internal contradictions of monopoly capitalism, of the *overcoming* of the anarchy of capitalist production and the market, of the *planning* and organising capability of trust capital? To base all perspectives of the proletarian revolution on the “immense sharpening of competition *between* the capitalist countries” means for the practical work of the working class movement to deprive the Communist advance guard of all initiative, and the passivity of the working class in the face of both an intensifying economic struggle and an unprecedented *sharpening* of class contradictions between labour and capital. Lenin understood the imperialist epoch as the epoch of contradictory processes. He fought mercilessly against the pedants who do not understand that revolution is a living process, against the mechanical, non-dialectic interpre-

tation of the proletarian revolution as a *single* act. “The Socialist revolution,” he wrote, “is not a single act, not one fight on a single front, but a whole epoch of class conflicts, a whole *series* of battles on *all* fronts.”

THIS was Lenin's answer years ago to Bukharin and those who then were of his mind. And this, on the basis of Lenin's teaching, is the answer of the Communist International to Bukharin now. The source of Bukharin's present openly-opportunist errors is historically the same as in 1916, when in the fight against Lenin he cloaked his opportunist errors with “left” phraseology. It is his misunderstanding of the *unequal* development of imperialism, his misunderstanding, or more exactly, his anti-Leninist understanding of the epoch of imperialism. Just as at that time *the passivity of the colonial and oppressed peoples in the face of imperialism* was concealed under the slogan of “pure” imperialism, so to-day the slogan of “pure” (planned, without internal contradictions) monopoly capitalism covers up the most dangerous opportunist *passivity at a period of developing crisis within capitalist stabilisation*. On whose scales does Bukharin put his new theoretical goods, if not on those of the Right renegades, the ultra-Left pessimists and the social-democratic theoreticians of super-imperialism? “A ‘theory’ of this kind, which serves as an ideological basis for all Right elements in the Comintern, is refuted by the whole development of capitalism, and is in essence a capitulation to reformist ideology” (Tenth Plenum resolution on Bukharin).

THUS the position underwent a fundamental change when Bukharin passed on from particular “corrections” to the creation of a theoretical basis for the whole of international opportunism, from particular manoeuvres to an attack on the line of the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern, from particular deviations from the Leninist line to the open *revision* of Lenin's political testament. Bukharin has rendered outstanding service to the C.P.S.U. and to the Comintern. But, remembering Lenin's testament, the Communist International will mercilessly fight all and every kind of opportunist deviations which

threaten to weaken the Communist advance guard. In the conditions of the "third period," this is the most important pre-condition for the successful issue of the coming revolutionary battles. If in order to take the bourgeoisie by the throat our attack must pass over the body of social-democracy, a successful fight against social-democracy requires a

decisive struggle against deviations from the Comintern line, a merciless exposure of every manifestation of opportunism within the ranks of the Communist advance guard. This is why the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. was compelled to draw its own Bolshevik political conclusions from these theoretical conclusions arrived at by Comrade Bukharin.

"Organised Capitalism" in the various Countries

Concerning a Revisionist Theory of Comrade Bukharin

By Heinz Neumann

BOTH the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and the last Plenary Session of the C.C. of the Communist Party of Germany passed resolutions, directed against the opportunist attacks of Comrade Bukharin, which condemned the systematically developed theory which he has recently put forward, of "organised capitalism," as a surrender to reformist ideology and as embodying an approach to social-democratic revisionism. It is necessary to understand the peculiar significance of the problem of "organised capitalism" and to examine it from the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist theory.

For the parties of the C.I., excluding the Party of the Soviet Union, it is indispensable to begin with a description of the chief ideas contained in Bukharin's recent literary utterances and to quote from the most important passages therein. We must apologise to the reader if, in the pages that follow, numerous quotations are given from the works of Lenin. In defending his attitude, which is opposed to all the basic ideas of the C.I., Comrade Bukharin appeals continually to Leninism. He comes forward as an orthodox Marxist, and we are therefore compelled to compare Bukharin's theories, as they are set out in his theoretical documents, with the theories of Lenin.

I. MONOPOLY AND COMPETITION IN THE EPOCH OF IMPERIALISM.

Comrade Bukharin formulates his attitude towards the question of organised capitalism in two long articles which have appeared in *Pravda*.* One of the questions raised in these articles is: What differentiates "the second cycle of the State capitalist wave from the first 'war cycle' "? He deals at length with the growth of State-capitalist tendencies in the post-war capitalism of to-day, and on this point he raises the following questions:

"What is the limit to the tendencies towards centralisation which, it is generally agreed, do exist? State capitalism in its completed form. What does State capitalism mean as far as competition is concerned? It means *the decay of competition within the country and the greatest intensification of competition between the capitalist countries.*" (Italics, here and elsewhere, by me.—H.N.)

Comrade Bukharin, who speaks elsewhere in his article of the "co-existence of monopoly and competition," describes this co-existence, which all Marxists will admit, in a manner peculiar to himself. *Within* the separate

**The Theoreticians of the Bourgeoisie and some Problems of Present-Day Capitalism (Pravda, 25.5.29) and The Theory of Organised Extravagance (Pravda, 3.6.29).*

capitalist countries, monopoly not only rules the entire national economy, but rules alone. *Between* the different capitalist countries, competition leads an isolated life. *Within* the separate capitalist countries competition is dying, is disappearing. *Between* the different capitalist countries competition is being deepened, intensified and increased to the uttermost; it is forging new imperialist wars.

At this point there is astonishing unanimity apparent between Bukharin's ideas and Hilferding's well-known theory of "organised capitalism." In his article on the programme Hilferding gave a brief summary of his theory: the war and the post-war period brought about an extremely great strengthening of the tendencies making for the concentration of capital. The growth of cartels and trusts received a powerful impetus. The period of free competition is approaching its end. The great monopolies are becoming the real rulers of economy. This means that "capitalism is changing over from free competition to organised capitalism." Organised capitalism means the deliberate ordering of economic life, the deliberate management of economy. Development is proceeding in the direction of organised economy, even though that organisation assumes "hierarchical and antagonistic forms."

We shall return to Hilferding's last and general conclusion later on. At this moment we are concerned with the starting-point from which Hilferding develops his theory. It is the same incorrect starting-point from which Bukharin begins—the underestimation, indeed the denial of the part played by competitive struggles in the epoch of finance monopoly.

How did Lenin analyse the mutual relations between monopoly and competition? It is enough to examine Lenin's most important writing on imperialism, to see that Bukharin's ideas are utterly opposed to Lenin's theory on the mutual relations between monopoly and competition. Lenin also considered the "transformation of competition with monopoly" as "one of the most important—if not the most important—phenomena of modern capitalist economy."* But Lenin repeatedly

emphasises "that monopoly, which has sprung from free competition, does not drive the latter out of existence, but co-exists over it and with it, thus (and this "thus" is of decisive importance—H.N.) giving rise to a number of very acute and very great contradictions, antagonisms and conflicts."†

In the debate on the programme in 1917 Lenin expressed this same idea still more vigorously and sharply:

"It is this very union of contradictory "principles"—competition and monopoly—which is essential to imperialism. This it is, too, which brings about its downfall, *i.e.*, brings about the Socialist revolution." (*Proposed changes in the theoretical, political, and other parts of the Programme. Lenin. Complete Works, Vol. XIV. p. 121.*)

This brings to light the contradictions between the two hostile theories of imperialism in all their sharpness. Lenin proves that monopoly does not do away with free competition. The union of monopoly and competition is the *essential* characteristic of imperialism; and it is this dialectical mutual relation between monopoly and competition which gives rise ("thus") to friction, contradictions and conflicts. It is this which accelerates the Socialist revolution.

Hilferding, who tries to hide or smooth down the contradictions of imperialism, maintains that competition disappears altogether. Monopoly blots out every trace of it—hence "organised capitalism" and hence no contradictions and no Socialist revolution.

And Bukharin? Bukharin stands half-way between Lenin and Hilferding. In common with Hilferding he denies the existence of competition *within* capitalist countries. In common with Lenin he recognises the existence of competition *between* capitalist countries. Bukharin finds some explanation for friction, contradictions and conflicts in the international sphere, for the "external contradictions" of imperialism. But Bukharin finds no explanation for the friction, contradictions and conflicts within capitalist countries, for the "internal contradictions" of imperialism. The class struggle, the conflict between proletariat and bourgeoisie, which Bukharin of

**Imperialism*, English edition, p. 13.

†*Imperialism*, p. 103.

course admits (Hilferding, too, does so in his phrase "capitalism organised antagonistically"), is deprived of its economic basis. It hangs in the air, finding no logical place in Bukharin's theory. Bukharin's attitude is one of pure eclecticism. It implies an approach to Hilferding and a withdrawal from Lenin.

The question on which Bukharin breaks with Leninism is of no little importance. Whoever estimates the relation between monopoly and competition incorrectly, must necessarily arrive at a false attitude towards imperialism generally. Lenin described the imperialist epoch as that of "the transition from completely free competition to complete socialisation." He derives the necessity of the Socialist revolution directly from this characteristic of the imperialist epoch :

"Production becomes social, but appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few. The framework of nominally free competition remains, and the yoke of a few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes a hundred times heavier, burdensome and intolerable." (*Imperialism*, p. 23.)

Always and everywhere in his writings on imperialism, Lenin differentiates between the epoch of free competition and the epoch of finance capital :

"The old capitalism of free competition and its indispensable regulator, the Stock Exchange, is passing away. A new capitalism is succeeding it, which seems to have a somewhat transitory nature, and representing a kind of mixture of free competition and monopoly." (*Imperialism*, p. 41.)

This dialectical manner of considering the question, this conception of imperialism as of "a transitory nature" as a "mixture," was the basis of the struggle which Lenin waged against the opportunists and social-chauvinists during the world war. Kautsky, too, made a certain "theoretical criticism" of imperialism during the war. Lenin made it quite clear that this "criticism" was merely a counter-revolutionary cloak flung over bourgeois policy :

"Because this critique avoids and obscures precisely the most profound and essential inherent contradictions of imperialism; the con-

tradiction of monopolies existing side by side with free competition; the contradiction between the immense 'operations' (and immense profits) of financial capital and 'honest' trade on the open market, the contradiction between combines and trusts on the one hand and non-trustified production on the other," etc. (*Imperialism*, p. 139.)

It should be observed that all the contradictions enumerated here by Lenin belong to the category of "internal contradictions." Every concrete examination of capitalist economy in the post-war period arrives at the result that these contradictions have not "disappeared," as Comrade Bukharin maintains, but have grown much more acute: the contradiction between the immense operations of finance capital, and trade on the open market, between trustified and non-trustified industry, between industry and agriculture. Within the trusts themselves a desperate struggle is being carried on between the different producers about the distribution and redistribution of the quota. Whole industries are fighting each other for markets both within and outside the country. Whole industries are fighting for the possession of the most important raw materials both within and outside the country. The new technical discoveries of the post-war period, such as, for example, the liquefaction of coal, give rise to a number of new problems, which can only be solved within capitalist economy by anarchical means, by a pitiless competitive struggle. There was, for example, the struggle of the German Chemicals Trust against the Coal Syndicate for the control of the Ruhr mines—a struggle in which the largest banking concerns took part and which found political reflection in the parliamentary parties of the bourgeoisie. There was the fight waged by the American luxury and consumption industries for the custom of the consumers. It is impossible, within the limits of this article, to deal in greater detail, on the basis of practical statistical matter which cannot be ignored, with the part played by free competition in capitalist states. We shall only refer to the latest edition of Liefmann's well-known book on cartels, which contains abundant instances and examples of competitive struggle in the era of finance capitalist monopoly. We shall content ourselves with

treating the question from the standpoint of principle and theory.

Before turning to any of Bukharin's further remarks, we think it will be as well to draw attention to an extremely important remark made by Karl Marx. In *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx pitilessly tears to shreds the involved Proudhonist "metaphysics of political economy." In his polemic against the eclectic and pretentious phrases of Proudhon, Marx devotes one paragraph to the subject of competition and monopoly, which contains the following passage, astonishingly brilliant in its manner of putting the question, but unfortunately too little regarded in our present-day literature :

"In practical life we find not only competition, monopoly, and their antagonism, but also their synthesis, which is not a formula but a movement. Monopoly produces competition, competition produces monopoly. The monopolists are made by competition, the competitors become monopolists. . . The synthesis is such that monopoly can only maintain itself by continually passing through the struggle of competition." (*Poverty of Philosophy*, Eng. edition, pp. 134-5.)

This passage, which was written in the winter of 1846-47—years before the appearance of *Capital*—contains, with all its brevity, the germ of the whole dialectic of the relations between monopoly and competition. In all Lenin's writings dealing with this same question in the changed conditions of the imperialist epoch, the thread of this Marxist dialectic can be traced. Comrade Bukharin replaces the living synthesis of monopoly and competition, their contradiction in movement, by an artificial and ridiculous differentiaion between competition dying in each separate country and competition flaring up on a world scale. It is obvious that this improvement on Marxism can only lead to Hilferding's improved platform.

II.

ORGANISED OR ANARCHIC CAPITALISM.

The question of the relations between monopoly and competition is only one problem raised by the total appraisalment of imperialist

development. In his last article Comrade Bukharin deals with the general character of post-war capitalism. He draws the following conclusion from the objective development of capitalist economy :

"Its anarchic nature passes over to the principles of international economic relations. The problems of markets, of prices, of competition, of crises, are becoming to an increasing extent problems of world economy, which, within the country itself, are replaced by the problem of organisation. The most painful, the most gaping wounds of capitalism, the most crying of its contradictions, are brought to light here, on the world battle-field. Even the problem of problems, the so-called "social question," the problem of class relationships and class struggle, becomes a problem which is closely connected with the position of this or that capitalist country on the world market."

This line of thought is a logical and consistent development of that which Comrade Bukharin expressed earlier when dealing with the question of competition. Here again there is evident the sharp differentiation between the "internal" and "external" contradictions of capitalism. The internal contradictions disappear. It is not only competition that is dying, but also markets, prices and crises. What then is left of capitalism, of the capitalism that Marx and Lenin analysed? A capitalism without markets, without prices, without competition and without crises—this is not capitalism any longer. For Bukharin, "problems of organisation" within the country take the place of these fundamental characteristics, these indispensable features of capitalism. In other words; in this age of finance-capitalist monopoly we are witnessing the development of an organised capitalism. The amazed reader of Bukharin's article will not find much difficulty in maintaining that, if this be so, their good old Hilferding was right. Let us give just one brief glance at the Protocol of the German Social Democratic Party Congress, held at Kiel in 1927. In his report to the Congress on the "tasks of the social-democracy within the republic," Hilferding, in essentials, put forward the same ideas as

Bukharin in his last utterances.* For Hilferding, the passing of the era of free competition means that the rule of the "blind forces of the market" is at an end. We are entering upon the period of the capitalist organisation of economy. The free play of economic forces is replaced by organised economy. For Hilferding, this means that "the capitalist principle of free competition is replaced by the Socialist principle of planned economy."†

As far as the *internal* position of capitalist countries is concerned, Bukharin makes practically the same estimate as Hilferding. The anarchic nature of capitalism "passes over" into the arena of international economic relations. In some inexplicable fashion, it jumps out of the capitalist countries. What remains is organised capitalism.

Within world economy, markets, prices, competition and crises remain in existence; all capitalist contradictions increase and thrive as soon as they overstep the boundaries of the particular country. Anarchy grows, leading to imperialist wars. In order to avoid giving the impression that we have been dealing with an accidental slip made by Bukharin, with an arbitrarily chosen quotation, we shall give a later section from the same article, in which Bukharin writes:

"To a certain extent the problem of markets is disappearing, although the hunt for markets continues to be a burning practical question . . . The problem of organisation, the problem of the best, the "optimum" organisation

*"The decisive fact at the moment is that we are living in a period of capitalism when, in essentials, the era of free competition, in which capitalism was controlled by the workings of blind market laws, has been passed and we are approaching the era of the capitalist organisation of economy; we are, that is, moving from the economy characterised by the free play of forces, etc., organised economy." (Protocol of Kiel Congress, p. 1666.)

†"Organised capitalism, therefore, in reality, means the replacement of the capitalist principle of free competition regulated and consciously directed economy affords far greater possibilities for society to exercise its influence; that is, no other than the influence of the only conscious organisation of society, equipped with forces to compel its decisions; influence exercised by the State. . . . This means that our generation is faced with the problem of transforming, with the help of the State (!), with the help of conscious social regulation, this economy, organised and managed by the capitalists, into an economy managed by the democratic State. From which it follows that the problem which faces our generation is no other than the problem of Socialism." (*Ibid.*, p. 169.)

possible in the given conditions, and on a scale which extends far beyond the limits of private economy, is coming more and more into the foreground. This problem includes in itself the question of the "economic rationality" of this or that form of organisation. . . . The entire "logical style" of the theoretical economy of the bourgeoisie is changing. The method of production, the point which is fundamental and decisive, which concerns the class relationships between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, remains in principle the same old capitalist method of production, but internally it is being transformed: in so far as it does not touch world economy, but deals only with the "national" capitalist organism, the tendency towards the rationalisation of economic processes is steadily and obviously making headway. . . . The problem of irrational elementary forces is replaced by the problem of rational organisation."

It appears from Bukharin's statements that the following phenomena can be observed in capitalist development:

1. Market, prices, competition and crises are disappearing within the capitalist countries.
2. Capitalism in each separate country is losing its anarchic character; it is becoming organised capitalism.
3. The principle of planned economy, of "economic rationality" is making victorious headway. Capitalist rationalisation is not, as the Communists maintain, a reactionary method of increasing the exploitation of the workers, a hopeless attempt of the bourgeoisie to meet the growing contradictions of the capitalist method of production, but a real "rationalisation of the economic processes," it is therefore historically progressive.
4. The capitalist method of production remains, only in respect to the class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie, in principle the "same old capitalist method of production." For the rest a method of production with new principles is arising, an "internally transformed capitalism." In this new capitalism which Bukharin has discovered, the previous contradictions of capitalist development as a whole—with

the exception of the *one* contradiction between the classes—are absent. Its anarchic nature is now in evidence only in the social sphere, and no longer in economy. The economic structure of this internally transformed capitalism is no longer chaotic, but rational.

Let us examine these statements in the light of Leninism. Lenin never said that the problems of markets, of prices, of competition and crises in the imperialist epoch are replaced by problems of organisation. Rather, on all these questions, Lenin put forward a view diametrically opposed to that of Bukharin. In the discussions on the proposal for a new Party programme for the Bolsheviks in the years 1917 and 1918, Lenin fought against a group of comrades who constructed a mechanical difference between the “old capitalism” and “pure imperialism.” At that time Lenin wrote:

“In its present form the general section of the programme contains a description and analysis of the most important and fundamental peculiarities of capitalism as a social-economic structure. These have *not* been radically changed by imperialism, by the epoch of finance capital. Imperialism is the continuation of the development of capitalism, its highest stage that—in a certain respect—indicates a change towards Socialism.” (Lenin: *Proposed changes . . . in the Programme. Collected Works*. Russian edition, Vol. XIV. p. 120.)

While, according to Bukharin, imperialism is no longer “in principle the same capitalist method of production” (with the exception of the class struggle), Lenin expressly declares that “the most important and essential peculiarities of capitalism remain, in principle, *unchanged*.” Bukharin maintains that these peculiarities have been radically changed by imperialism. Lenin proves that they have not been radically changed.

Let us continue the above quotation from Lenin: “In reality imperialism does not and *cannot* transform capitalism from top to bottom. Imperialism complicates and intensifies the contradictions of capitalism, “mingles” monopoly with free competition, but imperialism *cannot drive out of existence* exchange, markets, competition, crises, etc.” (Ibid. Lenin’s italics.)

Bukharin drives markets, prices, competition, and crises out of every actual capitalist country into an abstract world economy, so that it is difficult to locate the planet in which this world economy, which is not composed of the separate “national” capitalist economic systems, exists. Lenin, on the other hand, declares that imperialism not only *does not* drive exchange, markets, competition and crises out of existence, but that objectively it *cannot* do so.

Further on in the same article on the question of the programme, Lenin puts the problem still more sharply:

“Imperialism is capitalism playing itself out, but not played out; capital dying, but not dead. Not pure monopoly, but monopoly together with exchange, markets, competition, crises—*this is the most fundamental peculiarity of imperialism as a whole.*” (Ibid. pp. 120-121.)

Bukharin hides and denies this most essential peculiarity of imperialism. It is clear that his standpoint is not only a revision of certain elements of Leninism, but the revision of the Leninist theory of imperialism as a whole. In this Bukharin is openly and consciously contradicting the programme of the Comintern. He places himself without hesitation on Hilferding’s ground, on the ground of “organised, even if antagonistically organised,” capitalism. A capitalism without markets, a capitalism without prices, a capitalism without competition, a capitalism without crises—this is nothing but a Utopian-reformist discovery calculated to stupify the working class and to tone down the bourgeois rule of exploitation.

What about the anarchic, the chaotic nature of capitalism in the epoch of finance-capitalist monopoly? According to Bukharin, capitalist anarchy, too, melts into the airy spaces of the abstract world economy which is not considered as the totality of the national capitalisms, but which is “freed” from all concrete qualities and is sharply differentiated, as an international thing in and by itself, from the separate countries. According to Hilferding, anarchy disappears both within and between the capitalist states. Lenin, on the other hand, says:

“The statement that combines do away with crises is only a tale for the marines, used by bourgeois economists who set out to justify capitalism at all costs. On the contrary, when monopoly appears in certain branches of industry, it increases and intensifies the chaos proper to capitalist production as a whole.” (*Imperialism*, p. 27.)

Lenin by no means dissolves the chaotic character of monopoly capitalism into world economy, as Bukharin does, but he proves the correctness of his analysis in the passage which follows the one quoted above, by a number of examples which, without exception, refer to the “internal contradictions,” to the anarchical character of economy *within* the capitalist countries. In glaring contradiction to Bukharin, Lenin puts forward the view that “the extremely rapid rate of technical progress gives rise more and more to disturbances of equilibrium, to disproportion, crisis and chaos in the various spheres of economic life.” (*Ibid.* p. 27.) He refers to the struggle of the most-strongly trustified heavy industry—particularly coal and iron—against other industries, to the “disproportion between the development of agriculture and that of industry which is characteristic of capitalism.” Lenin refers pointedly to the “still greater lack of concerted organisation” brought about by “the privileged position of the most highly trustified industry” in “other branches of production.”

While Lenin carefully searches in and quotes from the writings of the bourgeois economic theoreticians, in which even those thoroughgoing defenders of capitalism, like Jeldels and Liefmann, are forced to admit the chaotic nature of capitalism, Comrade Bukharin, unfortunately, with a devoted ardour, accepts and spreads those very “tales for the marines used by bourgeois economists who set out to justify capitalism at all costs.” Bukharin believes every word uttered by Sombart and Bente about this swindle of a planned economy, every apologetic phrase about the “rationalisation of economic processes.”

On the question of rationalisation, of the “regulation of economic life,” Lenin always took up a revolutionary, Marxist attitude,

which is as the poles apart from Bukharin’s philosophy of plans:

“The reactionary capitalist State, which fears to undermine the bases of capitalism, the bases of the economic domination of the wealthy. . . this State needs nothing except the bread card. Not for one moment, not in one of its actions, does this State lose sight of its reactionary objects: to strengthen capitalism, not to let it be undermined, and it limits ‘the regulation of economic life, and particularly the regulation of consumption, only to those measures which are unconditionally necessary if the people are to be fed.’” (Lenin: *Collected works*, Vol. XIV, Part II. p. 198.)

Lenin wrote the above passage when he was examining the war capitalist measures taken from 1914 to 1918 in the most important imperialist countries. Bukharin, dealing with the question of imperialist war economy and post-war capitalism, puts forward the exactly opposite viewpoint. Bukharin’s pamphlet on *The Economics of the Transformation Period*, which appeared in 1920, is very informative on this point. At the beginning of this work Bukharin deals with the question of the “consciously active parts of capitalist world economy.” He formulates his conception of the structure of modern capitalism in the following way:

“Finance capital has abolished the anarchy of production within the great capitalist countries. The monopolist employers’ combinations, trustified undertakings and the penetration of bank capital into industry, have created a new type of production relations, by changing the unorganised capitalist commodity system into finance capitalist organisation.” (German edition, p. 5.)

Here we have again, in our even more obvious form, Bukharin’s idea of the disappearance of capitalist anarchy of production. In the Lenin Institute there is a copy of the *Economics of the Transformation Period* which Lenin annotated. In the margin besides the passage quoted above, he added a most instructive note. Lenin crossed out the word *abolished* and wrote in the margin “has not abolished.”* Their “little” dispute as to the

**Soviet Encyclopaedia*. Russ. ed., Vol. VIII., p. 280. Article on Bukharin.

words "has abolished" or "has not abolished," this discussion drawn from the past, is again coming into the forefront of our internal Party struggles to-day. The disagreements of that time have now grown into decisive differences of principle between Bukharin and the Comintern.

III.

TWO THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM.

The question of the "new type of productive relations" which, according to Bukharin, has been created by the monopolies, is of great importance. In this, again, Bukharin is opposed to Leninism and in this, again, we are dealing in essence with an old dispute that occurred many years ago. We have already mentioned the debates on the programme in 1917-1918, when Lenin attacked the false idea that the capitalist method of production is radically changed in its essential features by imperialism. This disputed point came up again at the Thirteenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., held in March, 1919. Bukharin and other members of the programme commission defended the theory of "pure imperialism" and wished to strike out those parts of the Party programme which dealt with pre-imperialist capitalism. Lenin fought sharply against this suggestion. In his report on the programme question to the Thirteenth Congress, he said:

"If the programme were to be written as Comrade Bukharin would like it written — then it would be an incorrect programme. It might perhaps reproduce the best that has been said or written on finance capitalism and imperialism, but it would not reproduce reality, for in that reality there is no such uniformity. . . . That is why any other formulation of the programme would be incorrect. The facts must be stated: the programme must contain what is absolutely irrefutable, what is proven by fact.

"Theoretically, Comrade Bukharin understands this perfectly well and says that the programme must be concrete. But it is one thing to understand this, and quite another to put it into effect. Bukharin's concreteness is the bookish explanation of finance capitalism. In reality many varied phenomena can

be observed. In every agricultural country monopolised industry exists side by side with free competition. *Nowhere in the world has monopoly capitalism existed without free competition in a great number of industries and nowhere in the world will it so exist.* To talk about such a system would be to describe a system that is detached from life and is incorrect." (Lenin: *Collected Works*. Russian edition. Vol. XVI.)

It is just such a system, detached from life and incorrect, a system that is, in its real meaning, revisionist, that Comrade Bukharin talks of in his last article.

Instead of meaningless and misleading phrases about a "new type of production relations," Lenin analyses imperialism as a superstructure over the old capitalism:

"If Marx called manufacture the superstructure over very widespread small-scale production, then imperialism and finance capitalism are the superstructure over the old capitalism. If this summit were destroyed, the old capitalism would be exposed. To take up the standpoint that there is a uniform imperialism without any of the old capitalism, is to take one's wishes for reality." (*Ibid.*)

Lenin's theory of imperialism as the superstructure over the old capitalism is of great importance. In Bukharin's obstinate effort of years to "refute" this theory, to revise and to combat it, we find one of the ideological roots of his present-day approach to reformism. Bukharin wants to prove, at any price, that imperialism is not only a new form, with its own principles, of the old capitalism, its "last stage," but that it abolishes, does away with, eliminates all the essential peculiarities, all the characteristic features of the old capitalism. Bukharin looks on imperialism as a new method of production. In his search for the real content of this new method of production he inevitably reaches opportunist conclusions. He replaces the basic features of capitalism as a whole, which actually remain in existence in the imperialist epoch, by certain discovered "peculiarities" of finance capitalism, such as the disappearance of crises, regulation, rationality, etc. This inevitably leads him into Hilferding's camp.

Lenin fought against these ideas of Bukharin from the strategical-political standpoint,

as well as from that of theoretical analysis :

"If we were faced by a uniform imperialism which had completely transformed capitalism, our tasks would be a hundred thousand times easier. It would mean that we had to deal with a system in which everything was subjected to finance capitalism alone. We would only have to remove the top layer and give the rest to the proletariat. That would be very pleasant, but unfortunately things are not like that. In reality development has taken such a course that we must proceed in quite another manner. Imperialism is the superstructure on top of capitalism. If it is destroyed, we have still to deal with that destroyed summit and with the basis that has been exposed beneath it. . . There is the old capitalism which, in a number of areas, has grown into imperialism. In reality the gigantic substructure of the old capitalism exists. The superstructure of imperialism exists, which led to the war, and from the war sprang the beginning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. You cannot get away from this. This fact characterises the rate of development of the proletarian revolution over the whole world, and it will remain a fact for many years to come." (*Ibid.*)

What is remarkable here, as in the other questions at dispute, is the complete assurance with which Lenin uses the dialectical method in examining imperialism. To Bukharin's bookish "concreteness" he opposes an analysis of capitalist reality as it exists in the present epoch, in order to show how the old capitalism grows into imperialism, how, by the processes of economic-social development itself, the imperialist superstructure is built over the capitalist basis. Lenin starts with the inherent contradictions of the imperialist epoch in order to derive from them the principles of the Socialist revolution, of the proletarian insurrection. Bukharin tries to weaken those contradictions, to conjure them away, to expel them into an abstract world market. Lenin explains the growth of the old capitalism into imperialism. Bukharin separates imperialism from the old capitalism as a new method of production, as a new world order, making a mechanical division between the two. In the last analysis the result is necessarily that of the growth of monopoly capital-

ism into Socialism. Growth in Hilferding's sense: no markets, no prices, no crises, no competition, no anarchy of production. All this is replaced by regulation, rationality, organisation.

What does this finance capitalist organisation look like when examined more closely? Bukharin describes it as follows:

"Capitalist national economy has grown from an irrational system into a rational organisation, from an economy without a subject to an economic subject." (*Economics*, op. cit. p. 10.)

In this case Bukharin's standpoint coincides exactly with Hilferding's idea of development "from the economy of the free play of forces to organised economy." (Speech at the Kiel Congress.) In Bukharin's case, it is true, commodity economy on the world market has not yet disappeared. The decisive fact, however, is that it "is either dying or shrinking within the country, by giving way to organised distribution." (*Ibid.*, p. 11.)

After Bukharin has abolished the anarchy of capitalist production and transformed imperialist chaos generally into a rational organisation, he adds "organised distribution" to his earlier discoveries. What, then, remains of the capitalism that Marx described? Nothing at all! Bukharin even informs us that, under finance capitalism, commodities are actually commodities no longer, but that:

"The product distributed in organised fashion (!) within the country is a commodity only in so far (!) as its existence is bound up with the existence of the world market." (*Ibid.*, p. 11.)

Later on Bukharin describes in detail the further reorganisation of the production relations of finance capital:

"The reorganisation of the production relations of finance capital is in the direction of State capitalist universal organisation, with the abolition of the commodity market, with the transformation of money into one unit of payment, with production organised on a State scale, with the whole national economic mechanism subordinated to the objects of world competition, subordinated, that is, to the objects of war." (*Ibid.*, p. 37.)

This is Bukharin's idea of capitalism in the war period.

Lenin said that the reactionary capitalist State needs nothing besides the bread card; social-chauvinist twitter of the "planned regulation of economic life" is impudent treachery; this regulation is limited only to such measures which are absolutely necessary to feed the cannon fodder and equip the army. Bukharin sees State-capitalist universal organisation, the abolition of the commodity market, money as a unit of payment, etc., etc.

Bukharin approached these matters from quite another standpoint than Lenin. Lenin considered development from the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. He examined the "great extent to which monopoly capital has intensified all the contradictions of capitalism." For him "this deepening of contradictions constitutes the most powerful driving force of the transitional period of history." (*Imperialism*, p. 147.) Bukharin uses a method wholly different in principle. He writes:

"We examined all changes from the point of view of eliminating anarchy in production . . . The processes of eliminating anarchy in production began with the elements of organisation already established by finance capital."

Lenin says: "In capitalist society, internal trade is connected with foreign trade. (*Ibid.*, p. 76.) Bukharin erects a fantastic, insurmountable wall between the "planned and organised" internal trade, and foreign trade in which anarchy still continues for a while.

Lenin analysed "capitalist monopoly. . . in conditions of commodity production and private property. . ." In monopoly capitalism Bukharin sees "a new type of production relations," the "abolition of the commodity market," "organised economy."

Lenin calls imperialism that stage in the development of capitalism at which all its contradictions, both internal and external, are exposed with the greatest acuteness.

Bukharin calls imperialism a new method of production in which the internal contradic-

tions are fast shrinking or have disappeared altogether, while the external contradictions still exist.

Hilferding calls imperialism organised capitalism in which there are neither internal nor external contradictions, but in which the "Socialist principle of planned production" has won its triumph.

We should be guilty of exaggeration if we failed to mention that Bukharin adds certain qualifications to his theory of the disappearance of internal contradictions: the class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie remains. Unfortunately, however, this concession to Marxism does not greatly differentiate Bukharin's theory from that of Hilferding. All the semi-intelligent bourgeois economists, including Hilferding, cannot but recognise the class struggle as a fact; but this recognition is of no use if the objective basis, the concrete foundation of the class struggle in the present epoch, is denied or distorted.

Putting the matter in its shortest form, Bukharin's standpoint grows out of the theory of an organised capitalism in each separate country. Like the Greek philosopher Epicurus, who located his gods, in which actually he did not believe, in the interstices between the framework of the world, so Bukharin transfers the broadest and deepest contradictions of capitalist society to a "world arena" which, wholly distinct and apart from all existing capitalist countries, leads a purely mythological existence.

Bukharin's theory of imperialism is not revolutionary, but reformist. It is not a guide to the activity, but to the passivity of the proletarian masses. It does not arm Communists against social fascism, it disarms Communists, ideologically, before Hilferding and Kautsky.

That is why it is necessary to struggle ruthlessly against the reformist legend of organised capitalism in its most recent form, as represented by Bukharin.

The ENGLISH EDITION of the *COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL*
is published twice monthly.

Subscription Rates 8s. per annum in England, \$2 per annum in U.S.A.
post free through any bookseller.

Socialist Rivalry and the Trade Union Movement

By I. Rv.

AT every turn of the revolution, at every steep ascent, we meet with new forms of the mass movement, with new expressions of the readiness of the Soviet proletariat to fight for the successful continuation of the great event which began in October, 1917. During the period of struggle for the possession of industry, workers' control arose, which alone made it possible to continue the organisation of the Soviet management of nationalised industry. Thus, during the period of reconstruction of economy, which was ruined by the war and the blockade, the working-class began to form industrial conferences—a new form of participation by the masses in economic construction. And now, when Soviet Russia has entered a new period: the period of Socialist reconstruction and the final elimination of the remains of capitalism, when simultaneously with the creation of grandiose tasks of the five-year plan, the working class, its party, and its power, have come face to face with big difficulties—once again we are the witnesses of a wide mass movement the like of which is unknown in the history of mankind.

THIS MOVEMENT IS SOCIALIST RIVALRY.

What is Socialist rivalry, what are its aims and tasks, what is its political meaning, and what influence has it on the further construction of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.? This rivalry is the reply of the working class to the five-year plan, the reply of the great masses to the policy of the Communist Party and Soviet power, which is directed towards decisively overcoming all political and economic difficulties, and the hastening of Socialist reconstruction in industry and in agriculture.

The Rights and the conciliators became frightened of these difficulties. They fell into a panic. They began to defend the ideas of capitulation before the "kulaks" and "Nepmen," and of relinquishing the strong-

holds of Socialism to its enemy capitalism. In 1928 already, when the process of reconstruction was finished and, on the basis of the growth of productive powers in the Socialist section of economy, a great increase had begun in the process of socialising industry and distribution, we came up against great difficulties, chiefly in the food question. The "kulak," the chief representative of capitalism in the land, organised resistance to the policy of the Soviet power and tried, by means of corn sabotage (refusal to sell corn), to delay the gradual movement of socialisation. Then, already, a feeling of capitulation was noticed amongst the unruly members of the party (those very members who, subsequently, appeared in an organised form as the Right wing). Instead of a firm attack on the "kulak" and "Nepman," they advocated the theory of "concessions" (Liadoff and others). The five-year plan of economic development evoked the sharp criticism of the Rights and conciliators, who feared the difficulties, and put forward demands which would have really meant a slow descent to capitalism.

The political aspect and true significance of the Right deviation and the conciliators, have been sufficiently exposed in the documents of the C.P.S.U. and Comintern. It is unnecessary to repeat what is known by everybody. We need only point out that the party voted unanimously for a forced Socialist attack, for an increased speed of reconstruction, for socialisation of agriculture, for the firm overcoming of difficulties, for a pitiless fight against the class enemy, for the five-year plan in its improved form (that form that had been ratified by the Fifteenth Party Conference and the Fifth Congress of Soviets).

The working masses discussed the five-year plan. And the workers replied to this great plan of works by the organisation of Socialist rivalry.

Bourgeois economists and philosophers have always, in their fight against Socialism,

stated as one of their greatest arguments that Socialism will kill private initiative—the most important factor of progress and that there will be no ground for competition. Already in 1918 Lenin proved the groundlessness of these statements :

“Socialism does not only not kill rivalry : on the contrary, it creates the possibility for the first time of using it widely on a real mass scale ; of attracting a real majority of the workers into such work where they can reveal themselves, make use of their talents, of which there is a virgin source in the people, and which capitalism bent, oppressed, and stifled by the thousand and million.”

“A wide, true, mass creation of the possibility of showing initiative in rivalry can make a bold beginning only now” when “for the first time after centuries of working for others, of forced work for exploiters, the possibility of working for one’s self has arrived.”

And indeed, the working class masses have begun to realise Lenin’s theory at the present stage of the revolution, when Socialism in the U.S.S.R. is approaching by great strides. The start was made by the working class youth—the “komsomol.” On the initiative of the “komsomol” the so-called “fighting” brigades were formed in the factories. A group of young enthusiastic workers formed themselves into a brigade, and undertook the task of showing an example of highly-productive and disciplined labour which would be much more productive than the labour of the rest of the workers ; they then challenged other workers, chiefly the young workers, to compete with them. The brigades voluntarily raised the rate of production, applied new methods to their work, and aimed at considerably lowering the cost price of goods in the Socialist factories. As in the case of all pioneers the “fighters” met with distrust at first. But soon the “fighting” brigades became very popular. Others—not only the youthful workers, but the adult and old workers as well—were infected by their enthusiasm. Rivalry was becoming common to all the workers.

The workers of the Kamensky paper factory and of the *Red Elector* laid the foundations of rivalry amongst the workers generally. They published a letter in the press in which

they put before all the workers the necessity of carrying out, and if possible of exceeding, the tasks of the economic plan in the sphere of productivity of labour, lowering of cost prices, etc. They challenged the workers of other factories to compete with them. This appeal met with the warm response of the proletarians. A mass movement of rivalry began. A decisive impetus was given by the historic “Tver Contract.” On the 8th of April a conference was called of the textile workers of various districts in Tver. In the name of sixty-eight thousand workers a Socialist contract on rivalry was concluded. The concrete duties which the workers in each factory had to fulfil were detailed in the contract. The exact amount of the increase in the productivity of labour, and of the decrease in cost prices for each factory, was clearly stated. The contract was concluded in the presence of thousands of workers amidst scenes of unprecedented mass enthusiasm.

After this a wave of challenges and contracts began which rolled over the whole country. Hardly a factory was left which had not challenged another or had not been challenged itself. The roll-call of the factories lasted about two months. Rivalry had taken on a wide mass character.

As an example of the terms of these contracts on rivalry, this is an extract from a contract concluded by the workers of the tobacco factories :

“Filled with the ardent desire to realise the great task undertaken by the Communist Party in accordance with Lenin’s testament, we enter into Socialist rivalry with factory workers and undertake to raise the labour productivity of one worker in the second half of the year as compared with 1927-1928 ; 35 per cent. in the “Java” factory ; 40 per cent. in the “Doukat” factory ; 30 per cent. in the “Red Star” factory ; 50 per cent. in the “Clara Zetkin” factory ; 44 per cent. in the “Rosa Luxembourg” factory ; 46 per cent. in the “Oussachev” factory.”

The decrease in the cost price must, according to the contract, be from 8.8 per cent. to 11.25 per cent. in every factory. The limits of waste and idleness allowed are laid down exactly for each factory separately. In the

"Java" the workers undertake to decrease idleness from 6.8 per cent. to 5 per cent.; in the "Doukat" from 6.9 per cent. to 5 per cent., etc. Waste in the production of cigarette case bobbins must diminish from 4.5 per cent. to 3 per cent. in the "Java," from 5.82 per cent. to 2.5 per cent. in the "Doukat," etc.

We see thus that the contract is by no means just a show—and agitational document. It has an extremely serious business character. The workers undertake certain obligations on the basis of precise calculations and of an all-round study of the conditions of production in each separate factory. Entirely concrete obligations are undertaken. The tobacco workers' contract is typical of the great majority of the contracts. At the same time, before the contract is signed, it must be discussed by the workers of every factory entering into rivalry.

The conclusion of a contract of rivalry between various factories is followed by the organisation of rivalry within the factory: between guilds and shifts, between separate brigades and groups of workers, and between individual workers. This rivalry is carried on everywhere. Guild with guild, shift with shift, group with group, etc., all conclude a contract where they state the exact obligations relating to productivity of labour, reduction of cost price, and so on. The enthusiasm of the workers has not stopped at this second stage of rivalry. We have thousands of cases of workers who voluntarily offer to increase the rate of production and reduce cost prices. We have an unprecedented growth of mass production and manifestations of real heroism in the Soviet factories. At any factory one can meet working-men and working-women who are full of enthusiasm for Socialist rivalry, and who, by their personal example, give examples of real Socialist labour. The enthusiasm of the workers has been communicated to the engineering and technical staffs. Engineers, technicians, masters, etc., take part in the rivalry movement.

The rivalry movement is not only in industry: it has entered transport, building, and all institutions beginning with the Co-operative shops and People's Commissariats and ending with the militia, the customs, etc. The intellectual workers; scientist, doctors,

agriculturists, teachers, writers, art workers—the whole of the hired labour in the country has gone into the movement. While the rivalry in factories takes place over the increase of productivity, the decrease of cost prices, etc., in the institutions there is rivalry over an improved service, precision in work, quick fulfilling of various tasks, the rationalisation of the apparatus, a decrease in expenses, and so on.

The metal-workers of Toula sent a letter to the plenum of the Russian T.U.C. in which they appealed thus to the poets, the writers, and the artists: "Flock to our guilds and workshops. Strengthen us and buoy us up with your good poems, stories, and pictures. We do not invite you to our workshops for the sake of singing our praises, but, as you will agree, there is nothing at the present moment which so interests and excites the masses as Socialist rivalry. The masters of metal hope to receive the masters of the pen and of the brush."

The "masters of the brush" took up the challenge. Writers and painters visited the factories and workshops in order to give real types of the rivalry movement in their literary works, and to show living examples of the best work.

It must not be thought that rivalry is only a temporary spark, a passing mass caprice. The Toula metal-workers very clearly expressed the attitude of the working masses to rivalry in the letter just quoted (published May 30th). "We look on rivalry, not as a temporary campaign, but as a system of labour. Our class enemy says that rivalry is just a Bolshevik idea and a game for a minute. Let us turn rivalry into a mighty advance to Socialism. Our class enemy remarks that our rivalry has often a showy character. Let us reply to this by serious, every-day, and energetic work." Not only the metal-workers of Toula, but the whole vanguard of the working-class looks on the matter in this light.

Socialist rivalry is a new method of Socialist labour, based on the enterprise and rivalry of free builders of a new, Socialist, society, who work, not for exploiters, but for themselves. At the same time rivalry should not be confused with competition. "The basis of competition is the defeat and death of one side.

and the victory and domination of the other. The basis of Socialist rivalry is the comradely help of the backward by the advanced workers in order to attain a general advance. Competition says 'Smash the backward in order to maintain your domination.' Socialist rivalry says 'Some work badly, others still better: catch up with the best and attain a general advance.'" (Stalin). It is this very idea of the general advance in Socialist construction in spite of all difficulties and obstacles that is the impetus which caused that growth of mass productive powers expressed in Socialist rivalry.

That we have to do with a mass movement, a movement which sprang up on the initiative of the masses, is proved by the facts. The appeal of the Sixteenth Party Conference to the working class to organise rivalry was issued on April 29th, 1929. But as it has already been stated, the Tver Contract was concluded twenty-one days before that, and the letter of the workers of the Kamensky and *Red Elector* factories was published still earlier. Rivalry began in many factories in March, while the "fighting" brigades had appeared even before that.

The most characteristic feature of the rivalry movement is that it has entered the village as well. There is a whole series of contracts between factories and peasants, in which the workers undertake certain industrial obligations, and the peasants undertake to improve the harvests, to use new methods in field cultivation, to go over to collective forms of agriculture. Such contracts exist between Ivanovo-Voznessensk and Ouzbakistan, between the Ural and Siberia, etc., etc. But rivalry exists in the village itself between collective farms, Soviet farms, communes, and between villages. Rivalry is fairly widespread now in the villages.

The Red Army is not behindhand. There are innumerable contracts between various army divisions, where each division rivals with the other on military and political studies, etc.

The fact that even the unemployed have considered it necessary to take part in rivalry may serve as an example of this veritably unprecedented Socialist enthusiasm. The unemployed metal and textile workers of

Moscow and Kharkov have appealed to all the workers of the U.S.S.R. to take part wholeheartedly in the rivalry movement and to realise within the appointed period the five-year plan.

It is early as yet to calculate the practical results of rivalry. It will be possible to do this only at the end of the economic year. But there are already a number of facts which point to the conclusion that the rivalry movement is giving big results. Here are a few examples chosen at random. In the Yaroslav flax factory "The Dawn of Socialism" cost prices, as the result of rivalry, have fallen 7.34 per cent., in spite of the fact that the cost of raw material has risen 25 per cent. In the Prokopiev mine "Kouzbass" the productivity of the workers has risen 74 per cent. The productivity of labour in railway transport has risen 21 per cent. in many districts. In the "Mikhelson" factory the average expenses for carriage repair fell by 20 per cent. in May as compared with the expenses of the first quarter of this year. In the painting section of this factory cost prices fell 35 per cent. in May. The miners of "Donougl" obtained 18 per cent. more anthracite and coal in June, thus exceeding the programme by 6.5 per cent. The amount of time spent in idleness has been decreased many-fold in many enterprises. There are innumerable similar examples. They all point to the fact that rivalry is giving absolutely real industrial effects, and that the obligations undertaken by the workers are by no means empty phrases. Tangible results are already seen in villages where rivalry exists.

What part do the Trade Unions play in the organisation and carrying out of Socialist rivalry?

Here two stages must be noted. In the first period, when rivalry was only of a local character and existed only amongst the young workers, the trade unions went no farther than encouraging and aiding the rivals. But when the movement began spreading to all the workers, the trade unions began to play a more active rôle. However, the direction of the rivalry movement lay in the hands of special "staffs," of three or five people, who organised themselves at the factories, and into which the representatives of the factory committees

were admitted on the same footing as the representatives of other factory organisations.

But later on this was considered to be incorrect. The directors of the rivalry movement went entirely over to the trade unions. In the workshops all the work for directing the rivalry movement was done by the industrial commissions and industrial conferences, *i.e.*, by all those organs which ordinarily carry out all the mass economic work. Thus a unity of direction was obtained, together with a close connection of Socialist rivalry with that everyday economic work which the unions have carried out in the factories and workshops (and institutions), for many years.

The Second Plenum of the Russian Trades Union Council passed the following resolution on Socialist rivalry:—"Socialist rivalry must be looked upon in the light of an important task for the trade unions. The development of Socialist rivalry, which is the most striking manifestation of the revolutionary initiative of the masses during the period of Socialist reconstruction, must meet with the complete preparedness and unrestrained initiative of the trade union organisations." "The trade unions must stand at the head of this mass movement of the working class—Socialist rivalry;—they must give the fullest practical help to the lower organs in this work; and, in accordance with this, they must strengthen their direction of the mass economic work in the factories and institutions." "Rivalry," continues the resolution of the Plenum, "must spread to the Socialist section of agriculture—Soviet and collective holdings, machine-tractor stations." The trade unions must "in every way aid rivalry which is directed towards an increase of cultivated areas, and increased harvest, and development of collectivism in the village."

The unions could have no other attitude to Socialist rivalry. The trade unions in the U.S.S.R. are the school of Communism. In the era of Socialist reconstruction the greatest task of the trade union movement is to mobilise the will and activity of the working class round the big tasks of Socialist construction for the overcoming of all the difficulties lying in the way of the realisation of the economic plans. The fundamental watchword of the unions is "A bond with the masses." This

implies that the unions must stand at the head of the masses. And therefore the trade union movement must stand at the head of that new mass movement which has taken the form of Socialist rivalry.

At the end of July the presidium of the Russian Trades Union Council discussed at a special meeting, at which were present the Economic Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Central Committee of the Y.C.L. (Komsomol) representatives of the Central Committee of Trade Unions, and of local trade unions, the question of Socialist rivalry once again. They passed a resolution which contained a wide programme of practical measures to be taken in order to assure the maximum success of the rivalry movement, and which said that the problems which evolved as rivalry developed, must come "foremost in the attention of the trade union organisations." The unions must "include Socialist rivalry in the programme of their everyday work—and, accordingly, change their methods if necessary, speed up their work, and subject the whole apparatus to the tasks of Socialist rivalry."

To lead and direct the rivalry movement—this is the task of the trade unions of the U.S.S.R., the organisations which act as the connecting link between the party and the working class.

We have no desire to describe idylls. In the process of Socialist rivalry there exist many obstacles and important defects. Undoubtedly, not every single worker is taking his share in the movement. A large part of the workers—the more backward workers and those who have just come from the villages—remains passive and takes no part in the general movement. In many factories rivalry is slow, and even the more advanced workers are not drawn into it. There are cases of desertion from the rivalry front: individual members leave the brigades, etc. In some cases show effects take the place of practical work. There were cases when challenges were made by factory organisations in the name of the workers when the workers had not yet sufficiently discussed the subject. By no means all the trade organisations have understood the importance of the rivalry and many cases have been noted of a purely formal and bureaucratic attitude to the task of directing this movement. Elements of

opportunism and trade union conservatism in the unions have undeniably come to light in the process of directing Socialist rivalry.

On the other hand, many facts can be cited which show a great inertia of the economic apparatus. There was not everywhere in the factories the necessary technical organisation which would provide a wide field for workers' initiative. Because of the delay in the provision of raw material, and because of the insufficient carrying-out of rationalisation, rivalry was held back in many places. In many places it is being held up even now. In particular, the administrative and technical staff has not, on the whole, showed much activity, and does not yet play that part in rivalry which, in accordance with its place in industry, it should. This also delays the successful development of rivalry.

It was these circumstances which caused the presidium of the Trade Union Council to call a general meeting and take decisive measures in order to overcome all the obstacles and difficulties which stood in the way of the rivalry movement.

But in spite of all these defects and deficiencies, the fact remains that Socialist rivalry has now become a colossal mass movement in which millions of workers are taking part. At the same time the movement is continually rising. This is illustrated, besides by other instances, by the following two facts:

The Leningrad worker Slobodchikoff sent a letter to the press in which he proposed that instead of celebrating the religious festival (Transfiguration), which takes place on August 6th, that date should be declared a day of industrialisation, *i.e.*, that all the workers should work on that day and that their wages should go to the special fund for industrialisation of the country. This proposal was accepted with tremendous enthusiasm by the whole of the working class. Industrialisation Day (not, it is true, on one special date, but on various dates, according to local conditions) will be celebrated in the whole country and on the initiative of the workers themselves. And not only workingmen, but all the hired workers in the land, who themselves offered to do this, will work on that day.

In the process of preparing for Industrialisation Day, the working masses have

thrown out a new watchword: "The five-year plan must be accomplished in four years." This watchword has become extraordinarily popular amongst the working masses. At the time of writing (August 2nd), a delegation of workers from the Don Basin (from Lougansk), has just arrived in Moscow. The workers in the Don Basin decided to shorten the term of accomplishment of the five-year plan. They sent a delegation to the Moscow workers which was to ask the Moscow proletariat to aid them in this work. "We," stated the delegates, "are aiming at realising the five-year plan before the date appointed, but the Donbass workers have not sufficient technical knowledge, the spreading of industrial knowledge is not developed. We, the workers of Lougansk, appeal to you for aid."

Moscow has promised, and will give, her aid. But this is not the point. The incident itself shows how great is the enthusiasm of the masses, how unlimited is their readiness to carry out a Socialist attack, in spite of all difficulties.

We can quote further examples of the unprecedented development of the Socialist initiative of the masses. Just now, for instance, a new form of testing the results of Socialist rivalry has become widespread. Workers send delegates to kindred factories, examine the successes attained, and, without fear, sharply criticise the defects. Not long ago, for instance, a delegation from a small macaroni factory in Armavir arrived in Moscow. Having studied the condition of rivalry in a Moscow macaroni factory, and found that it was going on very slowly, the delegation sent a sharp letter to the press, forced the Central Committee of the Food-Workers' Union specially to discuss the question of the Moscow factory, spoke to the workers of this factory, and thus gave a decisive impulse to clearing away all the defects found there. Workers send special brigades to the villages, and these brigades give help to the collective holdings, agitate for the collectivisation of agriculture, for the appliance of new methods to land cultivation, etc., thus strengthening the industrial tie with the labouring peasantry.

There have been several attempts on the part of the class enemy to bring about the failure of Socialist rivalry. "Kulaks," priests,

etc., managed to get into Soviet enterprises, and tried to raise the backward workers against the advanced workers who were energetically carrying on Socialist rivalry. But the masses themselves stood up with such fierceness against these attempts that the plans of the kulaks hopelessly failed.

These are the facts and this is the reality of the matter. It is sufficiently convincing and instructive. It shows, first of all, what enormous creative powers exist in the working class of the Soviet Union. It confirms the absolute truth of Lenin's words on those possibilities that lie hidden in the working class and which come to light only under the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship. These facts are the best proof of the correctness of the Communist Party's policy and of the complete hopelessness of the ideas of the Rights and Conciliators. Socialist rivalry dealt the death-blow to those who, frightened by the difficulties, gave the signal for retreat and for capitulation to the resisting class enemy. Out of the ranks of the Right were heard voices

advocating, instead of the speed-up of the five-year plan, the creation of a two-year plan, with a big peasant bias. The working class, hand-in-hand with the party, not only voted for the five-year plan: it now demands that the term of its accomplishment should be reduced. Can a bigger failure of Right ideology and Right policy be imagined?

Lenin wrote: "Communism begins when the rank and file workers evince a self-sacrificing desire to increase, in spite of the hard labour entailed, the productive powers of labour." Socialist rivalry is the greatest example of that desire which has filled the rank and file workers, the working class as a whole. And the tremendous enthusiasm of the millions, their readiness, "self-sacrificingly to overcome hard labour," is explained by the fact that they feel and understand that "Communism is beginning"; that, in spite of all the difficulties, the great plan of works created according to Lenin's testament, will be realised and every day will bring us nearer to Communism.

The Revolutionary Outlook in Palestine

The Social-political background of the recent events

THE recent events in Palestine have drawn the attention of almost the whole world to this small country. It is true that we are not yet in possession of sufficient data to draw clear conclusions in connection with these events. Bourgeois correspondents and reporters are talking nonsense in their very terminology, in their evaluation of what has happened. Some portray it as an "Arab pogrom" against the Jews (American version), others as a Zionist-Fascist attack" against the Arabs (German version), others as "mob rioting" (English version). But the bourgeois papers cover over and efface the real meaning of these events. Nevertheless, even from these scanty reports, carefully sifted by the British censorship, the national importance and character of the events are clear.

"But it is precisely this that gives to events the character of a revolution" (Lenin). It is just this that shows that we have before us not simple "riots," not a pogrom, but a fairly serious movement of the Arab masses against imperialism.

In essence, the Palestine events are only another link in the chain of important manifestations which show that the Arab revolutionary movement is developing. We have had a whole series of symptoms of the rise of a new revolution wave in the Arab East. In this connection we can cite the following happenings during the last few months: the conference of Syrian revolutionaries at Nabek; the meetings of Arab youth at Haifa and Jaffa; the emergence of the Central Committee of the Arab opposition in Transjordan; and

finally, the presence of fairly important groups of Arab nationalists, especially of the revolutionary youth, at the Second Congress of the League against Imperialism in Frankfurt. If we add to these the constant agitation, small encounters in Irak, the movements of revolt in Arabia, opposition activities (demonstrations, manifestoes) of the Arab youth in Damascus, we get some idea of the revolutionary background of the Palestine events.

Palestine, a small province of the former Ottoman Empire, as a result of the war became an English colony. Its area is only 23,000 square kilometres, on which small area lives a small population of some 900,000 persons. Nevertheless, in the past it has been the object of imperialist struggles. Germany, France, Britain and Tsarist Russia tried to get hold of it. It was not only its material wealth that drew the attention of the imperialists to Palestine; the main point for the imperialist powers was its strategic and political position. Palestine lies on the main routes of European imperialism.

Palestine's proximity to the Suez Canal, the link from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean which connects Britain with its Eastern colonies, makes Palestine specially valuable for the defence of the Suez Canal against attacks from the East. In the event of Anglo-Egyptian relations becoming strained, in the event of a serious threat to Suez from the Egyptian revolutionary movement, the British armies and aeroplanes in Palestine could easily be mobilised and set in motion. A reserve base and a cover for the Suez Canal, Palestine is at the same time a link in the chain of British possessions in the Mediterranean. According to the plans of the British Admiralty, the naval base at Haifa is to complete the transformation of the Mediterranean into a British inland sea. It gives Britain another war base for her Mediterranean fleet, in the series Gibraltar-Malta-Cyprus-Suez.

This base also has considerable importance because of the fact that overland routes for British trade pass through Palestine to the Persian Gulf and the Sudan. Palestine links the Mediterranean zone with India; through Palestine will pass the Haifa-Baghdad railway, which will form a section of the great British line Cape Town-Cairo-Calcutta, and

will at the same time enable British imperialism to establish its control over the Arabian deserts. At the present time, motor and air routes cross the desert (Beirut, Damascus, Palmira, Baghdad, Aman-Baghdad) connecting London with India.

And finally, Palestine serves as a barrier, separating French Syria from the British Suez Canal.

After the war, British imperialism made use of the Zionist movement as its agent in definitely securing for itself this most important strategical base. The Zionist movement, which took its rise in the imperialist epoch (end of the nineteenth century), is a counter-revolutionary movement of the Jewish big bourgeoisie, and has been able to draw in considerable numbers of the scattered and oppressed Jewish petty bourgeoisie, giving effect both to its own and to their desires to colonise. These colonising tendencies were concentrated by the Zionist movement, at whose head were the financial magnates and bankers of Germany, France, Britain, and in recent years, America. The leaders of the Zionist movement shoved their noses into every diplomatic office and ante-chamber of the Powers, pushing forward their colonisation plans, and offering the Jewish masses to them as suitable material for imperialist designs. And in the end the Zionist leaders succeeded in selling this plan to British imperialism, and the European banker Rothschild with the English Lord Balfour together established Zionism as the open agency of British imperialism.

Under the pretext of creating a "national Jewish home" in Palestine, British imperialism got possession of the country and transformed it into a British colony. The Zionist movement was in many ways useful for the British designs. With the help of the Zionists a Jewish base was created in Arabia: the Zionist immigrants into Palestine drove a Jewish wedge into the heart of Arabia. United ethnographically and historically, the Arab provinces were torn apart by "Jewish Palestine." Of course, the Jewish population in Palestine was not intended by the British imperialists to become a compact mass, economically and politically independent. It was to be a minority, closely dependent on its British guardians, and therefore a tool of

British interests. Finally, Britain built up through the Jews a fairly effective military police apparatus in Palestine. The Zionist immigrants drained the swamps, and turned the country into a suitable strategical base for British imperialism. And besides, the Zionist immigrants, the Jewish settlements, were to serve and have served as lightning conductors, towards which, in case of need, British agents could direct the revolt of the Arab masses against the occupation régime. And in fact, at the time when France was obliged to maintain in Syria a permanent garrison of forty to forty-five thousand colonial troops, Britain was content with 800 soldiers in Palestine. The British officials in Palestine skilfully manœuvred, setting one section of the population against the other, and in this way were able to hold the political balance of power in the country. On every occasion when symptoms of a rising revolutionary movement was observed, British agents in Palestine provoked national massacres, pogroms, and by this means paralysed, even though only for a time, the revolutionary movement in the country. Such pogroms took place in 1920 and in 1921. As a result, during the period when revolutionary risings were constantly sweeping over Syria (to some extent also Transjordan), in Palestine all was "peaceful and orderly"—except for the pogroms and nationalist collisions.

Such was the significance of Palestine for Britain, such was the rôle of Zionism in British imperialist policy.

The recent events in Palestine provide the completion of the political system, of the British colonial régime. They were undoubtedly organised by British agents, provoked by the Zionist-Fascist bourgeoisie, and arranged by the Arab-Mahommedan reaction. It is true that the organisers and instigators did not fully succeed in carrying out their aims. What happened went beyond the limits assigned by the British imperialists, and over the heads of the Zionist-Fascists and the Mahommedan feudal chiefs there arose a wide-sweeping revolutionary wave in all the neighbouring Arab provinces. A little incident on a religious matter at the "Wailing Wall" developed into an Arab national movement of revolt.

Why was Britain—and particularly a Labour Government—interested in provoking a national collision in Palestine just at that particular time? For several reasons. If we do not accept the version that the British Commissioner, Chancellor, to please the Tories, wanted to cause trouble for MacDonald, there are, nevertheless, a whole series of more substantial motives and causes. In the first place, the Labour Government, forced to conclude a political treaty with Egypt, was faced with the awkward question of safeguarding the Suez Canal. According to the Henderson proposal, in its treaty with the Egyptian Government, Britain will undertake to evacuate Egypt (even though only in form). This fact drives the Labour Government to strengthen the reserve base for its military forces on the other side of the canal, that is, in Palestine. It was necessary to create a justification for the arrival of new British armies in Palestine, it was necessary to justify in the eyes of the British working masses and of the Labour ministers the fresh enormous costs of the fortifications on the Sinai peninsula and of maintaining a large garrison in Palestine. Protection of the Jews from Arab pogroms was the most suitable pretext for the strengthening of the military régime by the British Labour ministers.

Secondly, Britain definitely wants to win over, in the interests of its imperialist policy, the Jewish bourgeoisie. The Jewish bourgeoisie began to demand from Britain the fulfilment of the obligations undertaken by the Balfour declaration. The Zionist importunities are becoming inconvenient, all the more so because the Zionist leaders are openly treating with American capital. Only recently, at the Zionist Congress in Zurich, a Jewish agency was established, an organisation formed jointly of Zionists and of non-Zionist, chiefly American, capitalists. At the first meeting of this agency a resolution was adopted, asking the British Government to adhere to the carrying out of the Balfour declaration. At the moment there is a sharpening of the Anglo-American contradictions, which are not confined to the Far East but appear in their clearest form in the Near East (the Irak incident, the conflict between the American Consul and the British Chamber of

Commerce in Cairo, American policy on the question of customs reform in Egypt, etc.). At this moment the penetration of American capital, even in the veiled form of Zionist colonisation in Palestine, is extremely unwelcome for the British imperialists. It was necessary to find some pretext which would "force" the Labour Government to make concessions to the Arab bourgeoisie and to quench the flame of Zionist fantasies; and for such a purpose the pogrom is a method for which there is no substitute.

Thirdly, in Palestine itself important social processes are taking place, of which we speak below. Here we need only note that the social-economic conflicts which have developed in Palestine during the recent period have affected not only the Jewish advance guard but also fairly wide masses of workers and peasants. The imperialists wanted to stop or delay by some means or other the growth of solidarity between the Jewish and Arab working masses.

CLASS DIFFERENTIATION IN PALESTINE.

Zionism has not justified itself. In the fifty years of its colonising activity it has only succeeded in settling on the land some 7,500 people, working only 83,000 hectares of land. More than £20,000,000 has been sunk in this colonisation, while the town industries established are very insignificant. The position of the Jewish emigrant-colonists is extremely bad. In the new Jewish centre at Tel-Aviv, of 40,000 inhabitants 30,000 are in receipt of public relief in one form or another; unemployment is on a scale unheard of in such countries. Instead of the intended immigration of large numbers (30,000 to 40,000 a year), there is evidence of a substantial emigration from the country.

Hand-in-hand with its economic bankruptcy, has gone the political bankruptcy of Zionism. The British Government was anxious lest an old "Jewish Ghetto" might be founded in the new "Jewish National Home." British officials turned the Jews out of the State institutions; and they are practically not admitted to the army and the police. Such difficulties were placed in the way of the assumption of Palestine nationality by Jewish emigrants, that in spite of immense expendi-

ture by the Zionist organisation in this connection, the number of Jews who have taken out Palestine citizenship papers is insignificant. The Jewish immigrants are loaded with heavy taxation, while at the same time the schools and hospitals have to be maintained at the cost of the Jewish population itself. The British Government definitely did nothing to help. The Jewish language, the colloquial language of the Jewish masses, is in practice not the official language. The ancient Jewish language, formally recognised by the Government, is not known and is even pushed aside by the British officials. So the boasted Jewish national autonomy in Palestine has been turned into a national group without rights in a British colony. The town council of "the first Jewish town," Tel-Aviv, became subordinate officials of the British commandant in Jaffa.

A deadly blow was dealt against Zionism by the successful colonisation of the Jewish masses in the U.S.S.R. Zionists are looking for some way out of the situation they have created. They make agreements with American capitalists, to whom they sell their Zionist ideals in exchange for financial credits and support; they pass from wide national colonisation to the narrow exploitation of concessions, to the simple business of orange plantations, etc. But with this change of aim there has also gone a sharp change in the economic position of the Jewish workers. Previously the Jewish worker had been put in a privileged position by the Zionist organisations. The wages paid to the Jewish workers were several times higher than the wages of the Arab workers. But now the protected Zionist economy is disappearing. The workers' guilds and co-operatives, which were supported by Zionist capital and carried out great economic constructive work, are tumbling down like houses of cards. The wages of the Jewish workers are falling and approximating to the Arab scale. Along with this economic levelling, there is taking place a political levelling. Class-consciousness of the need for solidarity between the Jewish and Arab proletariat is growing. More and more frequently the Jewish workers are coming out in defence of the Arab peasantry, against the Jewish kulak colonists and exploiters of the colonists.

A great change is also taking place among the Arabs. Thanks to the compilation of the land register, and with the help of the British officials, the native Arab gentry is expropriating the land from the peasants by means of trickery and extortionate transactions, and concentrating in its hands immense areas. The immense sums which have passed through Zionist channels into the pockets of the Arab Effendi have hastened the infiltration of capitalist elements into Arab agriculture. The area of orange plantations is extending, and the capitalist resources and forms of Arab agriculture are increasing. The native Arab gentry is fusing with the plantation capitalists, and is being transformed into a landowning and trading capitalist class. Its interests are bound up with the foreign market. Britain is the chief market for Palestine oranges. This bourgeoisie is at the head of the reformist tendencies in the Arab national movement, which has now entered the path of agreement with European imperialism. Last year, at the Seventh Arab Congress in Palestine, the consolidation of the trading bourgeoisie and the planters was carried through, on the general basis of reconciliation with European imperialism. The trading and landlord groups, which were formerly distinct by birth and dynasty, are now drawing together on the general platform of fighting their Zionist competitors and coming to agreement with British imperialism. Their only demands are the limitation of the rights of the Zionists and the summoning of Parliament.

The penetration of capital relations into the Arab village has resulted in the destruction of former economic forms and the stratification of the peasantry. The landless, expropriated peasantry is growing in numbers, increasing the reserve army of labour in the towns; while the British imperialists are establishing in the villages a hitherto unknown type of Arab kulak. The expropriation of the peasantry is proceeding in two directions: the buying of land by the European colonisers, and robbery by the Arab landlords. These expropriations are producing great agrarian conflicts and the sharpening of class relations in the Arab village.

As a result, we have the development, both quantitative and qualitative, of the Arab town

proletariat. The position of the workers is extremely bad. Female and child labour, hitherto almost unknown in Palestine, is spreading, and is displacing male adult labour (at the Mabruk tobacco factory in Haifa 250 children are employed; a special workshop for women has also been built).

The hard conditions of the workers in general, and of the Arab workers in particular, find expression in a whole series of strikes and other economic conflicts. We must note as something absolutely new the comparatively large number of strikes of Arab workers, and especially their stubborn character. The strike of the Arab bakers in Jerusalem, the strike at the Mabruk factory in Haifa, and a whole series of smaller strikes of Arab building workers are to be noted; there have even been cases of strikes among the Arab agricultural labourers.

There have been a great number of agrarian disorders in the villages, arising not only between the Arab peasants and the Zionist colonists, but there have been many cases also of disputes between the Arab peasants and the Arab landowners. In recent months there have been important agrarian conflicts at Ein-Kerem, Adi-Havaras, Kar, etc. In all of these conflicts collisions took place with the British police, and they ended with arrests and massacres of the participants.

The social basis of the Arab Congress is being undermined. The Arab peasants no longer trust their leaders of the Arab Central Committee, the Islam Mejliss, the highest Mahommedan council. A new movement is beginning, headed by the radical intelligentsia. It is true that this movement has been captured by the Pan-Islamic reaction. It is necessary to note that Pan-Islamism is a fairly extreme opponent of European imperialism, both in Egypt and in other Arab areas. Throughout the country the Mahommedan youth clubs are increasing and multiplying, and are assuming greater and greater significance. At the same time, revolutionary tendencies are growing among the Arab workers. The influence of the agitation and propaganda carried out by the Palestine Communist Party is rapidly spreading. International Jewish-Arab workers' clubs have been started, and on the initiative of the Communist Party a

number of international meetings and conferences have been held. Communist literature printed in Arabic is being widely spread, and is getting a greater and greater circle of readers. The Y.C.L., workers' fractions, the International Red Aid, and the Communist Party are the most active factors in the Arab working class. The imperialists, Jewish fascists, and the Mahommedan reactionaries have opened a raging campaign against Communist "sedition," but without result. The workers' movement among the Arabs is on the increase. The peasant demands are assuming threatening dimensions. We can note the workers' demonstration in Jerusalem, the peasant demonstration in Jaffa, the huge demonstration in Jaffa against the land brokers and speculators, and finally the international demonstration of Jewish and Arab workers on August 1st.

The Arab bourgeoisie, particularly the gentry of the Mahommedan aristocracy, feels the ground slipping from under its feet. It needs somehow to rehabilitate itself in the eyes of the Arab masses; it must somehow stop or paralyse the growth of solidarity between the Arab and Jewish workers. British imperialism comes to its aid with the provocation in connection with the "Wailing Wall." Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem, hoped with the help of a pogrom to re-establish his revolutionary renown among the Arab masses. The Zionist Fascists, for whom it is particularly necessary to stop the growing influence of the Communists and the drawing together of the Arab and Jewish workers, rattle their sabres, organise provocative demonstrations, and hurry forward the moment for the clash. British agents, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, allow Arab fanatics and Jewish chauvinists to arrange demonstrations at the same place and at the same time. The result is a bloody battle, a national massacre. But the British agents, together with the Jewish fascists and Arab reactionaries, have made an error in their calculations: the wind they raised was stronger than its makers. The little conflict in Jerusalem spread to Gaza, Jaffa and Haifa. The echoes of the Palestine events have already been heard in Syria. The Bedouins and the Druses mobilised great forces to help their Arab brothers in their

struggle against British imperialism and its Zionist helpers.

We are undoubtedly faced with a rapidly-growing revolutionary movement of the Arab masses. This movement cannot in one moment find its correct revolutionary path and methods of struggle. It is possible that the official leaders, national-reformists of the type of the Mufti of Jerusalem or petty-bourgeois nationalists of the type of the leaders of the Mahommedan clubs, were able to control the movement in time, directing it on to the wrong, reactionary path, even playing the game of the opposite imperialist camp, and they may again betray to British imperialism the interests of the Arab working masses. But the significance of these events must not be judged by the successes or defeats of the mass attack, but by the immense revolutionary educational part which they will play and are playing in the Arab East. After the treachery of the Arab nationalists in Palestine and Syria, after the treachery of the Egyptian bourgeoisie, it would have seemed to the British imperialists, and along with them to the social-democrats, that the imperialist position in the Arab East was firm and durable. The recent rising of the Arab masses in Palestine has torn to shreds this confidence in the firmness and durability of European imperialism.

The British Labour Government wanted to save itself from a mass rising, and to avoid any unpleasant interference from the United States in such a business. And so the Arab-Jewish massacres in Palestine were staged. The Zionist agents of imperialism and the Mahommedan reaction inflamed the nationalist instincts and religious fanaticism, in order by these means to gain for themselves the possibility of exploiting the masses; they sealed with the blood of Jewish and Arab workers their union with British imperialism.

The Second International has organised in practically every country of Europe and America Zionist-Socialist committees to cooperate with the Zionist adventure in Palestine. The sections of the Second International in Palestine carry on an openly chauvinist provocative policy, their slogans—take the land, get work—being the direct expression of their participation in this bloody massacre.

The Palestine reformists, in agreement with the leaders of the Labour Party, organised fascist bands which played an active provocative part in the recent events in Palestine.

As against the bloody adventurers, the Zionist bourgeoisie, the Pan-Islamists, the British agents, the Arab chauvinists, the hypocritical demagogues of the Second International, the Communist Party of Palestine is the only group which has honestly and sincerely fought against the imperialist reaction and the national chauvinists. For several years the Communist Party of Palestine has been conducting a loyal fight against the Zionist adventurers and a campaign to expose the bourgeois Arab nationalists and the Mahommedan reactionaries. The Party has mobilised the Arab and Jewish working masses under the international banner of revolutionary proletarian class solidarity. It must be noted that even in these nightmare days the spark of class solidarity was not extinguished. Even the bourgeois correspondents mentioned the fact that even in the heat of the religious-chauvinist upheaval in Jerusalem, the Arab workers with great self-sacrifice sheltered and saved the lives of their Jewish worker comrades (the builders engaged on the Rockefeller museum in Jerusalem). The E.C. of the Palestine Party issued an appeal in Jewish and Arabic, calling for class solidarity, for fraternisation, for the uniting of their forces in a common front directed against the permanent enemies—British imperialism and the Arab and Jewish bourgeoisie.

The MacDonald Government showed that it was continuing the colonial policy of British imperialism. This government not only does not lighten the burden of the colonial peoples, but in subtle forms it loads on them new chains, a new burden of subjection and slavery. The Palestine events brought to light a refined policy of violence and robbery on the part of British imperialism and the Premier MacDonald. Before the Communist advance guard in the Arabian East, and in the first place, before the Communist Party of Palestine, lies the historical task of leading the working Arab masses into a wide anti-imperialist stream and to direct it along the course of the agrarian movement. The first chief task is to expose the imperialist

rôle of the MacDonald Government. And the immediate object must be to co-operate with the mass peasant movement in a mighty protest against British imperialism, and to transform this movement into an anti-feudal, anti-theocratic and anti-capitalist movement, freed from the control of the Pan-Islamists, sheiks and feudal landowners.

It is necessary to set up everywhere peasant committees to control the elemental partisan movement and to recover the land from the feudal Effendis and large Jewish colonists. The united revolutionary front of all workers, without distinction of nationality or creed, against imperialism, Zionism and Arab feudal-bourgeois reaction—this is the general slogan which the Party must bring to the Arab and Jewish working masses. The Party must carry on a determined fight against the Right elements, who are against the slogan of a workers' and peasants' Palestine, against the slogan of the agrarian revolution. And at the same time it is necessary to fight in the same resolute manner against the ultra-Left tendencies, which find expression in the completely non-Communist slogan of ejecting all the Jews from Palestine. This slogan brings water to the mills of Pan-Islamic reaction, nationalism and chauvinism. The Jewish proletariat should, together with the Arab workers, form a single general revolutionary organisation to fight for Communism. It is necessary to organise joint meetings of Jewish and Arab workers to protest against British imperialism and bourgeois-reactionary Zionism, against social-fascism, which is supporting Zionism, against the clerical-feudal-bourgeois factions, which exploit the national and religious prejudices of the masses and capitulate to imperialism.

It is necessary to organise widely representative conferences of Arab workers in the surrounding countries—Syria, Irak, etc.—and to give them general political and social-economic tasks. The slogans of the war against British imperialism, and the agrarian revolution, should inspire all appeals and actions of the Palestine Communist Party.

At the same time, the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries, and especially of France and Britain, must develop a wide anti-imperialist campaign against their own im-

perialist governments. The British Party must expose the policy of MacDonald, who is protecting the mandate of British imperialism in Palestine with the aim of subjecting the Arab working masses with the help of the Jewish bourgeoisie and Arab feudalism, with the aim of suffocating the national-revolutionary movement of the Arab masses. It is necessary to organise demonstrations and meetings on a large scale to demand the recall of the British armies from Palestine. The French Communist Party must open a wide campaign among the French proletariat for the liberation of Syria from the French imperialist yoke. The American Party must agitate against American imperialism and the Jewish bourgeoisie which is helping American imperialism to strengthen its influence in

Palestine, against the subjugation of the Arab masses by imperialism.

The workers of the whole world—in particular of the imperialist States concerned—should organise a powerful movement of protest against the British-Zionist adventure. The peasants and workers of Palestine are making heroic efforts to rise to the height of their revolutionary tasks, to free themselves from the tutelage of the Islamic sheiks and the Jewish Zionists, from the yoke of Labour imperialism, but by themselves they cannot withstand the imperialist attack. The advance guard of the European proletariat must respond to the call of the revolutionary Arab masses, it must help them to find their way to the victorious path of revolutionary struggle.

The Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and the British Party

The need for a sharp change

THE new tactical line formulated by the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. has completely justified itself. The British reformists, who as a general rule boast of their moderation and *gradualness* in action, have on this occasion shown astonishing speed in justifying their main characterisation by the Ninth Plenum—the transformation of the British Labour Party into an ordinary social-democratic party. Simultaneously, the trade union bureaucracy have dropped all opposition in connection with the control of the Labour Party, and, merging with the Labour Party, are putting into effect an unconcealed fascist policy both in regard to the workers in the colonial countries and in regard to the workers of Britain itself. Under such conditions and in these circumstances the British Communist Party was certainly under an obligation, in response to the requirements of the class struggle, to follow the line of open and determined struggle against both the control of the Labour Party and the control of the trade unions.

The character of the evolution of the Labour Party is now being confirmed every day. The

second MacDonald Government is still more shamelessly and insolently than the first, carrying out the main tasks of British imperialism, dragging in the mire even those pitiful promises made by the Labour Party at the time of the election campaign. The colonial policy of British imperialism finds its expression in pogroms organised in Palestine, and in the well-known process of pacification. Ramsay MacDonald's international policy finds expression in the repetition of the Curzon demands in connection with the U.S.S.R., and equally in the frankly usurious stand adopted by Snowden, with applause from the whole bourgeois press of Britain, at The Hague Conference. And the internal policy of the pseudo-Labour Government is expressed not only in the fact that it has refused and still refuses to repeal the anti-Trade Union Act and the Mining Eight-Hours Day Act, but also in the active help given by the government to the magnates of the textile industry in reducing the wages of the textile workers.

There can be no comrades in the British Communist Party who do not now realise that the Party would have been politically anni-

hiliated if it had not adopted new tactics at the time of the last election campaign. Even those comrades who most stubbornly opposed the new line realise that it was only these new tactics that gave the Communist Party the possibility of mobilising the most advanced ranks of the British workers and of preparing them for the fight against the MacDonal Government—the government of capitalist rationalisation, imperialist subjugation, and preparation of war against the first Socialist State.

The numerically weak Communist Party was a united party at the time of the election campaign, which held aloft the banner of defence of working class interests. All three bourgeois parties turned the "electoral battle" into a competition as to the means by which the interests of British imperialism could be best, most faithfully and consistently served and the wounds of declining British capitalism healed.

It might have seemed that under these conditions and in this situation the Tenth Plenum of the Comintern would not have busied itself with the British question, which had been correctly formulated first by the Ninth Plenum and then by the Sixth Congress. But instead of this, the report of the Tenth Plenum is conclusive evidence that the Communist International paid special attention to the present situation in the British working class movement, taking as its point of departure the necessity of a sharp and determined change in the tactics of the British Communist Party. Naturally the question arises—what was it that aroused the special interest of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in the situation in the British Communist Party?

It would be a fatal mistake to suppose that the insignificant number of votes received by the British Communist Party at the time of the last elections was the reason for the alarm being sounded and the attention of the International drawn to the situation in the British Party. The whole circumstances of the electoral campaign were such that no one could have expected a *quantitative* success in the first electoral attack of the British Communist Party against all the bourgeois parties, including the Labour Party. The electoral campaign took place in a situation which was

extremely unfavourable for the Communist Party. In the so-called Labour Government the masses saw the only alternative in their fight against the Baldwin régime. And on the other hand, everyone knew that even the British Communist Party had continued the campaign for a Labour Government even after the defeat of the miners, when the whole line of the leadership of the Labour Party and of the trade union bureaucracy had been fully and clearly defined. The Congress of the British Communist Party in the summer of 1927 not only put forward the slogan of the Labour Government, but saw in the subordination of the Government to the Executive Committee of the Labour Party a guarantee that the MacDonal Government would carry out a correct working class policy. In January, 1928, the Central Committee of the British Communist Party, by a majority, continued to defend the idea of the need to fight for a Labour Government. This majority in the Central Committee struggled for a long time against the new line, not only within its own ranks, but also at the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in February, 1928. In such circumstances the first independent stand of the Communist Party against the Labour Party has immense significance in principle, apart from the number of votes won by the Communist candidates.

The electoral campaign showed with astounding clearness the main weaknesses of the British Communist Party and at the same time revealed those opportunist elements which over a long period had been accumulating within its ranks.

In the first place, the elections showed the degree to which the Party had been weakened as a result of its hesitating and wavering policy. Even after the Party had wholly and completely accepted the new tactical line (the Party Congress in January of this year), it was only able to find some twenty odd constituencies in which the Communist organisations were strong enough to put forward their own candidates. In other words, the Party had more or less vigorous organisations only in four per cent. of all the constituencies in Britain. This fact is by itself enough to show to what extent the Party had been weakened in the period between the end of the miners'

lock-out (January, 1927) and the beginning of the electoral campaign (January, 1929).

The Party put forward its own candidates in 25 out of 615 constituencies. But not even in all of these 25 constituencies had the Party sufficiently strong organisations. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the local organisations fully justified themselves only in one-third of these 25 constituencies. And the elections showed that in those constituencies where the Party had strong organisations, it was in a position to fight successfully against the pacifist illusions and against the whole range of demagoguery of the Labour Party. It must be borne in mind that it was just in these constituencies that the Party won some thousands of votes and came out as a serious and active factor in the electoral campaign. We have in view particularly Rhondda, Fife, Dundee and Greenock.

The electoral campaign thus shed new light on the development of the Party after the defeat of the miners. The organisations were falling to pieces, the members of the Party were dropping out of its ranks not only because of and not only in the measure of the depression and repression, but, in the main, because the Party had not been able to bring together and unite the most advanced elements of the working class in the struggle against the reactionaries, who were celebrating their victory after the betrayal of the general strike and the defeat of the miners' heroic struggle. A critical analysis of the events which followed the defeat of the miners shows convincingly that in every case where the Party made a break with its old habits and went right out against the whole reformist leadership, its slogans found active support. It is true, of course, that the defeat of the miners had left a gaping wound in the British working class. The Liberal leaders of the Labour Party and the permanent officials of the trade unions knew how to exploit this "favourable situation" in order to intensify the depression and to support all the repressive measures which were falling like hail on the heads of the British proletariat. But it cannot be doubted that at the same time a wave of intense discontent and revolutionary activity was welling up from the depths of the working masses. To this revolutionary wave was due the fact that

every bold stand made by the Communist Party met with sympathy and support. But the Party did not know how to draw its support from this movement in the lower ranks and to utilise it as its base of operations. Its eyes were turned, as in the past, to every form of understanding with the pseudo-Left elements, who knew how to exploit these understandings in the interests of strengthening reformism in the fight against Communism. Thus the *policy* of the Party resulted in the weakening of its organisational and ideological influence, and in this way strengthened the position of reformism.

The electoral campaign also showed that the Party leadership, after accepting the resolutions of the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, were then unable to get themselves on to the path of resolutely giving effect to these resolutions. It was remarkable that, on the eve of the elections, five members of the Central Committee (including three members of the political bureau) were in favour of supporting the Labour Party candidates in all constituencies where the Communist Party was not running its own candidates. If this proposal had been accepted, it would have meant that in 590 cases out of 615 the Communist Party would have supported MacDonald, and would have fought him only in twenty-five constituencies! It is true that the Central Committee rejected this proposal. But the proposal itself is in the highest degree characteristic: its authors sincerely thought and believed that they were standing on the platform of the Ninth Plenum and the Sixth Congress and that they were fighting opportunism and conciliation!

The elements of opportunism and broad-minded toleration in connection with opportunism came out even more clearly after the electoral campaign. In June last the Central Committee met, and decided, on the basis of the lessons of the electoral campaign and in view of the new tasks facing the Party, to carry out a certain reorganisation in its own ranks. The Central Committee realised the necessity of strengthening the district organisations and curtailing the central apparatus. In connection with this, a new political bureau was elected. The composition of the new political bureau showed a majority precisely of those

comrades who, on the eve of the elections, had been in favour of the idea of supporting the Labour Party.

The British Party delegates at the Tenth Congress attempted to explain this peculiar election on the ground of *practical* considerations. Thus, for example, they stated that the Central Committee, in electing the political bureau, had not had in mind the political line of the candidates, but had only considered how far they were able, from a practical standpoint, to carry out the duties with which they were charged. It is not necessary to demonstrate that this "practicality" has nothing in common with Bolshevism, and that it is a characteristic and typical expression not only of a conciliatory attitude towards opportunism but of direct encouragement of it. In this connection the Tenth Plenum emphasised that the young British Communist Party could not cope with the heavy tasks before it unless it developed a resolute and merciless fight against opportunism in all its manifestations and against any conciliatory attitude towards it. But such a fight is possible only if the Party itself recognises the ruinous path it had been following not only *before* the Ninth Plenum, but also *after* it.

At the same time, in the ranks of the British Party itself a regular revolt against the Party leadership had developed. This revolt found expression in a number of sharp and bitter resolutions, immediately directed against the leadership, adopted at the London District Conference, the Tyneside District Committee, the Y.C.L. conference, etc. The Tyneside resolution runs:—

"This joint meeting of the Tyneside District and Local Committees declares its dissatisfaction with the policy and leadership of the British Communist Party, and demands the calling of a Party Congress to review the policy of the Party and to elect a new leadership capable of carrying out the new line. This Congress should be held within the next three months in order to enable the Party to equip itself for participation in the struggle with a correct policy and with a competent leadership."

We print below extracts from the letter transmitting this resolution to the Central Committee of the Party, in which Ferguson,

of the Tyneside organisation, states that if the Central Committee does not accept the proposal the Tyneside organisation will consider itself justified in appealing directly to the Communist International. The resolution of the London Conference (of July 20) also ends with the demand for the calling of a special Party congress. From the report made by Comrade Lily Webb at the last Plenum of the Central Committee it appears that resolutions on these lines were also adopted in Scotland.

The last meeting of the Central Committee had before it, therefore, on the one hand, the criticisms made by the Tenth Plenum, and on the other hand the rise of a widely-spread movement which had arisen within the lower ranks of the Party *simultaneously* with the work of the Tenth Plenum. The Central Committee could not avoid giving a clear answer to all the questions which had been put to it by the course of events and which had been so clearly formulated by the district organisations of the Party. As the result of a protracted five-day session, the Central Committee worked out the draft of an extensive resolution, which was a serious attempt to make a critical analysis of the whole line that had been followed by the Party, and in the light of this criticism to state the new tasks standing before the Party.

A study of this resolution reveals in the first place that the Central Committee openly and bravely repudiates the theory, according to which objective conditions are to blame for all the misfortunes of the Party. "The chief cause of the present critical situation of the Party," we read, "is the right mistakes committed by the leadership, which interpreted the new line as being merely a changed electoral tactic, and failed to clearly understand it as an entirely new tactical line, a struggle for the independent revolutionary leadership of the masses in all their struggles." (Par. 25.) The Central Committee itself notes that its errors began, not after the Ninth Plenum, but long before the time when the new tactical line was formulated. "The Party's increase in membership and influence in the general strike and the miners' lock-out were not perceived to be the real basis upon which, immediately after the lock-out, it should have

been possible to have consolidated the ideological and organisational influence the Party had won in these conflicts by a sharper attack against the Labour leadership." (Par. 32.) The significance of this point lies in the fact that the Central Committee of the British Party for the first time underlines the extent to which, after the defeat of the strike, the revolutionary movement in Britain required a sharp and clear-cut change on the part of the British Communists. For a long time the British Communists believed that it was possible to make complicated zigzags take the place of a clear-cut change. But these complicated zigzags led the Party to the edge of the abyss, and the Party was compelled to recognise that one of the most essential conditions for its future development is not only the ability to manoeuvre, but understanding of how to make a sharp break with its former habits when conditions require a sharp change.

The chief value of the resolution adopted by the last Plenum of the British Party Central Committee is the fact that it is permeated with recognition of the need for an immediate and clear-cut change. The analysis of the errors made before and after the Ninth Plenum, and right up to the present moment, ends by pointing out that "this situation shows the necessity for making immediate changes in the leadership, in order to guarantee the carrying out of the Comintern line and the carrying on of a persistent daily struggle against the Right danger, which is deep-rooted in the daily life and traditions of the Party." (Par. 28.) The Central Committee breaks with the tradition of a conciliatory attitude, which found its clearest expression in the "practical" selection of a political bureau which puts opportunist elements in the majority. "The Central Committee therefore resolves to remove three members of the political bureau and the Secretariat, and to strengthen these organs especially by drawing in proletarian comrades from the factories. The Central Committee regards these changes as the first steps in the general renewal of the Party cadres." (Par. 29.)

The section of the resolution dealing with the question of setting up a daily paper deserves special attention. The necessity of a daily paper for the Communist Party is em-

phasised in a whole series of Comintern documents. The leadership of the Communist Party has been accustomed to push it off by describing all the difficulties which the advanced section of the British workers has encountered in the struggle for the freedom of the printed word in opposition to the mighty British trusts. Certainly no one will deny the fact that there is hardly a country in the world in which the "freedom of the press" has been so monopolised by finance capital as in England. But the Communist Parties of other countries have succeeded in overcoming obstacles which are not slighter and in some cases are much greater. In the time of the Tsars the Russian Bolsheviks were able to establish their daily *Pravda*, which served as a powerful organiser in the bolshevisation of the working masses. The Communist Party would not be a Communist Party, if it did not know how to surmount such obstacles and to start a real mass campaign which would arm the revolutionary proletariat of Britain with their own daily printed paper. "Whether the Party earnestly means to carry out the above tasks will be shown by what is done to establish a national daily paper. . . ." Without this powerful instrument of agitation the daily independent leadership of the Party cannot be realised. The publication of a daily by January 1st is the supreme task, which must be pushed to the forefront in all of our campaigns. This is a gigantic task, because of the trustified character of British newspaper production, and it can only be accomplished by the mobilisation of all Party members and sympathisers in building up a capital fund." (Par. 60.)

The formulation of the task is clear enough. But the whole question now is, to what extent this task, and also other tasks which have been laid down in this recent resolution, will be carried into effect. *The question of a daily paper is the question of the organisation of a mass Communist Party in Britain.*

There can be no shadow of doubt that within a very short time Britain will enter the arena of serious class struggles. The Labour Government of MacDonald has already clearly defined its policy. It stands for the continuation of the "glorious traditions" of Baldwin and for what is in fact a coalition

with the older ruling parties, with the Baldwin Party in the forefront. On the other hand, millions of workers gave their votes to the Labour Party in the hope that it would bring them some improvement, however slight, of their terrible conditions. The MacDonald Government has already begun ruthlessly to beat down these hopes (the textile workers' struggle). It is already drunk with those easy victories which it won in the battle against the revolutionary workers after the crushing of the miners' struggle. Its eyes are constantly turned, not on the workers, but on the bourgeoisie, which is now still more insolently and frankly proclaiming continued attacks on the workers' standard of living, under the protection of the "Labour" Government.

The workers are being stirred up to a more active struggle. In present conditions the Communist Party, if it follows the correct line, is the only Party which can take the leadership of the economic and political struggle of the British working class. For this, however, a *decisive change* is necessary. The resolution adopted by the full Central Committee shows that the Party leadership understands and recognises the ruinous nature of the political line which it had been following over a long period and right up to quite recently. It is necessary that all members of the Party should be permeated with the recognition of the importance of those tasks which have now been laid on their numerically small party, which at the present moment is the only revolutionary party of the British working class. The class war in Britain itself has immense significance, not only for the British proletariat, but for all the colonies and semi-colonies of the British Empire (and in the first place, for India), and also for the working class of the whole world. The negative side of the Central Committee's resolution is that it does not devote sufficient attention to the task of fighting against the pseudo-Labour Government of MacDonald, and only makes a superficial reference to the organisation of active help for the revolutionary movement in the colonies.

A correct and clear political line in the leadership of the British Communist Party is the *first* condition for the recovery and strengthening of the Party. The subsequent step

must be the firm and resolute *carrying into effect* of this correct line.

The Position in the British Communist Party

(From the reply of the reporter on the first point of the agenda of the Tenth Plenum of E.C.C.I.).

I WANT to dwell now on a very important question which faces the Comintern at the present time—the question of our British Communist Party. Our British comrades must not think that because to-day the Comintern is giving so much attention to the line of the British Communist Party, it means that the Comintern places them among the weaker sections of the Communist International. No, comrades, we do not look on the British Communist Party as a step-son, but as a Party which in present circumstances is faced with most responsible and heavy tasks.

The speakers who have joined in the discussion on the British question fall into two groups. The first group consists of those severe critics of whose pronouncements Comrade Khitarov's speech is typical. Comrade Khitarov demonstrated in his speech just how one should not criticise the British Party. But the speeches of the British comrades Campbell, Horner, and especially the speech of Comrade Bell, were models of how one should not defend the British Party.

Let us begin with Khitarov's speech. He said, criticising the British comrades: "But if the British Communist Party, after the world war, after the great political lessons in the course of this period, after the lesson of the general strike, and in spite of the fact that the Party controlled the Minority Movement in Britain, which embraced nearly a million workers, at the elections secured only 50,000 votes, this is a result which gives cause for serious reflection." I want to correct here certain comrades, who affirmed that Comrade Khitarov spoke of defeat. He did not go as far as that; he only urged serious reflection in connection with the elections.

I do not want to make any mechanical comparison between the British Communist Party and the C.P.S.U. But there was a time when

our Party found itself in a position closely analogous with that in which the British Party is now situated. Let us take for example May and June of 1917. It was after four years of imperialist war, when the masses stood under arms, tired and worn out. We were living then, during May and June, not after a general strike, but after a rising of the workers and peasants which had overthrown the monarchy. In May and June we had already the Soviets, we had an immediate revolutionary situation, and, nevertheless, in April and May we were only small groups in the Soviets against a general background controlled by the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries. At that time it never came into any one's head to reproach the Bolshevik Party with its being only a small group, because the masses, in their actual experiences, were passing through a great political school. And at the present moment, in Britain, where an immediate revolutionary situation does not exist, the masses are passing through this school even more slowly.

We should not attack the British Communist Party because it only got 50,000 votes, but we should give it support, and not allow defeatist tendencies to spread within it. We should build an iron wall around it, to protect it from international social-democracy and all the renegades who are now slandering it. This is what the renegade Roy writes in connection with the British Communist Party:

"If the Party acts in accordance with the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern and the Fourth Congress of the Profintern, it will isolate itself still further from the masses. Tactics which lead to the creation of new trade unions are catastrophic in any old capitalist country. But nowhere would this have such immediately catastrophic results as in Britain."

How does the Brandler organ *Against the Stream* judge the results of the elections?

"The estimate of the position given by the Executive Committee of the Comintern was completely false. In the eyes of the majority of the British workers, the Labour Party was not 'exposed' either by its participation in the Government of 1924 or by its treachery during the miners' strike. On the contrary, Labour

was able to get an even more substantial majority to enable it to carry on the work it had begun in 1924 and which had so soon been ended."

Vorwaerts says that the British Communist Party after the elections has ceased to exist as a factor in the class struggle.

The whole of the bourgeois press is now dancing a death dance round our British Communist Party. In such circumstances every word must be carefully measured. But what Comrade Khitarov said in his criticism of the British Party was not so dangerous. Much more dangerous were the speeches of certain British comrades incorrectly defending the British Party. We put to the British comrades the simple question: How is it that those individuals who were the first to defend the tactics of "class against class" have been removed from the controlling organs of the British Communist Party? How did our British comrades answer this question? It was Campbell who made the first reply. He said that it was not in the traditions of the British Communist Party to divide the Party into the sheep and the goats, into those who supported the line and those who did not support it, that they were all united in the ardent desire to carry out the general line with a united front. He considers that such a division would elate some comrades, on the one side, and on the other side, would offend other comrades. I am not acquainted with British manners: it may be that what he says is so.

But we are not people of etiquette. We express our misgivings in Bolshevik language.

What are the causes of the weakness of the British Party? Your first mistake, comrades from Britain, was that you succumbed to the tendency to depression after the general strike in 1926. You did not swim strongly enough against the stream. The British Labour Party and the General Council of the Trade Union Congress betrayed the general strike, and then they put in circulation the idea of depression, putting forward the slogan "Never Again." It was a definite class strategy: first to divide, then to allow the separate sections of the proletariat to be beaten down, first in the general strike, and then in the miners' lock-out; and then afterwards to cultivate the tendency to depression, to throw the responsibility for the

defeat on to the workers themselves. This was the strategy of the class enemy. And it seems to me that our British comrades did not put up a strong enough fight against these elements of depression.

In this connection the most characteristic point, disclosing remnants of these tendencies to depression, was Comrade Campbell's speech. What did he say? "It is a good thing," he declared, "that for the first time the Comintern has recognised that we in England have been and are swimming against the stream."

Pardon me, comrades, but this was not the only thing that the Comintern recognised, and it was not for the first time that it recognised it. We take the difficulties of your struggle into account, and for that reason we criticise Comrade Khitarov a little and draw him off, but at the same time we do not think that the only thing facing you is depression, that you are swimming only against the stream. You have had in the working class movement in the past certain elements of depression, certainly, but you have had also the radicalisation of the masses. The situation with you is much more complicated than either simple depression alone or simple radicalisation. You have the remnants of depression from the 1926 strike, *plus* the developing radicalisation of the masses on the basis of capitalist rationalisation. But you have not shown us this combination of the elements of depression and radicalisation. This combination gives the peculiar course of the movement which we observe in Britain. There the transition takes place, not directly in a single step from supporting the Conservatives or Liberals to Communism, but through an intermediate stage—the Labour Party.

And, comrades, we do not blame you for this. We remember and we recognise that even our own masses, in an immediately revolutionary situation, in 1917 did not come directly into the Communist Party, but through the stage of the Social Revolutionaries. There was an epidemic of this serious disease. We know also that the lessons of the transition through this intermediate stage will be different with you, where there is not an immediately revolutionary situation, from what they were with us in 1917.

It seems to me that the cause of the slow radicalisation of the British working class is connected to some extent with the slow tempo of rationalisation in Britain, to which some speakers have already referred. But if it is true that the MacDonald Government is a government of capitalist rationalisation, that is precisely why, comrades from Britain, we are now stating what we expect of you. This is the time that we ask you to become a mass party of the British working class on the basis of the disillusioned masses of the British Labour Party. We want to take measures in advance, we want now to prepare our Communist Party for the immense part which will have to play, and this is the reason for the great interest which this Plenum is taking in the British Party.

What was your second error?

It was that a considerable section of your Party comrades went into the fight under the slogan of class against class, not from conviction, but from discipline. We are glad that you are a disciplined party, but it is not possible to imitate conviction. The masses become infected by conviction, but the lack of it drives them away. You lost much valuable time in a peculiar kind of passive Gandhi-ism in connection with the introduction of the new line, instead of mobilising the masses. You considered for too long. For example, even in 1927 British comrades supported the slogan of a Labour Government. Through this you gave the Labour Party a powerful weapon against you at the time of the elections. The British Labour Party quoted your speeches and articles in defence of your former line.

Moreover, because of this lack of conviction in the correctness of your own line, you mechanically accepted the line of the Communist International. I remember the first draft of the thesis put forward by the Central Committee at the last Party Congress. Everything was in it—the third period, and struggle against the Right and the conciliators. But at the same time we cannot understand at all how this third period appears in British conditions. What concrete forms does the third period take in Britain? It was an extraneous insertion of the third period into the resolution, a kind of copy, and not an analysis of the concrete conditions of the period in

Britain. The correct articles of Palme Dutt and Page Arnot, pointing out that it was wrong to represent the new line of class against class as a line for the electoral campaign, that this line must permeate every section of the Party's work, did not meet much sympathy in your ranks.

But, comrades, the majority of the British Party was inclined to regard as agitators those comrades who made an effort to put the question in that form; exactly as you now, for example, regard Gallacher: a restless fellow, he interferes with work. Comrade Horner's speech, in which he attempted to give us a caricature of Gallacher, was not a correct speech. We have known Comrade Gallacher for a long time; he has his shortcomings, but he has also his brilliant qualities. Comrade Gallacher may come out against the new line, but after he is convinced of its correctness he will defend it as a Bolshevik should. It was not without reasons that, years ago, it took Lenin ten hours in discussion with Gallacher to convince this obstinate, stubborn Scot of the necessity of entering into the Labour Party.

The third error of the British Party was—your relations with Maxton and Cook. Here, in connection with Maxton and Cook, you kept intact the umbilical cord connecting you with the old set of conditions. You could swear as much as you pleased that you were for the new line, but in connection with Maxton and Cook, in connection with the Left of social-democracy it was clear that you still had some doubts, that you had not beaten down this gnawing demon of doubt. Your relations with Maxton and Cook were a kind of last barrier, which had to be surmounted before it was possible to show, not in words but in deeds, your conviction of the correctness of the new tactics.

I shall now put the question: Has the British Communist Party surmounted this barrier? No, comrades, it has not yet got past it. We have learnt with considerable surprise that, after Cook had been carrying on an agitation during the elections for the Labour Party, after Cook had opened up a raging campaign against the Communist Party, our British Party was so polite in its dealings with him that it invited him on to the committee for the aid of the victims of the

Indian revolution (the Meerut Prisoners' Defence Committee). The British Party thus gave Cook the opportunity to maintain the legend of his leftness. To expose Cook is also to expose the Labour Party, to expose the MacDonald Government. The comrade who does not expose Cook weakens his criticism of the MacDonald Government.

Your fourth error has been—your extreme, insular isolation. (Losovsky: This was a mistake from birth.) No, Comrade Losovsky, this was not a mistake from birth. I think that here we must blame, in the first place, their *political* birth. How can it be explained that all the fundamental problems of the Communist International pass over the head of our brother party in Britain? It is not that the British Party does not pass resolutions, has not reacted to the main questions. No, it did react to these. But in all of them there was no perception of the deep organic connection between all the problems of the world workers' movement. All of these problems appear as a kind of compulsory assorted consignment in the activity of the British Party. We have everywhere had great political discussions during the last few years. For example, think of the number of questions that have been passionately discussed by the German Party. The German comrades subject every word spoken, whoever the speaker, to a most severe examination. They do not allow any deviation from the line, they strike at every small deviation, no matter who the person involved may be. In the Polish Party also we have seen a series of similar important discussions. In the British Communist Party there is some kind of peculiar system, which can be characterised somewhat like this: the Party is a society of great friends. For example, at the last Congress of the British Party such a worthy comrade as Comrade Campbell read a report, and in this report, after all the fight we have had in the German Party on the question of control over industry, Comrade Campbell so to speak once more dragged out the slogan of workers' control. (Campbell: That is not true.) Comrade Campbell, so much the better if it is not true, and I am prepared to be proved a liar in order that we may celebrate the bolshevisation of the British Party.

Not once were the main problems of Right or ultra-Left deviations dissected in the British Party. Comrade Bell got up here and said that we have in the Comintern some malicious specialists for hunting out deviations. I do not know to whom Comrade Bell refers: I would like to have the names and exact addresses of these evil geniuses of the Comintern who disturb Comrade Bell's peace of mind. Take for example our youthful Y.C.I. We have a section of young workers who have recently come into the Communist International, who keenly follow every point of difference within the Comintern. Is this good or bad? It is good. This watchfulness is an element in the bolshevisation of the Party. But what Comrade Bell said is an element of conservatism, which we must denounce and fight, in order to prevent the Communist Parties from becoming congealed at the height of knowledge they have reached.

What is the solution, comrades? We must now, at this time, prepare our Party for the great part which it will have to play. The solution lies, in the first place, in a bold, open, bolshevik self-criticism by the Party of all aspects of its work, without fear of offending someone, without fear of treading on anyone's toes, of hurting someone's self-respect. Friendship does not make it less necessary to separate the revolutionary grain from the chaff.

We congratulate the British Central Committee on its ability to hold together, but it seems to me that it is sometimes necessary to drive in little wedges, not because we want to split the Central Committee, but because it is necessary to put life into its activity, to raise its ideological level, its attentiveness to the most important problems.

The second task is: the British Party must radically review all its methods of work. In this connection Comrade Piatnitsky made a speech that was very useful and to the point. Comrade Piatnitsky drew the attention of the Plenum to the question of the organised carrying into effect of all our decisions. Take our British Party: what do we find there? A decline in the number of factory groups, or, to speak more correctly, the absence of factory groups. The cause of this lies in the fact that the British Party thinks of the possibility of

Party work only through the apparatus of the trade unions. This has its favourable aspect: the British Party is the party that has done the best work in the trade unions. But now it has a very negative aspect: in essence it is the result of trade union traditions affecting our Party. To break through to the factories and to entrench itself in them by means of factory groups is now the main task of the British Communist Party.

Moreover, it is necessary to enter into every form of economic struggle in order to expose the MacDonald Government on this field, as a Government of war, capitalist rationalisation, and colonial oppression.

A further essential task, which you have already begun to carry out, and which you must go on with, is active help for the Indian revolution. If the British Communist Party does not help the Indian Communists, who will help them? The Plenum should demand from the British Communist Party the most active help for them. You are still a weak Communist Party, but on the basis of your own experience you can already give the Indian Party some help. You have been subjected to tests and have come through them fairly well. You were tested at the time of the British general strike. And we then had to record, that even before it had received the Comintern directives, the British Party had taken similar decisions independently, on its own initiative. This shows that the British Party has already passed a certain test of political maturity.

Finally, one of our central tasks must now be the starting of a daily paper. If the Party under present conditions is not able to start a daily paper as an organ for the concentration and mobilisation of the proletarian masses, then the Party's activities cannot achieve their fundamental purpose. Remember the part played by our *Pravda* during the years of reaction. And the situation with you is certainly more favourable. The Party must band together round this paper the widest masses of the workers, it must create a net of worker correspondents, build up a strong fund for the paper. The starting of this paper is an elementary condition for the transformation of your Party into a mass Party. There is something absolutely incomprehen-

sible in the anomaly that the tiny Belgian party has its daily paper, but the British Communist Party, a party standing at a most responsible post, which is destined to play a most important rôle in the fate of the world revolution, up to the present has not had its own daily paper, has not had the speaking-trumpet through which it can speak to the working masses.

Memorandum to the Central Committee of Communist Party of Great Britain

by R. Palme Dutt

AT THE PRESENT STAGE

The present stage of the British working class movement requires the existence of an active independent leading Communist Party to awaken and organise the independent struggle of the workers against the Labour Government and the capitalist-reformist alliance, and against the shackles of the Labour Party and trade union machinery. Any hesitation, vacillation, depression or lack of confidence of independent leadership at the present stage is fatal. The next twelve months are the testing time for the future of our Party. If we fail to harness and lead the gathering opposition of the workers, the movement will go past us and find other forms; and there will be long delay and heavy obstacles in reaching the ultimate outcome of the mass Communist Party.

Therefore at the present stage the question of Party leadership is more critical than at any previous point. *It is not enough to have a formal acceptance of a correct policy. It is necessary to have a leadership which fully embodies, is convinced of, and is able to realise in action the correct policy, which is able to transmit the energy of independent leadership to the membership, and not act as a buffer or delaying mechanism between the international line and the membership.* We cannot afford more mistakes. We must set ourselves to exterminate every sign of weakness, hesitation or scepticism in the Party leadership.

In the previous period the Party has still been in the process of growth and learning. Mistakes were still regarded with a measure

of indulgence as incidental to the process of learning. It was not necessary to regard a mistake as the inevitable expression of a tendency, but rather as a simple expression of inexperience. It was still open to question how far there was a basis to speak of tendencies within the Party leadership. This period has ended. The process of growth and learning now takes on a sharper form, because we are faced with the direct responsibility of independent leadership. It is no longer sufficient merely to "recognise" a mistake after it is pointed out, and pass on. It is necessary to draw out by the roots the *tendency* revealed by the mistake and brand it. If, after correction, similar mistakes are repeated, then we have to recognise that we are faced with a fully *formed tendency*, which we have to fight; and we have to be prepared to draw the necessary conclusions, including those with regard to changes of leadership.

WHAT IS THE RIGHT TENDENCY?

In essence, the Right tendency is, over-estimation of the strength of capitalism and capitalist stabilisation, under-estimation of the radicalisation of the working class, wrong relationship to social-democracy and Left social-democracy, lack of confidence in the independent leadership of the Party; and, on the basis of this, *surrender to depression, pessimism, scepticism, passivity.*

The basis in England for the Right tendency is especially strong. (1) England is the traditional country of bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism and the corruption of the working class. (2) A very strong Labour Party is confronted by a very small Communist Party. (3) There is a lack of revolutionary Marxist traditions and training. (4) In its social composition, the Party still lacks firm roots in the factories.

The forms of the Right tendency in England may be abundantly illustrated from the mistakes already recognised. It is not necessary for present purposes to give detailed examples; but important ruling types may be borne in mind. Such are (1) overestimation of capitalist stabilisation and working class depression, and incorrect treatment of the significance of the General Strike; (2) scepticism of the independent line of the Party and

of the present line of the C.I. and R.I.L.U.; (3) passivity and legalism in trade union questions; (4) passivity on the question of the daily; (5) attribution of Party weakness and limited influence solely to objective conditions or organising causes, without consideration of faults of the political line; (6) tendencies to bureaucracy in inner-Party questions, lack of adequate or spontaneous self-criticism, discouragement of discussion. Comrades on the C.C. will no doubt be aware of many further examples in discussions on the C.C. or in private conversation, revealing very much more blatant forms of unconcealed pessimism, direct hostility to the present line of the Party, antagonism to the International and its "interference" or "ignorance" of British conditions, distrust of the membership, etc.

It is the duty of every member of the C.C. to fight directly and mercilessly every sign of such expression or tendency.

THE GREATEST DANGER IS THE VEILED RIGHT TENDENCY OR CONCILIATIONISM

The Right danger, when it is open and openly expressed, is more easily fought, because it is in manifest opposition to the international line. *But the great danger is when the Right tendency endeavours to conceal its opposition to the international line under the form of acceptance, i.e., conciliationism.* This is the principal danger against which we must concentrate our fight.

Conciliationism is the formal acceptance of the international line, combined with failure to carry it out in practice, i.e., practical opposition. This may take many forms. It takes an extreme form when there is direct resistance to effective execution, "interpretations" of the international line in such a way as to destroy its meaning or conceal its difference from incorrect lines, etc. This is in effect conscious sabotage. But it may take more subtle forms, when the process is less conscious or even unconscious, when there is simply lack of conviction or enthusiasm in carrying out the line, when acceptance has been honestly given, but the habits of thought move along old lines, etc. This last form is particularly important, because it can be largely involuntary and unconscious; never-

theless, in its objective effects, it can be as harmful as direct and conscious opposition. All forms of conciliationism necessarily unfit for effective leadership at the present stage.

To sum up. We speak freely at present of the Right danger and the necessity to combat it. But it is not enough to speak of the Right danger in general and leave it at that. It is necessary to bring out precisely and unmistakably and in detail the character of the Right danger *in our Party*, and in relation to the tasks of our Party, and to establish the understanding of it clearly both for ourselves and for all members, and the methods to combat it. I have attempted here to make a first approach to this question, which may serve as a basis for the C.C. to take up and carry further.

There are two other points I should like to bring forward. The first is on finance. With the heavy demands in front, both of the Daily and future elections, we have got to give very serious attention to this, and to enlisting more effectively the co-operation of the membership and of the sympathetic workers. We need, first, to make new and the widest possible efforts to secure the help of voluntary workers so as to diminish expenditure at the centre; and second, to give far more prominent attention to the raising of funds, which still remain too much as a neglected corner in our publicity and work, instead of the centre of it. The question of finance is not simply a practical question, but is a very important measure of the real strength and degree of political support we are able to win in the working class.

The second is on the main line of our propaganda and campaign immediately ahead. It is essential, with the completion of International Red Day, that we should fix clearly and concentrate our main campaign in front. The central issues for us are the Labour Government, the war danger and the economic struggles. But what is the form of the campaign? It is not sufficient to set before us the general aims of exposure of the Labour Government, agitation against the war danger, participation in strikes, etc. The character of the present situation is that a growing unformed body of working class criticism towards the Labour Government is

gathering, but that it lacks definite shape and leadership. Our task is to give this opposition shape and leadership, so that it shall not disappear into disillusionment (and the decaying of the existing working class organisations), etc. But to achieve this, we need a United Front campaign; and it is just this that we have neglected during the past year. We speak of forming local united front committees, etc.; but we have not a clear united front programme of demands at the centre of all our propaganda, uniformly and continuously brought out, to rally and organise the working class opposition and form the basis of united front committees. We need now to work out our united front demands for the campaign of the period immediately before us against the Labour Government, centring on the Labour Government, the war danger and the economic struggle, and embodying the few central demands capable of securing the widest possible mass support (against the Labour Government's armaments programme; for immediate unconditional relations with the Soviet Union; Repeal of the Miners' Eight Hours and Trade Union Acts; Unemployed demands; united wage struggle). Having worked out our united front demands for the present period, we need to centre our propaganda and campaign around these throughout the country, organise around them, hold local conferences, build local united front committees, and so pave the way to the future wider Left-Wing movement around the Party's leadership.

Extracts from Comrade Ferguson's Letter accompanying the Tyneside Resolutions

"On June 28th Comrade Ramsay came to Newcastle with a letter from Lily Webb, who had been selected by the Party Centre as Party candidate.

This letter clearly indicated that the election fight was to be a nominative one and not a demonstrative one, as the following quotation from the letter shows:—

'We have explained to Ramsay, and would be glad if you would note for your own infor-

mation that we have fixed the sum of £150 as the maximum to be spent on the contest over and above the nomination deposit.'

Ramsay himself came to Newcastle quite clear that the fight was *not* to be only a demonstrative one.

Finally, I quote from Frank Bright's (Manchester District Organiser) letter to the Party Centre, dated July 16th, in which he protests at the sudden decision to refuse to allow the Party candidate to go to the poll. He writes:—

'When I saw Comrade Murphy on Sunday, June 30th, he gave me to understand that a decision had been arrived at to contest Preston and that a certain sum had been allocated over and above the deposit, from which we could come to no other conclusion than that it had been definitely decided to contest Preston.'

It is quite clear that it was intended to go to the poll.

Preston is in the heart of the cotton textile industry of Lancashire. The main aim of the election fight should have been to prepare the workers for the cotton fight. Yet on July 15th, when lock-out notices had already been posted against 500,000 textile workers, the Party Centre suddenly decided not to allow the Party candidate to go to the poll.

The workers in Preston have been deceived because they were told our candidate would go to the poll.

To take this action when the biggest struggle since 1926 is impending is nothing short of a political crime of the greatest magnitude. Joss was sent down to Preston to investigate. His typewritten report is purely organisational and concludes as follows:—

'In view of the poor response of the workers . . . at Preston, I raised the question of whether in the circumstances we should make it a demonstrative fight.

Bright and Lily and Ramsay were entirely against this course.

This matter should be considered. Estimate less than 1,000 votes. The percentage polled will be small.'

It is absolutely untrue that the response of the workers has been small. But if it were true, it would not alter the fact that this is a pure social-democratic view-point. We are

not in the fight for votes primarily, but to prepare one half million workers for a great struggle. This the Centre refuses to understand."

Resolution of the Tyneside Organisation

This Joint Meeting of the Tyneside D.P.C. and L.P.C. declares its dissatisfaction with the Policy and Leadership of the British Communist Party and demands the convocation of a National Party Congress to discuss Party Policy and to elect a new leadership which will operate the New Line.

This Congress to be called within the next three months so as to enable our Party to equip itself to enter the impending struggles with a correct policy and competent leadership.

Resolutions of the London District Labour Party on the Closed Letter of the E.C.C.I.

The membership of the Party in the London District welcomes the Letter of the Comintern to the British Party, accepts the political line contained therein, and records its appreciation of the International leadership of our Party, the value of which is demonstrated to all members by its criticisms of the British Party as contained in the Closed Letter.

We note that the Central Committee of the Party accepted the Closed Letter of the E.C.C.I. also, and agreed to remedy the weaknesses and errors to which the C.I. drew our attention. Despite this, the Central Committee has as yet done very little towards carrying their decision into effect, and has done nothing at all on some of the main questions dealt with in the letter. This attitude, the acceptance of criticism and subsequent failure to operate appropriate measures, is typically "Right" and emphasises the seriousness of the dangers facing the Party.

The Closed Letter raised very strongly the following points:—

1. *Trade Union Policy.* In clause (b) of Para. 5, it says:—

"The new line was chiefly accepted as an electoral policy. Very little attention was paid to the Trade Union question. . ."

The third clause of Para. 6 devotes some space to the decision of the Tenth Congress *re* dis-affiliation of unions from the Labour Party, and concludes by stating that this was confused and that "Exactness is necessary."

Clause (i) of Para. 10 states:—

"An end must also be put to vacillation and wavering in the sphere of Trade Union work. In all our Trade Union activity we must be guided by the fact that the Trade Union bureaucracy works in a close alliance with the employers with the object of frustrating strikes and to guarantee an undisturbed enforcement of capitalist rationalisation. In view of this our struggle against the reformists must be directly linked up with (a) the preparation of the workers for economic conflicts; (b) *simultaneous preparation of the Party itself for the leadership in those conflicts*; and (c) initiating economic fights wherever the conditions are mature . . ."

Notwithstanding the fact that the application of the new line to work in the unions, together with the problem of the unorganised, constitutes one of the most urgent problems before the Party, the *Central Committee has given no decisive attention to this matter, and has not developed an educational discussion among the membership. Trade Union problems remain the most pressing and difficult ones before the membership. In April and again in June the London District discussed work and policy in the Unions, but there has been no national contribution to the discussion. This hesitancy on a question of fundamental importance is a real evidence of the existence of Right errors within the Party leadership.*

2. *Left-Wing elements.* In Para. 6 of the Closed Letter the Congress decision to drop the Left-Wing movement is condemned, and the dangers of the resultant situation drawn to our notice. In clause (e) of Para. 10, the Letter says:—

"On this question of the Left-Wing, it is first of all necessary, not in words, but in deeds, to carry on more intensive work among the radical elements in the localities, and secondly, to find a suitable form of combining the activities of the radical elements under our leadership on a national scale, in order to provide a national centre for the struggle

against the treacherous policy of the Labour Party. The question . . . is an important and complicated question which must receive the careful consideration of the Party."

No steps have as yet been commenced on this matter, which, because of the errors of the past, and the resultant feeling within the Party, demanded that the Central Committee should decide on a line, and discuss it fully with the Party membership in order that political clarity might be secured as a preliminary to success in building up a suitable organisational medium for left-wingers around the Party itself. While the Centre draws attention to the danger of the illusions fostered by such pseudo-Lefts as Maxton and Cook, *the field has been left clear for these dangerous enemies of the working class to pose as the opponents of MacDonald and Mondism*

3. *Party Daily Paper.* The Closed Letter stresses the need for a real campaign on this issue, regarding which, however, very little has been done. The issue is not a real one within the Party, as yet.

The character of the *Workers' Life* (the forerunner of a daily and its best basis) remains thoroughly unsatisfactory. The *Life* has been condemned as "too heavy," insufficiently agitational, and not wide enough in its appeal, by the last Congress of the London District, and was again criticised at the Tenth Party Congress, without result.

This is an aspect of the question of the daily paper of immediate importance, capable of immediate handling, but despite protests and unsatisfactory sales, no serious effort has been made to go into the matter and find remedies.

4. *Self Criticism.* Clause (c) of Para. 10 says: "The importance and significance of self-criticism must be explained to the Party. In this connection we should recall that the resolution of the Ninth Plenum contained a special point on the need for a serious discussion in the Party on all issues."

Up to the present moment the value and meaning of self-criticism in the Party has been insufficiently attended to. Furthermore, the form of criticism within the Party is largely confined (among the membership) to criticism of small internal questions, and the Party is so uninformed on the views within the Central Committee on current problems,

due to lack of information, that there is no encouragement for members to take a constructively critical line on policy, and the principle of self-criticism is not fully understood.

This matter is related to some degree with the clause (g), of Para. 10 in the Closed Letter, which urges that "The inner life of the Party be revitalised on the basis of the utmost initiative of the membership, and carried out in the closest possible relationship between the leading organs and the members."

Finally, we are of the opinion that the facts to which attention is drawn disclose that the Right danger in the British Party against which, the Closed Letter urged "*The utmost energy be exercised,*" still remains within the Party leadership.

The non-application by the Centre leadership of the more important measures laid down in the Closed Letter is no accident, but is in fact the confirmation of the reality of the Right danger in the Party.

In view of the great importance of the issues involved, and our belief that the Central Committee has made no effort to deal effectively with them, this Aggregate Meeting of the London District membership requests the Central Committee to:—

1. Summon a Special Party Congress in October.
2. Make the Closed Letter an Open Letter as the basis for an immediate intensive discussion throughout the Party.
3. Make known to the membership the chief political issues dealt with by the C.C. since the last Congress and the voting on same.
4. Place on the Congress agenda for the Congress the following items:
 - (a) The Closed Letter.
 - (b) The C.C. Report on the Control Commission (remitted to them from the Tenth Congress).
 - (c) Chief political issues before C.C. since last Congress and the voting on same.
 - (d) Question of reports of C.C. meetings and discussions to D.P.C.s and L.P.C.s on main political questions and showing voting on same.
 - (e) Election of new Central Committee.

The Results of August 1st in Czecho-Slovakia

By Paul Reimann

AS part of the Communist International's general campaign for 1st August, the carrying out in Czecho-Slovakia of the international day of struggle against imperialist war acquires special importance. This arises from the fact that the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia is one of the strongest sections in the International and has recently experienced a severe Party crisis which, in its course, led to a complete change in the Party line, to the expulsion of the liquidators from the Party and from the Red Trade Unions, and to an almost complete change in the personnel of the leading bodies of the Party. The Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia, burdened with many elements of a social democratic character, showed itself unequal to meeting the sharper conditions of struggle necessitated by the "third period." It was possible to create a basis for the transformation of the Party, which should be capable of dealing with the new conditions of struggle, only by the most reckless efforts to overcome opportunism in the Party and to exclude all social democratic elements from its ranks. The Fifth Party Congress established the most important ideological preliminaries for this change. It brought about the ideological defeat of the opportunist theories of criticism which had won greater importance in the Party, and particularly in its leading bodies, than the Leninist analysis and Leninist attitude towards the problems of the class struggle in Czecho-Slovakia.

Once free from this centrist ideology, the C.P. of Czecho-Slovakia, after the Fifth Congress, could proceed along the correct line demanded by the new stage reached in the proletarian class struggle in Czecho-Slovakia. It was the adoption of this line which accelerated the desertion of the centrist, "left" social-democratic elements from the ranks of the Party into the camp of the avowed opponents of the proletarian class struggle. After the successful struggle of the Slovakian agricul-

tural workers in May of this year, the organizational separation from the liquidators was completed and they, at a national conference held at Kladno on the 29th and 30th June, formed a separate Party organisation which is, to an increasing extent, taking over the duties of a "left" social-democracy in Czecho-Slovakia.

However, the completion of the process of separation between the Party and the liquidators is not exactly the same as the elimination of opportunism as a whole. Opportunist traditions are so deeply rooted in the daily work of the Party, in all its methods of action, that they can only be entirely overcome by a systematic continuation of the policy of enlightening and cleansing the Party. This continuation of the struggle against opportunist traditions in Party work can be achieved only in the process of carrying on the class struggle itself, for it is the practical application of the new line, its translation from mere Party decisions into the daily life of the working masses, which is alone able to test the capacity of the Party leaders to carry out this policy. Herein lies the great importance of the activity of 1st August for the Czecho-Slovakian Party.

For the first time since the December events of 1920, the Party directed all its efforts towards mobilising the working masses for widespread mass action under expressly political fighting slogans. For the first time since the foundation of the Party the questions of political mass strikes and political fighting demonstrations were put before the Czecho-Slovakian working class. It was to be expected that the development of such activity should give rise to serious vacillations among those Party members, and among those workers who have, it is true, broken with the liquidators, but have not yet been able to dissociate themselves completely from the opportunist past of Party activity. This vacillation was expressed most clearly in an under-esti-

mation of the revolutionary advance of the masses. The opinion that, as a result of the Party crisis which had scarcely been settled, the Party had not the strength to mobilise the masses under slogans of struggle against imperialist war, was held very strongly in certain sections of the Party. These sections thought it necessary to lay the greatest emphasis on economic struggles and then gradually to direct these struggle along the lines of political mass struggle. The necessity of keeping in close touch with the daily economic interests of the working class was interpreted to mean that, instead of the slogans of struggle against imperialist war, the slogans of struggle against the weakening of rent restrictions, against the attack on miners' social insurance, etc., should be placed in the foreground of the activity for 1st August and that the struggle for these partial demands should be used as the basis for establishing united front bodies. These incorrect ideas, held by a large part of the Party, were to be found to some extent even within the Party leadership.

These ideas express a certain underestimation of the intensification of the class struggle. The preparations for August 1st in Czecho-Slovakia showed very quickly that class contradictions are strained to the uttermost and that, in Czecho-Slovakia, too, the open conflict between the bourgeoisie, developing towards fascism, and the masses of oppressed workers, is drawing to a head. The preparations showed that the bourgeoisie is deliberately pressing forward to an open fascist dictatorship, although for the time being it still avails itself of the method of the legal and gradual introduction of new, fascist methods of government. These preparations for an open fascist dictatorship proceeded so far on the eve of August 1st that in actual fact they almost brought about the complete illegality of the Communist Party. The Party press, with one or two slight exceptions, was closed down, meetings and demonstrations were forbidden, not only on 1st August itself, but both before and after that day, Party meetings broken up, as well as the united front conferences held before 1st August, attended by delegates from factories and mass organisations, and, for the first time since December, 1920, not only the leaders of the Party, but numbers of Party

workers and even non-party and social-democratic workers, who had taken part in the preparations for 1st August, were arrested. This first wave of mass arrests resulted in the imprisonment of close on 1,000 active workers all over the country.

In the present situation social-fascism has a double function; in actual practice to support the development towards fascism, while at the same time it must hide this development from the masses. The new social-fascist line of social-democratic party was indicated in the recent strike movements and in the mass exclusions carried out in all proletarian mass organisations. The social-democrats of all nationalities in Czecho-Slovakia are sharpening their fight against Communism, hoping thereby to win a leading position in the work of fascist progress. In its fight against Communism, social-democracy is trying to persuade the workers, by using the past Party crisis as proof, that Communism is a "dying force" in Czecho-Slovakia. In point of fact, the terrorist persecution to which the Communist Party alone is subjected, demonstrates clearly to the workers that the Communist movement, which reformism maintains is "dying," is very much alive and is actually the most feared enemy of the Czecho-Slovakian bourgeoisie. The brutal persecution to which the Party was subjected during its 1st August campaign strengthened the sympathy for the Communist movement even among those workers whom the Party did not succeed in drawing into its 1st August activities. This increase in sympathy forced social-fascism to carry out certain tactical manoeuvres. At first the social-fascists accused the Government of "advertising" Communism by taking such harsh measures against it, declaring that the Communist Party, even if it was not persecuted, had not enough strength to mobilise the masses for 1st August and that in consequence, those measures were superfluous.

In connection with the persecution of Communists, the Celebration Congress of the German-Czech social-democrats at Karlsbad adopted a resolution in which this persecution was described as an expression of fascism (although a few months earlier the social-democratic press ridiculed the Communists for having dealt with the question of the fascist

development of Czecho-Slovakia), and in which it was stated that the suppression of one section of the working class movement (the Communists are suddenly recognised as part of the working class movement) is a blow aimed at the whole working class movement, and that democracy must be defended against the fascist methods of the Czecho-Slovakian Government, for democracy is the "only proper field of struggle" for the working class. These declarations can be explained only by the deep impression which the bourgeois terror has made on the social-democratic working masses. Social-democracy, which is supporting and furthering fascist development, tries to appease its own working class supporters by using radical phrases against fascism. It is trying to utilise working class hatred of fascism to reawaken democratic illusions, by appealing to the workers to "defend democracy." This tactical manoeuvre on the part of social-fascism can be explained only if it is understood to be the results of the growing indignation felt even by the social-democratic workers.

All these factors make for an intense culmination of the class struggle in Czecho-Slovakia. It follows from this that the vacillations towards an underestimation of the possibilities of political mass struggle, which were apparent in the Czecho-Slovakian Party before 1st August, held the concrete danger of the Party lagging behind the development of the mass movement. That the masses do respond to political slogans is proved not only by the increased political demagoguery of social-fascism, but above all by the positive results obtained by the Party in mass mobilisation before 1st August. The united front conferences convened by the Party which took place before 1st August were attended by large numbers of social-democratic, Czech-Socialist, National-Socialist and non-party workers. In Brünn, where no less than twenty factories sent delegates to the united front conferences, a number of social-democratic and National-Socialist workers belonged to the Anti-War Committee. In Gablonz, where mass arrests were made during the 1st August demonstrations, a large number of those arrested were found to be non-party and even "hakenkreuzter" workers. There can be no doubt

that in spite of the defects and deficiencies of the Party's propaganda for the anti-war slogans of the 1st August campaign, the Party did succeed in reaching large sections of workers usually outside the range of Party influence.

If the political vacillation evidenced in the preparations for 1st August was one of the most important causes making for the insufficient success of the Party in mobilising the masses for 1st August, then the incompleteness of the change in methods of work was the second decisive factor that produced the negative results of the August campaign. The Party has failed to carry out that decisive change which is one of the most important conditions for the practical application of the political change. The Party's footing in the factories is still extremely weak and the capacity of Party members to carry on their activities in conditions of fascist terrorism, was wholly inadequate. In particular, a legalist attitude, both among Party workers and Party leaders, exercised a great negative influence on the work of preparing and carrying out action. These legalist feelings were concentrated mainly in the red trade unions, which did nothing at all to mobilise the workers for action, but spent several months of work on the enigma of the Government's probable approval or disapproval of the statutes of the newly-established industrial unions. The questions of changes in strike strategy, of struggle against the Genter system, of changes in the tactics to be used in factory committee elections, of preparations for 1st August—all these questions were buried under discussions on the statutes problem.

Nevertheless, it can be said that, with the growing radicalisation of the masses, August 1st in Czecho-Slovakia did not result in a defeat for the Party, as all its opponents maintain, but that the Party succeeded in making a very definite advance upon all its previous mass activity. On 11th and 12th August the Central Committee of the Party discussed the lessons to be drawn from 1st August and corrected the earlier evaluation which described 1st August as a most serious failure on the part of the Party. The most important thing is that on 1st August the class struggle of the Czecho-Slovakian proletariat assumed entirely

new and much sharper forms. Although the Party issued the slogan that the political mass strike should be carried out "only where possible," although it had from the first renounced any general mass propaganda for this weapon of struggle, the Party's call to carry out a mass strike was answered by no fewer than 17,000 workers who downed tools in the different parts of the country. This is truly a serious beginning for the first political mass strike movement carried out in Czecho-Slovakia, although it must be admitted that, had the Party dealt more energetically with the question, far greater masses could have been drawn into the fight. How strong the feeling was among the masses is shown by the example of Zwickau, where the mere threat of demonstrative strikes forced the authorities to release the workers arrested on 1st August.

A couple of weeks after 1st August the mass strike movement had a sequel in the strike of workers employed in the Inwald glass factory at Prague—one of the largest in the city—who downed tools to demand the release of the political prisoners.

Mass demonstrations in various parts of the country also assumed extremely great proportions. The districts which led the way were the Carpathian-Ukraine, Western Slovakia, and the German-speaking sections of Northern Bohemia, where the movement had a really broad mass character. There were 12,000 demonstrators in the Karlsbad district, 8,000 in Aussig, 6,000 in Reichenberg and more than 4,000 in the Carpathian-Ukraine, where the strike movement was almost 100 per cent. in the most important centres. These figures mean very definite Party progress. It is particularly significant that the street demonstrations in Bovenova—Carpathian-Ukraine—developed into a real fight, lasting several

hours, with the forces of the State, during which time the workers erected a small barricade. All these facts justify us in saying that the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia, in carrying out the recent changes in its whole policy, has not stood still, but, on 1st August took a good step forwards.

In welcoming this success, the Party should not ignore the fact that it was a most inadequate success and that its importance is greatly diminished by the fact that in the Czech parts of the country the most important industrial centres and the largest factories were completely, or almost completely, untouched. In Prague, Brünn, Mährisch-Ostran, Kladno and Pilsen the campaign was most unsatisfactory. In so far as demonstrations in these districts took place at all, they bore no mass character, but were limited to definite groups of Party workers. Not once could the whole of the Party membership be drawn into action in these same areas. This Party weakness in the most important industrial centres was considered very seriously by the Party centre, which arrived at the conclusion that a consistent policy directed towards the activation of Party work must be introduced into the important industrial centres. At the same time the Central Committee dealt with and explained the causes of this weakness, which were described earlier on in the mistakes made in the preparations for 1st August, and measures were decided upon to overcome the political weakness and the many deficiencies in the Party's methods of work. These measures, to be adopted alongside with the continuation of a ruthless struggle against opportunism, which is still apparent in the Party ranks, will create the basis for the further Bolshevik development of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia.

The First of August Struggle in Poland and its Lessons

THE first of August struggle, in which wide masses of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry marched under the leadership of the Polish Communist Party, showed that the party has achieved considerable results in the work of winning over the majority of the working-class and in drawing together these masses in an organised way. In spite of the unprecedented terror carried on by the Fascist dictatorship, in spite of the mobilisation of all the forces of the bourgeoisie and its agents, in spite of the unbridled Fascist-democratic agitation of the treacherous Polish Socialist Party, our Party showed, in a practical form, that it is the *only* working-class Party in Poland which, in spite of all opposing forces, is able to lead into the struggle the working-class and the masses of the revolutionary peasantry and the oppressed national groups. Political strikes, hundreds of meetings and mass demonstrations, technical agitational preparation—such as the distribution of banners and slogans, slogans on the walls of houses, etc.—and all of this in the face of the raging, concentrated terror waged by the enemy, demanded of the Party the greatest exertions and ideological determination, demanded the uniting under its banners of the best of the militant advance guard of the working-class, the instilling into it of revolutionary enthusiasm and confidence in the correctness of the Party line. Without this intense and rapid mobilisation of the Party masses and of the wide working masses, the Party would not have been able to arouse that courage and enthusiasm with which the masses entered into the fight against Fascism, armed as it is from head to foot.

* * * *

The ideological bases for the preparation and organisation of the Red Day were the decisions of the Sixth Plenum of the Central Committee of our Party, which, owing to the internal Party situation, only in June determined the tactical line of the Party for the ensuing period. This plenum, which has immense importance for the life of the Communist Party of Poland, opened a decisive battle against the manifestations of right deviation from the line of the Party, which

showed themselves in an incorrect estimation of the rôle of the Polish Socialist Party, of the Fascist dictatorship, and also of capitalist stabilisation. In its theses, the plenum determined the tactics of the Party in connection with the 1st of August, correctly linking it up with the whole actual situation in Poland, with the economic and political crisis, with the experience of the fascist dictatorship. In addition, the theses noted all the increasing symptoms of rot in capitalist stabilisation and the extremely rapid process now taking place of the revolutionising of the wide masses of the proletariat in town and country, and also of the poor and middle peasantry, besides the definite passing over of the working masses to the counter-attack, which expressed itself in large-scale, bitter strike struggles (both in town and village), in active peasant struggles, in the bankruptcy of the national policy of fascism. The resolution on Red Day, adopted by our plenum as early as June, was in complete agreement with the decisions of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

Putting before itself the task of organising the Red Day campaign of fight against imperialist wars and in defence of the U.S.S.R. as a *vital* task, our Party was compelled to show the maximum of activity and initiative, which would make it possible to arouse the militant activity of the masses and to lead them, under the slogans of the Party, into the fight against the capitalist dictatorship. The resolution particularly emphasised the need to expose—both during the preparations and on Red Day itself—the role of the Second International and its leaders, who, like MacDonald and Muller, stand at the head of bourgeois governments and are preparing war against the Soviet Union.

In Poland the social-fascists, in view of the rapid radicalisation of the masses, are resorting to ever more unscrupulous methods of deceiving the masses. MacDonald's accession to power was used by them for a great pacifist-democratic campaign, with its point directed against the U.S.S.R., and invited to Poland the leaders of the Second International so that they could offer their lying slogans to the masses with this

international sauce. In such circumstances the preparation for Red Day required the widening and deepening of our fight against the Polish Socialist Party, and giving it an international character as a fight against the whole Second International.

In the resolution on Red Day special weight was attached to the popularisation of the U.S.S.R. as the fatherland of the International proletariat, and to explaining to the working-masses the close connection between the fight of the Polish proletariat in defence of the U.S.S.R. and its fight for its own vital interests. The resolution runs—

“In defence of the U.S.S.R. it is necessary to popularise the five-year plan, as the historical achievement of the victorious proletariat, as an immense step along the road to planned Socialist economy. It is necessary to point out what has been achieved, the immense and self-sacrificing participation and initiative of the masses (Socialist emulation), it is necessary to emphasise the immense efforts of the proletariat in the Socialist reorganisation of the countryside (collective farming, Soviet farming), it is necessary to note the immense cultural progress made by the Soviet proletariat in connection with the free development of all nationalities which are united in the U.S.S.R. (emphasising the achievements of Soviet Ukraine and White Russia). The campaign for the sending of a delegation to the U.S.S.R. faces our Party as the immediate task of the moment, and should lead to the breaking down of the Chinese wall set up by the Fascist Government to divide the working masses of Poland from the working masses of the U.S.S.R.”

Underlining the rôle of the Party in the August 1st campaign, as the advance guard of the proletariat mobilising and organising the masses, the resolution emphasises the need to inspire the masses with militant enthusiasm, to popularise the slogans of the general strike and resort to mass political strikes and street demonstrations on August 1st. The resolution laid special emphasis on the need to give the street demonstrations a militant character by means of clearly showing their Communist nature, with Party speakers and banners and slogans demonstrating to the outside world the hegemony of the Party in the revolutionary

movement. In Western Ukraine and Western White Russia the August 1st campaign was to be linked up with the anniversary of the liberation of Soviet White Russia from the Polish occupation, and with the tenth anniversary of Soviet Ukraine.

The Sixth Plenum gave the following directives for organisation and tactics :—

(1) Base the campaign on the factories ; create special groups of action ; elect Red Day committees ; introduce resolutions in the factories, in the pits, in the buildings, at meetings of unemployed ; summon non-party delegate conferences. (2) A wide preparatory campaign in the countryside ; the setting up of peasant committees to organise Anti-War Day ; link up the campaign against war with the permanent struggle in the village and with the peasant resistance to the fascist land and tax policy, with the fight for land, etc. (3) Link the Red Day preparation campaign with the national-liberation struggle of the enslaved people, with the struggle against the Polish occupation and against all national oppression. (4) Strengthen and give the necessary lead to all organisations which unite the masses (mass revolutionary organisations, trade unions, sport organisations, etc.). (5) Strengthen the work among women (women's conferences). (6) Draw into the August 1st campaign the widest possible sections of the working youth. (7) Sharpen the fight against the auxiliary military organisations. (8) Give greater attention to work in the army ; organise conflicts in barracks and on exercise fields (not hurrying, singing revolutionary songs) ; fraternisation with the workers and peasants (marches to the barracks, etc.). (9) Organisation of workers' self-defence corps. (10) Bringing all Party and Y.C.L. publications, from the Party daily to the factory sheets, into the anti-war campaign. (11) Linking up all campaigns in progress with the August 1st campaign.

The points of departure for this campaign are—

1. Sharper fight against social-fascism.
2. A merciless fight against fascism.
3. To make the masses realise that only the U.S.S.R. is carrying out a policy of peace, and that the Red Army is the army of the

international proletariat, defending the building up of Socialism.

4. To show the masses that the struggle against war is a revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and for the proletariat dictatorship, a fight against the Polish occupation of Western Ukraine and White Russia, for the self-determination of the enslaved people, including the right to separate.

5. To make the masses realise that the defeat of the fascist government in a war against the U.S.S.R. is in the vital interests of the working masses, that in the event of a war developing against the U.S.S.R. the duty of every revolutionary worker and peasant is to do everything possible to hasten the defeat of the Polish bourgeoisie, and even to-day to ask the troops to support actively the interests of the workers and peasants.

We must oppose the pacifist deception of the Second International, which is organising for August 4th its own demonstrations under the slogans of "peace" and the League of Nations. On that day the social-fascists will try to distract attention of the masses from the war preparations against the U.S.S.R., advertising the imperialist League of Nations and putting into circulation their pacifist phraseology.

There must also be a campaign in connection with the congress in Warsaw on July 14th of Poles living abroad, which has been organised by the fascist government. In this campaign the Party must expose the fascist and military character of the congress, which is intended to popularise the government among the Polish emigrants, and thus to organise them around the fascist governments' war preparations. The masses must also be informed of the projected visit of a workers' and peasants' delegation from the U.S.S.R., which, if it comes, should be the occasion for mass demonstrations in favour of the U.S.S.R. In the event of the delegates not being allowed to enter Poland, the Party must open a wide protest campaign, and invite the masses to send their own delegation to the U.S.S.R.

The campaign must reach its culminating point on August 1st, but it should not then come to an end. On the contrary, that day should be the beginning of further mass

struggles in defence of the U.S.S.R. and against imperialist wars."

The resolution of the Sixth Plenum was the starting point for a wide campaign within the Party, which by the end of June had drawn in all party organisations. From the reports already received from the district party organisations it is clear that during the month the Party fractions applied the resolution of the plenum and that the Party soon mobilised the whole of its membership, which, in spite of the delay and the short time available, worked up useful ideological material and was thus able to convey to the masses the idea of the struggle against the danger of imperialist war. Thanks to this extensive ideological work carried out by the Party district and local organisations under the guidance of the Central Committee, and also the great publishing activity shown (far exceeding the 1st of May publications), substantial victories could be recorded by the Party in its August 1st campaign to mobilise and organise the masses for the struggle against war.

The publishing activities included the issue of special numbers of the Party and Y.C.L. organs, a number of publications in Ukrainian, White Russian, German and Jewish, a special number of the soldiers' paper and special pamphlets for soldiers, pamphlets on the Soviet Union and the struggle against war, a large number of appeals printed in different languages. But the greatest achievement was the issue of local appeals and leaflets, and factory and Y.C.L. sheets, which considerably strengthened the independent activity and initiative of the masses. This huge number of publications, issued illegally and under conditions of a severe police terror, show that the Party leadership was able, in spite of the fascist dictatorship, to organise a good printing equipment, which in spite of the enemy's strength brought the Party's leadership to the masses through the printed word. Alongside of the illegal publications there were also a whole range of legal ones. It is true that some numbers of these papers were either entirely confiscated, or appeared with white columns where the censorship had had effect. Nevertheless, the Party was able to exploit all existing opportunities allowed by the fascist dictatorship for the distribution of so-called "legal" papers. In spite of the fact that in some places the fascists succeeded in seizing some of the Party literature,

there is no doubt that it reached wide masses of workers and peasants throughout the country, and thus made possible the mobilisation of the masses and the active carrying through of the preparatory campaign.

* * * *

The efforts made, the scope and volume of the preparatory campaign far exceeded the Party's efforts in the May 1st campaign. The letter was carried on for two months, while the August 1st preparations lasted only one month. But although the preparatory campaign was much wider and more active than the May 1st campaign, the actual carrying through of Red Day was weaker. This can be explained, in the first place, by the great exertions made by the police terror, which is now affecting not thousands but tens of thousands of workers and peasants. While the police terror before the 1st of May chiefly affected the Party and the revolutionary militants, in connection with August 1st, it was let loose on other sections. Not being able to cope with the enormous movement among the masses, who expressed their determination to fight war at tens of thousands of meetings and demonstrations, the fascist dictatorship opened an unbridled orgy of terror on the eve of August 1st, and on the day itself, carrying the terror to such a point as we have not experienced since the formation of independent bourgeois Poland. But in spite of the terror, the Party carried through a wide campaign of meetings and mass demonstrations, which roused the masses and mobilised them for the struggle against war.

The struggle against war was linked up with the struggle against the bandit attack of the Chinese generals on the Chinese Eastern Railway, with the campaign exposing the fascist character of the emigrants' congress in Warsaw on July 14th, the demand for the admission to the congress of a delegation of working Poles from the U.S.S.R., with a wide mass campaign for the election of worker and peasant delegates to visit the U.S.S.R., against the social-fascism of the Second International, which, in order to support the treacherous leaders of the Polish Socialist Party, sent a delegation to Poland headed by Vandervelde and Cramp. From the partial reports already received it can be affirmed that the preparatory campaign touched

hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants—not only the proletariat in the large industrial centres, but also in the small towns and hamlets and in the countryside.

In Warsaw the organisation began with a number of factory meetings, linking the anti-war campaign with the metal workers' economic campaign for a new collective agreement, which preceded the anti-war campaign and in which some sixty factory meetings were held. Already after these first factory meetings the factories were inundated with police, who, as the 1st of August drew near, put them literally on a war footing. The factory "Potsisk" was surrounded by horse and foot police, and machine-guns placed at the main gates; the "Zbroevnia" factory by masses of foot police, and the "Paravos" by mounted and foot police, while crowds of detectives were sent inside. This was the position in all the large Warsaw factories.

But in spite of this the Warsaw Party organisation carried on through the whole of July a wide mass campaign of meetings and mass meetings in the factories, breaking into the factories of the war industries which have been closed to them thanks to the terror of the fascists and social-fascists and the factory administration. The Warsaw organisations held 169 mass meetings (in the 1st of May campaign 130); of these the Party organised 97 (May, 70) and the Y.C.L. 72 (May, 60). Of the total, 74 were held among the Polish proletariat, 95 among the Jewish. Most of the meetings (66) were at the large factories employing Polish workers; 17 were held in smaller factories; 56 in trade union quarters, of which most were among the Jewish workers; and finally, street meetings, mainly organised by the Y.C.L., in Jewish areas, numbered 50. In connection with this campaign in the large Warsaw factories, resolutions were brought forward along the lines laid down by the Sixth Plenum, exposing the fascist character of the Polish emigrants' congress at Warsaw and protesting against the refusal to allow a Soviet workers' and peasants' delegation to enter Poland. Thus the Warsaw proletariat was linked with the working masses of the U.S.S.R., which at the same time was conducting a great protest campaign. A feature of the campaign in Poland was the linking up of the question with the Chinese generals' attack on the Chinese Eastern Railway, and the call for

the election of a workers' and peasants' delegation to the U.S.S.R.

The mass campaign resulted in an unprecedented rise in the militancy of the Moscow workers. Even in the war industry factories, from which our comrades had hitherto been kept out by the fascists, social-fascists and management, Communist deputies and speakers were able to appear during this campaign, and the workers reacted quickly to every attack on them by the fascists and their lackeys. The working masses protected the speakers from the fascists, rescued them from the police, and threw out the fascist agitators who were trying to win support for the fascist organisations (at the big Lilpop factory the workers threw out of a meeting an officer who tried to get support for the Government Air Defence League).

In comparison with the number and scope of the meetings the organising campaign gave somewhat small results; in the whole of Warsaw barely eighteen Red Day Committee were elected; of these, eleven were at factories and the rest were at building sites and in the trade unions. It was this poor result in the organisation of committees—the result of a number of organisational defects—led to the weakness in the carrying through of Red Day. The Warsaw organisations issued a mass of literature in connection with August 1st. Apart from the publications issued by the Centre, twenty-one manifestoes were issued in Polish and Jewish, of which seven were distributed in factories, six on an area basis, besides appeals to the soldiers of the Warsaw garrison, etc. But fewer banners were brought out than in the May 1st campaign: on August 1st there were only 94 compared with 200 in May. But the chalking campaign was better than in May, thanks to the energy and initiative of the Y.C.L. and pioneers. The preparatory organisation in the Party itself was good, a special committee controlling the whole work under the direction of the executive.

In the Warsaw-Prigorodnia district, the campaign reached even the most outlying places. In Jirardov four mass meetings were held, including one factory meeting with a thousand workers present, and an anti-war conference of fifteen delegates which elected a committee for the struggle against war.

Our Lodz organisation carried through an extensive campaign. The whole Party and

Y.C.L. organisations were mobilised, and all details worked out. A number of anti-war conferences of factory delegates were organised, at the largest of which (over a hundred delegates from twenty factories) half the delegates were arrested, and it was not possible to elect an anti-war committee for Lodz. There were also several conferences of textile workers. All of these conferences adopted the anti-war resolutions. The meetings campaign covered sixteen large factories and many smaller works and trade union quarters, reaching a total of 50,000 workers. The great meetings on July 19th in connection with the Manchurian events, were attended by some 25,000 workers, and showed the growth of revolutionary spirit in the Lodz working-class. The police made ferocious efforts to drive the masses away from the meetings. There were conflicts with the police, the workers not only refusing to submit to terrorist acts but even themselves attacking the police. Thus, for example, at Balutak the workers dragged a policeman from his horse and beat him severely; at other places the workers attacked the police who had made arrests, rescuing the prisoners on two occasions; and they made several other attacks on the police with stones and sticks. The meeting organised by the Polish Socialist Party, at which Vanderfelde and his colleagues were to speak, was broken up by the Lodz workers, who did not want their lying speeches.

It is true that also in Lodz the campaign did not result in the election of anti-war committees of the workers themselves. Such committees were elected only at two large and a few small factories. As in Warsaw, the Lodz party organisation was not able to do the most important thing—to unite the masses around their own committees—and thereby it made the Red Day demonstration itself more difficult to carry out, in view of the heavy police repression. The Lodz organisationals issued a great deal of local literature in Polish, Jewish and German, and distributed it widely.

In the Dombrovsky Basin also the preparatory campaign was on a wide scale, concentrating on great mass meetings at the pits. Over 12,000 workers gave a warlike answer to the fascist and social-fascist attacks, and adopted with enthusiasm the resolutions put forward by our speakers. Anti-war committees were elected

only through the trade unions, and were not linked up, as they should have been, with the working masses in the pits, and therefore could not play an important part in the leadership of the anti-war struggle. In the Dombrovsky Basin also, wide delegate conferences were not held, as this also weakened the campaign.

The worst campaign of all, however, was the one carried out in the very important industrial area of Upper Silesia. The May 1st campaign had already shown the weakness of our organisation there; the August campaign added confirmation. Apart from a meeting in a large chemical factory at Khojov, the fraternisation at Bitom of a few thousand German and Polish workers, and a small number of meetings in other localities, our Upper Silesian organisation could not manage to organise mass meetings and demonstrations. They did not know how to mobilise the masses with the help of literature, which as the result of some provocative acts for the most part fell into the hands of the police.

The preparatory campaign not only covered the main industrial areas of Poland; it reached every area. Meetings and demonstrations were held throughout Posnanian towns, anti-war committees were elected and considerable agitational work done. The campaign in the Keltzi-Radom district was very well done, where ten thousand workers participated in the factory meetings. At Lublin, where fifteen mass meetings were held, thousands of workers participated. In the Western Ukraine, and even more in Western White Russia, where the campaign covered Vilna and a number of smaller towns and villages, it resulted in developing the revolutionary tendencies in the working-class.

As in the 1st of May campaign, so in this later campaign, the part played by the revolutionary peasants of Polish origin must be underlined. The partial information received, from only a few districts, already shows the advancing process of revolutionisation of the peasant masses and the strengthening of the alliance between them and the workers. In spite of the tremendous repression in the villages, which in some districts is even more violent than in the towns, peasant delegate conferences were held, anti-war peasant committees were elected, and mass demonstrations were organised. The Party also did important work among the rank and file of the military and of the fascist military

organisations, which achieved fairly considerable results. Soldiers took part in our meetings, revolutionary songs were sung by soldiers in barracks, red banners were raised in the barracks, there was a widespread distribution of literature among the soldiers, soldiers and reservists carried out mutinous acts, as for example in Lodz, where the reservists with arms in their hands protected the unemployed demonstration. In the fascist organisation "Strielke" we succeeded in winning over a number of sections in Warsaw, Lodz and other towns. This led to the intensification of fascist repression; various military groups were disarmed, mass arrests of the soldiers took place, and some sections of "Strielke" were disbanded.

The preparatory campaign led up to mass demonstrations on August 1st. It is true that the struggle did not show the determination on the part of the masses which might have been expected after the events of the preparatory campaign. The Party's slogan of a general strike met with response from the masses only to the extent of partial political strikes. It is true that these strikes took place not only in Warsaw and the chief industrial centres, but also in a number of other towns. In Warsaw some 4,000 workers struck, although, with the exception of the Obremsky factory, no factory was closed down, and the strikes were mainly among the building workers and the Jewish proletariat. In Warsaw district the partial strike affected brickworks and glassworks. In Lodz and the district round it the strikes were also partial, and did not affect the large factories, except in a few cases; the workers in some small leather works and clothing factories struck for several hours. In the Dombrovsky Basin the workers in a chemical factory struck work for two hours. In the armaments works at Ostrovtsi 4,000 workers struck; in Lublin some thousands of workers struck in brick factories and metal works. In Vilna the strike took a more general form, affecting glassworks, metal factories, bakeries, clothing factories and leather works.

This weak strike movement should have been supported by mass demonstrations. In general, the demonstrations and street processions were not of the same mass character as those during the preparatory campaign. The police terror, turning the factories into police strongholds and creating a state of siege in the towns, un-

doubtedly caused a weakening of the revolutionary forces. But in spite of this the workers did actually come on to the street, in the towns and hamlets throughout Poland. In Warsaw the demonstrations lasted from early morning until late at night. In the working-class districts crowds assembled, and in spite of the police terror—3,000 workers were arrested in Warsaw alone—marched under the banners of the Party and the Y.C.L. Thus large demonstrations took place in the Jewish quarter, in Gribovsky Square, where over 2,000 workers assembled, in front of the Government buildings, etc. The police arrested whole columns of district, factory and trade union demonstrators, forcing them into the nearest buildings and interning them there for the whole day. These tactics of the police put exceptional difficulties in the way of bringing the workers together at one central point.

At Lodz the police arrested large numbers of militants (about a thousand arrests were made, mainly of factory delegates, participants in anti-war conferences, active trade unionists, etc.); the textile workers however formed a demonstration numbering many thousands, which ended with the breaking of the windows at the British Consulate.

In Dombrowsky Basin the demonstrations began at six in the morning. About 4,000 workers near Bankovi Khuti came into conflict with the police, who rushed machine-guns there. In a number of districts demonstrations took place, which were, however, unable to unite at any central point. Demonstrations took place also at a number of other towns. At Lublin the workers' demonstration was joined by a group of seventy peasants, in spite of the many arrests that had been made among the peasants (on July 31st thirty peasants were arrested in the villages round Lublin and charged with taking part in the preparations for August 1st); in Kesenitz and the district round it large workers' and peasants' demonstrations were held under the slogan of unity of workers and peasants. In a number of villages in the Jeshovsky district in Galicia, the peasants demonstrated under red banners. In Lvov, Vilna and other towns of Western Ukraine and White Russia, thousands of workers and peasants demonstrated, and came into conflict with the police.

The 1st of August campaign, on which the Party concentrated its efforts and resources, therefore showed that the Party is able to lead into the struggle under its slogans a considerable majority of the working-class, that it is actually leading wide masses of the peasantry and of the oppressed nationalities. The correct political line laid down by the Sixth Plenum, its real understanding of how to draw in and mobilise the masses, the determination and self-reliance not only of the Party membership, but also of large numbers of non-party proletarian militants—all this shows considerable success in the work of bolshevising the Party.

At the same time the August 1st campaign showed a number of serious errors and shortcomings; the recognition of these will help the Party to correct them and to move further along the road of bolshevisation. In the first place, this campaign showed our organisational weakness. Our factory groups are either not yet in big industrial concerns, or do not show sufficient initiative and independence in organising the workers' struggle. The organisational structure of our groups is not capable of meeting the tasks facing the Party in the present "third period," when every group must be in a position to organise and lead the masses pressing forward to battle. Our groups are also not capable of putting up a defence against the intensifying fascist and social-fascist terror, which will be turned more and more against our factory organisations. We must immediately begin to put into effect the February resolutions of the political secretariat of E.C.C.I. on the organisational tasks of the Polish Communist Party, emphasising the necessity for such a reorganisation of our factory groups as will enable them on the one hand really to lead the working masses, and on the other hand will guarantee to the groups uninterrupted activity, through the necessary division of work, and also through going underground in view of the terror carried on by the police, factory management, fascists and social-fascists.

The 1st of August campaign showed that we are not yet able to strengthen organisationally our influence on the rising revolutionary wave among the masses. Though we organised hundreds and hundreds of meetings and mass demonstrations, we were only to a small extent able to secure the election of anti-war com-

mittees in the factories. Even in Warsaw and Lodz, where meetings were held at all large factories, only a small number of anti-war committees were set up. We were also unable to organise a strike wave on the scale required, to fulfil our rôle as the organisers of the strike struggle. It was precisely the lack of committees in all large industrial centres which, because of the terror waged by police and factory administration, deprived the working masses of leadership during the struggle, and to a considerable extent caused the weakening of the strike struggle.

Another factor having an adverse effect on the results of the campaign was the failure to organise committees of shop stewards and factory defence groups, which was a serious obstacle to the maintenance of the leadership by the masses after the arrest of the factory militants and to the defence of the workers' demonstrations.

The task now before the Party is to study the experiences of the 1st of August campaign in all their aspects, and to carry on a resolute fight against all those errors which this campaign revealed within our organisations.

Organisational Lessons of the First of August

By B.W.

AS yet we have no complete picture of the 1st of August revolutionary demonstrations, but it is already possible to draw certain preliminary conclusions. It is impossible to wait until all the material has been received from all countries; every Communist Party should lose no time in going on with and extending the work begun before the 1st of August. Provisional conclusions for each Communist Party should serve as a first indication of its future tasks.

* * * *

Was the 1st of August a success, or must it be regarded as a defeat for the proletariat? The bourgeoisie and social-democrats boast of their success in frustrating the plans of the Communists. But this is their class duty; openly they cannot say anything else, especially after all the measures they took to break the 1st of August demonstrations and after all their boasts that these demonstrations would in no case be held. But in fact, even on the basis of the published data (taken in part from the bourgeois press) the 1st of August demonstration must, beyond question, be regarded as a mighty political success for the Communist International.

* * * *

In forming any judgment on the 1st of August demonstrations it is impossible to leave out of

account the colossal difficulties of preparing for it and carrying it through.

The bourgeoisie made preparations for the 1st of August demonstrations as if the fate of the whole capitalist system was to be decided. This statement is absolutely exact; there is not a grain of exaggeration in it. The imperialist governments mobilised all the forces of their open and secret police, put their frontiers and war factories on a war basis, carried out grandiose mass arrests of the workers of the Communist Parties and revolutionary trade union movement, swooped down on the offices of Communist papers, arrested people selling the papers, and finally, closed down the papers and arrested their editors, and so on. All this went on during the last few months in the chief capitalist countries of Europe—in Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland. In these countries, which play a decisive rôle in the political and economic life of the Western European continent, even a long time before the 1st of August, preparation for it was declared a State crime, and the Communist Party was in practice driven underground (or half underground).

In such circumstances the 1st of August demonstration acquired the character of an open challenge by the proletariat, with the Communist Party at its head, to the whole world

bourgeoisie propped up by fascism and social-fascism.

* * * *

The difficulties in the preparation of the 1st of August demonstrations were very much intensified by the fact that the Communist Parties, both in their structure and their traditions, were absolutely unprepared for such a departure.

(1) In regard to organisation, all Communist Parties in capitalist countries, including even the best and strongest of them, the Communist Party of Germany, were very weak in the factories, especially in the large enterprises which have military significance. In all Communist Parties the factory groups are weak and do not play the rôle of basic Party organisations. As a result, the most important political campaigns are prepared and carried out on the basis of the old (social-democratic) methods—in the workers' homes, through public meetings, etc.

(2) All Communist Parties in the capitalist countries suffer from provincialism.

(3) All Communist Parties of the European capitalist countries (except the Polish and to some extent the German) were not adapted to the conditions of underground (or half underground) work.

* * * *

In spite of all these difficulties the 1st of August campaign achieved a political success. In the most important capitalist countries—Germany, France, Poland—considerable masses of the proletariat came on to the streets on the 1st of August. The workers knew that on the streets they would meet the police, that they would be beaten up, that many would be arrested, and that a still greater number would be thrown out of the factories and with their families would be left without bread. In Germany the memory of the 1st of May shootings was still fresh in the minds of the workers; the same Zoergiebel, having received the approval of the Magdeburg Congress of the German social-democrats, was as before at the head of the police forces. For the Polish workers, to take part in the 1st of August demonstrations meant facing the bullets of the fascist police and their social-democratic friends. Knowing all this, a greater number of workers went on to the streets than at the 1st of May, and contested with the police their right to the streets. Dispersed

by the police, they assembled again, fighting desperately for their red banners and revolutionary slogans.

It must be noted as very characteristic, that the 1st of August demonstration was not forbidden in Berlin. The reason for this, of course, was not that the Communists had transformed themselves into Social Democrats, or that Zoergiebel had been smitten with a passion for Communism. It means that the temper of large masses of the Berlin proletariat on the eve of August 1st was so definitely revolutionary that Zoergiebel would not risk challenging their right to the streets. It is necessary to take into account, in any case, that in Berlin alone a greater number of workers took part in the demonstrations than the total membership of the German Communist Party, and that all these demonstrators, beyond question, stand very close to the German Party.

The 1st of August events in France were extremely significant. The French Communist Party prepared and carried out on the 1st of August, strikes on a large scale. In these strikes the Party achieved considerable success. We must especially put to the credit of the French Party the fact that they extended the strike movement to the big industrial regions of the provinces (the coal mines of the Loire and of the North) and that in Paris the movement covered the chemical and metal industries. The French bourgeoisie and socialists exerted every effort to safeguard the war industries from Communist influence. The Citroen and Hotchkiss factories were protected inside and outside by a "rationalised" police guard, but nevertheless these factories struck work and demonstrated. In Troyes units of the regular army stationed in the town joined the demonstrators. This again was a magnificent success for the French Party: open fraternisation between the soldiers and workers demonstrating in defence of the U.S.S.R. under the slogans of the Communist International. The French police arrested some thousands of the French Party militants before the 1st of August. On the 1st of August these few thousands were in prison, including a number of members of the Central Committee and political bureau. In spite of this, the Party maintained controlling centres and the general leadership of the movement; the proletarian masses answered the

summons of the Party, as in Germany, more sympathetically and with greater determination than on the 1st of May.

Finally, the 1st of August demonstration of the Polish proletariat were literally a model of unrestrained heroism and iron determination to fight to the end against the fascist dictatorship and in defence of the first country where the proletariat rules. It is true that not the whole of the proletariat demonstrated in Poland on the 1st of August, but it cannot be doubted that that day proved that the Polish Communist Party is supported by very wide masses and that these masses by their own exertions have fully confirmed the correctness of the Tenth Plenum resolutions concerning the development of conditions for a new and high form of class struggle.

The main achievements of the 1st of August lead, therefore, to the following conclusions :—

(1) The Communist International has made a breach in the traditions of provincialism, and, in spite of gigantic difficulties, it has prepared and organised an international demonstration of the proletariat in the most powerful capitalist countries. This is a clear proof of the growing strength and internal cohesion of the Communist International. The Communist International is, in fact, advancing to the winning over of the majority of the working-class and to the preparation of decisive fights for power.

(2) The 1st of August showed the rising revolutionary temper of the proletarian masses, and their increasing determination to put an end to the military adventures of imperialism and to imperialism itself; a united front of the proletarian masses in capitalist countries and in the U.S.S.R. has been formed in action.

(3) Legal Communist Parties, such as the French, received their first and fairly serious baptism of revolutionary work underground.

* * * *

Though the 1st of August demonstrations showed great successes for the Communist-International in connection with its transformation into a real world revolutionary party of the proletariat, and in relation to the winning over of decisive masses of the proletariat, these demonstrations showed also immense weaknesses in the work of the Communist International. Without waiting to draw final conclusions from the August 1st demonstration, it

is necessary at once to note the following weaknesses in the work of the Communist Parties in capitalist countries, which showed themselves in the course of the preparation and of the carrying through of the demonstration :—

(1) The 1st of August demonstrations had an actual mass character and great political significance only in four capitalist countries: France, Germany, Poland and Finland. In the other countries the demonstrations did not have the character of a great mass revolutionary movement. The demonstrations bore this negative character even in such countries as Britain, Czecho-Slovakia and the U.S.A. This position in regard to the 1st of August demonstrations, apart from everything else, shows that there are still great weaknesses in the majority of the Communist Parties. There can be no shadow of doubt that, in an immediately revolutionary situation on the continent of Europe, the action taken in such countries as Germany, France and Poland would have immense influence on the course and issue of events, even if in all other European capitalist countries the class struggle of the proletariat still lags behind. Nevertheless, the Communist International cannot overlook the weaknesses of the Communist Parties in those countries where the 1st of August demonstrations did not assume the character of a mass revolutionary movement. In the first place, this refers to the powerful countries, such as Britain, Czecho-Slovakia and the U.S.A. The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of these countries (and of others, where the demonstrations were more or less unsuccessful) should immediately and with the utmost care study the causes of this lack of success, and in the first place, they must mercilessly criticise the work of the leading Party organs: to what extent were they able to rouse the revolutionary temper of the masses; in what measure were they wavering in deciding on practical measures to organise strikes and demonstrations; to what extent, finally, had they delayed beginning the preparatory work.

In regard to the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia, it can be stated at once that the preparatory work for the 1st of August demonstrations showed clearly the unsatisfactory position in the middle and lower cadres of the Party (the district committees and, in particular,

the local Party committees and the leaders of the factory and street groups. A considerable section of these cadres showed a more or less serious opposition to the directions of the Communist International for the preparation of the 1st of August, especially in connection with the organisation of political strikes. It is clear that this does not only refer to the Czechoslovakian Party.

(2) The absolutely unsatisfactory position of factory work. As before, the under-estimation of the decisive significance of this work; as before, insufficient attention to the work of strengthening and developing the factory groups. In this question, we may take as specially characteristic the example of the strong and highly bolshevised Communist Party of Germany. In the July number of the *Parteiarbeiter*, a leading article is devoted to the preparation for August 1st. In this article there is not one reference to the fact that the centre of gravity in the whole preparatory campaign must be the factories, and particularly the factories in the most important branches of industry; and that the main motive force in the campaign must be the factory groups. It is in particular the inactivity of the factory groups to which, more than anything else, is due the relative weakness of the strike movement on August 1st. In this connection the heaviest responsibility falls on the German Party. The German Party recognised in resolutions, after the 1st of May events, its weakness in the factories in connection with organising a protest strike against the murderous activities of Zorgebel. But after correctly noting the defects in its work, the German Party was not able to draw the necessary *practical* conclusions in connection with the 1st of August. It is necessary to repeat, for the German Party and for all other Parties, that it is impossible to carry out the line of the Sixth Congress, it is impossible to carry out the decisions of the Tenth Plenum of E.C.C.I. without making the factory the axis of all work, and the factory group the principal lever.

(3) As a result of the defects in the Parties' work in the factories, as a result of the weakness of the factory groups, the organisational forms of drawing in and winning the masses of the factory workers were as a rule unsatisfactory, and reminiscent of the old social-democratic

methods of mass work. For that reason it was only in rare cases that factory anti-war committees were elected at general or delegate meetings of workers. The main organisational form was the district and works committee, chosen at delegate conferences of factory representatives; but these representatives were not chosen at factory meetings, but from Party functionaries, delegates of the opposition trade unions, etc. For this very reason the representatives with full powers could not play any kind of important part. The 1st of August committees were revolutionary groups, with insufficient links to the workers in the factories.

(4) Unsatisfactory connections and forms of control between the Party committees and the factory groups. In the chief Party committees the former forms of connection and control were retained, though they were unsatisfactory for the actual conditions of work. Such forms were and in the main still are circulars and other written communications. The preparations for the August demonstrations required, however, the broadcasting of information through factory papers, special sheets, meetings and conferences, and on the other hand a systematic examination on the spot of the work of the people and organisations working for the detailed preparation of strikes and demonstrations. The participation of Central Committee members and members of district committees in the practical preparatory work resolved itself as a rule into their appearance at meetings, at a time when the most resolute work from below was required, in the factories and in the branches of the mass organisations.

(5) Participation in the mass organisations which were under the influence of the Party was everywhere definitely unsatisfactory and showed the weakness of the Communist fractions in these organisations (even though they were under the Party's influence), and insufficient control of the work of these fractions by the appropriate Party committees.

(6) In considering the preparatory work for the August demonstrations and strikes the Party centres should examine the personnel of the Party apparatus directly in charge of this work: in particular, the committees of the factory and street groups and the secretaries of district and local committees. In all Parties it was known that in this part of the Party apparatus

there were many comrades who, in spite of having voted for the lines of the Sixth Congress, in fact opposed the carrying out of the new line, usually under the pretext that the new line was correct and acceptable in general, but not in the particular factory or district organisation. In particular, the German Party had come up against this question in connection with the campaign for the re-election of the works' councils, when, according to the Central Committee's report, in a number of cases it was once more necessary to overcome the resistance of the factory groups. It is clear that this situation did not only apply in Germany: in Czecho-Slovakia it was present in an even sharper form. The following question therefore arises in a very sharp political and organisational form: were the necessary steps taken to deal with these concealed but actual opportunists; was everything done to explain to the members of the Party and sympathising organisations the mistakes of such a lead? was everything done to ensure, through internal Party democratic methods, the replacement of these people by fresh forces from the ranks of the workers who had shown themselves to be good workers and consistent revolutionaries at the time of the recent mass actions of the proletariat, and especially in the preparations for the 1st of May and the 1st of August. We can even now say that not only were the necessary steps not taken by all parties, but only in a few cases was anything on these lines attempted, and in other cases absolutely nothing. In many cases the lack of success of demonstrations and strikes is regarded as something inevitable, the result of the Party's weakness and lack of experience. It is necessary to put an end once and for all to such fatalist conceptions within the ranks of the Party. Weakness is weakness; but it must not be overlooked that this weakness comes also from incompetent leadership; it must not be overlooked that one of the main means towards the strengthening of the Party organisations is the removal from the ranks of the leaders of these organisations of every species of unsatisfactory element. The most important conclusion to be drawn from the 1st of August experiences is the need, in all Communist Parties, and without delay, to examine on the basis of internal Party democracy and self-criticism all leading cadres, from the standpoint

of their work in the preparations for August 1st. This examination must be carried out without regard to the persons involved, that is, in a most determined manner; it must show up and change all elements opposing and passively sabotaging the instructions of the Communist International in regard to the organisation of the 1st of August demonstrations and strikes.

(7) The most serious attention must be given to the preparation of strikes. The Central Committees must take upon themselves to guide and control the study of preparations for strikes in large factories. Along this line all opportunist and negative elements must be shown up and brought to the notice of the Party.

(8) The question of strengthening our work in the armies must also be raised. In connection with this there are great gaps in the work of all Parties. As far as is known, on the 1st of August there was not a single case (excluding the Troyes incident referred to above) of mass fraternisation between the workers and soldiers or of mass participation of soldiers in the 1st of August demonstrations.

* * * *

The most important immediate task now before every Communist Party, and on which every Communist Party and other class organisation of the proletariat must concentrate the maximum of attention, is the task of organising the most vigorous defence against the attempts of the ruling class to use the most severe repressive measures against those who participated in the 1st of August demonstrations and strikes. Already we have heard of mass dismissals of workers from the factories for their activities on the 1st of August. Almost everywhere these attempts of the ruling class have met with instinctive revolt on the part of the working masses. This movement must be extended to the greatest possible extent, under the slogan of the demand that the dismissed workers shall be taken back, linking this up with the most immediate economic demands and with the slogan of the struggle for proletarian dictatorship. At the same time a wide campaign must be developed for sympathetic strikes in other factories and for the organisation of material aid for the victimised workers and their families.

The whole of this campaign must of necessity be linked up with the general line of the ruling

classes to make the 1st of August the pretext for breaking up the revolutionary organisations of the proletariat. An extensive campaign of enlightenment in this direction must be accompanied by the strengthening and widening of the

organisations of proletarian self-defence, in the first place directed to the protection of the offices of the revolutionary trade unions and of the Parties and Party press.

A Marionette Show

THE capitalist press of all countries—the semi-official *Temps*, the radical *Quotidien*, the fascist *Ami du Peuple*, the *Times* and *Manchester Guardian*, the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the *Prager Presse*, etc.—the central and provincial organs of all sections of the social-fascist Second “International”—from the *Populaire* and *Daily Herald* to the *Vorwaerts* and *Arbeiter Zeitung*—have been celebrating in the course of the last week of August a new and brilliant “moral” victory over Communism, over the Comintern, over the U.S.S.R. Even the business *Bulletin Quotidien*, which is produced on a duplicator and sent round to respectable bourgeois institutions and to the editors of the journals of French heavy industry, directed the special attention of its readers to this sensational event.

What had happened?

N. Paul Marion—whose name had hitherto been in the highest degree unknown to the “general public”—had decided—no more and no less—to “make an open break with the Communist International.” And not only to make a break, but to unburden his uneasy conscience by making revelations about the French Communist Party, the Comintern, and the U.S.S.R.

Who was this fellow the night before he became the hardened hero of the bourgeois and social-fascists of both hemispheres? He was a self-satisfied member of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, a former university student, who some time ago had made his way into the Party as an assistant to the late lamented Souvarine. Calculating on an easy political career, after two years' stay in the Agitprop of the French Party, he went on to the Agitprop of the Comintern for the completion of his education. After his return to France in the spring of this year—with an execrable testimonial from Moscow, that he was a hostile element, a careerist—he tried in vain to get a job in the

Party apparatus and on the staff of *l'Humanite*. Foreseeing his inevitable and imminent expulsion from the Party, which had found him out, he decided to forestall it and, before he was chucked out, to go out himself and slam the door behind him as loudly as possible.

In order to achieve the greatest “effect” a suitable situation was necessary: the 1st of August and the repression let loose on the Communist Party and the revolutionary workers in connection with the anti-war demonstrations provided the occasion.

Having saved his skin by running away, he immediately turned up at the editorial offices of the social-fascist *Populaire*, and sold it his “revelations.” The goods were saleable, in spite of his own quite outstanding worthlessness. But the sale of Trotsky's “revelations” (of himself) had correspondingly lowered the demand from the buyers and the consumption of this class of merchandise.

Marion had been in Russia; he was an “eye-witness”: and what had he seen? “The domination of a caste of some millions of bureaucrats . . . from Stalin up to the last village correspondent” . . . “I have seen workers, former members of the Party, revolutionary fighters in October, 1917, who, eleven years after, thought it the greatest stupidity of their life to have fought ‘to take power.’ I have seen technical experts, who had been given the task of establishing the famous ‘five-year economic plan.’ ashamed of the statistics and the forecasts which they had been compelled to establish.” . . . “In Russia there is neither dictatorship of the proletariat nor the building up of socialism, but dictatorship of a caste and the burial of socialism.”

Marion's “deposition” is a combination of insipid lies with simple idiocy. A “caste” of some millions of people (some caste!) including the “last village correspondent.” Workers who had fought for October, and longing for the

Tsar and Kerensky. Technical experts—marionettes (!)—ashamed, having been “compelled” to “establish” the five-years’ plan. And this stuff is put before the readers at the very moment when the Moscow correspondents of the biggest bourgeois papers, marvelling not only at the five-year plan itself, but at its actual fulfilment, astounded by the raging energy which has surpassed the tempo assigned in the plan, are insistently warning their masters against the current phrases about a “paper” plan, and calling their earnest attention to the strength of the economic construction—and precisely of socialist construction—which is developing before their eyes.

No less stupid and paltry are Marion’s “revelations” about the Comintern and the French Communist Party. The Sixth Congress took place, according to the testimony of this “eye-witness,” in “an unreal world, where wars and revolutions are always imminent.” In France itself, after his return, Marion found “an unbridled propaganda in connection with the 1st of August, strikes exaggerated beyond measure in order to prove ‘the radicalisation of the masses,’ *the hysteria of the defence of the U.S.S.R.*, and the hysteria of the ‘war which is coming, which is here’ and of the ‘coming illegality.’”

From each line of these “depositions” there exudes, not a blind belief in the peaceful development of social and inter-State relationships, not a conviction that in the “real” world the danger of imperialist wars is a myth, and the sharpening of the social struggle a legend—no, each letter breathes an unclean fear of the consequences which might overtake the person of the author if in the coming and already present battles he was found on the revolutionary side of the barricades.

The confession of this coward and deserter ends with “definite” conclusions: “I remain attached (!) to the idea of the struggle for the

emancipation of the workers and the coming of a better society from which exploitation and war will be banished, but I am convinced that this can be attained, not with the doctrine and methods of the Communists, but rather according to the methods of which the English Labour movement, as a whole, furnishes us such a powerful example.”

The noise which the bourgeois and social-fascist press of all countries and languages raised round this ludicrous—pitiful and ludicrous in its contents—“manifesto” of a petty deserter, the whole heap of telegrams, articles, comments, shows one thing: how frightened the capitalist world and its lackeys are, in fact, of the growth of the militant spirit of the proletarian masses, of the mighty events in the class struggle which are drawing near, of the unrestrained and—for them—menacing growth of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.—if they have to console themselves with the “testimony” and “revelations” of *such* a Marionette.

For us the Marion incident is only a tiny detail in the work of cleansing our ranks in the period of putting them on to a fighting basis on the eve of great battles.

The Marionettes are those petty members of the intelligentsia, who slip into the Party of the proletariat, when times are comparatively peaceful, in the hope of easy political advantages, and who get out of it quickly when things become serious, when the smell of battle is in the air. The desertion of Marion is one of the signals showing the need for special vigilance at the present time, the need to make sharp demands on and closely examine those elements of the intelligentsia in its cadres in whom the Party places its trust and confidence by putting them in responsible posts. All those who are politically and psychologically petty—little men of the Marion genus—clear them out of the ranks. And the sooner the better.

REVIEW

Religion, Marxism and the Second International

(“*La Vie Socialiste*,” April–May)

IN the last few months an extremely interesting controversy has been conducted in the columns of the *Vie Socialiste*, the organ of the Socialist Party of France, on the question of congregations and of the relations between the party, religion and the church, that is, between socialism and religion.

It is not by chance that the socialism of the Second International was forced to revise its programme on this question. In Germany and Austria, not to speak of Italy and Poland, clericalism, the church and religion, has entered upon a militant phase, a “religious renaissance” is in progress, strongly supported by the entire bourgeoisie and by every kind of intellectual, for the intellectuals have long forgotten their old “atheism” or religious indifferentism and have stretched out a saving hand to “consoling” religion. Even France, the land of Voltaire, the land with such old traditions of bourgeois “free thought,” of the separation of church and State, is now settling down to help religion, making concessions to the papacy and preparing itself ideologically for the fight against the proletariat. How far this religious renaissance has spread among intellectual circles, among specialists, technicians, engineers, chemists, etc., is shown by the interesting statistics published in *La Vie Socialiste*. They deal with the so-called “pascal mass,” the Easter masses organised by the students at the various higher educational institutions. The figures refer to such important and influential educational institutions as the *Ecole Polytechnique*, the *Ecole Centrale*, *Polytechnique*, *Mines de Paris*, *Ponts et Chaussées*, and all the more important provincial schools. The flower of the French intelligentsia study at these schools, where the scientific brain of bourgeois France is trained, and it is from these circles that the most solid and capable scientific minds, as well as the core of intellectual free thought, arise. The *Ecole Polytechnique* instituted the mass for the first time in 1913, and

only 128 students attended. In 1928 there were 1,100 present, while the invitation to the mass was signed by 2,588. At the *Ecole Centrale*, 600 engineers attended in 1920 and more than a thousand in 1928. The invitations bore 2,293 signatures, and the same tendency is true of all other important educational institutions in France. Taken as a whole, more than 12,000 men of science officially acknowledge Catholicism. It should not be forgotten that these are the very people who will occupy important positions in industry and come into contact with the working-class movement, and that they penetrate very deeply into the central schools and educational institutions as teachers and professors. The Union of Catholic Engineers, which in 1920 had a membership of 1,200, has now 5,600 men in its ranks. These figures speak eloquently. Henry of Navarre, when he went over to Catholicism in order to get control of Paris, is reported to have said “Paris vaut la Messe”—that is, it was worth paying the price of the mass—for Paris. To-day the flower of the French intelligentsia, which leads industry and science, might be regarded as saying “The struggle against the proletariat is worth the mass,” that is, it pays to go to mass if that will supply them with new weapons in the fight against the proletariat.

As opposed to this, and to the Government offensive in Parliament concerning the relations with Rome, to the revision of legislation against the congregations and to the advance of the Catholic reaction in the schools and universities, the tasks of the proletarian revolutionary party are clearly and sharply marked out. These are the conduct of a bitter struggle against religion and the church, propaganda to explain the principles of Marxism in the sphere of religion, the relations between religion and State, religion and socialism, religion and parties, and pitiless struggle against any infringement of the separation of church and State. To carry out these

tasks an intense struggle must be waged against the slightest attempt on the part of the churches to conduct educational work in the schools, against any religious instruction in schools, and in favour of obligatory uniform secular schools, those private schools which are controlled by religious bodies to be abolished. These are the most elementary, the most well-known demands and axioms. Only very faint traces of this line of thought can be found in the columns of *La Vie Socialiste*. One thing, however, must be conceded to the French; they have an advantage over the Austro-Marxists and the German social-democrats in that they are far less tedious, far less pedantic and long-winded; they do not come forward with the pomposity of an Otto Bauer or a Max Adler, they do not swear every moment by Marx and Marxism, as Bauer does in his pamphlet on religion and social democracy.

The Frenchman Kahn expressed the whole "great scientific accomplishment" in one brief and polished sentence: "Religion is an act of belief in justice after death; Socialism is an act of belief in justice possible on the earth. This is the contradiction between religion and socialism, and we have no right to penetrate into the conscience of those who solve this contradiction in one way or the other."

This is just the same as Otto Bauer's lengthy and tedious reiterations: Socialism is concerned with life here and now, religion with life hereafter, and consequently socialism and the party have nothing whatever to do with religion. Marxism simply leaves the hereafter to religion, and that's all there is to it. Kahn knows nothing of Marx and does not appeal to Marx, but Bauer goes so far as to wish to prove that it is in accord with the basic principles of Marxism to leave the subject of the hereafter of humanity to the particular form of religion. We wish to say quite frankly that we greatly prefer the Frenchman Kahn who, without studying much and without "Marxism," reached the same conclusions as Bauer, the "learned Marxist."

Another French Marxist, Deixoune, expresses himself on this subject with equal polish. He has discovered that the basic principles of Marxism consists in the ideal it puts forward: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" Whoever says that, Deixoune maintains, accepts an ideal which "makes the Christian more christian and the atheist more atheistic, when they find

themselves in one and the same party, the party which recognises as its motto, 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!'" As far as he is concerned, the principle of secular schools answers everything in the question of religion. For, says he, this gives us a weapon against the reaction expressed by both the Jacobins (Radicals, Communists) and the clericals; both these tendencies have the same results, for they both occupy the attention of the proletariat with religious disputes and, thereby serving the interests of capitalist oppression, mislead the workers from the path of class struggle. More pearls from Bauer's treasure-chest. If Communists agitate for struggle against the church, against congregations and religion, this means that they are renouncing the class struggle. As though the struggle against religion, against the clerical danger, were not a part of the class struggle! What a wonderful picture! The "Socialists" of France, the bootlickers of Poincaré, led by Paul Boncour of the League of Nations, playing the part of acknowledged saviours of the purity of the class struggle!

It is quite natural for these class fighters to welcome representatives of all religious beliefs with open arms. The result is rather amusing, for here are Catholics and Protestants of every shade and dye, all members of one party, and each one praising his own little pet concern. One fears the Catholics because they are so numerous and so strongly organised, but has no objection to the Protestant and Jewish members of the party. Another is deeply concerned with exposing the differences between clericalism and Christianity. If he renounces clericalism, then his advocacy of Christianity, of "true religion," becomes more vigorous. He even makes the astonishing discovery, which he feels that he must communicate to the "Marxist" Bauer, that "We have to consider religion not as a social, but as a biological factor; its fruits alone are of a social nature."

Amazing discovery! Religion is a biological, not a social factor. Sociology has gained little from it, and as for an appreciation of the biological value of this discovery—we leave that to the biologists.

Perceau, the only man who went so far as to maintain the inconsistency of socialism and religion, although in a wholly un-Marxist fashion, was attacked by all other religious

Socialists. Caucalon, for example, apologises for Perceau to God, the creator of the world, and very solemnly puts forward the following "deeply philosophic considerations": "The hypothesis of a creator is by no means absurd. Even Voltaire said that a watch presupposes a watchmaker. I, personally, cannot understand how it is possible to avoid propounding the God-problem. Philosophic materialism does not exclude the deistic hypothesis. In these times moreover, is it possible to speak of materialism when science itself affirms the dissolution of matter into energy . . ."

After Voltaire comes Jaurés—historical determinism by no means frees us from the God-idea—and Jaurés himself declares that "a few mechanistic interpretations far from exhaust the meaning of the universe."

And this is written, in the year 1929, in France, the land of Diderot and d'Alembert,

more than one hundred and fifty years after the great Encyclopædists, the land of Voltaire, and in the central organ of the Socialist Party, almost fifty years after the scientific achievement of Marxism!

The grave danger which such religious poverty of mind threatens, in the terribly serious situation at the present time, must be made clear to the workers.

This is not mere stupidity, it is more; it is political treachery. The wire-pullers, the Blums and Renaudels who want to surrender the workers, have something to sell, and all means, all ways are good which facilitate their dirty traffic with the bourgeoisie. It is the job of the Communist Party of France, a task as simple as it is grateful, to take up this matter with all its weight and mental energy, and to expose to the working masses the moral level of these French Socialists.

A.M.

