

# The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VII. No. 9.

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

FIVE CENTS.

## CONTENTS

**Crisis in Europe - - 121**

### General

**International Significance of the XVIth Party Congress - -  
By BELA KUN 128**

**From Free Trade to Protection - - -  
By E. VARGA 132**

**League of Nations Finances Intervention - - - -  
By NEMO 136**

**Under the Banner of Fascisation - - -  
By Smolianski 141**

### Left T.U. Movement

**Question of T.U. Tactics in Poland - -  
By HALMA 145**

**Another Fractional Attack Against the C.P. of Poland -  
By A.D. 152**

## THE CRISIS IN EUROPE

THE world economic crisis, as is well known, had two chief supports as regards countries, from which the "infection" has spread throughout the capitalist world, viz.: South-eastern Europe, where the agrarian crisis had already for a long time paralysed the development of national economy, and the U.S.A., where the industrial crisis, in combination with the agrarian crisis, shook the very foundations of American "prosperity." It is quite natural, if the crisis in the agrarian countries of South-eastern Europe could, like a putrefying cancer, inevitably, though without visible convulsions, infect European capitalism as a whole, that the U.S.A. crisis should mean a very shattering, serious and stormy sickness. Thus, in the first half of 1930, the decisive factor in the European economic position was the U.S.A. crisis, its intensification and the effects of this, which immediately began to make themselves felt in the whole of world economy and on the European continent in particular. Europe was more and more drawn into the orbit of the world economic crisis, which in European conditions is taking on ever more pronounced forms, both in the purely economic and in the political sphere.

At the present time it is already necessary to record that at any rate some of the European countries have overtaken and surpassed the U.S.A. in regard to the *tempo* and *sharpness* of the economic crisis. This circumstance is seen to be the essential distinguishing feature of the situation, marking off the second half of the current year in comparison to the beginning. But it must be borne in mind that the world economic crisis in 1930 found the U.S.A. at the height of its so-called

“prosperity,” while the capitalist system in post-war Europe, even before the onset of the new world economic crisis, was already markedly weakened, as a result of the action of the deep-seated contradictions brought into being by the world war. Apart from France, all the European countries—even when the economic situation was favourable, in the period of partial capitalist stabilisation—were still very far from real economic equilibrium or anything like economic well-being. *Consequently, the world economic crisis, the most powerful since the end of the war, inevitably provoked in Europe serious convulsions, not only of an economic, but also of a political nature.* It was a specially aggravating circumstance that the present “serial” capitalist crisis takes place on the foundation of the general post-war crisis of capitalism.

Political life in Europe is becoming more and more disturbed. The political atmosphere is becoming heated to a greater and greater degree under the influence of intensifying class conflicts; the distribution of forces and the objects pursued by the various class groupings stand out in most unconcealed forms, while the clash of class interests takes on ever more embittered and even bloody forms. In the ranks of the bourgeoisie, differentiation is proceeding at an accelerated pace, leading to a concentration of power in the hands of a small group of monopolist capitalists and big landowners. Simultaneously, the influence of fascism is growing, gathering together an army of cruel and desperate instruments of capitalist dictatorship. The revolutionised proletariat increases every day, and economic struggles, in different countries and under different conditions, ever more frequently are being and will be transformed into revolutionary political struggles.

This last circumstance is particularly characteristic and significant for the development of the class struggle in Europe, convulsed as it is by economic crisis. In *Germany*, the strike movement assumes a clearly expressed political character, for the issue turns on the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat over questions which under present conditions have decisive significance for the fate of German capitalism. In *Poland*, the class conflicts are uncon-

cealedly political in character, for the whole country is in the throes of an ever-deepening political crisis and it is becoming clearer every day that the Pilsudsky dictatorship has got into a political and economic blind alley. In *Finland*, the sharp economic crisis has all at once found its open political reflection in fascism. In *Britain*, a government crisis is maturing, while already in *Ireland* a strike of railway workers has taken place under purely political slogans. Finally, in *France* the struggle against the virtual abolition of social insurance represents only a stage in the struggle against the general fascist attack on the working class which is being prepared by the Tardieu Government.

Before turning to an analysis of the political crisis in the most important European countries, it is necessary to mention one further essential feature in the position which has been created all over Europe. *There is literally not a single capitalist country on the European continent which does not exhibit a crisis in the entire political system as a whole.* In other words, not only have the conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat gone far beyond the limits of economic class conflicts, but the whole political life in each of the European countries is marked by the bankruptcy of the political system prevailing in the country, and in particular by the complete bankruptcy of the system of bourgeois democracy. In those countries, however, where “democracy” has already been replaced by open dictatorship, the latter is being deprived of its points of support owing to the blows of the general economic crisis.

A curious picture is revealed if from this point of view one casts a glance at the map of Europe, and reviews the countries from the west to the east. In the extreme south-west of Europe, in *Portugal*, in spite of relative financial stability, the present dictatorship, in striving to obtain new bases for its power, has had to enter into agreement with the clerical and monarchist circles, the influence of which is on the increase. In *Spain*, where not so long ago the unsuccessful military dictatorship of Primo de Rivera was overthrown, power has passed into the hands of another dictatorial clique connected with King Alphonse, whose political efforts amount only to a replacement

of the Parisian and London masters. The new dictatorship has not been able to achieve any stabilisation of political and economic life. On the contrary, unrest is growing daily in the country, the economic crisis is becoming intensified, approaching the point of complete economic bankruptcy. The labour movement is raising its head, and recently came to the fore in the general strike in Seville.

In *France*, which has not yet been overtaken by the present economic crisis, the internal political position shows an absence of equilibrium. The position of France will be dealt with in more detail below; it is sufficient here to mention the fact of the sudden adjournment for the holidays of the Chamber of Deputies, accompanied by essays in dictatorship on the part of the Tardieu Government. In *Germany*, the dissolution of the Reichstag and the developing internal struggle undoubtedly represents the mark of the deep-seated crisis of the German bourgeois republic. In *Poland*, as already indicated, the régime of Pilsudsky is passing through a desperate crisis. In *Finland*, a virtual overthrow of the state has already taken place and power has passed into the hands of the fascists. In *Latvia* and *Estonia*, the fascist kulak circles are preparing to follow the example of their Finnish confrères.

Such is the position on the continent. That in *Great Britain* matters have not yet come to a change of government is only due to the fact that the British Empire as a whole is in the grip of a crisis which restricts the freedom of action of the bourgeois parties in Britain. To characterise the internal political situation in Britain, it is sufficient to cite Lloyd George. According to his words, the situation in the country is so desperate that if the Government does not show that it is capable of action (and deeds are now being expected of it), the population will clutch at the first straw available. It is absolutely incontestable that Great Britain is in process of passing through a series of political convulsions, such as British capitalism has never before experienced.

The internal political tendencies of development of the European countries, the general crisis of bourgeois democracy, the onset of the period of general fascisation of capitalist Europe, is demonstrated very clearly on a

closer examination of the events taking place in France, the most "fortunately" situated country in Europe. It is, undoubtedly, a sign of the times that in France, where the economic crisis does not yet directly drive the bourgeoisie to adopt extreme measures, the idea of fascisation of the state and of terror against the proletariat takes no less definite forms than with other countries. In order to estimate correctly the events in France and the recent dissolution of the Chamber by means of a Government decree, it is necessary to bear in mind the context of the noisy programme speech delivered in Dijon on June 1st by Tardieu, Chairman of the Cabinet Council. After outlining his political plans and dealing, with a good deal of polemical passion, with his opponents, Tardieu went on to develop a conception of *transformation of the State*. This task was, in his own words, a task for a whole generation. He categorically pronounced against liberalism, which had outlived its time, *i.e.*, against bourgeois democracy, and against any division of power, and against the "Stateism" of the Socialists. He declared, "A democratic State must be strong . . . it is the protector of the two representatives of the general interests—producers and consumers." It is not difficult to detect that these remarks of Tardieu represent a hardly veiled proclamation of fascism, and it was precisely thus that his speech was understood in bourgeois circles. As the German journalist Zerrev remarked, the Tardieu speech "was hardly distinguishable in character and tendency from fascist speeches and declarations."

It is clear that Tardieu was indeed pursuing this aim, the aim of *proclaiming his fascist views*. In dissolving parliament by decree, the French Government did not conceal that the reason for its inactivity lay, not in accidental political motives, but in a *general tendency based on principle*. The same Tardieu, in a speech on July 14, at Monbrizon, before the League of Ex-Servicemen, came out with attacks on the parliamentary system in a very sharp and open fashion. He made use of all the phrases employed by the *fascists* in all countries. He declared that the Government could no longer suffer the disgusting spectacle of intrigues and struggles discrediting parliamentary representation. It is well known that

it is exactly on the basis of such arguments about the worthlessness of parliament that the supporters of bourgeois dictatorship deduce the necessity for fascism.

We have described in rather more detail the political programme of the French Government, for the very reason that this programme of fascisation, of the establishment of an open dictatorship of capital in France, is being realised, not under the influence of the rapidly growing internal crisis, but as a result of the fact that *the general position in Europe is driving the bourgeois on the road towards dictatorship*. It is obvious that the French bourgeoisie would not have hurried with the strengthening of their dictatorship and the liquidation of parliamentarism if it were not that they foresaw the approach of the period of open class struggles. The bourgeoisie hastens to pass to the offensive not only in its general policy but also in the policy of directly countering the interests of the working class. The virtual abrogation of the law of social insurance, carried out with the most direct and active assistance of the French Socialists, appears as one of the elements of the general fascist offensive of the French bourgeoisie. The working class is interpreting current events in precisely this sense, and it is not for nothing that the fight of the French workers against the new social insurance legislation embraces ever greater regions of France.

By July 18, there were 5,000 textile and metal workers on strike in Normandy, on July 21, in the northern centre of Roubaix there took place a demonstration of 12,000 workers. Altogether, according to *L'Humanité*, from June 1, when the social insurance law was introduced, up to July 12 there took place 183 strikes, embracing 44,000 workers. Moreover, it is certain that this is very far from representing the peak of the class struggle against the social insurance law. The offensive of the French bourgeoisie, the fascisation of the French republic, is meeting with ever more determined resistance on the part of the French workers, and thereby the general political crisis in France will develop further and further in depth and extent.

The struggle of the bourgeoisie in France for the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, although leading to a terror against the work-

ing class, and its Communist Party and revolutionary mass organisations, nevertheless, in certain respects still has a concealed character. In Finland and Germany, during the most recent period, there has developed a completely open and bitter struggle for fascist dictatorship. The methods employed by the Finnish fascists resemble in a very interesting fashion the methods of Italian and Austrian fascism. In Finland, as in Italy and Austria, the attack of the fascists was accompanied by ferocious terror against labour organisations and individual leaders of the working class movement, by acts of violence and beating up of workers, and finally developed in a march on the capital of the country. As in all the countries of fascist dictatorship, so also in Finland, the fascisation of the state, the alliance organised by the fascists, consisting of kulaks and declassed elements, in the last analysis leads to the creation of a *dictatorship of big capital*, of the big bourgeoisie, which in Finland is represented by the party of **Coalition**,

The fascist coup in Finland was carried out with the most active and unconcealed co-operation and sympathy of the social-democrats. The position adopted by the leaders of Finnish social-fascism in the parliament, in which the fascists dictated their conditions, was a revolting, treacherous position which evoked surprise even in the bourgeois press. Assistance in the terror against the Communists was perpetrated by the social-democrats in open and thoroughgoing fashion. The Finnish social-fascists hardly even attempted to make a show of resistance to the fascist coup; it was not in vain that the Lapuan (fascist) leaders could declare that they counted on the support of all parties, including the social-democrats.

As already pointed out, the strengthening of fascism and the crisis of "democracy," is a consequence of the bitter economic crisis in capitalist Europe. In Finland this is revealed in no less degree than in other countries. The economic crisis in Finland includes both agriculture and industry. For the characterisation of the economic position of Finland it is sufficient to mention that during four months of 1930 there were 716 firms which went bankrupt as against 346 during the corresponding period of the previous year. These bankrupt

concerns included 19 industrial, 249 of a mixed character, 17 agricultural and 321 trading enterprises. Finland feels particularly strongly the influence of the European agrarian crisis. The general fall in prices of agricultural products, the high tariff duties on agrarian products in all countries hits sharply at the interests of the Finnish kulaks and landowners. Thus, *the fascist coup in Finland is connected closely with the general European agrarian crisis.*

There is still another very important aspect of the process of fascisation in Finland. We refer to *the struggle against the Soviet Union.* The successes of Socialist construction, and in particular of collective agriculture, in the U.S.S.R., have produced a veritable panic not only in the ranks of the bourgeoisie but also in the landowner-kulak circles of the states bordering on the U.S.S.R. *The success of collectivisation, the reconstruction of agriculture on Socialist foundations, mean a death sentence for the kulak and landowner class, not only in the U.S.S.R., but in the other countries as well.* The industrial bourgeoisie exploits this mood among the kulaks of the village, and on this basis is created the union of industrial capital, landowners and kulaks, linked by common hatred of the proletariat of its own country and of the fatherland of the proletarians of all countries, the Soviet Union. It is exactly this phenomenon that is observable in Finland. It is also perceptible in Latvia and Esthonia. It is characteristic that in the last-named country a fascist outbreak is preparing analogous to the Finnish. In mid-July there was held a conference of kulak-fascists in the Esthonian agricultural region of Fellen, under the well-known slogans of struggle against "parliamentary absolutism," for a new electoral law and for extension of the powers of the President. As a result, *on the frontiers of the Soviet Union there has been created an encircling ring of five, consisting of countries where fascist dictatorship is more and more consolidating its position.* In this way, the advanced posts of imperialist intervention against the U.S.S.R. have been strengthened.

In Roumania and Finland, we observe the offensive of fascism and the passage to open dictatorship. In Poland and Germany, along-

side of these same processes, there is to be observed, in a greater measure than in other countries, a deepening of the crisis and growth of activity of the masses. In these countries, a situation is approaching when *class will be opposed to class in a decisive battle for power.*

The growth of revolutionary disposition among the masses in Poland is indicated daily by the struggles of the proletariat, by the breaking out of strikes, by demonstrations and meetings, in the course of which the workers more and more frequently resort to determined resistance to the police. The growing dissatisfaction not only among the proletariat, but also among the broad strata of the toiling population is reflected in the tactics of "His Majesty's Opposition," the left-centre opposition in the Polish Seim. The oppositional "Fronde" of the parties of the Seim, and in particular the Polish Socialist Party, reached its highest point in the Cracow Congress which ended on June 30. The speeches of the "oppositionists" sounded an unprecedentedly sharp note; matters went so far as recognition of the fact of the existence of dictatorship in Poland and of attacks on the President and on Pilsudsky himself. In the resolution adopted by the Cracow Congress, it is stated that "without removal of the dictatorship it is impossible to solve the economic crisis and to liquidate internal problems." Of course, it goes without saying that the opposition did not decide on active measures or on an active struggle against dictatorship. On the contrary, as was once more demonstrated by the development of events after the Cracow Congress, the left-centre opposition and the P.P.S. (Polish Socialist Party), bound to the existing régime to the end, constitutes only the "left" wing of the bourgeois dictatorship. In the course of some two weeks after the Cracow Congress, the leaders of the "left-centre" already began to speak about the interests of the Polish State, its external security and internal equilibrium, demanding the *co-operation* of all groups.

In these circumstances, the mutinous speeches made at the Cracow Congress and all the hollowness of the opposition in the Seim is revealed as only the inevitable reflection of the prevailing mood among the masses. Bourgeois parliamentarianism in Poland is virtually liquidated. A fascist dictatorship is in exist-

ence and is passing through a decisive crisis, which it is struggling to overcome by various methods, giving rise in particular to the use of lightning conductors of the Cracow Congress type.

The most characteristic feature of the Cracow Congress was precisely the stormy exhibition of the revolutionary feeling among the masses, which showed itself in connection with the Congress. The many thousands taking part in demonstrations in Cracow indicated in the most definite fashion that *a mass movement is growing up in the country against the Pilsudsky dictatorship*. The results of the by-elections during July also bear indisputable witness to this. In particular, in the Kovel-Vladimir-Volynsk region and in the Svetsiansk constituency, the elections were marked by the indifference of the masses towards parliamentary elections and the indisputable increase of votes cast for the left workers' and peasants' bloc.

*The economic crisis and the crisis of the fascist dictatorship is revealing to the Polish proletariat the path towards immediate revolutionary struggles.* It is not without ground that the French journalist, correspondent of the French *Volonté*, on his return to France, declared that "Poland is gripped in the clutches of economic crisis." Poland finds itself in a blind alley. The French bourgeois journalist asks in fright: "Where is Poland going, shaken by the convulsions of a powerful economic and political crisis?" The answer to this question will be given by the Polish proletariat.

In Germany, events are developing in different forms and along different lines from those in Poland, but there also the situation is characterised by the development of class contradictions and by the open, intensification of class struggles. In the preceding issue of the *Communist International* we pointed out that, as a result of the economic crisis, "for the German working class the movement of decisive struggles is approaching earlier than it seemed possible would be the case half a year ago." We pointed out that the position of the Brüning Government was becoming absolutely hopeless and that the approaching autumn would witness the most intense and serious internal political struggle in Germany.

The course of events has completely borne out this statement. The Government has been compelled to dissolve the Reichstag and decide on new elections in the beginning of autumn. It has not been possible to carry through the financial programme by parliamentary methods. It has not been possible to liquidate the strike movement. In Germany, the electoral campaign has begun and will be of an unprecedentedly embittered, brutal and bloody character. The fascists are arming for new attacks, the bourgeoisie are preparing for a desperate struggle for their dictatorship, the proletariat is faced with the task of mobilising all the revolutionary forces for a final passage from defence to offence. Thus, *the last few months are leading to a further development of class contradictions in Germany and the autumn will be a period of highly decisive battles.*

Although the internal struggle in Germany will develop round the elections to the Reichstag, nevertheless, it is certain that actually *the central question will be, not the composition of the future Reichstag, but the struggle for and against the dictatorship of big capital and landlordism in Germany.* The dissolution of the German Reichstag is not merely a sign of parliamentary crisis, it represents the manifestation of the general deep crisis of the German bourgeois state. Precisely for this reason, contradictions between different groups will be thrust into the background and the basic contradiction of capital society—that between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat—will be manifested in a naked form. It is on this account that the German proletariat must prepare for decisive battles under the slogan of "class against class," "against fascist dictatorship, for the dictatorship of the proletariat."

For the further development of events in Germany, as indeed in all Europe, the primary rôle will be played by the deepening of the economic crisis. As far as Germany is concerned, the most recent indication of this process is afforded by the balance sheet published by one of the powerful steel concerns. This balance sheet shows that the production of steel fell in comparison with the period 1928-29 by 37 per cent., the output of iron ore fell by 33 per cent., the output of coal by 20

per cent. There is no doubt that the contraction of production and contraction of trade will continue. The fall in world prices will continue and consequently also the attack on wages. The revolution in prices, as the German prime minister Bobning expressed it, is still far from complete. The representatives of American finance-capital consider that a further fall in prices is inevitable, and their consolidation at a lower level. This involves further serious blows for European industry, and the necessity for further attacks on the standards of life of the working class. Thus, the forces which have brought into existence the general European political crisis are continuing their destructive action. *The economic crisis has not yet attained its highest point, and consequently the political crisis has not yet reached the most extreme stage of intensification.* Europe is faced with the most stormy and important events.

If the objective situation is so serious, so much the greater is the significance of the rôle of the subjective factor. The position which has been created in Europe faces the Communist Parties with the most serious task of mobilising the masses for struggle against fascist dictatorship. Against the general slogan of the employers of lower wages, the Communist Parties must put a general preparation for the organisation of the counter-offensive of the proletariat. Against the fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie must be put the slogan of revolutionary mass struggle for Soviet power, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. This demands from the Communist vanguard organisation, organisation and still more organisation.

**“There is nothing I would like so much, there is nothing that I have hoped for so much as an opportunity to write for the Workers.”—Lenin.**

*And now read  
what he has  
written for you.*

## **THE WORKERS’ BOOKSHOP**

**can supply all the  
available books by**

**LENIN**

**Also books by  
MARX and  
ENGELS**

**16 KING STREET  
COVENT GARDEN  
W.C.2**

# THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SIXTEENTH PARTY CONGRESS

By BELA KUN.

THE world economic crisis is developing in several countries into a political crisis. As the Sixteenth Congress declared, insecurity is the strongest motive actuating the ruling class and its governments in the imperialist and colonial countries. The collapse of capitalist stabilisation makes the anarchy of world capitalism even more chaotic than it was before. In this chaos class forces are crystallising and aligning themselves in order to decide problems of world importance. After Rumania and Finland, the bourgeoisie in Germany is now trying to strengthen its position by the use of fascist bayonets. India and Egypt, as well as the repeated attacks of the Conservative Party in all important questions of British policy—particularly in the question of protection—indicate the fate of the Labour Government: the days of the MacDonald Government are numbered; in the not far distant future it will be out. Italian fascism plays loudly on the war trumpet, for Mussolini's statement that "it cannot go on like this" applies to the internal political situation of Italy even more than to what Mussolini calls the "intolerable foreign political situation" of the fascist country. Even in the U.S.A., the most powerful imperialist country, and in France, the most "stable" European country, the indications of the development from an economic to a political crisis are increasing. Hoover's authority has been deeply shaken. In the leading capitalist circles of America the conduct of Hoover and his government is regarded with no little disfavour, and even with contempt. He has failed to maintain even the appearance of prosperity. The position of the Tardieu government in France is, to say the least, uncertain. In Poland a successor to Pilsudski is being eagerly sought, and even if the part played by such "personalities" is estimated as low as possible, still it must be admitted that the political crisis would be accentuated by Pilsudski's exclusion from political life.

The pressure of low wages on the workers, and the burden of taxation on the petty bour-

geois and peasant sections, is bringing greater and greater masses of the working population into activity. The unsuccessful attempts of Brüning, Snowden and Tardieu to balance the state budget shew—although to different extents and at different stages of development—how the economic crisis, as a result of the catastrophic position of state finances, is changing into a political crisis. The reduction in social benefits, the disappearance of the gains won by the working class in the first revolutionary years of the post-war period, the absence of even the appearance of a democratic fiscal policy, are rapidly abolishing the social-democratic mass basis of capitalist stabilisation among the working class and the petty bourgeoisie. The alternative of fascism or bolshevism is actually the objective choice which faces a number of capitalist countries.

It is a fact beyond any doubt that there is only one unshaken and unshakable country on this earth—the Soviet Union, the land of the revolution and the proletarian dictatorship. The Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. demonstrated clearly that the only country which has remained untouched by any economic and political crisis, in this period of crisis, is the Soviet Union. Never was the imperialist and social-democratic press so full of rumours about the Soviet Union, of expectations of a political crisis and a change of government there, than immediately before the Sixteenth Congress. The bourgeoisie and the social-fascists made themselves literally drunk with illusions that the world crisis of capitalist economy and the growing political crisis would at least be compensated for by a crisis in the country of Socialism. With the sobriety that succeeded this state of intoxication there developed naturally enough a foul campaign against the Soviet Union, when it became clear that Lenin's party was never more firm and united around the general line, around its central committee and its leaders, than at the present time. The hopes which the bourgeoisie, the social-fascists and the renegades of Communism based upon the

right wing opposition, upon a party and government crisis, collapsed abruptly during the Sixteenth Party Congress. It became clear—as was only to be expected—that the unity of the Bolshevik ranks could be as little shaken by the right wing opposition, as by the left-opportunist and counter-revolutionary Trotskyists.

The firm Bolshevik unity of the Party, the iron strength of its contact with the workers and the poor and middle peasants, gave the Congress the strength to give the right wing leaders a further trial, despite their unsatisfactory statements and the continued existence of the right danger as the chief danger. It was only this unshakable unity of the Bolshevik Party which gave the leaders of the right wing opposition the opportunity to make good, in the practical work of socialist construction, for their mistakes which the whole Party unanimously and sharply condemned. The fight against right wing opportunism, which was not concluded at the Sixteenth Congress, but only reached its highest point there, meant not only the collapse of the leading opportunist group, but also brought with it a tremendous strengthening, both ideologically and politically, of the Party ranks and of the working masses outside the Party.

Against right wing opportunist deviations, which would slow down the rate of industrialisation and prevent the collectivisation of agriculture, were directed the ideological weapons of Leninism, and the working class and the overwhelming mass of the peasantry decided in favour of socialist construction in industry and agriculture. The fight against the opportunists did not prevent the Party leadership from carrying on a struggle against the "left" opportunists; on the contrary, it was the fight on two fronts which really made the fight against the principal opportunist danger effective. The mobilisation of the masses—party as well as non-party—around the vital problems of the Party, the defence of Bolshevik unity in an irreconcilable struggle against opportunism, the relation between party problems and the vital interests of the workers and peasants outside the party—these are the most important lessons for the sections of the C.I. in the fight against all kinds of opportunism, which make difficult or prevent the winning

of the masses. It was this mass struggle for the Bolshevik unity of the leading proletarian party which finally shattered all hopes of disintegration in the C.P.S.U. or of a split in its ranks.

This Bolshevik unity, this mass mobilisation around the general line of the party, is the source of anxiety to all the foreign ministries of the imperialist countries, and to the bureaucrats of the social-fascist parties and trade unions. It is said that the unanimity of the Congress on Comrade Stalin's speech and at the election of the Central Committee aroused much disquiet behind the scenes of the Congress of the Amsterdam International. The resolution on the report of M. Jouhaux on the international situation and the war danger was rewritten at least five times, each time after a report had come in about the progress of the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.

It would, however, be dangerous self-deception for the proletariat of the capitalist countries and of the Soviet Union to imagine that the firm Bolshevik unity of the C.P.S.U., strikingly demonstrated at the Sixteenth Party Congress, will in any way weaken the warlike intentions of imperialism and its social-fascist allies. That is far from being the case. This unity is directed towards the organisation and development of the Socialist offensive on all fronts against every relic of capitalism in the Soviet Union. If, therefore, the Soviet order has failed to please the capitalists and social-democrats up to the present time, it pleases them even less now, when Comrade Stalin—supported by the iron unity of the Bolshevik Party—in the name of the Party and of the whole working population of the Socialist fatherland, proclaimed the last fight, the decisive Socialist offensive extended on every front, against the capitalist elements in the Soviet Union. That proclamation was made with the steely quietness of the leader of an army who is assured of victory. The capitalist elements in the Soviet Union—however weak they may be—are still the natural allies of international capitalism within the Soviet Union, and their elimination means the elimination of an ally and prop of international imperialism. The unity of will which is directed to this purpose cannot therefore silence the bourgeoisie.

The economic policy of the Soviet Union has always been one of the most important factors determining world policy. This is still more the case at the present time, when the crisis of world capitalism is growing wider and deeper. The decisive Socialist offensive on the remains of capitalism, on all the possible props of international capitalism within the Soviet territory, will not fail to affect to a considerable extent the international policy of the imperialist countries. The bourgeoisie has always been deeply interested in the decision of internal Soviet problems, and the decisions themselves were made, not exclusively on the basis of the relation of class forces with the Soviet Union, but were also dependent upon the relation of world political forces. It cannot be doubted that the final decision on this problem, in the sphere of industry, in favour of Socialism and the final struggle for deciding the problem in the sphere of agriculture will profoundly affect international politics.

The beginning of the rapid industrialisation of the U.S.S.R. was in itself a blow against the imperialist bourgeoisie of the whole world. Still it did not deprive the bourgeoisie of all hope with regard to its future positions in the Soviet Union. The bourgeoisie still awaited the capitalist degeneration of the Soviet Union, it still awaited Thermidor and found its mistaken prophet in Trotsky. Meanwhile, still awaiting the Thermidor of Mr. Trotsky, the imperialist bourgeoisie tried to make full use of the given moment by efforts to increase the exports of commodities to the Soviet Union. The capitalists had to give up their attempts to break down the foreign trade monopoly, success in which, it was hoped, would be the means of establishing contact between foreign capital and the capitalist elements in the national economy of the Soviet Union; still they did not despise "smaller fry," particularly in view of the crisis in capitalist economy. When all hopes of breaking down the foreign trade monopoly had vanished, they turned their attention to industry, trying to link up the imperialist with the N.E.P. bourgeoisie. Now the bourgeoisie does not even believe Trotsky, who is venting all his anger against the "adventurous rate of Stalinist industrialisation" and coming forth as the last prophet

of the N.E.P. bourgeoisie for alliance with international capitalism. (It no longer even uses his plans as a means of agitation "amongst the common people" and has excluded his utterances from the publications of the Trotskyist opposition.)

The Sixteenth Party Congress has also destroyed the hopes that were based on the right wing opposition. By deciding on speeding up the rate of industrialisation, by making the economic plans more concrete, the Party Congress dealt a decisive blow at all the plans and attempts of international imperialism which were directed towards imperialist exploitation of the Soviet Union. It is not, therefore, surprising that the Soviet order which has given evidence of such strength in overcoming capitalism in all spheres of industrial life, should please the bourgeoisie even less than it did formerly, when that strength was still held to be a matter of doubt.

International imperialism feels even more acutely those blows which are dealt it by the collectivisation of agriculture. More important in the calculations of international capitalism than the N.E.P. bourgeoisie, which after all represents only a small section, was the village bourgeoisie, the kulaks and the middle peasants, working and producing on an individual basis. The N.E.P. bourgeoisie was regarded only as mediator, the real partner in all the plans of the bourgeoisie was the kulak and the middle peasant. Then came collectivisation, which meant also the liquidation of the kulaks as a class. The kulak class is being liquidated and, what is even more important, millions of individual peasant holdings are being collectively organised, and millions of individual economic units, which "chemically" give rise to capitalism, are ceasing to exist. The blow which this deals at world imperialism is rendered more severe by the fact that collectivisation is making the strongest and most rapid advance in those very areas which the international imperialist counter-revolution has always regarded with the greatest greed—in the Ukraine and the Northern Caucasus, which had been marked out as the areas on which to advance in all the plans for intervention made by the imperialist general staff.

Everything that has been said above shows

that, if the bourgeoisie is anxious to annihilate the Soviet Union (who can doubt that this is their wish?), the only method it can employ is that of armed intervention. The decision to develop the offensive against all capitalist elements within the Soviet Union must necessarily, in the present atmosphere of crisis, increase the war danger. The policy of peace which Comrade Stalin sharply emphasised has, it is true, compelled the bourgeoisie and the social-fascists to make, for a short time, small and insignificant changes in their methods of stirring up war. Not many weeks previously the Second International issued an appeal for the "salvation of the Russian Revolution from the counter-revolutionary danger" and described the Soviet Union as the real source of the war danger, but its sister organisation, the Amsterdam Trade Union International, had not a single word to say about the Soviet Union. Even if some slender basis of probability were not required in order to spread lies and slander, it is still more advisable at present for the social-fascists to keep silent, if only for a short time, or at most to indulge in nothing but general phrases against "all forms of dictatorship." With its eye on the Sixteenth Party Congress, the Amsterdam International at its Congress decided to say nothing about the living and triumphant progress of the Socialist revolution, unless they could speak ill of it.

The particular international importance of the Sixteenth Party Congress and the proclamation of an offensive on all fronts against capitalism in the Soviet Union, is determined by the fact that it took place at a time when the world crisis of the capitalist economic system had already, in several countries, developed into a political crisis. The economic crisis gives rise, among the capital class, to the question: "Would it not be possible to solve this or that contradiction of capitalism, or all the contradictions at once, at the expense of the Soviet Union; for by its very existence the Soviet Union is revolutionising the working class and the colonies, preventing new wars and the redivision of the world, and it does not allow the capitalists to get hold of the big Soviet markets, which they need so much at the present time because of the economic crisis?" (Stalin.)

These tendencies towards an attack on the Soviet Union were strengthened as the economic crisis developed, and still more strengthened when that crisis invaded the political sphere while, at the same time, the general offensive against all capitalist elements in the Soviet Union was decided upon. In this situation the proletariat of the capitalist countries and their Communist Parties are faced with two most important tasks; firstly, to support the Socialist offensive on capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, and secondly, to utilise to the utmost the economic and political crisis in the capital countries for organising and mobilising the masses against wage reductions, imposed by fascist methods, against taxation and the general oppression of the working class, and for a revolutionary solution to the economic and political crisis of the bourgeoisie.

These two tasks can be amalgamated into one great task—the organisation of the greatest possible number of workers against capitalism, profoundly shaken by crisis, against its fascist state machine and its social-fascist supporters. This offensive must be based on the day-to-day needs of the working class and the peasant masses on the one hand, and on the Socialist peasantry on the other.

The fact that the development from economic to political crisis, which is more than ever forcing the bourgeoisie in a number of countries to adopt fascist methods of government, is occurring at the same time as the Socialist offensive against capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, makes the working masses who have been blinded by social democracy aware of the objective alternative of Bolshevism or fascism.

The facts provide the basis for the widest possible application of the tactics of the united front from below in the struggle against the worsening of the workers' standards in all capitalist countries and in the struggle against the war danger. It is therefore the task of every Communist Party, while continuing the fight on two fronts against right opportunist deviations, to proceed to the mobilisation of the masses, to intensify their struggles and raise them to a higher level and to organise the working class for the fight for proletarian dictatorship.

# FROM FREE TRADE TO PROTECTION

By E. VARGA

ON July 5th the world was astonished by the publication of a resolution drawn up by leading English bankers, in which they announced a complete change in their former policy of free trade. Among the signatories to this historical document are to be found the names of two world-famous men, McKenna and Pease, presidents of two of the big five banks; four years ago their names were attached to the famous bankers' manifesto in favour of free trade.

The two manifestoes indicate the great change which has taken place in British economic policy in the last few years. The first bankers' manifesto was the last flicker of the historically obsolete economic policy of traditional free trade; the recent resolution illustrates England's acceptance of the economic policy being pursued by all imperialist states. This fact also explains the different reception accorded to the two statements: immediately after the publication of the bankers' manifesto, many of the signatories dissociated themselves from it and withdrew their signatures; while the recent bankers' resolution has been warmly welcomed among large sections of the English capitalist class, and more and more leaders of British finance capital proclaim their agreement.

Up to the present time England had taken up an exceptional position among the imperialist Powers. While the United States, Germany, France and Italy had high protective tariffs before the war, which have been raised since the war and which, during the present economic crisis, have been still further increased, England clung, in essentials, to the old system of free trade.\* England's position was due to the fact that her traditional economy in the course of the nineteenth century, when she possessed the industrial monopoly of the whole world, was organised on the basis of free trade. English industry, which possessed a monopoly market in the colonies, and the means to support industrial exports by capital export, in which before the war England left all her competitors far behind, could afford to ignore the protection of the

home market by tariffs, and assured, in its place, the provision of cheap foodstuffs and raw materials. This system worked satisfactorily so long as England's chief competitors possessed an industry which did not produce beyond the needs of the home market and the industrialisation of the colonies remained at a low level. In the post-war period however, the disadvantages of this system for the English bourgeoisie became increasingly apparent. The disproportion between the capacity of industry to produce and the capacity of the home market to consume, became greater and greater in industrial countries. Monopolies which developed behind tariff walls disposed of their surplus products on the English market, at "dumping" prices. The industrialisation of the colonies narrowed the market for finished goods from England. A few colonies, particularly Canada, fell more and more under the economic influence of Britain's chief rival, the U.S.A. The chronic economic crisis which has afflicted England for the last ten years, the chronic unemployment, compelled the English bourgeoisie to seek a new road in economic policy. The centripetal tendencies in British imperialism are working in the same direction. Consequently, the idea of protective tariffs has been gaining ground in recent years. The old free trade attitude could no longer maintain its position.\* For the English bourgeoisie there is no other way of fighting the crisis than that of introducing protective tariffs.

\* Four years ago, when the bankers' manifesto appeared, we pointed out that it was impossible for England to regain her exceptional position with regard to tariffs. In the *Communist International* for November 16th, 1926, we wrote as follows:

"The initiative in this demonstration came from the English bourgeoisie. English industry is at the parting of the ways. The old free trade system, in a world where every State is defending itself against the import of industrial commodities by high protective tariffs, is no longer tenable, for English industry has lost her monopoly on the world market, established at the time when free trade was introduced, and the monopoly position of English industry in relation to the colonies has been shaken. The dominions and colonies (India) have erected tariff walls against the import of industrial commodities, and England does not benefit greatly by preferential treatment... England must either pursue a policy of protective tariffs, or must try to bring the rest of the world into line on free trade. The manifesto drawn up on British initiative is an attempt to solve the problem in the latter direction.

\* The introduction of tariffs on a few goods—automobiles, optical instruments, etc. (the McKenna duties) after the war served principally armaments purposes.

The bankers' resolution means obviously that the fight between free trade and protection in England has been decided in favour of the latter. We are fully in agreement with the *Daily Worker* which wrote, on July 5th, 1930 :

"The resolution is of historic significance, for it indicates the final surrender by the English ruling class of the free trade principle and the acceptance of a new economic policy—a high tariff wall against imports, including the import of foodstuffs."

The supposition that the resolution signifies a change in the policy of the dominating section of the English ruling class is confirmed by the importance of the names attached to the resolution. The resolution was signed by the presidents of the big five banks, two directors of the Bank of England, a number of directors of large private banks and several industrialists, including a director of Royal Dutch. Since the publication of the resolution, many other industrialists have announced their agreement to it; for example, Lord Melchett. The small group of leading capitalists who really rule England has declared, almost to a man, in favour of the resolution.

We shall give this historic document in full : "It is resolved that urgent measures for the promotion of inter-imperial trade are needed to secure and extend the market for British products both at home and through the export trade.

"Bitter experience has taught Great Britain that the hopes expressed four years ago in a plea for the removal of the restrictions upon European trade have failed to be realised. The restrictions have been materially increased, and the sale of surplus foreign products in the British market has steadily grown.

"While we retain the hope of an ultimate extension of the area of free trade throughout the world, we believe that the immediate step for securing and extending the market for British goods lies in reciprocal trade agreements between the nations constituting the British Empire.

As a condition of securing these agreements Great Britain must retain her open market for all Empire products, while being prepared to impose duties on all imports from all other countries."

The resolution, of course, was warmly welcomed in the Conservative Press. *The*

*Times* points out that the resolution does not represent any abrupt change of attitude, but a trend of opinion which had long been apparent to close observers of the City.

"The root cause of the change of fiscal opinion in the city is that owing to various causes the costs of production in this country have become too high in relation to those current abroad. Other countries with small debt burdens, lower taxation, lower costs of government, smaller social charges, are able to produce goods cheaper than British manufacturers, with the result, for instance, that a substantial amount of iron and steel is nowadays imported into this country . . . and that foreign cotton goods now invade this market in competition with Lancashire, which once had a monopoly at any rate of the domestic market."\*

The increasing import of foreign commodities is also the reason which has recently induced the English trade union bureaucrats to look more kindly upon the idea of protection for the Empire. The report of the Trade Union Council Economic Committee, issued at the end of May, proposed that the T.U.C. should support the policy of free trade within the Empire, which means the same as protective walls around the Empire. In accordance with its character as representative of the labour aristocracy, the T.U.C. in this respect too, represents the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The bankers' resolution was also made the starting point for great activity on the part of the Conservative Party. Baldwin and Chamberlain introduced a motion of no confidence in the Labour Government because, instead of extending protection for home industry, it had limited that protection and had arbitrarily excluded any discussion on the introduction of duties upon foreign foodstuffs. The bankers' resolution supplied the necessary push which has carried the whole Conservative Party into Beaverbrook's camp. Imperial protection will supply the platform for a united Conservative Party which, under the influence of the economic crisis, was showing marked tendencies to disintegrate, and it will also serve as the Tory programme for the next election.†

\* *Times*, 10/7/30.

† There are, it is true, within the Conservative Party in Parliament, some elements in favour of free trade : a split on this question may come, but it is not probable. Even were it to happen, it would not be important.

We shall now briefly examine how the interests of the different classes will be affected by the adoption of a policy of protection.

The large landowners favour protection. The price of wheat is much lower in England to-day than before the war; ground rent is falling; without duties on foodstuffs the cultivation of wheat in England is doomed to ruin.

The interests of the industrial bourgeoisie are less unified. The sheltered industries are against any sort of protection—building, transport, the municipal services, etc. These industries, which do not export, can only suffer by Protection, which will increase the cost of raw material and labour power.

Those industries which work principally for export will derive little benefit from Protection. The Lancashire cotton industry, for example, exports 85 per cent. of its production, of which, at least one-half goes outside the Empire. Even if Protection would assure the Empire market entirely to Lancashire—which is wholly impossible, for neither the Indian nor the South African market can be assured to England by protective tariffs—it would still be faced with the problem of disposing of about half its exports in foreign countries. Since the adoption of Protection by England would be countered by most countries outside the Empire, with new duties on certain goods, it is extremely doubtful whether the English textile industry would derive any advantage therefrom. Many other industries stand in more or less the same position.

The industries most deeply interested are those which produce chiefly for the home market and which are most seriously threatened by dumping on the part of foreign competitors; these are, above all, the iron, steel and metallurgical industries.

It is clear that the change from free trade to protection would not by any means solve the problems of British capitalism, even if it were possible, in the present period of declining capitalism, to talk of "solution" at all. An appeal to the example of America or France is both incorrect and misleading, for these countries can dispose of a larger proportion of their industrial production in the home market than England, where the peasant class has almost entirely disappeared, and where practically the whole population lives by industry and trade.

On the contrary, the adoption of Protection will seriously affect a number of industries which have up to the present bought semi-manufactured goods cheaply at dumping prices, and later exported them as finished manufactured articles. And speaking more generally, the national economy of a country which has worked on a free trade basis for a hundred years, cannot pass over to Protection without experiencing profound shocks, and without the bankruptcy of numerous weak concerns. We can therefore count on serious resistance to Protection before large scale capital succeeds in operating its new line.

Apart from these conflicting interests within the bourgeoisie, the question of import duties on foodstuffs will arouse great opposition from the masses. The free import of foodstuffs has a long and powerful tradition behind it in England. It is very well known that in 1924, when the Conservative Party made Protection the election issue, it suffered an overwhelming defeat.\*

Resistance will be forthcoming from the workers, who rightly fear that the introduction of Protection will make their food dearer without any hope of compensation in the way of reduced unemployment. Protection will also be opposed by the rentier class and officials with fixed salaries, etc. The Liberal Party, and to some extent the Labour Party, will try to take over the leadership of these sections of the population. Since, however, these Parties, under the pressure of large-scale capital, will be incapable of making a real fight against Protection, it will be the work of the British Communist Party to defend the interests of the workers against dearer food.

For in every Party, with the exception of the Communist Party, there are both adherents and opponents of Protection. Even in the Conservative Party there are some free traders, though few. In the Liberal Party there are a few large industrialists who favour Protection,

\* The memory of this defeat is still very fresh in the minds of Conservatives. One of them, Sir Lambert Ward, writing in the *Manchester Guardian*, of 5/7/30, said: "While agreeing with every single word of the resolution, I cannot help feeling that, as practically none of the bankers in the conference has ever fought an election in an industrial constituency, they do not altogether realise what an appalling prejudice exists against protection in many parts of the country. The mere whisper of "food taxes" has cost me and the party generally thousands of votes in the past, and may very easily do the same in the future."

within the Labour Party there is an orthodox free-trade wing led by Snowden, and an imperialist protection wing led by Thomas, while MacDonald, here as always, steers a middle course. The bankers' resolution, which at one stroke made the question of Free Trade or Protection the central question of English political life, will deeply affect the three bourgeois Parties. (It is significant, that the conference of bankers which accepted the resolution decided at the same time to send it to the leaders of the three political Parties, in order to demonstrate that they were "above Party.") There will be bitter struggles on this question, but the victory, as far as England herself is concerned, will certainly fall to the Protectionists.

The position is different in the colonies and dominions. An analysis of the trade which is carried on between England and the dominions shows that the English market can absorb the surplus of foodstuffs and raw materials produced by the dominions just as little as the colonies and dominions can absorb the exports of English industry. While, however, the road of Protection and "Empire Free Trade" must be taken by the English bourgeoisie, there is no reason for the colonies and dominions to give up the road of industrialisation which they are follow-

ing, in order to confer benefits on England.

The question will be the most controversial one discussed at the imperial conference which is to take place in the autumn. It is highly probable that the plan of Free Trade within the Empire will come to grief because of the opposition of the dominions and colonies—in so far as the latter have anything to say in the matter. At the best, a compromise will be reached, by which England and the dominions will accord each other preferential treatment—the dominions for English industrial goods, England for the foodstuffs and raw materials of the dominions.

The political objective which it is hoped to reach by adopting Protection, is the creation of a bond which will lessen the centripetal tendencies within the British Empire, and, above all, England hopes to prevent the United States from extending her economic influence over the Empire. The establishment of Protection for England by means of free trade within the Empire, or by a system of preferential tariffs between the dominions and the motherland, is also a political move directed against the United States, and will introduce a new element into the forces which are accentuating the contradictions between England and the United States.

# THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS FINANCES INTERVENTION IN THE U.S.S.R.

By NEMO

## I. A LEAGUE OF NATIONS WAR PLAN

THE forthcoming autumn session of the League of Nations at Geneva will have to deal with a plan drawn up by the Finance Committee of the League of Nations, to which the workers cannot pay too much attention. Although the plan has been discussed and worked upon for years in League of Nations circles, the bourgeois press, for obvious reasons, has refrained from giving it the publicity which is its due.

The plan drawn up by the Finance Committee, and which has been worked out to the most minute detail, envisages war subsidies to States which are attacked, or are threatened by attack, lays down the political conditions which must be fulfilled before such financial aid can be granted and determines the technical manner in which it will become operative.

As in all economic and political steps taken by the League of Nations, whose militarist character is unmistakable, so in this case an attempt has been made to conceal the real character of the plan. Just as the whole imperialist policy of armaments is pursued under the hypocritical cry of "security and peace," so the acceptance of the plan to finance future wars will be represented as a step towards security and disarmament, order and peace. A careful examination of this plan shows that it is one of the most important aspects of war preparations, a step of which the exclusive object is to ensure now the financing of the coming armed intervention of the imperialist world in the Soviet Union.

## 2. THE ORIGIN OF THE CONVENTION

The idea of financing states which are conducting war is not new. A few years ago the Swedish Captain Roos suggested the establishment of a sort of security institute against war. Every state was to contribute towards a security fund, in return for which any state, in the event of an attack directed against it, could receive sums from the security fund. A similar idea was at the back of the suggestion made to the League of Nations in 1926 by the Finnish

Government, and which will shortly be acted upon. It is surely not incorrect to assume that the Finnish suggestion was made on England's initiative; in 1926 the relations between England and the Soviet Union were severely strained, and England was therefore deeply concerned with pushing on war preparations. According to a statement made by Lord Cecil, British representative on the Finance Committee of the League, the proposal made by Finland had been the "subject of private conversations" before it was made to the League of Nations; considering England's dominating influence over Finland, there is scarcely any doubt that those conversations took place in London.

The Finnish suggestion was examined by a preparatory commission and then referred to the Finance Committee of the League, which drew up the principles on which financing was to take place. After these principles were ratified by the Third Commission in 1928 and had been made known to the League Assembly, the Finance Committee was commissioned to draw up the final agreement; this was done in the course of several sessions. The final plan was considered by the Security Committee which met in May, 1930, and was referred to the following meeting of the Council for final ratification.

When this ratification has been given, the agreement will have to be submitted to the different Parliaments, in order that the Governments may be able to meet the financial obligations involved in the acceptance of the plan. Although for the time being several differences of opinion exist with regard to details, particularly with regard to the political conditions in which the plan is to come into force, it is most unlikely that any member of the League of Nations will reject the plan and, in the event of war, there is no doubt that the actual steps taken will go beyond the limits laid down in the plan. The fundamental agreement among the imperialist powers on the subject of financing war is indicated by a resolution passed at the general meeting of the International Union of the

friends of the League of Nations (Madrid, 1929) which called upon all countries to agree to the convention. Even the German Foreign Minister, Curtius, at the last session of the Security Committee, appealed to all States to use the short time which still remained before the autumn session of the League in order to achieve a useful result "so that a new means of securing peace and of promoting solidarity among the peoples may be created."

It is interesting to note how the League has lately been hurrying on the completeness of the convention. When, in September, 1929, the Finance Committee proceeded to discuss the separate articles of the plan, the president read out a letter from the League Assembly in which the Finance Committee was requested to conclude the discussion in the shortest possible time." The League appears to be in a surprising hurry about "building up the obligations of states towards each other." While the League, during the ten years of its existence, has been unable to further disarmament by one single step, this convention which, according to Balodis, promises to be an uncommonly important factor in so far as security and disarmament are concerned, is to be accepted in the shortest possible time. It is enough to realise that the proposed convention claiming to promote security and disarmament, was accepted by the Security Committee of the League of Nations on the same day that it accepted the agreement on "methods of preventing war" and the project to establish a League of Nations world air force, to understand that this is exclusively a question of establishing League of Nations "sanctions." that is, of preparing for imperialist war on the Soviet Union.

### 3. THE CONTENTS OF THE CONVENTION.

The proposed convention, debated by the Finance Committee of the League of Nations at numerous meetings, consists of thirty articles, of which twenty were immediately accepted, while the remainder were at first the subject of contention. According to Article I. financial help is guaranteed to all parties to the agreement who are attacked or threatened by attack, such help to be accorded by a unanimous decision of the Council. Under Articles 2-5 financial assistance is to be given in the form of a loan, the term of which is not to exceed thirty years. Threefold guarantees are provided for such a

loan, firstly, by the attacked state itself, secondly, by all the signatory states and thirdly, if possible, "by any states which are in an exceptionally strong financial position." This can only refer to the United States of America, which, not being a member of the League of Nations, will remain outside the convention, without having to fear that the convention, which is to be valid for a period of ten years, will ever be directed against herself.

Significantly enough, the amount of the loan is not fixed in Article 6 itself, although in working out the plan several different sums were mentioned, including one suggestion of 150 to 200 million gold francs. It is assumed that each state will guarantee a maximum of fifty times its annual contribution to the League of Nations, and that the total sum guaranteed will amount to £50,000,000 sterling, to which must be added further guarantees from "states in an exceptionally strong financial position," should circumstances make this necessary.

During the debates in the Finance Committee it was laid down that a state to which a loan was to be granted would be obliged to fulfil all the political conditions required by the League of Nations. The League of Nations retains the express right to prescribe for weaker states whether or not, for example, they may conclude a separate peace, an armistice or a treaty of neutrality. According to a Geneva correspondent of the *Baltic Press* (6th May, 1930), the significance of the plan lies in the fact that "it was to the advantage primarily of small and financially weak states," by which is meant the western neighbours of the Soviet Union. In return for this advantage, the League of Nations assumes the right to keep these states in political leading-strings. These states have also to fear the loss of their economic independence; the Dutch representative on the Finance Committee proposed that loans should be granted under international control, "such as was the case in Austria."

It is clearly recognised, in League of Nations circles, that the sums which will come in on the basis of the annual contributions of member states to the League is quite insufficient for the financial requirements of the imperialist powers in any modern war. The organisers of armed intervention in the Soviet Union calculate that this sum will be enough for the immediate requirements of Poland, Rumania, and the

border states, whose job it is to pick the chestnuts out of the fire for the imperialists. For example, the well-known pacifist journal *Friedenswarte* wrote (1930, No. 5) :

“It has, however, been agreed that a small state, possessing only very limited possibilities of credit, could make good use of a guarantee system of this character in any conflict with a more powerful neighbour, in such states, therefore, the feeling of security is increased.”

Just as the proposed convention is intended in the first place to ensure rapid and adequate war subsidies to the western neighbour states of the Soviet Union, so it can not be doubted that it also represents the basis for financing all the states which take part in the war.

#### 4. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AS A SANCTION.

In the course of the debates on the practical application of the “convention for rendering financial assistance to states which have been attacked or are threatened by attack,” there arose a number of interesting questions, which utterly destroyed the hypocritical talk about the convention preventing war and promoting disarmament, and clearly revealed its anti-Soviet character. In the first place the League of Nations will be compelled to explain and answer a problem which capitalist diplomacy has so far left unsolved, the problem of who is the attacker, and who the attacked ; moreover, the answer to this question will have to be given before the opening of hostilities—previously this was always a matter for the victor to decide after hostilities had ceased. There was also some controversy on the question whether, on the outbreak of war, the League of Nations has only the right, or the duty, to render financial help ; whether this help was to be given before the opening of hostilities and whether unanimous agreement was necessary for these decisions.

No less complicated is the problem of financial help in the event of war in which a state which is not a member of the League of Nations takes part ; as far as Europe is concerned, this applies only to the Soviet Union, and consequently it merits particular attention from the workers. That the League of Nations violates the principle of neutrality whenever it finances a state in a war against a third power, is admitted by prominent experts in capitalist international law. The Swedish jurist, Professor Uden, wrote :

“It may be said that a state guarantee for a war loan to a belligerent state is a measure which the enemy is entitled to consider as a violation of neutrality.”

Here is a frank admission of the intention of the League of Nations to ignore neutrality in the event of war on the Soviet Union. The remarks of Sir Henry Strakosch, who reported on behalf of the Finance Committee and who boasts of being “one of the individuals who originated the plan,” are extremely illuminating. He referred to Article 16 of the Locarno Pact, “which imposes extremely heavy economic and political obligations that may turn out to be very costly and that can be met only with the utmost difficulty.” On this pretext it is claimed that the signatory states, in accepting the convention, will create an instrument for preventing war, “which is more effective and can be more easily employed than any other at the disposal of the League.” The delegate from Portugal also referred to the necessity of imbuing the convention with the “spirit of Article 16.” Nor was the spokesman for Norway more ambiguous : “The Norwegian Government regards the carrying out of the plan as an expression of the feeling of solidarity which is the predominant motive in the Council. Consequently the plan can only come into operation on the particular and definite basis of Article 16, so that the proposed convention may be of the greatest value in carrying out as quickly as possible all the measures recommended by the Council.”

These remarks indicate the anti-Soviet tendency in the proposed financial assistance scheme ; they illuminate the real meaning of the Locarno Pact and clearly reveal the criminal activities of the League of Nations, which is uninterruptedly perfecting its system of sanctions, in order to bring about a new world-shambles.

#### 5. FINANCIAL HELP FOR WAR PREPARATIONS.

According to a remark made at the Tenth Assembly of the League of Nations by Procopé, Finnish Foreign Minister, the convention on Financial assistance has no other object, but “to maintain peace, and to re-establish peace in the event of a crisis. That being so it is surprising that a Danish proposal to guarantee financial assistance only after all other efforts to maintain peace had failed, was decisively rejected by the Finance Committee. As Lord Cecil said :

“The League of Nations must retain the liberty to decide in what circumstances it is in the interests of peace to guarantee financial assistance.” The Portuguese representative declared himself definitely in favour of guaranteeing financial help *before* the outbreak of war, for, in his opinion, “it would mean the complete bankruptcy of the entire system of peace if we waited for the declaration of war.”

The hypocritical diplomatic declarations made by the representatives of the capitalist Governments are designed to give the impression that the convention is aiming only at securing peace. To achieve this object, they declare that general disarmament will be made a condition of the convention. Actually, the originators of the convention are well aware that, in the present stage of development in the war danger, the prospect of certain financial support is an incentive, rather than an obstacle, to war. The League of Nations will facilitate war by every possible means, so long as that war is directed against the Soviet Union. The Geneva correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt* (13th April, 1930) involuntarily admitted the truth of this when he expressed himself as follows about this “excellent method of preventing war.”

“An aggressor state will find itself opposed immediately by the united financial strength of the signatory states. Moreover, this system would work better, or more quickly, than that outlined in the Pact, and it would, besides, entail less cost. This agreement would also provide a certain amount of security against the effects of the danger of war on economic and financial life.”

We have only to follow the debates in the Finance Committee on the proposed convention to recognise it as a preparatory war measure taken by the League of Nations to provide the necessary materials to the border states, Poland and Rumania, in the event of armed conflict with the Soviet Union. Sir Henry Strakosch himself declared:

“Nobody doubts the value of arming for defence against a first attack, but this alone becomes insignificant, once the grim business of war begins.”

In Strakosch's opinion all war preparations, in the modern age of technique and of the rapid consumption of raw materials, are inadequate. and “the mere acceptance of this principle

indicates how essential and decisive foreign support will be.”

However unambiguous the statements of bourgeois diplomats and newspapers may be, we shall refer further to the extraordinarily illuminating remarks in the *Baltic Handbook* for 1930 on the importance of Finland's suggestion to the League of Nations, which is described in the following terms:

“The starting point was given by the fact that certain small countries possess so few raw materials and so few concerns for manufacturing the materials of war that in the event of war, they would be unable to provide, by their own efforts, the requisite amount of war materials. If they did not wish their security endangered, they would be compelled, in peace time, to raise considerable sums for providing the necessary raw materials and for establishing adequate munition factories, or for laying in stores of finished war materials.

“This would be even more indispensable because such a small state, if drawn into war, would scarcely have enough means or enough credit to be able to buy from other countries all the essential war materials. Such a situation would consequently put obstacles in the way of the League of Nations' efforts at disarmament (!). Disarmament would be greatly facilitated if the states which are in this position were guaranteed the necessary financial assistance for obtaining war materials and other commodities required during war-time.”

This quotation is a glaring example of the hypocrisy of defending the imperialist policy of armaments. The League of Nations, in the sacred interests of peace, will guarantee financial support to the small and financially weak states bordering the U.S.S.R. These vassals of the great imperialist powers must not be afraid of the costs involved in the bloody adventure which they are planning, as far as they are concerned, the fight is represented as—almost—harmless.

#### 6. SABOTAGING DISARMAMENT.

In order to conceal the real character of the convention as the financial basis for war on the Soviet Union, the imperialist wire-pullers explain their acceptance of the plan on the grounds of hastening disarmament. The extent of the hypocrisy of this statement, the extent to which the certainty of obtaining finance for the coming war from the League of Nations strengthens the

interests of the armaments international in a new war and increases its activity, is shown by the manner in which the Finance Committee dealt with the proposal of neutral powers that general disarmament should be made an essential condition of financial assistance. The Swedish proposal that the convention should come into force only after disarmament had actually taken place was, like the similar suggestion from Denmark, hotly rejected. Lord Cecil in particular was emphatically not in favour of increasing the difficulties of disarmament by combining the two matters, and insisted upon the omission of the words "at the earliest possible date" from the Swedish suggestion that the Council of the League of Nations should draw up the text for an agreement on disarmament which should be ratified by all states.

The representative from Denmark pointed out that the agreement concerning the control of the private armaments industry had not yet been ratified "because of the strong opposition to it" and that consequently the creation of a war fund for the purchase of war materials would give the armaments industry great encouragement. He said: "What would be more important is the fact that the creation of a large fund for the purchase of war materials would in certain circumstances be a great temptation to the armaments industry . . . which would regard the fund as its lawful prey. With the help of their connections, the armaments industrialists would try their utmost to bring about a situation which might be described as a "war danger" and thus afford them the opportunity of taking possession for a time of the fund."

The control of the private armaments industry just like general disarmament, will continue to be discussed after the acceptance of the convention; within the capitalist order of society the establishment of such control is as impossible as the abolition of imperialist war itself. The remarks made by the representative of the Danish Government in themselves suffice to show incontestably that armaments are being speeded up in connection with the proposed subsidy for war.

#### 7. FINANCIAL BLOCKADE OF THE SOVIET UNION.

At the same time as the League of Nations is organising the coming intervention in the Soviet Union and is guaranteeing a war loan to all capitalist countries in the event of their active participation in this war, a financial blockade is

being prepared against the Soviet Union, in order to injure the construction of socialist economy. While the League of Nations, the representative of "civilised Europe," is collecting huge sums of money in preparation for the imperialist shambles, efforts are being made to withhold from Russia the financial means required for carrying out the five-year plan, for raising the economic and cultural standards of 150 million human beings.

The *Hamburger Nachrichten*, for example, on the 13th April, queried how far foreign credits should be used to help the Soviet Union to establish collective economy and increase its production, while the vice-president of the American Federation of Labour, at a mass meeting in New York, appealed for a financial boycott of the U.S.S.R. as the most effective means which capitalist countries could employ in protest against religious persecution.

The *Deutsche Bergweg-Zeitung* is particularly vehement in the demand for financial boycott. It is specially insistent upon the withdrawal of foreign credits from the U.S.S.R. In an article published on 13th March, 1930, this leading newspaper of German heavy industry suggested (wholly ignoring the Treaty of Rapallo) that preparatory steps in defence against Russia could be taken if a conference were convened of representatives of powerful capitalist countries, and the international world of finance. This conference was to discuss primarily how a financial boycott of Russia could be effected. This would involve mutual agreements not to invest money in or grant loans to the U.S.S.R., "until order and the inviolability of property has been restored in that country. There is no doubt that if this were done the rule of bolshevism would come to an end."

In consequence, greater attention must be paid to the International Bank for reparations. The reserves held by this bank are destined, according to the Young Plan, to be used for obtaining new markets, which means the violent seizure of the Soviet market for world capitalism.

It is clear that the International Bank for Reparations can be used as the centre for a financial blockade of the Soviet Union, and that this blockade will develop easily into armed intervention in the U.S.S.R. when the League of Nations decides to deposit the war fund of world imperialism with the International Bank for Reparations.

# UNDER THE BANNER OF FASCISATION

(To the Stockholm Congress of the Amsterdam International).

THE world economic and political crisis of capitalism becomes more intense. The proletarian wave of activity rises still higher, and the attack of monopoly capital on the working class grows ever fiercer. Capitalism is making frantic efforts to clamber out of the growing economic crisis by lowering the standard of living of the working masses. If the beginning of the "third period" was significant by the attempt to suppress the new strike wave by means of the universal introduction of compulsory arbitration and attack on the trade unions; if at the beginning of the economic crisis the general slogan of monopoly capital was the demand for complete abolition of social insurance, then the present stage is characterised by a direct attack on wages. There is undoubted evidence of a *much higher* degree of attack by monopoly capital than was the case on the eve of the economic crisis over a year ago.

Alongside of this, the work of international social-fascism becomes more subtle and rotten. The last Congress of the Amsterdam International held in Stockholm gives a classical picture of this. The process of merging the reformist trade unions with monopoly capital and its position, which has been particularly hastened since the period of capitalist rationalisation, becomes not only a factor nationally, but is transformed into the *international* slogan and finds its *programme-theoretical* expression in the official congress of the Amsterdam International. It could not be otherwise. In the interests of overcoming the world economic crisis, against the world upsurge of the revolutionary workers' movement, against the world uprising of the exploited imperialist colonies, the social-fascist bureaucracy had to bring forward its world programme of action. That is why, despite three years of complete organisational collapse of the Amsterdam International, despite the social-imperialist intrigue which is characteristic of this organisation during the last six years—"the opposition" of the English in Vienna and Paris, the rivalry in Stockholm, they found a common language. "The Congress took place in a splendid atmosphere" the Vice-Chairman of the Amsterdam International

stated in an interview with Belgian journalists, "186 delegates were fully in agreement regarding the aims and methods of the international trade union movement . . . Differences belong to the past." The matter of agreement is one of ideological and organisational preparation, in connection with the growing revolutionary upsurge, for a general attack on the revolutionary proletarian vanguard!

It is only necessary to look over the agenda of the Stockholm Congress of the Amsterdam International, in order to be assured of what "historical place" this Congress holds in the development of reformism after the war. Here are the main problems:

- (1) the working out of an international economic programme.
- (2) the working out of an international social-political programme,
- (3) confirmation of the transfer of headquarters from Amsterdam to Berlin.

In all these questions we see a single idea running through them, the activation of the Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy, the strengthening of the rate of fascisation of the reformist trade unions, the rate of merging them with the bourgeois state apparatus, strengthening of suppression of the revolutionary trade union vanguard, and a more definite attack "on Moscow," i.e., on the Red International of Labour Unions (Profintern) and the Central Council of Trade Unions in Moscow.

This is proved not only by the contents of the speeches and debates at the Stockholm Congress itself, but by the commentaries of the whole of the *international social-fascist press and the results of the Congress*.

"The Congress met faced with tremendous tasks, which the new development of State capitalism places before the trade unions." writes the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*. The actual report of the Amsterdam International, presented by the Executive Committee to the Stockholm Congress, also admits this quite openly. "We close with the hopes, that the *severe economic crisis* . . . will become weaker and its place taken by *healthy economic relations*."

The Amsterdam International was created as an auxiliary weapon of the League of Nations.

Not for nothing did the old pope Oudegeest, during a period of seven years of actual leadership of the Amsterdam International, say with pride that the Amsterdam International had saved capitalist Europe from bolshevism. When partial capitalist rationalisation commenced, the reformist trade unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International, one by one took upon themselves the active support of realising the tasks of national capital. And it is significant, that as the process of merging the national centres of the reformist trade union movement increased, with their national bourgeois-state apparatus, national differences within the Amsterdam International developed more sharply and openly. On the very threshold of partial stabilisation, at the Vienna Congress of the Amsterdam International, the first conflict with the English takes place. On the threshold of the third period at the Paris Congress in August, 1927, when partial capitalist rationalisation had reached its highest development, these contradictions become sharper. This Congress, which ended with all against each other inside the Amsterdam International, reflected photographically the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation. The present Congress in Stockholm no less faithfully reflects the new situation which has been created by the growing world economic and political crisis of capitalism, the condition of general fright in the ranks of the bourgeoisie and its social-fascist agents in the face of the oncoming revolutionary struggles of the proletariat. Because of this we have the touching "unity" of these mothers of social imperialism, who are simply the agents of their national fatherland capital.

What is the basis of the new economic programme of the Amsterdam International? This programme contains within itself nothing original. It is a simple summary of all the experiences of collaboration and merging with monopoly capital in the more important capitalist countries, and in the first place in Germany. This programme bears all the signs of the theoretical work of the social-fascist leaders of German social-democracy and the German trade union movement. The scheme of their arguments is approximately the following: The new technical revolution is developing by huge

strides. Organised trust capital is growing and strengthening. The organised interference of the State in the economic life of the country becomes greater. Capitalism has proved itself capable not only of opposing the proletariat, not only of restoring the economy which was destroyed by the war, but also of new creative efforts (listen, Comrade Bukharin). The task of the trade unions is to assist this process of development of organised capital, to assist capitalist rationalisation, because this is the only path to the realisation of control of capitalist production, to the "democratisation" of the bourgeois state and capitalist economy.

"The restoration of world economy," says the speech of Leipart, "has made encouraging successes; the peaceful relations between the peoples strengthen from year to year . . . The old, and what might have been considered finally defeated economic form has proved itself extraordinarily capable of resistance. It has unfolded unexpected powers."

From this the inference to be drawn is:

"The trade unions should assist the planned development of industry, its rational merging into larger entities, financial organisation and the exchange of old machinery and methods of work for new equipment and new technical methods." (Section in the Stockholm programme on capitalist rationalisation.)

Maertens formulated this programme still more concisely in an interview with a correspondent of the Belgian newspaper *Le Peuple*. The meaning of the new economic programme, according to his statement, amounts to the following: In the *national scale*—a guarantee (to the trade unions!—G.S.) of collaboration for the fulfilment of rationalisation, control of industry, credits (Brandler, Brandler, where art thou?) the development of social enterprises; in the *international scale*—collaboration with the League of Nations, control by the League of Nations of trusts, international arbitration of economic questions, and levelling of conditions of labour.

This is a typical programme of the most spineless labour aristocracy which, under the conditions of present capitalist rationalisation and thanks to its peculiarities, links up its fate with that of monopoly capital. And it is extremely characteristic that it was specifically the German delegation that led those who demanded

the unequivocal collaboration with capitalist rationalisation. "The trade unions hold too important a place in contemporary economic life to stand aside and say that they are not concerned with the tremendous changes in technical development" explains the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*. "The trade unions should have a positive attitude towards this development, in order to influence rationalisation." Some "opposition" was shown by representatives of backward countries, where capitalist rationalisation has no semblance of technical progress, and it is difficult for the trade union bureaucracy to convince the workers of its "benefits."

Is it necessary to add that no mention was made of the world economic crisis at the Congress, nor of the attack of capital on wages and social insurance, nor of the organised counter-attack and strike struggle. In the financial report of the Amsterdam International not one instance of support of any strike movement is mentioned. All the reformist unions together have spent only 9½ per cent. of their budget on forced support of the workers in strike action? Is it necessary to add further that in this *basic question* the Stockholm Congress of Amsterdamites showed *real unanimity*, and not one voice of criticism was levelled against this programme? The "director" of the International Labour Bureau of the League of Nations, that "socialist" Albert Thomas, felt at the Stockholm Congress as if it was his birthday. It is significant for the present reputation of the Amsterdam International in the eyes of the working-class that Albert Thomas considered it necessary to take under his "socialist protection" the collaboration of the Amsterdam International and the League of Nations.

"All that has been said about the control of the Amsterdam International by the International Labour Bureau, is more than ever disproved (!). Amsterdam collaborated with the I.L.B. on the basis of complete freedom, in no way sacrificing its autonomy or its "ideals."

This unanimity of the Stockholm Congress was not disturbed even by the participation of the acrobats of "left" social-fascism—Cook and Fimmen. Both Cook and Fimmen reappeared on the scene in Stockholm after the betrayal of the English miners following on the "union" with the Prince of Wales, after hymns of praise in honour of the P.P.S. trade unions in Poland.

After the loathsome attack on the British C.P. and the Minority Movement, Cook again comes out in the role of "exposer" of the Amsterdam International and a violent opponent of collaboration with capital. After two years of "great silence" after a triumphal tour of all the war posts of Polish fascism, Edo Fimmen again comes forth with a threatening speech against the inactivity of the Amsterdam International in combatting the war danger. These speeches of Cook and Fimmen are also significant of the period and enter into the general scheme of preparation by the Amsterdam International for a general attack on the revolutionary proletarian vanguard. But in the light of this, it is characteristic that on the main question of the aims and methods of the reformist trade unions, on the question of the new economic programme of the Amsterdam International, i.e., on the question of the theoretical development of fascisation of the reformist trade union, Cook and Fimmen formally and actually are in a united front with all the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy.

Of no less importance in the sense of activation of the Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy and the sharpening of its attack against the Soviet trade unions, is the second important item on the agenda of the Stockholm Congress—the question of transferring the headquarters of the Amsterdam International from Amsterdam to Berlin. The tense interest displayed at the Congress, which was shown by the hall being full to overflowing during the discussion on this item, was due to the fact that this was the sharpest *imperialist contradiction* within the "international." All remember the rôle played by the International Secretariat of the trade unions under the leadership of Karl Legien as the weapon of German imperialism, which can be likened to the Versailles Treaty for the German trade unions, by transference of the headquarters to "neutral" Holland. Actually the International centre of the reformist trade unions was transferred from the most important defeated country to the most important victorious country, England. The elected chairmen of the Amsterdam International were always English. Up to the time of the Vienna Congress in 1924, the hegemony of the English in the Amsterdam International was in full swing. The English trade union constituted

the main financial basis of the Amsterdam International.

At the Paris Congress the picture changes. The German trade unions, after the upheaval of 1923, revived. This process went parallel with the successes of capitalist stabilisation in Germany. Then the Germans raised the question of transferring the centre from Amsterdam to a country with a "strong trade union movement." They were confronted, however, with the sharp opposition of the English and French. The Germans as yet, did not dare to talk of transferring from Amsterdam to Berlin. At the Stockholm Congress it was the English themselves who suggested transferring the centre headquarters to Berlin.

The forthcoming revolutionary struggles compel the Amsterdam trade union bureaucrats to counteract the growing influence of "Moscow"—particularly in Germany—by a stronger, more reactionary and ideologically and organisationally strong reformist trade union organisation of capitalist Europe. Not for nothing did the Leipzig *Folkszeitung*, in its estimation of the importance of the Stockholm Congress, consider the transference of the headquarters to Berlin the most important decision of the Stockholm Congress. And only the fierce nationalist hatred by the French social-imperialist of the Germans forced Jouhaux to speak against the suggestion. For the first time they adopted voting on the basis of the number of members of organisations, which gave nearly 10 million votes for the transference of the centre to Berlin, and 1,664,000 against, and 1,073,000 abstentions. "The trade union world parliament," as the Amsterdamites call their Congress, understood the problems confronting a disintegrating capitalism.

The national-imperialist contradictions of

international social-fascism retreat before the basic task of the general attack on the revolutionary proletarian vanguard. An exact copy of the relations between world imperialism and the country of proletarian dictatorship.

Such is the "historical place" of the Stockholm Congress. When the Paris Congress ended in 1927 full of dissensions, the Amsterdamites, nevertheless, asserted the Congress had not weakened but on the contrary, had strengthened the Amsterdam International. This assertion was based then on the well-known consolidation of the reformist trade union movement nationally—on the basis of co-ordinating with the then stabilised capital. Now we have the reverse. In connection with developing and deepening world economic and political crisis of capitalism, in every capitalist country the ground is giving way under the feet of trade union social-fascism. That is why world social-fascist trade union bureaucracies lean closer to each other, and openly commit themselves to the system of fascist reaction and anti-soviet bloc. That is why at the Stockholm Congress we saw present for the first time in the history of the Amsterdam International, agents of imperialism in the East, "yellow" leaders of Indian, Japanese and Egyptian trade union movement all the Syzyki's, Joshi's and others, in the rôle of "lookers-on". And that is why the trade unions and the revolutionary trade union organisations of the whole world should strengthen *tenfold* the campaign of exposure of social-fascism and its various "left" forms, and in particular must *tenfold* strengthen all their efforts for the organisation of a united proletarian front from below—against the attack of capital, against fascist and social-fascist reaction, for power to the Soviets, for the dictatorship of the proletariat!

# THE QUESTION OF OUR TRADE UNION TACTICS IN POLAND

By HALMA.

**T**HE fascist dictatorship in Poland which has already existed four years, has not solved any of the most important economic and political problems of the country. On the contrary, it has only deepened and strengthened these problems which have led to the development of a general national crisis, making Poland one of the weakest places in the tottering capitalist stabilisation of the whole world.

On the part of the working masses the situation finds its reflection in increasing unemployment, in constant spontaneous outbreaks of the workers, in their conflicts with the police, in their increasing struggle against the fascist dictatorship—during the past period sharp conflicts took place in Sanoki on the 6th March, in Weston's factory at Olkushe, in Zaventze, and in the struggle of the peasants against the heavy burden of taxation, against the agrarian policy of fascism, etc.

The expression of this crisis takes shape amongst the bourgeoisie in the form of internal differences; constant changes in the external, formal representatives of the government (Bartel, Svitalsky, Slavek), the increasing opposition of a number of parties, disagreeing with the actual power of Pilsudsky because of the methods used for the preserving of the capitalist régime, and for keeping a place in the fascist camp.

The position which has been created demands of the Polish Communist Party and the trade union opposition a clear revolutionary line, which must be as free from opportunist waverings, from trade union legalism, from impermissible lagging in the rear of the masses, as well as events, as also from ultra-left phraseology which divorces us from the masses.

Does such a consistent line in our trade union work in Poland exist? Unfortunately, we cannot say that this is so. A number of facts prove that in this respect, things are not so good. The discussion before the Fifth Congress of the Profintern makes it possible for us to refer to a number of mistakes in trade union tactics in Poland.

We will not talk about the mistakes of the united front committees in Warsaw at the end of

1928; consisting of expressed as well as organisational support to the P.P.S trade unions. (Julavsky against the new trade unions of the fascist P.P.S.\*; Javorsky and the defence of these mistakes by several leading comrades of the Communist Party.) These mistakes have been acknowledged in practice, and, if not formally, have been corrected in the work of our Warsaw supporters. Likewise we will not talk about the similar previous mistakes of trade union legalism, which expressed itself particularly during the great strike in Lodz in the autumn of 1928. These mistakes, despite their importance and the fact that they have not yet been overcome, have been condemned; some of the incorrigible open "legalists" (the Lodz group of textile workers headed by Kravetz) have been removed from the ranks of the revolutionary trade union opposition.

It is important to discuss those mistakes and waverings in the work of our supporters in Poland, which have been not at all, or but little discussed, but which touch the basic problems of revolutionary trade union tactics, for they prove its non-understanding by a number of Polish comrades, the results of which may be harmful.

What is to be our trade union policy in Poland under the following conditions?

Complete division in the trade union movement; the merging of all trade union groupings with the fascist government and bourgeois parties; the playing with radical phrases on the part of the P.P.S. and the Central Commission, while at the same time they adopt the most merciless repression in relation to revolutionary trade union functionaries; when the unorganised comprise 90 per cent. of the workers; of the growing radicalisation of the working masses and the throttling of their revolutionary activities by the various trade union leadership.

Under these conditions our task consists in the strengthening of the work of those organisations where the masses are to be found, in creating within them strong opposition groups, which clearly disassociate themselves from the leadership of the trade unions, and in relentless

\*Socialist Party of Poland.

struggle against all trades union groupings. Under such conditions, where our work in the reformist trade unions is impossible as a result of repressions, when a huge majority of workers are not in these unions, and have no trust in them, when the fascist or social-fascist character of these unions are evident to the workers, then the task before the trade union opposition is that of creating independent revolutionary trade unions.

In relation to the already existing revolutionary trade unions the task is that of organisational strengthening, by putting their work on such a basis as to make them examples of real class trades unions; and by their defence of the workers' interests, the bringing in of masses into their ranks.

Have these tasks been fulfilled by our Polish comrades?

At the Fourth Congress of the Profintern, the General Secretary, Comrade Lozovsky, raised the question of the greater organisational independence of our supporters in Poland. This was expressed, by the way, in the demand for the organisation of an independent miners' trade union in the Dombrovsky basin. This question was seen in its full perspective during the Lodz strike of August, 1928, and the breakaway from the P.P.S. trade unions. In the resolutions of the Comintern and Profintern which characterised the Lodz strike, the Polish comrades were criticised for not having exploited the revolutionary upsurge by forming an independent left textile workers' trade union.

How did our Polish comrades understand this criticism? Instead of working out a policy on the basis of the instructions of the R.I.L.U., *which would take into consideration the difference in circumstances in various places and various industries*, they simply went all out for the *general line* of new trade unions. They stated that "the creation of independent, revolutionary trades union organisations is an historical necessity," that the creation of revolutionary trade unions is "the only means of defending the working-class against the capitalist attack, fascism and war, the only means of saving the trade union movement for the class struggle and socialism" (Resolution of the January Plenum of the Polish Communist Party and the March Trade Union Conference).

The resolution of the Trade Union Conference—in so far as the existence of revolutionary trades unions is conditional on their struggle against the fascist régime—took the line of least resistance and decided to become illegal.

In practice, this change in tactics had worse results. Whoever pointed out the necessity for strengthening our work in the social-fascist trade unions was branded as a "right," as an opportunist, almost as a Brandlerite, or a liquidator. It is only necessary to bring as an example our work amongst the Warsaw metal workers.

Here a special policy was introduced, in accordance with the passivity of our work amongst the metal workers: "We will not yet create our union, but we will not call for entry into the P.P.S. trade union." Those who left the P.P.S. union were openly supported (Prague declaration), and when a number of comrades, who were not in agreement with such passivity, demanded "the mobilisation of the workers in the ranks of the trade union opposition within the P.P.S. trade union" at the same time "creating preparatory steps for the organisation of a real class trades union," they were branded as opportunists, because they had talked about work in the P.P.S. trades union. This was substantiated by referring to the resolution of the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. (!) and the branded comrades were accused of not fulfilling the line of the R.I.L.U. The name of the R.I.L.U. was used for incorrect, bad work.

Of course, such a "change" in our trade union work in Poland, together with its practical results, could be supported neither by the Comintern, nor by the Profintern. The Polish comrades had to beat a retreat, and straighten out the trades union line. But as is often the case in carrying out our tactics, they went from one extreme to another.

In the resolution of the Trades Union Conference—which straightens out the line of the trades union tactic—it says, "The trade union opposition calls on all unorganised workers to enter the social-fascist P.P.S. trades union (Bunder, etc.) everywhere where there are no revolutionary trades unions and where the trades union opposition is not creating new unions."

That is to say, the trades union opposition calls upon the workers to enter the ranks of the social-fascist trade unions ! And nothing more; there the phrase ends. Why are they called upon to do this ; for what purpose ? The unsatisfactory nature of this sentence, its opportunism, does not need proof, it is self-evident.

The question is, of course, not simply that of an incorrect formulation of a resolution, but whether in practice that change has taken place in our trades union tactics in the sense of more organisational independence of the trades union opposition. The Comintern and Profintern gave the Polish comrades detailed instruction as to the way which this change should take place. The Tenth Plenum of the Comintern speaks of the task of the creation of revolutionary miners' trade union in the coal region. Has this task been fulfilled ? The resolution of the Polish comrades already referred to, which straightens out the trades union line, says in connection with this question : "At the same time, the Conference points out the incorrectness of the decision of the March Conference, for the creation of the Union of Oilworkers in the Borislavsky region and the Mineworkers' Union in the Dombrovsky basin. The creation of a Mineworkers' Union remains an outstanding problem." In this way, the task set by the Tenth Plenum over a year ago, still remains a problem. How long is it to remain a problem ? The article of a leading Polish comrade, O. Chervetz, remains silent on this.

In order to strengthen our influence amongst the working masses, the R.I.L.U. put before the Polish comrades the task of a unified trades union opposition, on the examples of the trade union opposition in Germany, the Minority Movement in England, etc. Has such an opposition been formed ? The Fifth Congress draws nearer, but of the fulfilment of this task nothing is heard, no step forward seems to have been taken.

The frame of mind of the leading trade union workers is an extraordinary example of muddle. They have come to the amazing conclusion that the trades union opposition should form groups in the factories composed only of left members of the "class" trades union, who will elect trusted comrades for the collection of member-

ship dues, and representatives of factory groups on to the committees of the unions.

This attempt to create trades union groups in the factories, solely comprised of supporters of the Profintern, isolating them from the masses of the workers still under the influence of the P.P.S., and from the unorganised, and on the other hand, the inclusion of those groups who in actuality are red fractions in the system of "class trades unions," is a clear proof of the amalgamation of ultra-left and opportunist tendencies.

The wavering policy of our trades union work in Poland, which, deprived of all Bolshevism form, leads to all sorts of exaggerations, arises out of the passivity and lagging behind events, of our Polish comrades. Their tactics approximately amount to the following : "There was a great strike movement and we were called upon to change our policy —very well, we will. We were checked—let us make another complete change. Even if excellent opportunities come our way, although we may not be able to make the most of them yet (more of this later) we'll have none of it, since it means undertaking something new. No ! we're not fools":—once again exaggerations.

But while there is this wavering policy, these lagging behind tactics, are there no positive features, which may be not fully recognised, or not recognised in resolutions ? Yes, there are.

First of all this is expressed in our attitude towards the independent left trades union. In Poland, we have a number of organisations won over by the lefts ; the free trades union in Upper Silesia, the Union of Chemical Workers (led at one time by the present traitor Chumoi), the Union of Glassworkers, Bakers and a number of others less important. The attitude of the R.I.L.U. to the independent left trades union movement is well known. It is most attentive. The question of the Unitarian French trades union, of left unions in Czechoslovakia has been considered separately in more than one Plenum or Congress of the Profintern (the last time at the Sixth Plenary Session in 1929). And this is to be understood. These organisations at any rate work better than the reformist ones, and should be examples of revolutionary organisations.

How is this work in Poland ? It is almost the weakest section of our trades union work.

From the small union which we won for ourselves in Upper Silesia, we could and should have created organisational support of the left trade union opposition, not only in Upper Silesia, but also in the Dombrowsky basin, and generally speaking throughout the whole of coal district. Did we do this? We did not. The "Free" trades union, under the leadership of the lefts, scarcely held its head above water, did not become organisationally stronger, but weakened; they were not able to prove themselves to the masses as the leaders of revolutionary struggle, their upper circles were infected with opportunism, which led to the union losing its left character. In the large trade union of chemical workers, where for a number of years there existed a leadership, we were unable to create a firm, ideological basis, which at the right moment would be able to counteract the blows directed against it; the trades union is completely unable to recover from the treachery of its secretary Chumoi, and finds itself in a condition of organisational disintegration. The glass-workers' trades union instead of showing itself to be a revolutionary organisation, has stepped into the opportunist path of the Upper Silesian "free" trade union. The left leather workers' trade union in Warsaw arising out of legal, opportunist motives, refused assistance to the strike committee, which was leading the struggle of the leather workers, in organising a meeting of strikers; as a result of this one of our oldest and most hopeful sections in Warsaw—the leather worker proletariat, came under the influence of the P.P.S. union. This is but a small picture of our "leadership" of the independent left trades unions.

What is the reason for such an inadmissible, inattentive, careless attitude on the part of our Polish supporters to the independent left trades union organisations? For to push all the blame on to objective circumstances is impossible. The roots of such a deeply unenviable position of our work in Poland, lie not only in defeatism and passivity, but to a great degree in the bad attitude towards the trade union movement generally, and to the independent left trade unions in particular. Within our ranks in Poland there exists a popular and widespread accusation in relation to the leading comrades in the Profintern, who insist on the creation of left trade unions under given circumstances and in given

districts. They are accused of *organised trade union fetishism*. This is characteristic; we have not yet created a single sound organisational basis for our revolutionary trade union movement, we allow organisational disintegration, and what is closely bound up with it—ideological decay of the existing trade unions. For a number of years we have had no fractions within the social-fascist trades union organisations, and have been very weak organisationally—and yet we already shout and are afraid, and defend our passive, organisational inactivity by attacking organisational fetishism. What does this mean? This means an under-estimation of the organisation question of the revolutionary trades union movement. This in turn means the inability of our Polish comrades to rid themselves of their non-bolshevik heritage.

In connection with the under-estimation of the organisational side of our movement, the *phraseology* of committees of action is popular in the ranks of our Polish comrades. They are to be found, and we create them everywhere? Everywhere and at all times, be the conditions favourable or otherwise, whether we have connections with the masses or not, in connection with the conduct of a campaign, or, more frequently, without any campaign whatsoever—exactly as in the well-known opera "Figaro here, Figaro there." If we were to measure our successes in Poland by the number of committees of action, then we should have had a revolution in Poland long ago. The correct line of the committees of action is blurred by the phraseology of committees of action. They are the panacea for all evils, the basis and completion of nearly every campaign; they have to take the place of left trades unions, factory committees, and almost of the Soviets.

It will suffice in this connection to give a few characteristic illustrations. First, in the summer of 1929 at the Western Ukrainian Congress of trade unions, the lefts received an overwhelming majority of representatives, and despite the protests of the Central Commission, instead of electing a left leading trade union organ, which would unite around itself all the Western Ukrainian trade union movement, and conduct the struggle against social-fascism in the trade union movement, our Congress adopted revolutionary resolutions, elected central and local anti-fascist committees of action and . . .

left for their respective homes. Of course, in the given situation we could do no better service to social-fascism. The second example: in May of this year at the Congress of the Central Commission, more than 100 delegates from factories and left trades union organisations turned up. They were forcibly prevented from entering the Congress. Instead of organisationally uniting itself in one form or another, and putting itself forward as the real representative of the masses, this self-called Congress of bureaucrats adopted revolutionary sounding resolutions, elected anti-fascist committees of action, and again peacefully dispersed. In both illustrations no useful attempt at a large organisational character whatsoever! Truly, we cannot by any means be accused of organisational fetishism!

This phraseology of committees of action as the "be all and end all" of the revolutionary movement in Poland is not new. In 1925, a pamphlet by O. Chervetz was published, entitled "Committee 21," which describes the struggle of the Silesian proletariat. This pamphlet propounded the theory of supplanting trades union work by committees of action, the theory of leading the whole of the economic struggle of the proletariat, right up to the revolution, by committees of action. This incorrect, anti-trades union, harmful theory, which corresponded to the anti-trade union tendencies of the leadership of the Polish Communist Party of the time, was condemned by the Comintern. But the ideas contained in this pamphlet exist in the ranks of our Polish supporters, its ideas, and not resolutions, to a large extent determine our practical work in Poland. The careless, negative attitude of the Polish comrades to trade union work, and to left trades unions, and the support of the creation of all sorts of committees of action is a proof of the fact that the harmful views of Chervetz's are not uprooted, and on the basis of our passivity, the difficulties of our work under the conditions of the fascist régime are growing and stronger.

On another question too, the Polish comrades show surprising firmness—in the relations to the P.P.S. trades unions by the Central Commission. These trades unions were historically created by the merging of various P.P.S. and Communist trades unions. At one time they united the most conscious workers, were a large factor in the

social life of Poland, and their leadership was comprised not only of P.P.S.'ites., but to a large degree of revolutionary workers. At that time the tactics of the left opposition consisted in uniting all the workers in these unions, in the destruction of other organisations, and the transfer of the centre of attention of all the work and struggle to the so-called class trade union movement.

Since that time, however, much water has flowed under the bridges; with the assistance of police and P.P.S. repressions, the lefts have been completely ousted from the leading positions. These trades unions neither socially nor organisationally represent half the strength which was previously theirs. Within their ranks there has taken place a division into social-fascist and fascist sections, and the first because of its oppositional phraseology represents a greater danger to the consciousness of the workers than the second. Lastly, what is most important is that these trades unions have become almost completely the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and the fascist government, merging with the latter's apparatus, representing a strike-breaking organisation, and becoming an inseparable part of the preparation for war against the Soviet Union.

It would seem as if, in such circumstances, in our relations to them all differentiation or comparison with other national, christian, or pure fascist trades unions should disappear. But no! Our Polish comrades consider that our work, as in the past, must be concentrated on the P.P.S. trades unions, that they are the "natural" base of our work. They call for the destruction of other trades unions, but for entry into these; in these they conduct their work (if only they would do it properly here!), in other trades unions our work is absolutely allowed to collapse.

Why is this so? In resolutions relating to this question we have profound talmudic verbiage to the effect that within the P.P.S. trades unions there are more conscious, more revolutionary members (an under-estimation of the radicalisation of the masses) that these unions are quantitatively stronger, that despite everything, we have within them support for us, etc., etc.

But all these proofs, which incidentally have no basis in reality, in no degree justify the difference in our tactics and "privileges" which

we show to the P.P.S. trades unions. Our duty is to work where the masses are to be found. This is the most important principle of our work. And, arising out of this principle, if (I will take the most paradoxical example) the communal workers of Warsaw are almost completely organised within the fascist P.P.S. trade union of Jarovsky, and we have not yet created our left trade union, then we must not concentrate our work inside the weak P.P.S. trades union, but in the fascist. But if we approach the question of our line—and that is the only correct way—then it is quite obvious, that the general slogan “enter the social-fascist trades unions,” particularly if it is a sacramental phrase, binds us to nothing. When the question is regarded in such a fashion, then there is no place for such a slogan.

The Polish comrades who support the other line, must logically arrive at an opportunist formulation of the slogan referred to above, will make the mistakes of the united front committees of 1928, and will again and again repeat the mistakes of trades union legalism; the type of mistake made during the Lodz strike.

How is the obstinacy of the Polish comrades in this respect explained? It is explained by the still existing opinion that despite everything the P.S.S. trade unions are slightly better than the others, that they are after all *class unions*. At one time the leader of the Polish Ultra-lefts, Domsky, when the work in the P.P.S. trades unions was being discussed at the Fourth Conference of the Polish Party, said that despite everything the P.P.S. unions were socialist. This socialist covering deceives not only many ordinary workers, but also a number of our responsible comrades. And because of this they represent a danger. Just because of this it is necessary to get rid of any ideological differentiation between the P.P.S. and other trades unions. It is also necessary, because of this, to get rid of the slogan “Enter the reformist trades unions.”

The mistaken trades union tactics of our Polish comrades are closely bound up with a number of big mistakes in strike strategy. Strike strategy is very often decided upon by revolutionary phrases. In this connection two examples are typical: the preparation for struggle of the Warsaw metal workers and the strike of the miners which took place last year.

What was the position amongst the Warsaw metal workers? There, despite the low wages and extremely great dissatisfaction on the part of the workers, there was no strike movement for a number of years. Beginning in the autumn of 1928 our Warsaw comrades prepared the struggle of the Warsaw metal workers. But despite great efforts and excellent opportunities for struggle, nothing emanated from these preparations. After very “careful” preparation—complete fiasco. Why? Here is a small example of our preparation: In the autumn of 1928—at the best possible moment for struggle, since it was during the Lodz strike—our Warsaw comrades, without any sort of preparation, called a conference of twenty-five metal workers (not elected in the factories, but among themselves) elected at this conference a committee of action, and considering everything to be done (for a committee of action was elected!), called a strike. But the metal workers did not take this call for action at all seriously, may be even knew nothing of it, and were satisfied with a miserable 5 per cent. arbitration increase; while at the same time the Lodz textile workers refused to talk about arbitration. A similar result was arrived at after the “preparation” for struggle in the summer of 1929. Simultaneously in the Warsaw factories the factory election campaigns were being conducted (let us recollect that the Lodz strike broke out specifically because of the elections), and in the factories, left factory delegates were dismissed.

What is the mistake of the strike strategy of our Warsaw comrades? It consists in a lack of understanding of the fact that “the organisation of a strike, particularly among the Warsaw metal workers, under the fascist régime, is not a simple and easy matter, but demands careful preparation, a life contact with the masses, a capable reaction to the manœuvres of the enemy, and that in the process of the preparatory campaign it is necessary to convince the masses of the necessity of strike action as the only means of obtaining the demands. In the preparation for the struggle of the Warsaw metal workers, we had a kind of wooden approach, a bureaucratic fulfilment of orders; a committee of action was elected, no matter how, in the main completely divorced from the masses, one or two proclamations were issued, and if one or two of the Seim deputies were mobilised to some meeting or other, then

the strike was called. And the result of such preparation? Obvious. Complete defeat.

If we add to this, that over a number of years no fraction of metal workers in the trades union has existed in Warsaw, neither Communist, nor Red, that our work in the social-fascist unions is absolutely non-existent, that questions of struggle are decided by members of the Party nuclei in the main, who are not members of a trade union, and who consider it unnecessary to become members of a trades union, then we have a complete picture of our lack of contact with the masses, and the completely careless and harmful attitude towards questions of organisation, and a non-understanding of the fact that there can be no struggle without organisation. In practice we get revolutionary phrases without revolutionary work.

The lack of understanding of our strike strategy was more clearly demonstrated during the strike campaign of the miners in November, 1929. Our mistakes in this campaign, show how badly we understand our line of independent leadership of the economic struggles. Not at all in a bolshevik fashion. What happened here? As a result of low wages and poverty, discontent had been seething amongst the miners for a long time, and the struggle drew nearer. Everybody knew and was preparing for this. The P.P.S. and other trades unions of miners, not having the strength to openly oppose the discontent of the masses, went with the strike

wave, as if preparing for struggle, but actually preparing for its suppression. The method adopted to suppress the struggle was that of calling a day demonstrative strike which broke up the energies of the masses, and interfered with the real struggle.

Were we able to interfere with this game of the P.P.S.'ites, and use the feelings of the masses and lead them into the struggle? We were not.

Firstly, because of the incorrect understanding of the independent preparation of the campaign, we boycotted the P.P.S. conference of factory delegates. Secondly, when the demonstrative strike was called by the social-fascists on the 5th November, we, being afraid of trailing in their rear, instead of supporting the date fixed by the P.P.S., and calling for a strike until victory called for such a strike without any indication of the date, simply in the air. By this "independent" tactic we put grist into the social-fascist mill.

It is unnecessary to prove that the line laid down by the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. does not demand such action in the independent leadership of economic struggles.

In this article we have touched upon the most important errors of our trade union work in Poland. We have touched upon these errors in the name of self-criticism, in order to correct our line, in order to strengthen our work, in order to bring our trade union work into the path of bolshevik tactics.

## ANOTHER FRACTIONAL ATTACK AGAINST THE C.P. OF POLAND

THE revolutionary trade union movement in Poland conducts a struggle under extremely difficult circumstances. Mass revolutionary work under conditions of fascist régime is particularly beset by dangers, both from the right and the left. This danger has increased considerably at the present moment both in connection with the sharp crisis of fascism and the strengthening of the manoeuvres of social-fascism. Under such conditions a tactful bolshevik criticism is essential and useful. The C.C. of the C.P. of Poland in a number of its resolutions gives such criticism. Comrade Halma's article is the fractional attack of the rights against the leadership of our Party, along the same lines as the statement of Comrades Pruxnyak, Stefanovsky and others. We have neither space nor time for a detailed refutation of all the concoctions, exaggerations and distortions of fact, with which the article is filled. We consider it more useful to concentrate attention on the incorrect theories expressed therein, and which are in contradiction to the line of the Comintern and Profintern.

What is the basic idea in Comrade Halma's article? Comrade Halma wants to prove that it is not necessary to differentiate between social-fascist and fascist trade unions, and that the adoption of different tactics towards our work in social-fascist and fascist trade unions is a mistake, and that, therefore, the political line of the Polish trade union movement is incorrect.

Comrade Halma comes to the conclusion that "in our relation to them (that is, to the social-fascist trades unions) all differentiation or comparison with other national, christian, 'pure' fascist trade unions, should disappear."

"In resolutions relating to this question we have profound talmudic verbiage to the effect that within the \*P.P.S. trade unions there are more conscious, more revolutionary members (an under-estimation of the radicalisation of the masses) that these unions are quantitatively stronger, that despite everything, we have within them our support, etc., etc. *But all*

*these proofs* which incidentally have no basis in reality, *in no degree justify the difference in our tactics.*"

As we see, Comrade Halma evaluates the carrying out of any sort of differentiation between social-fascist and fascist trade unions as "talmudic verbiage." All the reasons brought forward by us are insufficient to explain to him to what degree various tactics in our work in these unions is essential. We consider that such a presentation of the question is entirely opposed to the line laid down by the Comintern and the decisions of the Profintern.

It is quite self-evident that it is necessary to fight in the most determined fashion against all theories which go to prove that social-fascism struggles against fascism. The P.P.S. and the Bund are integral parts of the fascist camp in Poland. We adopt different tactics in relation to the unions which enter in the social-fascist Central Commission, or to the nationalist unions of Posnani and Upper Silesia, than in relation to the fascist unions; not because we think that there exists a difference of principle, or because we think that the social-fascist unions are better. We do this because the methods used for deceiving the masses by these organisations are not alike, and their influences are not the same. The Federation of Labour and the Yavorovshiki openly call for the support of the fascist government. The P.P.S. hides its fascist work by revolutionary phrases, and by such treacherous means gathers the support of the radicalised masses. It takes advantage of the feelings of the mass by its phraseology. The example of Poland clearly contradicts the views of Comrade Halma which assert that there is no difference between the P.P.S. methods of gulling the masses and the methods of the Federation of Labour.

To put the sign of equality between fascism and social-fascism only leads to an under-estimation of the danger of social-fascism.

The question, as to which direction it is more necessary to concentrate the main fire of attack is not, as is assumed by Comrade

\*P.P.S. Socialist Party of Poland.

Halma, the question of trade union statistics. The concentration on work in specific trade unions cannot be placed as dependent upon the numerical membership of the organisations at the present moment, but is dependent upon the influence of the given organisation on the working masses, and on the dangers which threaten the revolutionary movement from its side.

The fascist crisis in Poland makes social-fascism and the peasant parties in the village which take its place, of especial danger to the working class and the toiling peasantry. The Sixth Plenum of our C.C. pointed out that :

"P.P.S. and other parties of compromise are the enemy which pierces more deeply into the working masses, and more cunningly disorients the masses who are desirous of struggling against fascism, and by the aid of not only radical and democratic, but oppositional phrases regarding the Government, drags these masses away from the revolutionary struggle. This enemy, which holds the leading organs of the trade union and co-operative organisation, treacherously divides the economic and political struggles of the proletariat and spreads hatred towards the proletarian state—the U.S.S.R."

Social-fascism which more and more becomes part and parcel of fascism, developing fascist terror by the aid of its military units, enjoys at the same time a higher form of demogogy for the purpose of making use of the revolutionary feelings of the masses. In the Dombrowsky Basin, where the dominating influence on the masses was the communist—the P.P.S. made use of the deceitful slogan of "united front with the communists." The Congress of the Unions of the Central Commission put forward the slogan of seven-hour day. The Bundites at the Congress of trade unions put forward the demand for the legalisation of the Communist Party. Pacifist phraseology is one of the tried arms of social-fascism and the peasant compromisers for the covering up of the active participation in the preparation of war against the U.S.S.R.

The C.C. of the C.P. of Poland states in its decision of June this year, that "the process of weakening in influence by social-fascism has not yet taken a wide character. The putting forward of slogans, which half-a-year ago

were qualified in the "Robotnik" ("Worker") as provocation (the slogan of "Away with Pilsudsky") makes it easier for social-fascism to make use of the dissatisfaction amongst the masses, and even to partially strengthen its influence where we have none, or where our work is insufficient."

This resolution of the C.C. further states that the "direct transmission belt of the Government to the masses in the P.P.S., and the Federation of Labour is weakening. These organisations are weakening at a high rate although unequally."

All these factors were taken into consideration by our C.C., when it defined the trade union policy, making the Party pay particular attention to the work in the fascist trade unions and directing the main fire of our work towards the P.P.S.

Comrade Halma goes away from reality when he says that the leadership of the revolutionary trade union movement in Poland, correcting the decisions of the Tenth Plenum, took a general line for new trade unions—and that it went to extremes—namely, that "the trade union opposition calls upon workers to enter the ranks of the social-fascist trade unions and no more." Did the Sixth Plenum of the C.C. actually put the question in such a fashion? The Sixth Plenum indicated the concrete, specific conditions under which we call upon the revolutionary workers to enter the social-fascist trade unions, and confirmed the correctness of the decisions of the Tenth Plenum in abolishing the slogan of "the mass character of the union of the Central Commission," and underlined the following :—

"Communists calling on the masses to enter trade unions, do not create an illusion regarding the possibilities of winning over the trade union apparatus which is becoming more than ever an integral part of the state fascist apparatus—by democratic and legal means. *They call upon the masses to strengthen the revolutionary trade union opposition as an independent force, leading the struggles of the proletariat.*"

The question was dealt with in the same fashion in the resolution of the September trade union meeting. The Seventh Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P. of Poland placed the question in a still sharper form at the Decem-

ber trade union meeting. In these resolutions they put special emphasis on the fact that the actions necessary for bringing away the masses from the influence of the social-fascist, nationalist or christian bureaucracy are the revolutionary activity of the *left trade unions and their overcoming the bars of trade union legalism and the basing of all their activities on united front organs in the factories.* The sending in of revolutionary workers, under special conditions, to the social-fascist trade unions for the strengthening of the trade union left, must take place in a more organised fashion and should be directed towards ensuring that these workers do not become the prey of the social-fascist bureaucracy, and that they really take part in the strengthening of the struggle against this bureaucracy. *The statement of Comrade Halma, that we did not indicate to the revolutionary workers the reasons for their entering the social-fascist unions, is simply an invention. The under-estimation of the work of the social-fascist trade unions is one of the most serious weaknesses of the revolutionary trade union movement in Poland.*

In view of all this, we are not in the least bit surprised that in freshening the discussion which took place in the Polish trade union movement in connection with the decisions of the Tenth Plenum and the January trade union meeting, Comrade Halma takes up the position of those Warsaw comrades, who attacked these decisions from the right, and even went so far as to speak against the Party at non-Party meetings, under the pretext of defending the correct line. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that being a violent opponent of any differentiation being made between social-fascism and fascism, he did not disassociate himself even by one word, from the opinions of Comrade Kostrijev on the question of social-fascism. Did he see any relation between these views and the legalist mistakes in the revolutionary trade union movement in Poland? Views which are the basis for a number of legalist errors in our trade union practice.

Does Comrade Halma consider that the views of a group of comrades having a decisive influence in the C.P. of Poland during the period of the Fifth Plenum of the C.C., and

which were only eliminated at the Sixth Plenum, had no influence whatever on the practical work in the trade unions? As we have already shown, Comrade Halma, when speaking about the decisions of the Fifth Plenum, kept absolute silence on the rôle of the Sixth Plenum in straightening out our trade union tactic, and particularly the straightening out of the general political line of the trade union movement in Poland. He kept absolutely silent about the Sixth Plenum, not only because of his close position with the rights, but also in order to collect corresponding facts in order to justify the accusation of "a vacillation policy in our trade union work in Poland, deprived of bolshevik semblance."

In the trade unions meetings, the C.C. of the C.P. of Poland subjected our activities in the economic struggles and the trade union movement to a sharp criticism, not only generally, but also specifically (resolution on Upper Silesia and Warsaw). What did Comrade Halma do? He did not show in any way that the mistakes that were actually made, were criticised basically and in good time. He remained silent about all the signs of improvement, to be noted in our activities, and concentrated accordingly all the material and "proved" that the line of the C.P. of Poland is incorrect. Let us consider, one by one, the incorrect accusations. It is incorrect to say "that in the large union of chemical workers over a period of a whole number of years of left leadership, we were unable to create a firm ideological basis, so that at the right moment we could be able to counteract the blow directed against it." It is true, that after the treachery of Chumi, all the sections of the union adopted a resolution branding the provocateur. The special congress which was called by the initiative of the trade union left, and closed by the fascist government, adopted unanimously, revolutionary decisions. The government suppressed the existing central leadership. The new chemical trade union is gradually reforming itself, despite severe police repressions.

It is untrue that "the free unions ceased to be left." The mass of membership, under the leadership of the left trade union, placed itself in opposition to the treachery of the

officials who in the majority were following the renegade Vashak, and these officials who leaned for support on the police and legal jugglery, was isolated after the struggle. The proof of this is the conference of free trade unions in June, which by 134 votes to 6, spoke against Vashak and elected a new Chairman. Vashak at the moment remains formally chairman, aided by the police.

There is only a quarter of the truth in what Comrade Halma says about the Warsaw Union of Leather Workers. The mistake which he refers to did take place, but none other than the December meeting brought this mistake to the light of day, and criticised it thoroughly. But since that time, the Leather Workers' Union, which has been frequently suppressed has come into being again, has conducted a number of gallant strikes, and in the bargain, successful ones. In every strike the union had to conduct a severe struggle with the armed groups of the Bund-P.P.S.ites. This "small picture of our leadership" of independent trade unions, as Comrade Halma says, won't be so bad, in spite of the big mistake which was made last year.

Despite difficult conditions, errors committed, and despite defeat in various spheres of struggle, the left trade union can record a number of successes. During the last few months we have won the Council of trade unions in Lublin; the Tramway Workers' Union of Lodz have strengthened the class union of tramway workers in Warsaw. We are rebuilding the Textile Workers' Union in Lodz; strengthening the revolutionary unions of Jewish workers; and are developing the Union of Glassworkers in Western White Russia. Further, we have a number of successes amongst the agricultural and forest workers.

Characteristic of Comrade Halma's article is his approach to the development of the revolutionary trade union movement in Poland, as if it exists in time and space. He is but little interested in the fact that fascism suppresses and disperses trade unions, that for instance, in the period of the last half-year in Poland over fifteen revolutionary trade unions have been closed down. In refuting the incorrect or distorted facts of Comrade Halma we do not intend to maintain that everything

is quite in order. In the above-referred-to resolutions in connection with the work of the Upper Silesian and Warsaw organisations, in the decisions of the December trade union meeting, and in our articles, we severely criticised the behaviour of our comrades at the Ukrainian trade union congresses, the non-election of a committee of the left trade union at the Opposition Conference during the Warsaw Congress, as also the Warsaw campaign of the metalworkers and the Silesian miners. Here is what the decision of the C.C. of the C.P. of Poland says:

"The main reason for the lack of success of the economic campaigns was the poor organisation of united front from below and its weak basis in the large factories. Committees of action, factory committees, and unemployed committees, won over to and led by the trade union left, embraced to a very small degree the unorganised masses and workers who still follow the P.P.S. The elections of these committees seldom took place on the basis of sound agitational and organisational preparation. The metalworkers' campaign showed also the incapacity for mobilising the masses around the actual grievances which interested the workers of a given factory at the given time. A decided change must take place in our work in mass organisations, and in the first place in our trade union work. Our lack of contact in the P.P.S. metalworkers' union is one of the main reasons for the poor results we have with the metalworkers, especially those who still follow the P.P.S." And further:—

"The situation in the revolutionary trade unions must be radically altered. Alongside with those unions which embrace the wide ranks of the proletariat, there exist in important industries, unions which number no more than 100 members. The correct way for altering this position is the real leadership with the unions of the economic struggles of the workers, the wide adoption of the united front from below, and a live participation in the strengthening of the trade union left."

Regarding Upper Silesia, it says:—

"Thanks to increasing activities of this district, and despite the actual absence of any work in the previous period in the trade union, the Association of Labour and C.S.G. resolu-

tion adopted at the conference of the C.S.G. demanding the calling of a strike to a successful finish, received 43 to 51 votes, together with Stanchik. The holding of a conference on the same day by the trade union left for making the position clear and exposing the manoeuvres of the social-fascist was correct, although this conference was not representative of the wide masses.

However, the mistake in the last period during the strike was our failing to make use of the date, the 5th November, which was popular amongst the masses and proclaimed by social-fascism as the date for the beginning of the miners' strike. The C.C. states that the mistake of the leadership in connection with the one-day demonstrative strike, was in the 'uncertainty of the date of the 6th,' and also in the fact that our organisation declared the strike without having the necessary preparation for an immediate strike. This mistake committed by Comrade K. was a characteristic example on the basis of the Party's lagging behind the developing events which finds birth in the ultra-left tendencies . . . "

We have cited this extract from the decisions of the C.C. in order to show the real tendency of Comrade Halma's article, and that the facts which he brings forward "were not submitted to criticism."

Is it correct, however, to say that we have only negative experiences with the committee of action? Last year in the Western Ukraine, the trade union left conducted a large agricultural strike. It led this strike despite the absence of any trade union, despite the social-fascist bureaucracy, basing its activities on the strike committee which was elected by the

masses. The same applies to a whole number of less important strikes in various sections of industry.

Why did Comrade Halma find it necessary to use such colouring? Apparently, in order to prove that the C.P. of Poland had not overcome the ultra-left traditions of Domskey in the question of the committees of action, and that we underestimated the organisational factor in the trade union movement.

If we compare the accusation in Domshisne with the silence on the question of the Sixth Plenum for a better proof of so-called vacillation in our tactics, with silence on the question of right conceptions on the question of social-fascism — then the political meaning of this accusation becomes absolutely clear. During the period, when our C.C. and C.I., conducting a struggle on two fronts, state that the right danger in Poland is the most important, and that the struggle against this danger should be closely bound up with the struggle against evidences of ultra-left dangers, Comrade Halma says nothing about the right theories of Kostrejev, and thus aids the indecision of a number of comrades on the question of social-fascism. He concentrates all attention only on the mistakes of Domskey, which apparently have not yet been overcome.

To sum up: the article of Comrade Halma proves his incorrect political line, the singular linking of ultra-left theories on the question of social-fascism with right tactical theories. This article is objectively a defence of the right group, it pours grist into the mill of struggle of the right against the Party. Instead of healthy criticism, Comrade Halma has treated us to a deviationist's tirade.