

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



May 15th, 1932

VOLUME IX

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No. 9

THREEPENCE
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number - - 9

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. WHAT THE ASSASSINATION OF DOUMER REVEALED

Do not the traces of this crime lead to the highest circles of the Government of France? Mons. Tardieu himself stressed his moral responsibility for the murder of Doumer. That his provocation against the U.S.S.R. failed, only renders vigilance more necessary. (See page 295)

2. THE BOLSHEVISATION OF C.P.'s IN THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES BY OVERCOMING SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC TRADITIONS (Part II.)

The concluding portion of a report to teachers at the International Party Schools; dealing with fractions, the Press, agitation, tactics, the United Front, legal and illegal work, factory work, etc. Invaluable for all active militants. (See page 300)

3. THE VII CONGRESS OF THE C.P. OF FRANCE

The results of the activity of the C.P. of France over the last three years, in the light of the present French economic situation; and the debates and decisions of the Congress. (See page 311)

4. THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

Explodes the sedulous British Imperialist propaganda of economic revival in India, showing the real basis of India's export of gold—impoverishment. Shows British Imperialist policy of compromise, with the Indian bourgeoisie, and exposes its agents in the Labour movement. (See page 317)

5. HINDRANCES TO FACTORY WORK IN ENGLAND

Records the subjective difficulties hindering this all-important work, which can and must be eliminated at once. (See page 325)

6. MICHAEL NIKOLAEVICH POKROVSKY (Obituary.)

(See page 331)

WHAT DOUMER'S ASSASSINATION REVEALED

THE assassination of the President of the French Republic, Doumer, followed by the slaying of Inukaya, the Japanese Prime Minister, reveals to what extent the international atmosphere is now impregnated with the poison gases of war.

All the ghastly secrets of the war now being hatched will be learned by the world when the victorious Revolution in capitalist lands will give us access to the police and ministerial archives of imperialist governments, as was the case following the October Revolution, which opened the archives of the Tsarist government to us. The elaborate network of deceit, bribery, falsifications, provocations, murders and forthcoming murders, as well as the countless crimes resorted to by the leaders of decaying and rotting capitalism, in its preparations for the intervention against the U.S.S.R., and of an imperialist war to solve the crisis of capitalism, will be disclosed.

But the murder of Doumer occasioned a partial raising of the veil shrouding the secret war preparations. This great service to the proletariat and toiling masses must be ascribed completely to the credit of our French Communist Party, and its central organ, "L'Humanite," which has kept vigilant watch during these days, and to the other Communist Parties who warmly supported our French comrades in their campaign of exposures. Our French and other Communist Parties, in contradistinction to all the bourgeois and social-fascist parties, are the only ones interested in establishing the truth and the entire truth. They have successfully fulfilled and are continuing to carry out their militant task of exposures in connection with the murder of Doumer. In order to bare the truth they have quickly and ably availed themselves of, drawn comparisons, and illuminated a number of facts which have leaked out from behind the shady scenes of government, police and white-guard organs, not by accident, but because of the unavoidable confusion (not due to chance but to inevitable discords, disagreements and mutual accusations in the bourgeois camp). These disagreements and discords arise from the fact that the imperialist bourgeoisie, and its social-democratic agents, who are concocting the war, are about to take a dangerous leap into the unknown, which they well realise may end very disastrously.

The whole camp of the bourgeoisie, beginning with Monsieur Tardieu and ending with the "left" social-democrats, are preparing for war, and primarily for intervention against the U.S.S.R., in the hope of finding a way out of the crisis of capitalism.

Therefore the entire bourgeois camp, from Mons. Tardieu down to the "left" social-democrats, are maintaining, encouraging, subsidising, arming and inciting Russian white guards, the scum of society, parasites who were ejected from the land of the Proletarian Dictatorship, to all kinds of provocative acts. At a time when the last pittance of a dole is being denied to millions of unemployed, at a time of crisis unprecedented in history, tens of millions are expended on these white-emigrés, on these degenerate and degenerating parasites, bandits and souteneurs, directly assigned in some places from the State budget. In Czecho-Slovakia, for instance, the sum of 750,000,000 crowns (kroners) has already been disbursed from the State budget. During the current year 7,000,000 crowns were assigned for their upkeep. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Benesh, gave a 50,000 crown subsidy to the assassin of Doumer, Gorgulov, alone.

The white guards are freely permitted to organise their own military academies and military reviews (in France), to run semi-public terrorist organisations, to publish leaflets frankly calling for terror. They are being drilled for the future intervention, they are utilised for diversive acts, they are being armed for the Far-Eastern front. Their pens have forged and still continue to forge documents and their hands to commit murders. Simultaneously they are employed on a large scale as gendarmes, police informers and spies to crush the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the strike struggle in the different countries (at home).

* * * *

Western Europe once extended the right of refuge to Russian Revolutionary emigrants who fought against the Tsarist monarchy. This right of refuge is now exclusively granted to Russian counter-revolutionary white emigrés. They are now patronised in every way by the entire bourgeois camp, including the "left" social-democrats.

Our enemies manifest a touching unity in their accord on the question of intervention and support to the white emigrés. However, there is one point on which the bourgeois camp lacks unanimity and which gives rise to internal friction and dissension. The left wing of the bourgeois camp which has contact with the masses, and which includes the social-democrats and the left-radical bourgeoisie of France, realise that not only the proletariat, but the widest circles of the petty bourgeoisie have no desire for war (the results of the last Parliamentary election confirm this). Realising the danger which threatens th-

capitalist structure should a war break out, they attempt to make other preparations for the war besides military-diplomatic ones. They seek to win the sympathy of the masses for such a war. They strive to conceal war preparations under a heavy veil of pacifism. The right wing of the bourgeoisie, the conservative (die-hard) politicians like Mons. Tardieu, representing the heavy and war industries, who would reap colossal dividends from a war, specialise in this game, as well as the Russian white emigrés who have, comparatively, little more to lose; having already lost the main things as a consequence of the October Revolution. These latter groups are infinitely less concerned with "moral" preparations for a war. Their patience has worn out. They are ready to start the intervention by any means; even the most risky and adventuresome, although it be attended by a possible loss of the support of the wide masses of the petty bourgeoisie.

All these divergences in tactics, despite a complete unity in the aims of the bourgeois camp; dissension which has become aggravated during the parliamentary elections and parliamentary struggle between the "left" and the right blocs, furnished the background for the assassination of Doumer. They have been adroitly used by our Communist Party, not only to unmask the falsity and stupidity of the Tardieu Government's statement that presumably the murder of Doumer was the work of a "neo-Bolshevist organisation," "incited by the Communist International," but actually to expose the real clues and roots of this crime which are assiduously covered up by the Tardieu government as well as all its "left" bloc opponents, including the Socialists.

What has the assassination of Doumer actually revealed?

* * * *

The ideological motives for the murder, which M. Tardieu strove to lay at the door of the Communist International were completely exposed; firstly, by the testimony of Gorgulov himself, recorded through the negligence of the police, and, much to Tardieu's embarrassment, in the presence of journalists; then by his published pamphlet and appeal, and finally by his defence speech found already prepared in advance. Gorgulov gave evidence that he had killed Doumer "in order to force France to a combat against the Soviets." His shot, according to the report of the "Morning Post," "was a protest against what he *imagined* was a friendship of France for the U.S.S.R."

The above was a suitable comment on the testimony of Gorgulov and on the outline for his defence speech, which reads: "France has done nothing to liberate Russia from the Bolsheviks

. . . You Europeans are riff-raff . . . Why do you support the Bolsheviks and act in unison with them?"

How shameless is Tardieu's statement, attempting to parade Gorgulov in the light of a "neo-Bolshevik," is revealed in the programme printed by Gorgulov and called the "All Russian National and Peasants Green Party," which he sought to organise, and which classifies the Soviet Government as a band of "pillagers," the "Soviet-Sheeny Government," and which advances the slogan, "Butcher all the Communists" and other watchwords, "Put the entire government into the hands of the Russian non-party Soviets." "Down with the Communists," a slogan which, by the way, was borrowed from Miliukov and dates back to the time of the Kronstadt uprising. Gorgulov's aim was to exterminate the Communists, and he wrote in his "Appeal to the Russian People" as to the means required for this purpose: "Your only salvation is war—your final salvation is war. It makes no difference what kind of a war—civil or foreign; war and war alone is the only salvation of all Russian emigrés who are to be found in every corner of the globe."

The complete biography of the assassin, as related in his evidence, and enlarged on by the testimony of his friends, indicates that he was a full-blooded white guard from the very beginning up to the very end, not only in his political but in his loathsome moral person and his character, which was black of the deepest dye. After the declaration of war he joined a Cossack division; in 1918 he was a member of the underground Cossack organisation which stirred up uprisings in the districts against the Bolsheviks; he participated in General Liachov's Partisan division; he was active in the underground organisation of Savinkov in Minsk; and a member of the Yudenich and Wrangel armies. He fled to Czecho-Slovakia in 1921 and arrived in Prague with a Polish passport. There he completed his medical education, receiving a subsidy from the Czecho-Slovakian government. During his student years in Czecho-Slovakia he made himself notorious by public debauches; on graduating from college he specialised in abortions, incidentally frequently raping women. He was in Court on eight occasions in Czecho-Slovakia and released each time because of great influence and protection. He moved in the circle of Czech fascists and had connections there with the fascist General Gaida. He organised the "Green" Party, and then transferred his activities to Paris, from which city he was banished because of shady dealings. He admitted himself that he had planned to kill Hindenburg in 1929, but was denied a visa to Germany. He considered the possibility of

assassinating Masaryk, but rejected it, in view of the delightful reception accorded him by the latter. He had also weighed the possibility of murdering the Soviet Ambassador in Paris, but was not received by him.

* * * *

Gorgulov maintained a very close and unbroken contact with active white emigrés. He connected himself with General Hodorovoch and his adjutants in Prague in 1929. While there he also had a long conference with General Miller, the immediate aide of General Kutepov. Maslov, chairman of the white guard terrorist organisation, declared in an interview that Gorgulov had proposed to him to merge his fascist organisation with the "Krestinskaya Russia" (Peasant Russia), directed by Maslov. When Maslov moved to Paris, Struve, who directed the white emigré city committee, furnished him with a letter of recommendation. A similar reference was supplied to him by Zagorsky, chairman of the "Trade Union of Mental Labour."

The facts of the case prove irrefutably that Gorgulov committed the assassination of Doumer, directly under the influence of the "new policy," to kill members of foreign governments, adopted by the white emigrés, after Stern's attempt, in order to provoke a new "Sarajevo." The white emigrés, who enjoy extraordinary protection, have become so daring and impudent in many countries that they permit themselves, incidentally unpunished, to openly campaign for the murder of members of the government, in capitalist countries, to speed up intervention. They live up to the Russian proverb "Give a pig a finger and he'll grab a hand." Immediately after Stern's shot at von-Tvardovsky reverberated there followed a roll-call of the white guards of Paris, Warsaw and Riga. The Paris white guard press and the white guard hack writers and speakers openly called for an emulation of Stern's act, as soon as the shot was fired, and at the funeral requiem service held for him in Paris. Kerensky wrote in the "Dniach" (The Day): "Stern has died . . . but not in vain. Stern is no exception. The sacrificial flame of individualistic terror will now be fanned." The Monarchist "Vozrozhdenie" (Rebirth) reported the meeting of the "All Russian Central Association" in Paris as follows: "A new tone threaded all the speeches of the emigrés, in all probability evoked by the new stimulus which has come from the shot of Stern . . . Whoever aids in the overthrow of the Soviet Government *outside* of Russia is one of us." Four days prior to the death of Doumer, "Vozrozhdenie" wrote: "The shot of Stern has been heard and will be repeated. His shot is not the end—but only the beginning." The Warsaw

White Guard "Molva," a second "Vozrozhdenie," wrote: "The aim of this article is to inflame our Russian youth here abroad with a desire to struggle." The Paris white guard Yablonovsky participated in this exchange of opinions and published the following statement in the Riga newspaper "Sevodnia" (To-day): "The shot of Stern . . . seems to mark a complete change in the tactics of the Russian terrorists, whose political meaning is easily determined. Don't shoot . . . at your own Bolshevik swallows. It is far more advantageous in every respect to 'Turn the batteries and fire at foreigners.'"

This white guard propaganda for a new policy of terror leads us directly to the assassination of Doumer. It was no accident that Stulba, representative of the "Russian Imperial Union," a white guard organisation, with whom Kriuchkov, secretary of Gorgulov, was directly connected, frankly stated at the above-mentioned meeting of the "All Russian Central Association" in almost identically the exact words printed in "Vozrozhdenie" that: "The shot of Stern has been heard and will be repeated." There was purpose in the publication by "Vozrozhdenie" of a large photograph of Doumer on May 3rd, three days before the attack, on its front page above the editorial. Obviously this was so that the assassin might recognise his victim.

* * * *

The intimate and direct contact between the "New policy of terror" adopted by all active white emigrés and the murder of Doumer is unmistakably established, and no one will succeed in hiding this fact. But our French Communist Party succeeded in establishing something far more important. They were able, on the basis of facts, divulged by the bourgeois press, to also establish the connection of this murder with the Paris police. "L'action Francaise" reported that the same Peter Kriuchkov, who was named by Gorgulov as secretary of his group, is moreover an agent of the French secret service. The newspaper states that it was this Kriuchkov who supplied the police documents dealing with Gorgulov's "Green Association" organisation. "L'action Francaise" reports that Peter Kriuchkov is employed at the Renault Plant and has, at the same time, instructions from the Intelligence Department of the Prefecture to watch over the Russians at the plant. This newspaper continues: "Kriuchkov has been assigned to be an agent of Vidé, Commissar of the Prefecture. The latter's rôle in the investigation of the Kutepov case is generally known. Besides, he (Kriuchkov) has been placed at the service of the chief Russian agent whose initials are Z. K. . . . and who heads the secret Russian Imperial Union."

Thus the police had a direct contact with Gorgulov and the white guard secret organisations through Gorgulov's secretary. The police were also aware of the decree to banish Gorgulov from France to the Riviera in view of certain dubious transactions. Nevertheless, Gorgulov was able to cross the border, could gain entry to the Book Exhibition and walk straight up to the French President and shoot him. Under what circumstances did the shooting take place?

According to the "Vossische Zeitung": "The President of the French Republic had received a personal warning not to sign his name to the non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union." This means that Doumer had been threatened previously. Further, the police organ, "Liberte," writes that "from the moment the Exhibition opened a stranger was seen strolling around the grounds. Madame Farrère even drew attention to his nervousness, and the way he stalked to and fro." "Paris Soir" also reported that the wife of the writer, "Claude Farrère, noticed Gorgulov at the Exhibition and remarked on his 'excited' manner." "She"—writes "Humanite"—"warned her husband as well as Gishar, chief of the criminal police, but to no effect." Nevertheless, when the French President appeared, Gorgulov was able to push his way through the crowd, to head determinedly in his direction, and to deliberately shoot at him from his revolver.

In view of this mysterious failure of the police to protect the President, notwithstanding the fact that they were fully aware of the personality of Gorgulov, despite the forewarning at the scene of the crime, the statement of Camille Eimar, chief editor of the Paris Police journal, "Liberte," acquires special significance. This journal was careless enough to admit the following in its editorial, published in the issue of "Liberte" which appeared several hours before the murder: "There is no guarantee against political murders incited by the confidence in *non-punishment which the guilty have.*" These are reckless words, but Camille Eimar could risk them, having the worthy aim of expressing approbation of the murder. "Vozrozhdenie" could also be insouciant enough to print Doumer's portrait four days before his assassination in order to aid the murderer to locate the target of his bullet.

* * * *

The setting in which the murder of Doumer took place indicates that the Paris police continues to live up to its "glorious" traditions. The Prefect of Police, Andreas, admitted in his memoirs that the anarchist, Vayan, who threw a bomb in the House of the Deputies, had acted under the influence of a provocateur who had received corresponding instructions from the police. At all events

it has been shown that the white guards, with the permission of the police, openly propagated in Paris (as they do in Warsaw and Riga) the murder of responsible State leaders of foreign powers, on the other side of the borders of the U.S.S.R., for provocative purposes. It has further been proven that the Paris police were well informed with regard to Gorgulov as an adventurer connected with white guard terrorist groups—yet Gorgulov was nevertheless freely permitted to return to France, from whence he had been banished; and that he was not hindered from entering the Exhibition; and that the police were aware of the immediate danger threatening Doumer from a "certain person" wandering around the Exhibition grounds, in view of his strange behaviour, which had attracted attention; and that the police had been warned of this. However, the Paris police, which always exercises the greatest vigilance when the location and crushing of a workers' demonstration is concerned, took not the slightest measures to protect the President of the Republic.

Could the police have acted at its own risk and responsibility in a matter which was threatened with catastrophic political consequences? It may be assumed that the answer is negative. Neither local nor Metropolitan police personally engage in "high politics." The murder of Doumer involuntarily recalls another assassination.

On September 1st, 1911, Stolypin, a Tsarist Prime Minister, was mysteriously killed by a gendarme, Vogrov. Subsequently this mystery was cleared up. Witte, former Minister of Finance, narrates in his reminiscences that the provocateur, Vogrov, received a pass to the imperial performance at the theatre from Kuliabko himself, and from Kurlov, Vice-Minister of Internal Affairs—that the threads of the crime lead further and higher to the apartments of "high personages" (read "great princes").

The customs of Tsarist Russia have since moved to republican France, which has taken upon itself Tsarist Russia's rôle of international gendarme. If one therefore takes into consideration the whole atmosphere in which the murder of Doumer took place, the question arises whether the traces of the crime do not lead elsewhere, further and higher. History will some day answer the question. But, at any rate, it may now be stated that so far as Mons. Tardieu is involved (and he is responsible for the Paris police), he must openly admit that jointly, with the white guards, they directly, with his permission, appealed for assassination. They granted their permission to carry it out, and they must share the responsibility for the provocative murder of Doumer, for the political goal aimed at by this murder—namely, a direct solution by intervention against the U.S.S.R.

Monsieur Tardieu himself stressed his moral responsibility for the murder of Doumer, firstly, by taking every possible measure, before the journalists, to efface the traces of the crime, and, secondly, by his conscious attempt, from the very start, to deceive public opinion and set it on a false track. It was for this reason that he published a special communiqué drawn up following an important conference, at which Tardieu and the Ministers of Justice and Home Affairs were present, as well as the prosecuting attorney of the Republic, and the Police Prefect. This communiqué gives a stupid version, directly contrary to all the facts established by the evidence taken, that Gorgulov while in Czecho-Slovakia was purported to have been a Communist, that his group was seemingly of a "neo-Bolshevist character," and that in all likelihood it was "inspired by the Third International." We have already seen what the pogrom programme of the "Green Party"—the party which Gorgulov organised—was with regard to Communists. The Official Communiqué had the impertinence to call this "neo-Bolshevist." The reference to the fact that, in conformance with official information from Prague, Gorgulov had held a membership card in the Communist Party in 1930, was also unmasked as a deliberate falsehood. The chief editor of the Czecho-Slovakian Telegraphic Agency, which has the sole monopoly of the release of official statements abroad, categorically declared that the above-mentioned information was not supplied by the Czecho-Slovakian Telegraphic Agency. Gorgulov was indeed a member of a political party at one time in Prague, but of the social-democratic, not the Communist Party. He represented himself as a Menshevik who had fled from Russia. The social-democratic party has confirmed this.

* * * *

The Tardieu Government organised its provocative act very inefficiently, and when it attempted to improve matters, it was too late. After the assassin had frankly admitted himself to be a white guard, in the presence of numerous journalists, the journalists were immediately barred. But Gorgulov's testimony had already received wide circulation in the press and could not be repudiated. Monsieur Tardieu decided to improve matters. On May 7th he gathered all the journalists at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and angrily queried them: "Why are you delaying with the campaign against the Soviets? We have furnished you with complete material and telegrams which we ordered to be sent from Czecho-Slovakia. I cannot permit you to retreat before 'L'Humanité.'" But Tardieu's angry wail was without effect. The personality of Gorgulov, his evidence, writings, biography, and contacts so

undeniably establish his crime as a clear-cut white guard act that no one excepting the press of the government party, dared support Tardieu's provocative version, for fear of compromising themselves before the wide masses of the petty bourgeoisie, as well as of the proletariat.

The left bourgeois and Socialist press repudiated Tardieu's provocative version. The Socialist Blum wrote in "Populaire": "The government failed to preserve its dignity in its appeal to the public and adopted a policy contradictory to the unity of our country. The Ministries and police who bear this great responsibility . . . attempted at the last moment to make use of the catastrophe as an election manoeuvre. The statement issued on the night of the assassination is an example of licentious insinuation: the madman turns out to be a simulator. The white fascist is turned into a G.P.U. agent, this individualistic act is made into the conspiracy of an entire party."

The bourgeois left-radicals and Socialists found it impossible to support Tardieu's provocative versions for fear of compromising themselves before their electors. However, they attempted, nevertheless, to defend the white guards who are so near to their hearts from the very start. They therefore sought to portray Gorgulov as insane. The Social-Democratic "Populaire" wrote: "It would be strange to use the testimony of a madman to poison public opinion against the white guards. We wish (for the sake of mankind) to believe that the assassin was abnormal. One would truly have to be mad to see in Doumer a patron of Bolshevism." The rumour that Gorgulov was insane soon had to be relinquished, for his conduct very logically and coherently coincides with his past and his surroundings. There remained only one assertion, that Gorgulov had acted "alone," that he had no contact with anyone, and that the white guards therefore bore no responsibility for his action. This claim is now supported by the white guard and bourgeois press, solidly, as a whole, even including the social-democratic press. This false and infamous version, in glaring contrast to the actual facts, must continue to be persistently and indefatigably unmasked by the Communist Party.

Our French Communist Party and its central organ, "Humanité," have from the very beginning revealed the whole truth of the Gorgulov cause; they have established the direct contact which existed between Gorgulov and the "new policy" of the white guards on the one hand and the police and Tardieu government on the other, holding the white guards and Tardieu government equally responsible for the murder of Doumer, aimed at loosing the intervention against the U.S.S.R. The Communist Party of France and

the "Humanité" have drawn the practical conclusion from the facts of the case and demand prohibition of white guard organisations and exile of their active members.

* * * *

All our Communist Parties must support this initiative. The fact that the provocation of Mons. Tardieu in connection with the Gorgulov affair has failed does not mean that this is the end of the matter. We are in no whit guaranteed against some new fraudulent, malicious interpretation being trumped up for the trial and given support by some stool-pigeon testimony. Should this fail to happen it does not mean that we are guaranteed against a new provocateur being advanced from the ranks of the white guards, who will prepare his crime so cleverly with the aid of the police that its traces will be harder to locate.

These are more than possibilities — they are probabilities. Our Communist Parties must all therefore bend every effort to support the campaign which has been started by the Communist Party of France—a campaign to expose the inciters of war—Tardieu and his adherents—a campaign to exile all active white guards. A systematic struggle must be waged in this connection against the social-democratic licentiousness of "pacifism" which strives to save the "reputation and name" of the white guards who are now deliberately stirring up war provocation by terroristic acts, and causing uneasiness and indignation even among the wide masses of the petty bourgeoisie. This campaign must be extended and expanded as a vital link in the struggle against the intervention aimed at the U.S.S.R.

THE BOLSHEVISATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES BY MEANS OF OVERCOMING THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC TRADITIONS

PART II.

O. PIATNITSKY.

The Communist Fractions and their Relations with the Party Committees.

OF course, it was easier for the Bolsheviks than for the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries to establish the mutual relations between the Communist fractions and Party committees since the Party organisations actually conducted a great variety of activities, they led the economic struggle, organised trade unions and co-operative societies and created all sorts of labour organisations, such as were allowed to exist under the Czarist regime, from 1905 until the war. That is why the Party organisations were recognised authorities in the eyes of the workers in all these organisations, especially of the Party members and sympathisers. This situation appeared to all to be quite natural and no one raised any question about it. When we came into power there were some tendencies among certain Soviet Communist fractions to supplant the Party organs, but this was a passing phenomenon. The relations between the Party organisations and the Communist fractions (or individual Communists) in the non-Party mass labour organisations prior to and, especially, since the capture of power, have been such that the Party organisations decide the important questions while the Communist fractions and the individual Communists, no matter what non-Party organisations

may be affected, carry the decisions into effect. The Communist fractions themselves decide upon the methods for carrying out the decisions. In their everyday work they are entirely independent. They can and must display initiative in their work within the non-Party organisations and bodies. The Communist fractions in the leading bodies of the non-Party organisations must not only report to the conferences and congresses which elected them, but also to the Party committees. Prior to the October Revolution, and even immediately after it, when there were still Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in some of the non-Party mass organisations, the Bolsheviks converted each newly-gained position into a stronghold for the capture of the organisation in the district, city, region and nationally. They demonstrated their ability to work better than the others, prepare the questions, lead, and weld together and organise the masses of the workers. That is why they succeeded in driving the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and the other "Socialist" and populist parties out of the mass labour organisations.

In the Communist Parties in capitalist countries things are different because in them Social-Democratic traditions are still preserved, which are frequently interwoven with sectarianism. The trade unions and the other proletarian mass

organisations, as has been pointed out above, arose before the Social-Democratic Parties in the principal capitalist countries and made a strong position for themselves in the working class as independent organisations which led the economic struggle.

The members of the Social-Democratic Parties who led the mass proletarian organisations, therefore, had a definite amount of independence. Moreover, the Social-Democratic Party not only did not oppose this independence but on the contrary, they themselves developed the theory that the trade unions were equal in value to, and therefore should have equal rights with, the Party, that the trade unions were neutral organisations. As has been said already, the only exception in this respect was the Bolshevik Party. A number of cases could be quoted in the history of German Social-Democracy for instance, when the decisions of the trade union congresses differed from those of the Social-Democratic Party Congresses—for instance on the question of the general strike in 1905. And this was so despite the fact that the delegates to the trade union congresses were Social-Democrats who knew the standpoint of the Party. The same thing occurred in connection with the celebration of the First of May. Before the war the Social-Democratic Parties in Central Europe celebrated May Day on the first of May, while the Social-Democratic "free" trade unions sabotaged the First of May celebration, in order to avoid paying victimisation to workers who might lose their jobs for taking part in the May Day celebration on the First of May. The trade unions urged that May Day should be celebrated on the first Sunday in May. These relations which existed between the Social-Democratic Parties and the trade unions before the war, and which the Bolsheviks regarded as abnormal (since the war surprising unanimity has been displayed between the Social-Democratic Parties and trade unions and there has been complete co-operation between them in betraying the interests of the working class in their respective countries) cannot be tolerated in a Bolshevik Party since they prevent uniform leadership being exercised over all forms of the revolutionary labour movement. But they have been inherited from the Social-Democratic Parties by the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries.

The abnormal relations between the Communist Parties and the Communist fractions in the trade unions and in all the other mass proletarian organisations are due to two fundamental causes: the Party committees sometimes supplant the mass organisations, they remove the elected secretaries and appoint others, they openly publish in the press such things as: We propose to the red trade unions that they do this or that; that

is, they act in a way as is very rarely done even by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Usually the decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or of the local Party committees are carried out through the Communist fractions or through individual Party members working in this or that non-Party organisation. Another cause of the abnormal relations is that the individual members of the Communist Party work on their own accord, disregard the directions of the Party organs or disobey them. There have been cases in France, for instance, when the Party organs thought that they must do absolutely everything, that they must take the place of the International Red Aid, the trade unions, the co-operative and sport organisations, where they alone can perform the functions of these organisations. This is absolutely wrong. Even had the leadership of many of the Communist Parties been a hundred times superior to what it is, in reality, they could not do the work of these organisations. This, in fact, is unnecessary because both the Central Committee and the local Party organisations should only determine the line, see that the line is carried out, lead the Communist fractions and the individual Communists working in the mass organisations. The Central Committee and the Party committees must get their directives carried out in the mass labour organisations through the Communist fractions or the individual Party members where there are no fractions, but they must not do their work for them.

However, I think it is hardly necessary to go into further details to prove that these incorrect relations between the Party, the trade unions and the mass organisations generally interfere with the extension of the Party connections among the masses, with the real consolidation of the Party among the masses.

In the countries in which there are red trade unions there exist side by side with them, in the same industries, trade unions of other tendencies. However, the red trade unions have very rarely succeeded in capturing whole organisations, or more or less considerable groups of members, from the trade unions of other tendencies.

The trade union oppositions in the reformist trade unions frequently succeed in gaining a majority in the local branches of the different reformist trade unions. But the Communist Parties and the trade union oppositions do not convert these into strongholds from which to extend their influence over the other branches of the same union or over branches of other trade unions which are affiliated to the same local trades council. This can be only explained by the fact that the opposition branches not infrequently take up the same position as trade unions. The same

applies to the red factory committees. They do not receive proper leadership and the necessary aid in their work.

THE PRESS.

The Bolshevik Party Press, expressing as it does the Party line, has always carried out the decisions of the Party both during the illegal period and at the present time. It mobilises, organises and educates the masses of the workers.

The Party press must not be separated from the Party committees. Abroad, the Social-Democratic Parties used to elect the editors of the Party newspapers at their congresses. There were cases when the Central Committee could do nothing with such a newspaper: the paper had its own line while the Central Committee followed its line. Such was the case in Germany with the *Vorwärts*, the same occurred in Italy with *Avanti*. The Communist Parties naturally discarded these "excellent" traditions. But the "independent" press which the Social-Democrats had before the war nevertheless left a deep impress upon the Communist Parties as well. Not that the editors are appointed by the congresses and remain independent of the Central Committee and Party committees, this does not happen in the Communist Parties, but in many cases the Central Committee and the Party committees give very little attention to the Party press, and so the press in these cases goes its own way while Central Committee and the Party committees go their own way. The line of the Central Committee and of the Party committees often differs from that of the Party newspapers—but this is not because the Central Committee, the Party committees and the editors want this to be so.

In Germany we have 38 Party dailies. If all of these 38 daily newspapers had good and proper leadership they could exercise much greater influence upon the masses of the workers than they do at present. Remember that from 1912 to 1914 the Bolshevik Party had only one legal daily, *Pravda*. And what miracles *Pravda* performed in Russia in those days! What an inestimable help the *Pravda* was to the workers locally, though owing to the censorship it could not say everything it desired. *Pravda* wrote on all the most important and serious questions in popular language that could be understood even by the uneducated workers. *Pravda* devoted much space to events in the factories and mills. In those countries to which I have referred the newspapers are legal, they are able, more or less, to say whatever they think to express and carry out the Party line. Like the mass labour organisations, newspapers are channels through which the Communist Parties can and must influence the workers, through which they can and must

win the workers. One must know how to utilise the newspapers, how to run them properly.

The legal daily Communist press in many countries is not distinguished for popularity of style, the topical character of subjects discussed, or brevity of articles. The newspapers are filled with thesis-like articles instead of popular and brief expositions of the most important vital tasks. If the active members of the Party, the members of the Party generally, and the revolutionary workers do not get material for the fight against the Social-Democratic Parties, the reformists, the National-Socialists and other Parties, which still have a working class following, the responsibility for this must rest upon the press. The Party press must not only indicate the line and give facts proving the treachery of the Social-Democrats and reformists and exposing the demagogy of the National-Fascists, but it must also explain how these facts should be utilised. Most of the Party newspapers contain no news from the factories. The Party press has no room for such things.

Not all the Communist Parties have yet learned to appreciate the importance of the Party press. Teachers at International Communist Party schools must give the Party press special attention in their work with the students. Many of the students graduating from the International Party schools become editors.

We have not observed that they are bringing fresh blood into and helping to revive the Party press; that they are breaking down the Social-Democratic traditions in this field.

AGITATION

The capitalist world is at present experiencing a profound industrial crisis, an agrarian crisis, financial upheavals, an imperialist war in the Far East, which threatens to spread to the other countries. All this not only affects the workers and poor peasants, but also the urban petty bourgeoisie (office employees, Government officials, etc.).

These masses are much more open to Communist agitation under present conditions, when capitalist stabilisation has come to an end, than was the case during the period of capitalist "prosperity." Unfortunately, the agitation the Communist Parties carry on in their newspapers, leaflets and oral agitation is too abstract. It seems to be based on the assumption that all the workers know as much as those who write in the papers, who write the leaflets and speak at meetings. When an emergency decree is published in Germany which stings every worker to the quick, which cuts the wages or increases taxes, etc., instead of examining the decree point by point, instead of showing how much the

workers will have to pay in taxes, to what extent wages are to be cut, so that the masses can understand it all, instead of this, they simply write: We are opposed to the emergency decree! We demand a strike against this decree!

How did the Bolsheviks carry on agitation in the past and how do they do so at the present time? Did they do it in the way some of our Parties are doing it now? The strength of the Bolsheviks was due to the fact that they took up every question: be it a matter of a wage cut of even a kopek, of absence of lavatories, broken windows in the factories, hot water, fines, the quality of the provisions sold in the factory store, etc., etc., and argued about them this way and that until the workers themselves drew the logical political conclusions from them.

Take the strikes which occurred in 1903 in the South of Russia. The Bolsheviks succeeded in developing this economic strike movement which was initiated in Odessa by Shayevich and Co., the agents of Zubatov, Chief of the Moscow Secret Police, into a colossal political movement which affected the entire South. Many of the Communist Parties have not yet learned to agitate effectively, while the leading comrades acting as editors, agitators, etc., think that since they understand what is taking place it must be more or less clear to the workers as well. And this is the way they approach the Social-Democratic workers. Instead of taking every little fact of treachery—where it happened, when it happened, naming the witnesses, citing the exact records, relating just how and when the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders negotiated with the government and the employers and betrayed the interests of the working class, instead of painstakingly explaining this to the Social-Democratic, reformist and non-Party workers, our comrades keep repeating: "Social-Fascists and trade union bureaucrats," and that is all. And they think that having said "Social-Fascists" and "trade union bureaucrats," all the workers must understand just what is meant by these terms of abuse and believe that the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders deserved them. This only has the effect of repelling the honest workers who belong to the Social-Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions, since they do not regard themselves either as Social-Fascists or trade union bureaucrats.

It should be quite clear, therefore, that methods of carrying on agitation must occupy a prominent place in the curriculum of International Communist Party Schools. Read Lenin's articles written in 1917. At that time the Bolshevik Party was accused of being in the pay of the German

imperialists.* One would have thought that the only way to reply to such a charge, to such an insinuation, would be to say to the accusers: "You are scoundrels, rascals, we do not want to talk to you! We do not think it necessary to justify ourselves before you; you may think what you will, but we will continue our work." This is probably how many Communist Parties would have replied under the circumstances; they would have said that it was below their dignity to refute such mean accusations! But how did Lenin react to this charge? In the first place he began to explain who Alexinsky* was, and listed all the foul acts by which Alexinsky had distinguished himself in France, that at such and such a meeting in France, this man had been thrown out because he was such a liar and skunk. He then returned to Russia. The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, in which the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries predominated would not receive him until he rehabilitated himself. Alexinsky began to attack the Bolsheviks in the press and accused them of working for the Germans, for money, in July, 1917. Lenin exposed this Alexinsky in his true colours, showed what a creature he really was. Having thus exposed the moral character of Alexinsky and destroyed him, Lenin then proceeded to reveal the part the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries played in this dirty campaign. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries knew that the Bolsheviks were being falsely accused of espionage. Tseretelli, the Menshevik leader, even telephoned to all the newspapers informing them that Alexinsky's document was a forgery and asking them not to publish it. Lenin then quoted a third fact. The slanderous document was known to the Provisional Government as early as June, yet it did not arrest any of those who were accused of being in the pay of the Germans. Hence, it was evident that the Provisional Government did not believe in this calumny against the Bolsheviks. Lenin analysed all these facts, dissected them in a popular style and then put the question: Who was at the head of the Government? Kerensky? No. The Central Executive Committee? No. It is the military. It was the military who wrecked our printing office! Who ordered it to be wrecked? Was it

* "Zhivoe Slovo" (Living Word) a yellow sheet published in Petrograd, in its issue of July 18, 1917, No. 51, published a declaration signed by Alexinsky, a renegade Social-Democrat, and Pankratov, a Socialist-Revolutionary, in which they, on the evidence given by a certain Lieut. Yermalenko, under examination at the General Staff Headquarters and the Military Intelligence Service on April 28, 1917, accused the Bolsheviks of receiving money from German General Staff Headquarters for the purpose of carrying on anti-war propaganda.

the Provisional Government? No. Was it the C.E.C.? No. There is another power, that power is the military, and it was they who wrecked our printing shop. And do you know who stands behind the military? The Cadets.* A day later, in another article, quoting the speech of the National-Socialist, Tchaikovsky, at the C.E.C., Lenin showed that the Cadets and the Western imperialists had common aims, that the imperialists were willing to provide money only if the Cadets came into power. Lenin began with Alexinsky but ended with the question of who was to be in power, with the question of the class character of the State. He did not merely hurl abuse, he did not say that it was beneath our dignity to refute the mean charges, but he proved that they were insinuations and lies which were first circulated by a yellow sheet and then taken up and trumpeted through the country by the entire bourgeois, Menshevik, Narodniki and Socialist-Revolutionary press.

By carrying on agitation in this simple manner, intelligible to the masses of the workers, the Bolsheviks succeeded not only in repelling the attack of the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionists and Cadets at a time when the situation was very acute for the Bolsheviks, but they succeeded in developing during the next three months wide agitation against all the Parties of that time, particularly against the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionists who still exercised some influence over the workers, peasants and soldiers. In this campaign the Bolsheviks utilised against these Parties, all their acts and deception on all questions that came to the front at that time. You must remember that in the period before the October Revolution, in 1917, millions of workers, soldiers and peasants had been drawn into the movement. Just before the October Days the Bolsheviks had already won the support of the entire working class and the majority of the soldiers, while the peasantry also supported the Bolshevik slogans for land and peace.

Is this the way the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries are carrying on their work of agitation? The Social-Democrats have committed so many acts of treachery against the working class of every country that one can easily understand the perplexity of the workers of the Soviet Union who frequently ask: what stuff are the foreign workers made of? The Social-Democrats daily betray their interests, we can see from here that they are being betrayed, yet these foreign workers still continue to vote for the Social-Democrats and remain in their Party. The reason why the Social-Democrats are still

able to get the support of the workers is that many Communist Parties do not know how to carry on agitation even in the extremely favourable situation which has been created by the present world industrial and agrarian crisis. The Communist Parties must present their criticisms in a detailed and painstaking manner particularly because the Social-Democratic leaders, despite their innumerable acts of treachery, still manage to find new forms for their demagogic manoeuvres. The German Social-Democrats have helped with all their might to carry out the emergency decrees, to rob the unemployed as well as the workers who are still employed. Now, they are introducing a series of demagogic bills in the Reichstag—to reduce unemployment, to increase unemployment benefits, to reduce rents, etc.—and at the same time, by voting against the Communists with whom, after the withdrawal of the National-Socialists, they have a majority in Reichstag, get the Reichstag dissolved indefinitely, without any date being fixed for its reassembly, without any discussion of their bills and, of course, without a discussion of the proposals of the Communist fraction. Under these conditions it is the duty of the Communist Parties to catch the Social-Democratic swindlers “red handed” as it were, to expose with facts and proof every one of their manoeuvres, every step in their treachery.

Both before and after the capture of the power, the Bolshevik Party managed to educate its members, to give them such instructions, such directives, as enabled all the members of the Party to work towards one aim; no matter where they were, no matter what functions they performed, all aimed towards one point. And yet, often the local Party bodies received their directives only through the press. The Bolshevik Party achieved all this by applying those methods of work which I have described above. Unfortunately the same cannot be said of the majority of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. There we have frequent cases of Party members aiming towards different points.

THE PRESENT SITUATION, TACTICS, SLOGANS, THE THEORY OF “LESSER EVIL” AND THE UNITED FRONT.

Before the October Revolution the Mensheviks ridiculed the Bolsheviks for frequently placing on the agenda of their meetings the question: “The Present Situation.” Yet, without making a precise analysis of a given situation and defining its character it is very difficult to determine the tactics to be pursued. The adoption of correct tactics in each given situation, and still more, the correct application of these tactics is a great art. To master this art means to ease the struggle and

* Abbreviation for: Constitutional Democratic Party. The Party of the bourgeoisie. Ed.

the task of winning the masses. It is no small art to advance appropriate and timely slogans corresponding to the situation and to the needs of the moment. At the present time hardly anyone will think of denying the ability of the Bolsheviks to determine in masterly fashion the character of the situation, prevailing at any given moment, to adopt correct tactics and apt slogans to which the great masses would and do respond and rally. Comrade Lenin mocked at those Bolsheviks who clung to the tactics of yesterday and failed to see that they no longer suited the new stage, or changed situation (for instance, the proposal made by Kamenev and Bogdanov to boycott the elections to the Third State Duma in the same way as the Bolsheviks boycotted the First Duma).

It is this ability to define the "present situation" and to adopt correct tactics corresponding to the given situation that the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries often lack (and this despite the fact that the Comintern, unlike the Second International, decides and frequently lays down the tasks and tactical line of its sections).

While some Communist Parties regard the fall of this or that Cabinet as a "political crisis," others have regarded the temporary elimination of Parliament from the discussion of current questions as the establishment of a Fascist dictatorship and have deduced from it the necessity of proclaiming as the main slogan the struggle against Fascism, and therefore, of diminishing the struggle against the Social-Democratic Parties. When the mistake is rectified the struggle begins to be conducted against Social-Democracy alone and the Fascists are lost sight of. Very frequently the slogans advanced are absurd: sometimes they apply to domestic questions alone, sometimes they are directed against war, without, however, being organically connected with the questions of domestic policy. Unfortunately we have had absurd slogans not only in the field of "high" politics but also in the economic struggle where they are no less harmful. It is necessary to study very carefully and attentively the peculiarities of the developing situation, to watch its changes and tendencies, to study how the workers react to events, how the enemies, the Social-Democrats, the Fascists, etc., are preparing, what they are about to do, what tactics they are adopting.

Only such an analysis and study of the current situation can enable us to adopt correct tactics, correct and timely slogans and to carry on our agitation on proper lines. The questions arising out of the current situation should be broadly and frequently discussed in the Party press so that the analysis of the situation, the refutation of the arguments and agitation of the opponents,

the exposure of their plans and deceitful tricks might serve to arm, educate and prepare the Party members for the struggle. For the same purpose it is necessary to have frequent discussions on the current situation and the tasks of the Party at the Party meetings, meetings of the Party nuclei, etc.

Such discussions will not only enable the Party members to understand the Party line and tactics, to get their bearings on the burning problems of the day and to arm themselves with arguments for discussion and agitation in the factories, among the unemployed, in the trade union and in the street, but will also put more life into the nuclei and local Party organisations.

In recent years the Social-Democratic Parties and the reformist trade union bureaucrats have been making special use of the theory of the "lesser evil." The reformists persuade the workers to agree to a wage cut of 8 per cent. instead of the 12 per cent. "demanded" (not without a preliminary agreement with the reformists) by the employers. Then they proclaim this "gain" of 4 per cent. as a victory for the workers. The Social-Democratic Parties support the most despicable laws, which place upon the toilers a heavy burden of taxation and cut down wages, on the pretext that the Government and the bourgeoisie had intended to tax the workers even more heavily. And this too they represent as a victory for the workers. They propose to vote for Hindenburg whom in the 1925 elections they attacked as a reactionary and a monarchist, by representing Hindenburg to be the "lesser evil" compared with Hitler. The Russian Mensheviks also resorted to the theory of the "lesser evil." Thus, during the elections to the Second State Duma the Mensheviks, on the pretext that Russia was menaced by the Black Hundreds, urged the workers to vote for the Cadet Party. The Bolsheviks then struck the Mensheviks a crushing blow. They convinced the revolutionary electors that they must vote for the revolutionary candidates by showing that both prior to, during and after the 1905 revolution the Mensheviks supported the liberal bourgeoisie — just as the Social-Democratic Parties are now supporting the bourgeoisie in their respective countries on every question.

The Mensheviks opposed the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Hence, their cries about the Black Hundred danger was only a ruse designed to divert the working class from the correct revolutionary path. The Communist Parties have not yet succeeded in exposing the manoeuvre of the Social-Democratic Parties on the "lesser evil," by the methods with which the Bolsheviks exposed the Menshevik manoeuvre on the Black Hundred

danger. And as long as this false manoeuvre of the Social-Democratic Parties remains unexposed to the masses, it will be difficult to free the workers from their influence.

Among the vast masses of the workers there is a desire for unity. There have been many cases in different countries when the crafty agents of the bourgeoisie resorted to the unity slogan to dupe the workers.

The Social-Democrats too sometimes put forward the slogan of unity. And in this the renegade Trotsky hastens to their aid with his proposal for a "bloc" between the Communists and Social-Democrats. In support of his proposal he argues that the Bolsheviks and Comrade Lenin adopted the same tactics.

I have tried to show above how the Bolsheviks established the united front from below in the factories and mills.

Cases have occurred in the history of Bolshevism when the united front policy was applied simultaneously from below and above; but these cases occurred only in the midst of *actual struggle*. Such cases occurred in 1905 during the strikes, demonstrations, pogroms, uprisings (Moscow) for the duration of the action. So-called contact and federative committees were set up for the duration of the joint action. The united front which sprung up from below in the course of the practical, united struggle, compelled the Menshevik leaders to join the struggle which the Bolsheviks led. Joint manifestoes were issued. What was the situation during the Kornilov days in 1917, by referring to which the renegade Trotsky attempts to mislead the Communists?

At the end of August, 1917, Kerensky, not without the knowledge of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, invited Kornilov to march on Petrograd with loyal troops in order to strangle Bolshevik Petrograd. Kornilov came. But before reaching Petrograd he demanded that practically all power be transferred to him. The workers and soldiers who followed the lead of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionists realised that if Kornilov came into power he would not only hang the Bolsheviks but would also hang them. Under pressure of the masses, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were compelled to join the struggle which was already proceeding under the leadership of the Bolsheviks. They were obliged to distribute arms to the workers of Petrograd for this struggle. This was a "bloc" only for the duration of the struggle against Kornilov. But even during the struggle against Kornilov the Bolsheviks did not discontinue the campaign against the Mensheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionists and the Provisional Government, who, by their betrayal of the interests of the workers, soldiers and peasants,

brought the country to the Kornilov affair and wavered between supporting Kornilov and fighting against him. Can there be any comparison between this and the situation in Germany? How is it possible to deduce from the Kornilov events the necessity of establishing a "bloc" with the German Social-Democrats, say, for the struggle against Fascism when the Social-Democrats are doing nothing but helping the Fascists and the bourgeoisie: the Social-Democratic Minister of the Police in Prussia dissolved the Red Front League because the latter fought against the Fascists, but at the same time he not only tolerated but protected the Fascist Shock Troops, while the Social-Democratic police always side with the Fascists and attack the workers whenever they resist the Fascists.

The Communists will not be deceived by the fact that Hindenburg, on the eve of the Prussian elections "dissolved" the Fascist Shock Troops. Officially these Fascist Shock Troops were declared dissolved, but their organisation was not destroyed, in fact no real damage was done to them. The object of this manoeuvre was to provide the Social-Democrats with the pretext for claiming that a fight was being waged against the Fascists and thus dupe the workers and win them over to their side.

Practically every Communist Party has made numerous mistakes in the application of the united front tactics. It must be said, however, that there have already been cases of a correct application of the united front tactics. An example of this is provided by the miners' struggle in Northern Bohemia which was led by the Communist Party and red trade unions of Czechoslovakia.* It is necessary to avoid mistakes and at all costs secure the correct and energetic establishment of a Bolshevik united fighting front from below in the factories and mills.

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL WORK. THE UTILISATION OF LEGAL POSSIBILITIES.

The Bolshevik Party in Czarist Russia, although a completely illegal Party, yet managed to utilise legal possibilities to the utmost extent.

Beginning with 1905 legal weeklies and magazines of a more solid nature were published in various parts of vast Russia even in the years of blackest reaction. These were in addition to *Pravda*, the daily organ of the Bolshevik Party, which played such a tremendous rôle in the consolidation of the Bolshevik Party for the struggle against Czarism, the bourgeoisie, and the Mensheviks, the Liquidators, the Trotskists, the Conciliators, etc.

In addition to the legal press, illegal Party newspapers and leaflets were of course published.

* See No. 8 "Communist International."

The illegal Bolshevik Party utilised all legal congresses of public organisations: of doctors, co-operators, teachers, etc., in order to speak on the lines of the Bolshevik programme of demands. It worked in all the legal workers' societies, trade unions, co-operatives, recreation societies and other organisations. Moreover, the Bolshevik Party utilised the labour organisations formed by the Chief of Police, Zubatov and the priest, Father Gapon, during the period preceding 1905, in order to free the workers from the influence of the police agents and from these police traps, which it succeeded in doing by exposing the machinations of the police at the meetings of these very organisations.

How successful the work of the Bolsheviks was may be seen from the fact that the police priest, Gapon, was compelled by the pressure of the masses to include in his programme the most important demands of the minimum programme of the Bolshevik Party, in order to avoid being exposed as an agent of the police.

It must be said that not only have the illegal Communist Parties failed to utilise the legal possibilities, but, what is more surprising, even the legal Communist Parties have not succeeded in successfully employing underground methods of work, though they have far greater opportunities for doing so than the illegal Communist Parties.

When the legal Communist Press is temporarily suspended or when the authorities forbid them to write about the emergency decrees which are aimed against the working class and which have been coming thick and fast lately, or about the shooting down of demonstrators, etc., the legal Parties have failed to pour a stream of illegal newspapers and leaflets into the factories dealing with the topics which the legal papers are prohibited from writing about.

The same may be observed with regard to the prohibition of meetings and demonstrations. To call meetings for ostensibly other purposes, to call sudden demonstrations in the working-class districts, despite the injunctions, is not only possible but necessary in such cases after careful preparations have been made.

The authorities and the police close down newspapers for various periods, prohibit labour meetings and demonstrations at the most critical moments. The Communist Party is therefore vitally interested not only in telling the workers what the authorities seek to hide from them but in getting the workers to come out in protest under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Only in this way can the Communist Parties win the masses and become their leaders. In the absence of good cells in the factories it will be much more difficult to work and maintain connec-

tions with the masses when the legal Communist Parties are driven underground.

URGENT TASKS.

1. *Communist and Trade Union Work in the Factories.*

What is the main point that should be emphasised in the course of studies at the Communist Party Schools? *Work in the factories at all costs.* Unless work is carried on in the factories it will be impossible to win the majority of the working class, and that means that it will be impossible to fight successfully for the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is the first point. But work in the factories assumes exceptional importance in view of the approaching imperialist war, which will mean, in the first place, the break-up of the legal revolutionary labour movement, of the legal Communist organisations and of the trade unions. Under such conditions work in the factories becomes more important than ever, and almost the only means of maintaining contacts with the masses of the factory workers; of influencing them and guiding their actions. Moreover, in time of war, nearly all factories are transferred to the production of munitions and the manufacture of supplies for the imperialist armies of the home country or of other countries; consequently, the fight against war must, more than ever, be carried on in the factory.

Work in the factories is a difficult matter. At the present time, when unemployment is rife, all the revolutionary workers are being discharged. Our task is to penetrate into the factories and mills at all costs, by all means, if necessary, under another flag, it makes no difference how, but we must penetrate into the factories in order to carry on Communist work in them. Wide and popular agitation must be carried on of the kind that the Bolsheviks carried on in the old days, and from February to October, 1917. The Communist Parties in the principal capitalist countries are still legal. They have their own Press, they can call meetings. But the work of agitation must assume a different character; it must be developed in the factories, at the factory gates, at the tram stops, near the subway stations, wherever the workers and office employees work and congregate. You must train a body of active people who know how to speak briefly and clearly, you must supply them with information and instructions and send them into the street, into the factories and mills as agitators. Is this possible? It certainly is possible. The students who return to work should know this, should know how to do this themselves and how to organise this work.

2. *Strikes.*

How should strikes be prepared? How should they be conducted, what demands should be advanced? These are not easy questions. They present very many difficulties to the majority of the Communist Parties, red trade unions and trade union oppositions. Up to very recently many of the Communist Parties advanced demands only from the maximum programme and did not take the trouble to advance every-day demands.

Now they seem to be saying: Let us advance only every-day demands without any connection with the politics struggle and the maximum programme, for when we advanced political demands the workers did not listen to us, did not follow us, and the work was badly done. We know from experience that the Bolsheviks always connected politics with economics and economics with politics. I know cases in 1905 when in starting a political strike the Bolsheviks advanced economic demands and *vice versa*.

To prepare strikes well is a difficult task. There was an enormous difference between the Social-Democratic reformists and the Bolsheviks both in the aims they pursued in strikes as well as in the organisation and conduct of strikes. The Bolsheviks collected information on the conditions of the workers in the factories; they conducted activities among the individual workers in order to explain the situation to them. When the preparatory work was finished (after the cell had discussed all the details of the strike with the revolutionary non-party *activists*) the strike would be declared, the demands put forward, a strike committee would be elected which called the workers together and put to them the questions connected with the strike. If the strike committee and the revolutionary *activists* were arrested a new committee would be formed in the same way. There were no collective agreements then. If the strikes broke out unexpectedly—owing to a worsening of labour conditions, accidents, the absence of safety screens around the machines, etc.—the Bolsheviks of the given factory placed themselves in the leadership of the movement, formulated demands, etc. Thus, strikes were prepared from below, in the factories, and in those cases when strikes spread from factory to factory, or from city to city, this did not always occur spontaneously. The party organisations in the city, district and the factory cells discussed methods for broadening the movement, etc. The Bolsheviks, in conducting strikes, pursued two objectives: firstly, an improvement of the material and cultural standards of the workers, and, secondly, the broader objective of drawing the largest possible number of workers into the general proletarian struggle for the overthrow of

the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As soon as trade unions were formed, the Social-Democrats and the reformists introduced such centralisation in the matter of strikes that the trade union members in the factories could not go on strike without the sanction of their trade union. Whenever they went on strike without such sanction and the Union Executive (chairman) refused to approve the strike, it would be declared to be "unofficial" and the strikers refused material assistance. When they did sanction a strike it took the leadership into its own hands and the strikers had nothing to do except perhaps send pickets to the place of the strike if this was required. When the reformist trade unions grew strong they began to conclude long-term collective agreements with the employers' associations and during the period the collective agreement remained in force strikes rarely occurred. Strikes, sometimes big strikes, took place whenever a new collective agreement had to be negotiated. In such cases the strikes were led by the Central Committees of the unions. The strikers at best had to act as pickets. The reformist trade unions were guided in the conduct of the economic struggle (before the war they conducted strikes) only by the desire to improve the material and cultural standards of the working class, completely neglecting the struggle against the capitalist system as a whole. The Communist Parties, in leading relatively small red trade unions which almost invariably are dual unions, or trade union oppositions with the reformist trade unions, in most cases adopted not the Bolshevik but the Social-Democratic, reformist method of preparing strikes, the method of preparing them in their offices, without always knowing the sentiments of the workers. For that reason, to this day the workers frequently fail to respond to the strikes called by the red trade unions and trade union oppositions, sometimes workers come out on strike from factories that were not expected to come out on strike.

In the International Party Schools the students must also learn how to prepare, conduct and lead strikes.

3. *The Struggle Against the Reformists and Social-Democratic Parties.*

The Social-Democrats and the reformists must be exposed, they should be shown up for what they say and what they actually do. This must be done day in and day out, in every article of the party press, in leaflets and in oral agitation.

It is necessary to watch the Social-Democratic and reformist press and immediately react to their agitation and leaflets and to reply to them. It is

necessary to react in a popular and intelligible manner. Every article, every speech written and uttered by the Social-Democrats and reformists can furnish the Communist agitators and propagandists with material for their speeches against the Social-Democrats and Reformists. Only in this way can we expose Social-Democracy; without this it will be hardly possible to expose them. In exposing the Social-Democrats and the reformists you must not overlook the other parties and organisations which exercise or seek to gain influence over the working class (the Catholics, National-Socialists, etc.).

The Social-Democratic Parties in the different countries apply various methods in performing their rôle as the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie. In England, until the last elections, the Labour Party openly played its part while in the Government. As soon as it saw that the masses of the workers were turning away in disgust from its policy, that it was endangered from this side, it sacrificed its leaders and went into "opposition." In France, the Socialist Party has not participated in the Government since the war. Sometimes, on the eve of an election, it even votes in Parliament against this or that Bill when it is certain that the Government is assured of a majority without the Socialist votes. In reality, the French Socialist Party is a most devoted servant and pillar of bellicose French imperialism. It is hardly necessary to speak at all about the German Social-Democrats. They are past masters in the art of deceiving the masses and the most cunning Party in the Second International in manoeuvring.

The Communist Parties, like the Bolsheviks in Tsarist Russia, must anticipate the manoeuvres of the Social-Democrats and warn the masses against them. They must expose them whenever they succeed in carrying out their manoeuvres and deceive the workers and toilers. The Communist Parties, the red trade unions and all the mass revolutionary organisations, must tirelessly expose the Social-Democrats and the reformists, for unless the workers are freed from their influence the Communist Parties cannot win the majority of the working class, without which it will be impossible to fight successfully against the bourgeoisie. The Communist Parties must also carry on a vigorous and unrelenting struggle against the National-Socialists who take advantage of the treachery of the Social-Democrats and reformists as well as of the mistakes and weaknesses of the Communist Parties in order to extend their influence over the petty bourgeoisie and permeate the unemployed with the aid of their demagogic slogans, frequently even with the aid of Communist slogans.

4. *Unemployment.*

Unemployment is rife. None but the Communist Party pays any attention to the unemployed. Nevertheless, even when it was possible to organise the unemployed, when it was easy to do this by championing the every-day interests of the unemployed, the Communist Parties failed to take advantage of the situation. They failed to achieve such organisation. There are not many Communists in the factories since most of them have been discharged. It is not easy to work in the factory. But why has the work not been organised among the unemployed, at the labour exchanges, in the lodging houses, in the bread and soup lines? There is an enormous number of members of the Party and of revolutionary trade union organisations among the unemployed; is it difficult to organise the work among these comrades? In Czecho-Slovakia and Poland the unemployed organisations succeeded in places in mobilising large masses and brought pressure to bear upon the municipalities, as a result of which, the latter were forced to issue grants to the unemployed. In America the unemployed receive no aid either from the State, or from the employers, and are forced to depend upon charity. Large numbers of them are being evicted from their homes. During 1930 and 1931, 352,469 families were evicted in New York alone. There is a vast field of activity for the revolutionary and Communist organisations, but they only take advantage of these conditions in a very slight degree. At one moment they set up an exclusive unemployed organisation, at another they spend all their time organising demonstrations and overlook the need for establishing kitchens for the unemployed, for organising a movement capable of preventing the evictions of the unemployed, demanding and securing benefits for the unemployed, etc., etc.

WHY THE COMMUNIST PARTIES AND REVOLUTIONARY TRADE UNIONS LAG BEHIND THE REVOLUTIONARY LABOUR AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS.

I have tried to show the difference between the tactics, organisation, methods and content of work, and ultimate aims of the Bolsheviks and Social-Democrats, and I have also tried to show the causes of this difference. We, the workers on the E.C.C.I., sometimes hear arguments to the effect that the old Bolshevik experience does not apply to the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries, especially in regard to methods of work in the factories. The experience of the past few years, however, has refuted this view. Where the Bolshevik methods of work have been applied, where flexible tactics have been applied in the work in the factories, they have yielded excellent

results. Does not the intensity of the struggle, the mass character of the labour and peasant movement in Poland and the leading rôle the Communist Party plays in this struggle, in this movement, reveal the superiority of Bolshevik methods over the Social-Democratic methods? You must remember that the Polish revolutionary proletariat, the former S.D.P. of Poland and Lithuania, now the Communist Party of Poland, in spite of the mistakes it committed, fought shoulder to shoulder with the Bolshevik Party of Russia. They adopted the Bolshevik methods of work; that is why they have not become isolated from the Polish proletariat despite the ruthless fascist terror that is raging in the country. But the Communist Parties, the red trade unions and the trade union opposition in the capitalist countries which have not yet freed themselves from Social-Democratic traditions, have not adopted, are not carrying out, or are carrying out poorly, the Bolshevik methods of work and forms of organisation, are not giving the work a Bolshevik content, are lagging behind the revolutionary labour movement, behind the revolutionary events and are unable to consolidate their growing political influence organisationally (for instance, we get four to five million votes and at the same time we fail to organise resistance to the employers' attack on wages). This lag will be inevitable until the Communist Parties, the red trade unions and the trade union opposition discard the Social-Democratic traditions and assimilate and apply the truly Bolshevik experience in every field of their political work and every-day activities.

TRAINING CADRES AND THE METHODS OF TEACHING IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY SCHOOLS.

The question of cadres is assuming tremendous importance for the Communist Parties, red trade unions and trade union opposition, in the present conditions. The International Communist Party Schools therefore play an important part in training revolutionary cadres.

The question of instruction in these Party Schools is of vital importance because the need for theoretically-trained cadres who combine theoretical knowledge with practical experience is very acute in the sections of the Communist International. This need has not diminished in recent years, but, on the contrary it has increased. We have not trained such cadres in sufficient numbers. The Communist Parties in the capitalist countries can obtain these cadres from the International Communist Party Schools. Some of these Party Schools have been in existence for some time now, but the Comintern has not yet received the cadres necessary for Communist work. To be sure, when the students of the International Communist Party Schools return to

their Parties upon graduating, they know, perhaps, quite well, the most important works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and in some of these countries they even become Party leaders.

But what the Communist Parties have not yet received from the International Communist Party Schools are comrades capable of applying Marxism and Leninism to the local conditions, capable of organising and conducting mass work, and this is precisely what the Communist Parties are mainly in need of at the present time.

They have not been getting workers really capable of helping them to rebuild the Parties, the red trade unions and the trade union oppositions on a factory basis.

What are the causes of this? The causes are as follow: the students study Party structure which cannot be fully applied in their countries at the present time, but only after the capture of the power by the proletariat. But they even learn the Party structure of the C.P.S.U. superficially: they do not study with sufficient attention what they ought to study most, *viz.*, the methods of mass work, the mobilisation of the masses, the different approach to the different sections of the toilers, mass agitation, forms of organisation of mass agitation, the relations between the Communist fractions (especially in the lower mass non-Party organisations) and the respective cells and Party committees, the work of the factory Party cells and of the factory trade union committees, etc. They do not study and assimilate the experience of the period preceding the capture of the power by the working class, that is the experience of the Bolsheviks in the Tsarist days and in the Kerensky days from February to October.

Yet it is this experience which our Communist Parties need most.

It is this experience which contains elements of similarity with the situation in the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries at the present time. Of course there are also points of difference.

That is why I dealt with the difference between the position of the Bolshevik Party under the Tsar, and that of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries at the present time.

The fact that the Communist Parties do not get the kind of graduates they need from the International Party Schools proves that the instruction given is apparently not conducted with a view to the peculiarities of each individual Party, to its development, traditions and former customs.

The task of the International Communist Party Schools is to assist our Communist Parties to assimilate the experience of the Bolsheviks, both in Party organisation as well as in Party work as

a whole, and in such a way as to enable them to apply this experience to the conditions prevailing in their respective countries. The conditions in the various countries differ. Conditions in Germany differ very much from those in France, they differ very much from those in England and not less from those in the United States. In every country the labour movement has its own peculiar features, its own history and traditions, its peculiar forms of Party organisation and of labour organisations. When you are giving

instruction according to groups of countries you must bear this in mind. It should be stated that teachers can obtain the necessary material and facts concerning each country, and describing the conditions prevailing there, from the students who have taken part in the practical work of their Parties.

The International Communist Party Schools must help the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union movement to train genuinely Bolshevik cadres.

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

By LEROI.

THE VIth Congress of the French Communist Party was held at St. Denis at the beginning of 1929, at a time when, after the stabilisation of the currency, production in France was developing above pre-war level, the mouthpieces of the bourgeoisie were singing hymns about the "inauguration of a prosperity policy in France," accompanied by proclamations by their lackeys, the Socialists and their satellites, the renegades, and the Trotskyists, on the exceptional position of France.

New factories were created, new metallurgical and coal trusts were formed, the same development took place in other branches of industry—above all, in the chemical and electrical industries. The number of blast furnaces in the metal industry increased from 131 in 1923 to 153 in 1928. The production of cast iron increased from 8,306,000 tons in 1927 to 9,387,000 in 1928, while the production in 1913 had not reached 5,207,000 tons. At the same time, export of cast iron and steel increased from 500,000 tons to 4,500,000 tons.

Mass unemployment had not yet appeared in France and French capitalism, on the contrary, searched in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and in other countries for skilled and unskilled labour.

In the U.S.S.R., the proletariat, led by the Communist Party, was only approaching the realisation of the first Five Year Plan, it had just begun . . . and the bourgeoisie with the Socialist "theoretician" at their head were still declaring the inevitable "failure" of the plan of Socialist construction.

The Communist Party of France, in this situation, was the only one that clearly foresaw the approach of the economic crisis and the consequences of the contradictions of capitalist

economy in France. It rightly emphasised at its VIth Congress that capitalist stabilisation signifies greater exploitation of the masses of the workers and, as a result, the growth of the class struggle, of which the first indications appeared in the development of the strike movement at this period; during the last four months of 1928, the number of strikers in France was equivalent to the average number of strikers for a whole year during the period from 1922-1927. It foresaw and pointed out the imminence of the danger of imperialist war and, above all, of military intervention in the Soviet Union. It attacked the bourgeois and Social-Democratic theories of the "exceptional position" of French capitalism energetically; these theories were echoed even by some of the Communists and in the ranks of the C.G.T.U.

The picture which the capitalist world and French imperialism in a crisis actually offers as opposed to the Soviet Union, the land of the victorious construction of Socialism, plainly justifies the perspectives and the political line traced by the Communist International and by the VIth Congress of the Party. The essential ingredients of the partial stabilisation of capitalism which correspond to the methods of plunder of Germany, and agree concerning the re-partition of spheres of interest in China, etc., are in great part breaking down. In the Far East, war has begun in fact, with the active support and inspiration of French imperialism, and the threat of aggression against the U.S.S.R. is very definite. The partial and precarious stabilisation of capitalism is nearing its end.

Despite the prattling about the exceptional prosperity of France, French imperialism has not escaped the fate of world imperialism. Entering

late into the crisis, it developed rapidly. The production of coal in 1931 (7 million tons) declined 8 per cent. at the end of the year in comparison with 1930; the production of cast-iron (8 million tons) declined 18 per cent. in comparison with 1930 and 24 per cent. in comparison with 1929. The production of steel (7,800,000 tons in 1931) declined 17 per cent. in comparison with 1930 and 19 per cent. in comparison with 1929. The decline was accelerated in January, 1932. The number of blast furnaces in action fell from 154 on the 31st of December, 1929, to 137 in December, 1930, and to 85 in January, 1932.

At the beginning of the year, a fifth of the French fleet was dismantled. The figures of export show a decline of 38 per cent. in value and of 16 per cent. in weight for imports, a decline of 30 per cent. in value and of 22 per cent. in weight for exports in the month of January, 1932, in comparison with 1931.

The number of totally unemployed reached 1,615,000 on the first of February, as against 1,474,000 on the first of January, 1932. There was at this time 6,198,500 partially employed (against the 5,676,000 in January). Of this number, about 1,277,000 workers only work four days and less per week.

The economic crisis has struck the French colonies more severely, and this fact aggravated, in turn, the crisis in France. The development of the agrarian crisis has quickened. A constant diminution of the sown area confirms this fact.

French imperialism succeeded in profiting from her delay in the development of the crisis, by using the difficulties of the countries, affected more rapidly by the crisis, to advantage. It used financial pressure as its means, credits whose sum total reached more than 10,000 million francs, mainly to the countries of Central Europe and the Orient. The orientation of these credits is clearly imperialistic and military. The credits were placed, above all, with the countries bordering the Soviet Union and are for the purpose of assuring for French imperialism strategic, decisive industrial positions. Meanwhile most of these countries are so weak from a financial and economic point of view that the French credits constitute not only the principal support of their existence but also French imperialism is obliged to constantly extend new credits to these countries and to risk part of the credits formerly granted, in order to avoid financial bankruptcy. By promising these credits, by withdrawing or maintaining short term investments, French imperialism has been able to obtain certain advantages and relatively reinforce her positions. This strengthening implies, above all, the strengthening of the exploitation of the peoples enslaved by the Treaty of Versailles and especially the

increase of the threat of intervention against the Soviet Union.

A great part of the deliberations of the VIIIth Congress were devoted to the examination of the rôle of champion of anti-Soviet aggression played by French imperialism and of the tasks which devolve upon the C.P. of France. In the political reports of the Central Committee, in the report of Comrade Marty on the struggle against imperialist war, on the organisational and trade union tasks, during the whole discussion, the question of imperialist war begun in China, the imminence of an anti-Soviet aggression and imperialist aggression, the struggle against French imperialism, were placed in the foreground.

Why did French imperialism become the organiser of military intervention against the Soviet Union? The Congress replied to this question:

1. France, as a great imperialist country, is interested in the conquests of new markets, consequently, in the destruction of the Soviet power, and the re-organisation of Russia on an imperialist basis.
2. The Soviet Union is the crumbling part of the Versailles edifice on which French imperialism rests.
3. The direct contact of the Soviet Union with the neighbouring countries and the crisis developed in these countries offer a solid base for the shining example of Bolshevism in the vassal countries of France, which are defending the bases of the Versailles system in eastern Europe.
4. The existence of the Soviet Union, the successful construction of the first Five Year Plan and the preparation of the second Five Year Plan, the national policy of the Soviet power is a factor of the utmost importance in the revolutionary process in the capitalist countries as well as in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The Congress denounced the manifestations of French imperialism in its attitude of systematic provocation and of war with regard to the Soviet Union. The action of the Industrial Party showed how French imperialism had organised sabotage and espionage with a view to intervention against the Soviet Union, the actions of the Menshevik Party have also shown the direct relations of its agents of counter-revolution with French imperialism. Finally, the recent provocations in Moscow, the attempts at assassination by the Czech diplomat, Vanek, who was revealed as an agent of Czecho-Slovakia, inspired by French imperialism, and the attempt of Stern-Vassilief upon the life of the consul, Twardowski, were likewise directed from Paris.

The Congress, faced with the heavy responsibility resting upon the French proletariat and its

revolutionary vanguard, was able to show that the Party had led the struggle against the danger of imperialist war during the entire period since the Congress at St. Denis. If the results of this struggle are not yet entirely satisfactory, the Party has had certain success in this quarter, at least. On the first of August, 1929, a notable demonstration against war took place. Since the beginning of the war in the Far East the Party has mobilised the proletariat for the defence of the Soviet Union. It is the only Party which denounces the danger of imperialist war and exposes the pacifist phrases of the Social-Democracy and the activities of imperialist politics in the factories, among the masses, through its press, leaflets, posters, factory newspapers and the Chamber tribune. It is this work which has won the sympathies of the workers, and even of the Socialist Party. The secretary of the Socialist section of St. Ouen wrote: "You alone draw the attention of the workers to the war."

The national day, February 4th, prepared as a demonstration for the economic demands of employed and unemployed workers, was transformed into a demonstration against imperialist war. The Party and the C.G.T.U. succeeded in drawing the attention of the large masses of workers to the danger of war. The increasing activity of the workers in the exposure of war manufacture, the protest strike of the dockers at Dunkerque, the increasing demonstrations in front of factories are the best proofs of it.

In the discussion on the reports, the delegates exposed the war preparations in all parts of France and brought facts forward showing the feverish preparations being made by French imperialism, its ever more active participation in the war already begun in China.

The Congress was unanimous in recognising that the work which must be the centre point of the attention of the whole Party, from now on, is systematic work against the imperialist war, the greatest efforts must be brought to bear, above all, in the factories, the rail stations and the ports. The Congress called upon the Party to struggle against the pacifist deceits of Social-Fascism, a most active factor in the preparation of the imperialist war and, more particularly, of military intervention against the U.S.S.R. By decision of the Congress, the last week in the month of March was proclaimed anti-war fighting week. The Party sessions have therefore become the practical point of departure in the reinforcement of Party action against the war.

The Congress emphasised at the same time the weaknesses of Party work against French imperialism, due above all to an under-estimation

of the danger of imperialist war and the imminence of military intervention in the Soviet Union.

After emphasising the necessity of concentrating forces against the pacifist lies of the Social-Fascists in order to expose them, and resolutely condemning the errors committed by the propaganda of pacifist slogans, and other means; by the participation of members of the Party in a pacifist committee of radicals and Socialists (at Thiers), the Congress proceeded from the list of general considerations on the anti-war work to ask that the delegates render account of the work done in their regions, districts and cells. "Comrades of the Lyons district, what work has been done in Creusot?" asked the reporter. "Comrades of the North, what work is being done with the Khulmans of the Madeleine?" "Comrades of the Federation of Sous-Sol, what are you doing in the by-product works which are becoming more and more numerous in the mining valleys?"

With a unanimity which characterised the Congress, tasks were assigned in the struggle against imperialist war and military intervention in the U.S.S.R. "The realisation of these tasks implies the vigorous exposure of each action of preparation for war by French imperialism, energetic action against imperialist intervention in China, for the active support of the Chinese Soviets, for the evacuation of Indo-China and of all the colonies suppressed by French imperialism, for the mobilisation of the masses for active defence of the Soviet Union. It implies the popularisation of the success of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, in the construction of Socialism, in order to render the class character of the anti-Soviet war in preparation clearer."

The sessions of the Party Congress have perfected the ideological arsenal of the Party for the struggle against imperialist war and the defence of the U.S.S.R. It is the rôle of the Party to control and orientate the realisation of this task for which the French proletariat and its advance guard bears a particularly heavy responsibility.

The Congress declared that the battle for defence of immediate demands, strikes and activities of the unemployed must not be separated from the struggle against war.

In the report on the tasks of the Party in the economic struggles, Comrade Frachon depicted the characteristics of the offensive of the French bourgeoisie against the working class. For the past year, with the direct support of the Social-Democracy and the reformist bureaucracy, the bourgeoisie has succeeded in imposing reductions in wages which range from 15 per cent to 20 per

cent., reaching sometimes, as is the case in the textile factory of l'Isere, 50 per cent. The railway workers are threatened with a reduction in wages. Already the report Fournier testified that the effort to eliminate waste resulted in the reduction of the total personnel of the railways from 700,000 to 500,000 with a reduction in expenses of 3 thousand million francs by half per year. They are preparing for a reduction in the personnel of 80,000 office employees. But at the same time, they are conducting a campaign for a reduction in the wages of the railway workers. To the direct measures against the working class, to the various forms of exploitation is added spoliation by means of the policy of prices and customs tariffs.

The Congress marked the rôle played in this offensive by the Social-Democracy and the C.G.T. They support each attack of the boss on the standard of living of the workers. At first, they began by spreading the "theory" of the passivity of the masses of workers. Their agents in the midst of the syndicalist movement, the minority and the Trotskists have faithfully popularised these theories, proposing the suspension of the class struggle for 40 years (Chambelland). On the basis of the facts of these latter years, the Congress has unanimously rejected these conceptions and testified to the increasing resistance of the French proletariat to the capitalist attacks. The struggle against the former reductions in wages by application of the bourgeois and Social-Democratic law on social insurance has drawn more than 200,000 workers into strikes. 3,000 textile workers of Cours struck for three months, liquidating the reformist union. In March, 1931, approximately 30,000 to 40,000 miners, under the leadership of the C.G.T.U., struck against a lowering of wages. In the summer of 1931, for 11 weeks, 125,000 workers, men and women, of the textile industry led the struggle. 500 strikers in Sedan under the direction of the C.G.T.U., forced the bosses to withdraw a reduction of wages for 5,000 workers. In spite of the efforts of reformist officials, 8,000 workers of the shoe factory at Fougeres have been on strike against wage reductions since February, 1932. In Vienne, 1,500 male and female workers of the textile factory, Etablissements Reunie began a strike which has lasted six weeks. The workers' movement at the Renault establishment where several thousands are leading the struggle in the factory in a state of siege, and the activities in other metal factories in Paris, signify the approach of greater struggles in the metal industry.

The activities of the agricultural workers (the strike of Coursan) show that the radicalisation of

the masses is drawing the agricultural proletariat in as well. In all these strikes, above all in the course of the last months, one sees not only the more active participation of the most exploited sections of the proletariat (women, young girls, immigrant workers) but particularly a great increase in the activity of the unemployed. The unemployed workers supported the movement of Chez Renault; at the time of the strike at Vienne, there were 2,000 unemployed workers who joined the movement on the spot. The workers often come out on strike, despite the fact that they have been working only two and three days a week for a considerable time (Pont de l'Arche, Vienne).

The Congress was able to show improved activity in the organisations of the C.G.T.U. in several strikes during past months.

Our organisation was at the head of the movement of Chez Renault, at Vienne, they succeeded in assuming the direction of the strike at the Pont de l'Arche. Thanks to a better application of revolutionary tactics in the strikes and improved work in the united front, several strikes of the latter period have been ended successfully. The fact that most of the strikes led by the C.G.T.U. in the month of February, 1932 (14 strikes of 26) were victorious, refutes the reformist theory of the impossibility of successful struggles at a time of crisis most convincingly.

Apart from certain improvements in the general work of the Communists in the ranks of the revolutionary union, the Congress noted the weaknesses which still remain predominant in this domain. If the organisations of the C.G.T.U. have succeeded in leading certain strikes and struggles, they have not yet succeeded in exposing the treason of the reformists in the economic struggles. The recent big strikes in France and movements for demands are still being conducted under the leadership of the reformists and they end in defeat because of this. In general we only lead the small movements and not those in basic industries. The principal cause of the weaknesses of the Party in this field is the underestimation of the readiness of the masses for struggle by the workers in our ranks, an underestimation which has not yet been resolutely combated. The secretary of the committee of the Givors section did not believe there was a possibility of declaring a strike in Vienne, while the masses of textile workers already decided to come out on strike the following day.

Another cause of the backwardness of the Party in economic struggles is the fact that certain sectarian tendencies among the militant elements prevent the Party from forming closer ties with the working masses who are still under the influence of the reformists, and from applying

the united front methods. These sectarian tendencies prevented the C.G.T.U. from taking a firm lead of the extensive movement for trade union unity in the beginning of 1931, and they are the principal cause of the failure to actually place the question of trade union unity in the class struggle in the centre of attention in the work of the Communists in the unions. These tendencies have been at the bottom of the errors made in the various movements, for example in the movement of the miners at the beginning of 1932, when our militant members launched the slogan of the boycott of the referendum organised by the reformists, instead of participating in the referendum and allying themselves with the reformist workers, thus forming united front organisations with them to expose the treason of the officials and lead the miners in the struggle.

That is why the Congress emphasised the fact so forcibly that the application of the "united front" tactics from below, for the mustering and organising of all the proletarians in the enterprises around and under the direction of the Communist Party, is the weapon necessary to the Party for the preparation, the spreading and the victorious unfurling of the workers' struggles for decisive battles for power." It repelled "in a categorical fashion all attempts at agreement from above between the organisations of the Communist Party and the S.F.I.O. The proposals for a united front made to the union organisations of the reformists or others must be subordinate to work among the masses."

In spite of certain success obtained in recruiting work, in the daily work in the unions and the direction of the districts, a real turn has not yet been made. The work of our trade union organisations has not yet been concentrated in the factories. The Congress emphasised the necessity for the creation of trade union sections in the enterprises as one of the indispensable conditions for the spreading of the economic struggle under revolutionary leadership. To attain success in the transformation of the revolutionary union organisations on the base of factory sections, the Party must fight the anarchist-sindicalist survivals, the distrust of organisation, the orientation to spontaneity of mass movements and the insufficiently detailed preparations for economic movements.

The Congress approached the discussion on the increased struggle against the social democracy and emphasised the fact that "the effective struggle against French imperialism demands the strengthening of the attack against the social democracy, to expose, isolate and defeat the socialist party, the chief social support of the bourgeoisie." In emphasising the importance of

the next election campaign, the Congress confirmed the slogan of "class against class" verified in the course of all the elections since 1928. "The bitter and systematic struggle against the social democracy will not be realised if the Party does not turn its face in its entirety, in a decisive fashion, towards the socialist workers, and the masses influenced by the social democracy, and win over each socialist worker, assuring the constant use of the united front as a basis."

If the discussion on these questions did not show any resistance to the tactic of "class against class," it would not be correct to affirm that the correct application of this tactic in the Party is already assured. The tendencies toward capitulation to the social democracy still exist, but the sectarian tendencies have been insufficiently resisted. In drawing up the balance sheet of activity of the Party during recent years, the Congress noted the almost complete abandonment of united front work. A great many of our militant members do not understand that the correct application of the "class against class" tactics demands a bitter struggle against the social democracy not only during election periods, but also particularly daily work in the factories, among the unemployed, to expose the socialist party and the C.G.T., and to win over the socialist workers by the united front policy, under the direction of the Communist Party.

The Congress forcibly emphasised the slackness of the Party in the field of organisation. The tasks which face the Party; action against the imperialist war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, the mobilisation of the masses against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the organisation and leadership of the economic struggles, the struggle against the principal social support of the bourgeoisie—the social democracy—demand that the centre of activity of the Party be carried into the factories. The report of Comrade Duclos stated, meanwhile, that among the 2,387 cells of the Party, only 490 were factory cells. But even these latter direct their efforts toward the factories in a very weak manner. One of the principal tasks of the Party is to learn how to work in the factories. To-day the activity of the factory groups is very inadequate. For the 490 sections there were only 140 factory papers.

The Congress decided to concentrate efforts particularly in the most important industrial centres of the following regions: Paris region, Northern, Eastern, Lyonese, Marseilles, Alsace-Lorraine, and to instruct the Party leaders to devote the greatest efforts to these districts.

The first results obtained in the course of preparations for the Congress, in the field of recruiting (about 4,000 new members of the Party,

15,000 new members in the C.G.T.U., a certain strengthening of the Young Communist League), indicate the greatest possibilities for our Party. To clinch and develop these results, the Congress decided upon the political, organic and ideological reinforcement of the Party and the augmentation of its results; the improvement of the work in the Party committees by every measure possible, the improvement of the social composition of the organisation and the stabilisation of its results. The condition of the Party organisation demands far greater collective work of all the committees and organs of the Party, the brightening of the interior life, the practice of democratic centralisation. Special attention must be devoted to the improvement, the control, the development and circulation of "L'Humanité" as well as the provincial press. The "Cahiers du Bolchévisme" ("Bolshevik Notes") must become an organ of the elaboration and deepening of the questions of principle placed before the Party. Systematic work for the formation of Bolshevik cadres is one of the most important tasks.

The report and the discussion on the question of organisation have proved that a decisive strengthening of the organisational work is an indispensable condition for the realisation of the tasks which face the Party. If the Congress could list the weaknesses in the several regions of work, without doubt the backwardness in the organisational field (Party organisation, union organisation, organisation of struggles) would be seen to require the greatest efforts of the Party and its directives.

The peasant question, the question of Alsace-Lorraine and the colonial problem have been likewise under discussion in the Congress, which had to recognise the insufficient support of the national revolutionary movement in the colonies, and the indifference with regard to the national liberation movement in Alsace-Lorraine. The discussion on the problems of work among the immigrant workers has shown the need for strengthening the struggle against chauvinism and nationalistic provocations by the bourgeoisie and the socialists.

The Congress, and even before the Congress, the whole of the Party, unanimously condemned the conspirative and sectarian group of Barbe-Lozeray. This group, a particularly outstanding expression of the sectarian and mechanical practices of the Party, has very greatly contributed to the development of opportunistic tendencies, through the weakening of the struggle of the Party against opportunistic deviations. The struggle against the attitude and practice of this group demands the attention and systematic work of the whole Party.

The Congress observed a certain strengthening of the Party in that direction and it has thus

become a point of departure for better work and more rapid development of the Party. The events which occurred on the eve of and during the Congress, the strikes at Sedan, Vienne and the Pont de l'Arche under the leadership of the Party, and the revolutionary unions, the great demonstrations on the occasions of the funeral services of Camelinat and the murdered unemployed worker, Fritsch, the first results obtained in the recruiting campaign of the Party, are proof that objective conditions are favourable for the reduction and even removal of the backwardness of the Party in the developing situation. The task of the new Central Committee, elected largely by newly recruited militants, not forming part of the old leadership of the Party, will be to carry the decisions of the Congress among the Party members.

This task, although very urgent, has not yet been accomplished. Two months after the Congress, the decisions and resolutions are not yet known to some members of the Party. The leadership must accomplish this elementary work without delay to acquaint the Party with the objectives of the Congress.

"The French Communist Party will know how to lead the struggle on the two fronts with energy, against right opportunism and sectarianism with leftist phraseology, the other extreme of right opportunism.

"It will fight the survivals of social democracy and anarcho-syndicalism in its midst bitterly, to prevent their penetration and to repel all conceptions or theories hostile to Bolshevik outlook.

"It will vigorously repulse the slightest attempts at revision of the Party line and of the C.I., at the weakening of the struggle against the social democracy; it will line up against all conciliatory tendencies with regard to right and left deviations.

"The Party will realise its tasks, it will win over the majority of the working class, if it is well acquainted with the spirit and sentiment of the masses, if it knows how to utilise the least manifestation of their discontentment, if it launches in every situation appropriate slogans, if it directs the daily struggles for immediate demands effectively, if it knows how to link these struggles with the general movement against imperialist war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, for the support of the revolutionary movement in Europe and of the liberation movement of the colonial peoples oppressed by French imperialism. By mobilising the working masses, assuring the hegemony of the proletariat, for a bitter and resolute struggle against the dictatorship of the French bourgeoisie and against the social democracy, the French Communist Party will lead them in the decisive struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat."

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA.

By VALIA.

I.

The Economic Crisis and the Situation of the Toiling Masses.

THE British imperialists have lately begun to talk a great deal about signs of recovery from the economic crisis being observable in Britain and particularly in India.

The Minister for India, Hoare, speaking in Parliament, declared:

"With regard to the economic situation, he doubted whether it was always realised how great had been the economic crisis through which India had been passing. India was through the worst of the crisis and was in a better position to take advantage of a general recovery than almost any other country in the world." ("Times," March 1st, 1932).

The British imperialists, with Hoare at their head, substantiate their statements by such arguments as that India has "paid out" her debt of 15 million pounds sterling to the British Treasury, that the prices of raw materials have slightly increased, that the value of securities and imports into India have gone up.

The real facts, however, go to show not only that the crisis is further sharpening, but that under the burden of the feudal and imperialist system of exploitation in colonial India, the structural crisis of the entire economy, which is now interweaving with the world crisis, has reduced the country to the lowest depths of destitution and misery. We shall cite a few facts in proof of our thesis.

Foreign Trade.

During the first ten months of 1929-30 the value of the exports amounted to 265 crore rupees,* while the exports for the corresponding period of 1930-31 amounted to 135 crore rupees. Imports for the same period declined from 201 to 105 crore rupees. In some cases the decline was even more striking: the import of cotton goods dropped from 49.7 to 15.9 crore rupees, and the export of jute products, from 62.9 to 20.9 crore rupees.

The figures relating to the foreign trade turnover for the last few months indicate a further decrease. In December, 1931, exports and imports amounted to 24.85 lakh rupees,† compared with 24.13 lakh rupees in January, 1932 (including the export of gold) and 22.61 lakh rupees in February.

Thus the figures of foreign trade confirm that the crisis in India, which is a raw-material exporting country, far from weakening, is displaying a tendency towards further intensification. The fall of the foreign trade has been accompanied by a sharp decline in the domestic trade. A certain indication of this is provided by the deficit of the railways. In 1931, this deficit amounted to seven million pounds sterling, despite the sharp rise of freight rates. During the same year the passenger traffic dropped by 15 per cent.

If we take the amount of freight carried per mile of railway in 1923-24 as 100, then that for 1926-27 is equal to 96.1 and that for 1929-30 to 87.7.

Fall of Prices.

The official statistics of the wholesale price index contain the following figures, the index for 1914 being taken as 100:—

Year	Raw Cotton	Cotton Goods	All Goods
1918	309	298	178
1921	143	280	178
1924	272	229	173
1927	167	159	148
1929	146	160	141
1930	91	139	160
1931	83	123	96

In considering this table it is necessary to remember that British imperialism carried out various manipulations with the quotation of the rupee in order to strengthen the non-equivalent exchange, i.e., to despoil the peasants and workers of the country. Besides, in India the divergency between wholesale and retail prices, or to be more exact, between the wholesale prices and those at which the peasants sell their produce, has reached greater proportions than anywhere else in the world, and the official figures therefore considerably diminish the real extent of the robbery of the peasant masses.

The official table quoted above indicates, firstly, that in 1931 the decline in prices was particularly drastic; secondly, that this price decline greatly exceeds the decline which took place during the crisis of 1920-21, and, thirdly, that the prices of raw materials dropped far more than the prices of manufactured products, including cotton goods, so that the peasantry was particularly affected.

An even more striking picture of the fall of prices and of the ruination of the peasantry is provided by the retail prices. The weekly Journal, "Makhrat," contains the following data: In

* A crore rupee is equal to 750,000 pounds sterling.

† A lakh rupee is equal to 7,500 pounds sterling.

December, 1929, a peasant gave for one rupee, seven seers* of wheat or five and a quarter seers of rice, or 10.25 seers of barley, while in May, 1931, he had to give for one rupee 13 seers of wheat, or 9.3 seers of rice, or 25.05 seers of barley.

The Coalowners' Association report contains the following figures: In 1930 a peasant gave for one rupee five-six seers of rice, in 1931, 16 seers of rice ("Capital," January 7th, 1932). These figures confirm the well-known fact of the unheard-of ruination of the peasantry, who are unable to retain for their own use even a starvation ration, or to maintain their farms which are at the lowest possible state of degradation as it is.

The crisis results in a reduction of the acreage planted with industrial crops. The jute acreage, according to a number of newspapers, has been reduced to half. The reduction of the cotton acreage has been relatively small. In 1930-31, the cotton acreage amounted to 23,014,000 acres compared with 22,350,000 acres in 1931-32 ("Capital," of January 7th, 1932). Some of the industrial crops are being replaced by the ruined peasants by grain crops. "Commerce," of July 26th, states that the total cultivated acreage has been reduced as follows:—

Year	Acreage
1926-27	226,012,867 acres
1927-27	226,172,000 "
1928-29	223,862,000 "

The fluctuations of prices during the recent months in connection with the dropping of the gold standard, the depreciation of the rupee and the speculation caused by the war in the Far East, in consequence of the increase of the demand for cotton, rice, etc., do not affect our general conclusions. The Indian capitalists still cherish the hope for a great war which will benefit them in the same way as did the war of 1914-18.

Industry.

Under the influence of the crisis all industries, with the exception of the cotton industry, have reduced operations. A particularly sharp drop of production has been recorded in the jute industry working on export. The Tata works have also drastically curtailed their output in consequence of the reduction of railway construction operations and the decline of the export of iron, especially to Japan.

The few orders received in connection with the war have not altered the general situation. The slight growth of the cotton industry (and the erection of several new small cotton mills) connected with the boycott of the British goods does not change the general picture of the growing crisis.

* A seer is equal to one pound.

The production of cotton goods has developed as follows according to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce:—

Year	Yarn in million pounds	Cotton Fabrics in million yards
1927-28	809	2,357
1928-29	648	1,893
1929-30	833	2,419
1930-31	867	2,561
1931 (April-June)	312	969

The increase for three years was extremely negligible (slightly exceeding the output for 1927-28) compared with the general drop of the import of cotton goods for the same years, as shown by the following figures:—

Import of Cotton Goods.

Year	Million yards
1929	1,910
1930	1,253
1931	742

Thus the cotton industry succeeded only in an insignificant degree in utilising the reduction of the import of cotton goods, and this only due to the boycott movement. The reason is clear: *it consists in the monstrous ruination of the masses and the constant curtailment of the home market.*

To illustrate the above we shall cite the following data from an editorial of the "Bombay Chronicle" of December 23rd, 1931:—

"The per capita consumption of cotton goods decreased from 13.5 yards in 1913 to 12 yards in 1930."

If we take the consumption of the toiling masses alone, it declined, according to the "Bombay Chronicle," from eight yards in 1913 to three yards in 1930. Anyone in the least acquainted with the situation in India knows that these figures, far from being exaggerated, do not even give a full picture of the speedy impoverishment and unprecedented plight of the toiling masses.

The contraction of the home market (and the force of the boycott of the British goods) may be judged to a certain extent by the value of the average import of British goods per head of population. The following is taken from "Capital," of April 7th:—

1924	5 shillings 8 pence
1930	3 "
1931	1 " 10 "

Depreciation of Money and the Drain of Gold.

The British imperialists utilise the money and finance system, as well as the entire State machinery, not only for the purpose of securing a

monopoly of the exploitation of the Indian masses but also in order to extort by non-economic compulsion an additional share of colonial super-profit. The whole history of the despoliation of the Indian people strikingly confirms this. The latest development, the gold drain, follows the same line. British imperialism, by depreciating the rupee and dropping the gold standard, cut down, at one blow, the wages of the workers by more than 30 per cent., reinforcing, at the same time, its monetary policy by a tremendous increase of taxation. It has forced the toiling masses (including the middle peasants) to throw upon the market their miserable savings in the form of gold and silver trinkets. The price of the rupee dropped from 16 to 11 annas.* The slight rise of prices caused by this, as well as by the war speculation, did not compensate the robbery of the masses resulting from the depreciation of the rupee. In February and March the prices again dropped and they are now below those which prevailed before the abolition of the gold standard.

The ruined toiling masses of the population, fearing death by starvation and anxious to preserve the land, etc., were forced to throw upon the market at reduced prices (compared with the world price) their gold and silver trinkets (in India, where there is no regularly functioning banking and savings bank system and where the semi-feudal system of usury still exists, these trinkets at present represent the only popular form of small savings, "sanctified" in addition by various customs and religious traditions). The colonial peasantry generally sells its agricultural produce at prices far below the world prices. This constitutes a manifestation of the non-equivalent exchange between the colonial and the imperialist countries. It has found its reflection also in the fact that the prices of industrial products declined far less than those of the raw materials produced by the colonial peasantry, who are oppressed by the imperialist and semi-feudal system, vigorously supported by the colonial bourgeoisie.

The selling of gold articles which has become known as "distress gold," is characteristic not only of India, but is being observed also in Indonesia and in a number of other colonial countries. This has been admitted by the Indian bourgeois economists and even by the British imperialists.

The re-sale of this gold brings high profits to the Indian speculators and big usurers and benefits British imperialism as well. The export of gold from India from September 26th, 1931, to February 27th, 1932, amounted to 513 million rupees. By this gold, which is being pumped out of India,

the British imperialists hope to pay their debt of 80 million pounds sterling which they owe to the United States and France. While issuing paper rupees (kept at par artificially by means of direct Governmental pressure), that is, while resorting to the printing press, the Anglo-Indian Government is buying up gold, exporting it to England and exchanging for paper pounds which it then imports to India, paying the "debts" (!) of the Anglo-Indian Government to the Bank of England with them, thus essentially again robbing the Indian people.

In this way the Anglo-Indian Government has paid out 15 million pounds sterling to London, following this up by the impudent statement, made through the mouth of the Minister for India, that this indicates the beginning of a recovery in India.

India.

The Indian imperialists seek to represent the gold drain as a normal phenomenon, consisting of an attempt by the Indian business men, rajahs, etc., to take advantage of the difference in the price of gold. The Indian bourgeoisie are forced to admit that the gold is being obtained at the price of the ruination of the toiling masses, but this does not worry them. The Indian bourgeoisie is concerned not with the interests of the toiling masses, but only with stopping the gold drain from the country and utilising the gold for the creation of a Reserve Bank of India, in the interests of the exploiting classes of India. At a conference of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce ("Hindustan Times") held on March 28th, Mr. Fhali demanded that the Government should collect for the Reserve Bank 100 crore rupees and buy up "distress gold" to the amount of 56 crore rupees at least. The Indian bourgeoisie demands protection of its interests. The position of the National Congress on the gold question furnishes added proof that the bourgeois National Congress is opposed to the people.

The impoverishment of the masses and the gold drain are directly connected with an increase of taxation and indebtedness of the workers, peasants and the city poor. To illustrate the burden of taxation we shall quote the following figures:—

In 1929-30 the taxes from 201 crores of imports amounted to 33 crore rupees.

In 1930-31 the taxes from 105 crores of imports amounted to 21 crore rupees.

Here we see a considerable increase of the custom duties. During the same year of 1931 freight rates were increased by at least 15 per cent., and at the same time the tax on salt, kerosine, etc., was also raised. The lowest gross income from which income tax was collected

* One rupee is equal to 16 annas; one anna is equal to about two cents.

amounted to 2,000 rupees in 1930 and was reduced to 1,000 rupees in 1931, which means that a vast number of clerks, handicraftsmen, etc., were brought under the action of direct taxes. In addition, the old taxes were increased. Not content with this the imperialists are preparing to *introduce new indirect taxes upon food and articles of general consumption.*

Despite the enormous growth of taxation, the budget deficit of 1931 amounted to 15.5 crore rupees, plus the deficit of the different provinces, etc., etc. The deficit grows, the taxes soar, poverty increases, railway construction work has come to a practical standstill, trade is stagnant, production declines, yet the expenditure on the police, army, prisons and the entire machinery for the enslavement of the Indian people are being increased. *All this testifies to a further contraction of the home market and a further aggravation of the economic crisis in India.*

In this connection it is necessary to note that those Indian Communists who at the end of 1930 predicted the coming of a "boom" were cruelly mistaken. The methodological root of their mistake lay in the fact that instead of taking the economy (and the tendencies of its development) of the country as a whole, and considering its inter-effect upon the world market, they mistook the superficial slight improvement in the cotton industry caused by the boycott of the British goods, for an all-determining factor, failing to distinguish the temporary, superficial phenomena from the deep, basic tendencies of economic and political development.

Impoverishment of the Toiling Masses.

The weekly "Makhrat" notes that out of every 16 annas (16 annas = 1 rupee) of value of his produce, the peasant of the United Provinces has lost 11 annas through the depreciation of the rupee. This constitutes about $\frac{2}{3}$. But the Government has granted to him temporary tax exemptions to the amount of two annas seven pice.*

A commission of the United Provinces Government has calculated that the indebtedness of the peasantry in the province has now reached 129 crore rupees.

The report of the local committee of the National Congress points out that while prices have declined 52 per cent., completely ruining the tenant farmers, the Government reduced the tax by 6 per cent. and the landlords provisionally reduced the rent by 7 per cent. Thus, in 1931 the destitute peasantry must pay even higher taxes, rents and interest rates, than in past years. The Minister for India, Hoare, stated in Parlia-

ment on March 1st that owing to the reduction of agricultural prices the indebtedness of many peasants had grown by 70 per cent. Under these conditions the insignificant concessions made by the imperialists could not help the peasantry, arrest the development of the crisis, or stop the further growth of the agrarian movement caused by it.

The spontaneous movement in favour of refusing to pay rent, debts and taxes thus rests upon a solid economic base. Refusals to pay debts have become so frequent that the total sum of usurious capital circulating in the United Provinces has drastically declined. The commission of the United Provinces Government says in its report:—

Capital used for loan purposes now constitutes only between one half and one quarter of the sum accessible for credit before the outbreak of the crisis.

In a number of districts in the country starvation conditions prevail. Many cases are on record of children being sold. Never has the position of the peasantry been so grave as at present. The sale of farms under the hammer for arrears has assumed mass proportions.

The newspaper "Hindi" reports that in a certain district more than 300 peasants deserted their farms owing to inability to pay debts and taxes. Similar reports are published more and more frequently together with reports of forcible eviction for non-payment of debts, taxes and rent. Lately even the lands of the small landlords have begun to be sold for arrears. Reports to this effect are coming in from Bengal, partly from the Madras Presidency and elsewhere.

The situation of the workers is going from bad to worse. There are numerous facts to show that the pressure of the employers and Government upon the miserable living standards of the Indian proletariat is growing all the time. As an illustration we shall quote various reports from bourgeois sources which are far from interested in describing the situation worse than it actually is.

"Capital," of January 7th, reports that the miners' wages in 1931 were cut by 33 per cent. The average wages of a miner were reduced from nine to six annas per day. The wages of the jute mill workers dropped to one rupee ten annas per week (we take this from "Liberty," where a report is given on the wages of the workers of the Ristra jute mill); the wages of the workers in the cotton industry have declined. The official report states that the wages of the workers in the gold mines of Mysore are so miserable that they are unable to spend more than two annas per day on their family, thus being 20-30 per cent.

* 1 anna = 4 pice.

below the minimum spent for the maintenance of criminals in prison. The wages of the rice mill workers in Calcutta were cut in two instalments from eight annas to four annas per day, the working day being 12 hours, etc.

In Bombay alone there are upward of 70,000 unemployed, while the railways have recently discharged more than 50,000 workers. An excess of 120,000 railwaymen are now working on short time, and the same applies to all the jute mills. During 1931, more than 75,000 jute workers were thrown on the street.

In Bombay the short working week in the railway shops means, according to the data of the reformist trade unions, a 40 per cent. reduction in the wages.

The intensification of labour is growing, the textile workers being forced to operate a larger number of spindles and looms per person. The wage cuts and the reduction of employment have affected the coal industry, the Tata iron works, the plantation workers. On January 1st the Government effected a 10 per cent. wage cut among the railwaymen at one blow and began to enforce a 10 per cent. reduction of the salaries paid to all the Government employees, including the postal workers. At the same time the municipal taxes, and services such as electricity, tram fares, railway fares, the excise tax and house rent, are all rising. Thus, the Tata Co. raised the rent in its houses by 50 per cent. The direct and indirect taxes are growing, the food prices display a rising tendency, the depreciation of the rupee has sharply reduced wages, etc., etc.

The unemployed receive no benefits and the workers' indebtedness grows. The short working week is accompanied by a lengthening of the working day. All this on the background of the surviving slave system which we have repeatedly described in the press: a 12-14 hour working day, fines, the payment of wages once per month, dependence upon the jobbers and usurers, total disfranchisement, etc., etc.

The starvation among the masses gives rise to constant epidemics and a high death rate. According to the investigation of the Indian doctors, about one million people die annually from tuberculosis alone and the average length of life in India during the last few years has dropped from 25 to 22 years (Putna, the "Indian Nation," February 15th).

Mr. Brockway, the representative of the Independent Labour Party, the pseudo-labour imperialist party which specialises in duping the working masses, was forced to admit in his book, "The Indian Crisis," that "the average length of life in India declined from 30.75 years in 1881 to 23.5 years at the present time" (page 19). He

is also forced to admit the slavish, plunderous, robber character of British imperialism.

Thus the growing crisis and the increasing exploitation on the part of the imperialists, landlords, usurers and Indian capitalists result in unprecedented destitution and distress among the toiling masses, a steady contraction of the home market, an increase of starvation and mortality, and a growth of the hatred of the awakening working and peasant masses for the existing system of oppression, hunger and slavery.

This gives rise to keen disappointment with the treacherous policy of the National Congress. Ever-growing masses of workers, peasants and city poor are beginning to desert the bourgeois National Congress and take up the revolutionary programme of struggle for their national and social emancipation.

II.

The Policy of British Imperialism.

The tendencies of the development of foreign trade in India during the past years indicate a steady decline of the share of Great Britain. Compared with 1930 England's share in India's foreign trade in 1931 dropped from 39 per cent. to 34 per cent.

An even more striking picture is presented by the import of cotton goods into India. From this point of view it is interesting to study the table drawn up by the Manchester Chamber of Commerce:—

Year	Total yardage in millions	Total value in million pounds sterling
1928	1,542	30.4
1929	1,374	26.1
1930	778	13.7
1931	390	5.5

Thus the reduction of the imports is enormous, especially if we remember that in 1913 and 1914 India imported from England about three milliard yards of cotton goods. At the same time the share of Japan has been steadily rising; the same report points out that the yardage of cotton goods imported into India from Japan increased from 90 million yards in 1921-22 to 562 million yards in 1929-30, a rise of 600 per cent.

England's control of the Indian market is contested not only by Japan but also by the United States and a number of other countries. Thus is the field of galvanised iron England is being hard pressed by Belgium. The aggravation of the crisis, the competition of the imperialist countries and the general tendency of the positions of British imperialism to weaken led the British bourgeoisie to the scheme to solve the crisis and consolidate

their positions by strengthening the British Empire, increasing the exploitation of the colonial peoples and of the British working class. This is the road chosen by British imperialism in the attempt to solve the crisis.

The post-war economic development of India, especially during the years 1930-31, reveals that in the field of cotton goods (of the lower and middle grades) the Indian market has been lost to England for good. The British export, which largely consisted of textiles, must now change its character. This altered position British imperialism is attempting to utilize in its negotiations with the Indian bourgeoisie on the question of the conditions to be laid at the basis of an agreement between them. British imperialism—and in this respect the editorial in the magazine, "Capital," of April 7th is highly significant—attempts to frighten the Indian bourgeoisie by the competition of Japanese textiles (which is actually assuming serious proportions), the prospective competition of the U.S.S.R. in the field of wheat, flax, hemp, etc., in the European market, the threat of counter-measures against the Indian bourgeoisie in Britain, her dominions and colonies, and, finally, the importance of its army and navy both for the struggle against the revolution in India and against foreign invasions. "Capital" assures the Indian bourgeoisie that it is in their interests to voluntarily support the British Empire and the system of preferential tariffs, promising to leave them the Indian market for cotton goods of the coarse and middle grades, to assure for the same goods the markets of the other British colonies (in Africa, etc.) which are now threatened by Japanese competition, and to make some other concessions of an economic and "constitutional" character.

British imperialism therefore seeks to introduce a system of preferential tariffs and, with the aid of custom duties and other measures (of an economic and administrative character, such as the gold drain, etc.), preserve the empire market. The same applies to India. Lately a number of preferential tariffs has been introduced in India (on cotton goods, metals, etc.).

The policy of the British imperialists in India consists of consolidating their economic and political power. While fighting the revolutionary mass movement the imperialists, seeking to prevent and defeat the Indian revolution, resort on the one hand to terroristic methods: tens of thousands of workers, peasants and revolutionary youths have been thrown into jails, and punitive expeditions are wreaking havoc all over the country where a state of siege has been proclaimed. Abolishing every semblance of law and order, the imperialists are shooting down thousands of

workers and peasants, making use of every arm including aviation. But on the other hand they are prepared to make some slight economic and political concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie in order to attract them on their side. These concessions (the extent of which is determined by the power of the revolutionary mass movement) in the economic field follow, on the whole, the line of preserving India as an agrarian-raw materials appendage of the mother country, and in the political field, the line of attracting the exploiting classes to a certain measure of participation in the Government while securing the interests and ruling position of British imperialism.

For an estimation of the policy of British imperialism the "Times" editorial of May 3rd is of interest:

"The emergency ordinances, in themselves, settle nothing . . ." says the "Times." "The Imperial Government must give conclusive proof that their word is their bond and that the completion of the work of the Round Table Committees means the practical initiation of constitutional reform . . . the sooner the better, for there is no other permanent solution of the Indian problem."

British imperialism has good reason to worry, for all the facts show that the terror failed to throttle the revolutionary movement which, in the conditions of the growing crisis, is assuming more and more serious dimensions, involving millions of peasants and creating the elements of a revolutionary uprising of the toiling masses. By these concessions British imperialism cannot solve the existing contradictions. On the contrary, they will lead to a further development of the revolutionary struggle by demonstrating once more the counter-revolutionary character of the Indian bourgeoisie.

All the events of the last years of the crisis testify that the contradictions between British imperialism and Indian capital are not becoming mitigated. Even those concessions which the imperialists are making show that British capital is incapable of solving the problems of a national market for the Indian industry. The basic economic contradictions between the interests of the development of the productive forces of India and the interests of British imperialism remain intact. The anti-national character of the Indian bourgeoisie is demonstrated particularly in the fact that by fighting against the Indian revolution it betrays the fundamental interests of the economic and political development of the country.

The Indian bourgeoisie fears a popular revolution and, fighting against it together with the imperialists, is heading towards such an agree-

ment, without, of course, refusing to take advantage of every favourable opportunity in order to cringe for some new concessions and increase its share in the exploitation of the masses.

In the field of economic concessions British imperialism has lately introduced protective tariffs for the paper, sugar, artificial silk, and cotton industries and has rendered considerable aid to the Tata Works.

The assistance to the Indian cotton industry was carried out in such a way as to undermine the competition of Japan and safeguard the interests of Lancashire. For apart from introducing protective tariffs the imperialists have also introduced a duty on imported cotton used for the production of high-grade goods, thus weakening the positions of the Indian bourgeoisie in their struggle against Lancashire.

By these concessions (the introduction of protective tariffs) British imperialism seeks to direct Indian capital into agriculture and those industries which are connected with the immediate treatment of agricultural produce and do not strengthen the contradictions with England, attempting at the same time to consolidate its influence also by extensively interweaving and merging with Indian capital, as has been the case in the jute industry.

The struggle did not end there, however. The Indian bourgeoisie demands further concessions, demands a share of the State budget, insists that a part of the military expenditures must be carried by Britain herself, demands the creation of a reserve bank to assist Indian capital, and participation in the regulation of the financial system of the country, the introduction of protective duties, and opposes the separation of the railway budget from the general State budget (by means of which Britain seeks to strengthen and assure its predominance over the railways).

British imperialism in its negotiations with the Indian bourgeoisie is consistently protecting the interests of its feudal allies, meeting in this with the support of the section of the Indian bourgeoisie which is connected with the landlords and the usurers.

In the Governmental field British imperialism is prepared to allow the bourgeoisie greater participation in the administration, to increase the percentage of voters in the elections to the legislative assemblies, to give the latter greater independence in the health department, etc., even to grant them 15-20 per cent. of the State budget to be disposed of in accordance with their own wishes, though preserving, of course, the veto powers of the Viceroy, etc. At the same time they are proposing a federation scheme which, they hope, will consolidate, with the aid of the princes, landlords,

clergy, and the other reactionary groups, the power of the imperialists and of the feudalists by weaning over the Indian bourgeoisie. In its scheme of a feudal-federal colonial India British imperialism seeks to create such a system as would enable it to preserve and consolidate in the safest possible manner its rule over India, by utilising to the utmost the feudal relics and all the different contradictions (of a national, religious character, etc.). British imperialism, while conducting negotiations, is resorting at the same time to every means of pressure and seeking to sharpen the internal contradictions. One of the most effective methods in this field is the fanning and utilisation of the national antagonisms.

The constitution which imperialism seeks to introduce is aimed not only at strengthening the British yoke but at consolidating all the exploiting classes for the struggle against the Indian people, against the Indian revolution.

The constitution prepared by British imperialism closely resembled the draft constitution worked out by the Indian bourgeoisie itself. The draft prepared by the commission of representatives of all parties, presided over by Nehru, and approved by the National Congress, represents a fundamental document of the Indian bourgeoisie of all shades and currents. This document was promulgated by the bourgeoisie in 1929, and to this day it is still essentially fighting for it.

At the same time British imperialism demands from the Indian bourgeoisie loyalty, support of the British Empire and of the system of preferential tariffs, as well as support of British imperialism in its struggle against the Soviet Union. British imperialism seeks to secure the support of the Indian bourgeoisie in its fight against the other imperialist countries which have advanced the demand for a new partition of the world (the United States, etc.) as was the case in 1914-1918.

III.

The Round Table Conference and the National Congress.

The second session of the Round Table Conference outwardly ended in a rupture with the National Congress, but in reality no such rupture took place: the negotiations are continuing and the struggle for concessions is still in progress. The fundamental cause of the negotiations failing as yet to result in a formal agreement consists in the immense swing of the revolutionary struggle of the peasant and working masses, which, under the conditions of the unrelenting economic crisis and growing destitution has forced Congress to resort to a "left" manoeuvre to forestall a

national uprising and attempt to secure further concessions from the British imperialists.

Statements by different Congress leaders fully confirm this view. Mr. Gandhi, upon returning to India, sent a telegram to Lord Irwin in which he justifies the Congress decision to proclaim a boycott movement, adding (according to the London "Times") :

"Please believe me. I have done everything I could but have failed. Nevertheless, I am not losing hope, with the help of God, to preserve the relationship established during our negotiations in Delhi. I will not betray your trust."

Yes, the liberal conciliationist Gandhi has fully justified the trust of the British imperialists. His rôle of an aide of British imperialism has again been strikingly confirmed.

"As regards helpers (of the British imperialists) of the type of Gandhi, czarism had a whole flock of them in the person of the liberal conciliationists of all kinds" (Stalin, "Political Report of the C.C. to the XVI. Congress of the C.P.S.U.").

Subhas Bose, one of the "left" leaders of the National Congress, in an interview with the "Bombay Chronicle" of December 25, 1931, confirmed this position of the bourgeois National Congress even more clearly :

"The Government have been carrying on their repressive policy in full swing . . . The only means . . . of weaning away the youth from the path of despair is for the Congress immediately to launch a militant campaign. This is why I have advocated a campaign for the boycott of British goods and of British institutions. If by doing so we rouse sufficient enthusiasm all over the province, we shall be able to reply to the challenge of the bureaucracy and to make effective our hitherto ineffective appeal for non-violence." ("Bombay Chronicle," December 25, 1931.)

The sense of the statement of the leader of the "left" national reformists is entirely clear: unless the initiative in the "action" is taken over by them a spontaneous revolutionary outbreak may occur, and the toiling masses, scorning the treacherous theory of non-violence, will start a national revolutionary uprising against the imperialists, landlords, usurers and other parasites and destroy the existing system of national and social oppression.

The peasant masses are drifting towards the left, millions have come into motion; the number of spontaneous revolts is growing; in Burma and Kashmir partisan warfare is under way; in the United Provinces the peasant masses are begin-

ning to refuse on their own initiative to pay debts and rents; in a number of districts the peasantry is beginning to look askance at the National Congress and are cooling off towards it; all this is driving fear into the hearts of the Indian bourgeoisie. The National Congress fears that the anti-imperialist and agrarian streams of the revolutionary movement will be converging more and more and that in certain districts the elements of a national war are already in evidence.

The young Nehru, the "left" leader of the National Congress, noting this tendency and paying lip-service to the no-rent movement in the United Provinces, declares that it is essential to prevent the no-rent campaign from assuming an anti-imperialist character. The "left" national reformists seek by every means not only to reduce the anti-imperialist struggle to nought, but also to keep the peasant movement within the confines of a peaceful campaign of protest, and of cringing for sops in the form of a slight reduction of taxes, rentals, and debts, without encroaching upon the rights of the landlords and the power of the imperialists. The organ of the Congress, "The Age," greeting Nehru and his policy of keeping the peasant movement within the limits of a purely economic campaign, openly wrote :

"Should the no-rent campaign develop into a political struggle and co-ordinate itself with the anti-imperialist movement the results will be disastrous to the Congress."

Congress is conducting similar work of disorganisation among the working class as well. The powerful development of the labour movement, the growing disappointment of the working masses with the National Congress, force the Indian bourgeoisie to resort to various manoeuvres in order to preserve their influence, isolate the communists, and consolidate their positions in the trade union movement. The revolutionary demonstrations of the toiling masses of Bombay, the battles with the police are described by the "Bombay Chronicle," the Congress organ, as "hooliganism." The Calcutta "Advance" wrote on February 18: "We do not want any labour troubles and strikes on the railways."

The bourgeois National Congress is now seeking to distract the working class from the anti-imperialist struggle and direct it along the path of economy. In this direction the bourgeois agency in the labour movement is conducting vigorous activities, striving to utilise the growing disillusionment of the working masses with the National Congress. As an illustration we will quote a statement by Ruikar, the Chairman of the reformist All-India Trade Union Congress, and member of the National Congress, made at

a meeting of the textile workers Union in Nagpur. We are quoting the "Times of India" of January 15.

"It is understood that at a recent meeting of the Executive of the Nagpur textile Union under the presidentship of Mr. R. S. Ruikar a resolution was carried asking workers not to take part in the Congress movement but to confine their attention to trade union activities . . . In the course of a statement Mr. Ruikar stated . . . that the workers felt that they were let down by the Congress leaders."

The propaganda of economism by the national-reformists facilitates the political agreement between the national reformists (including the Roy-W. N. Joshi-Kandalkar group) and the Joshi-Giri-Bakhala group, erases every semblance of "discord" between the national-reformists, this agency of the Indian bourgeoisie, and the Joshi-Giri group, the agency of British imperialism, in the struggle against the revolutionary proletariat, strikingly exposes the counter-revolutionary character of the Roy group, and testifies that the consolidation of all the counter-revolu-

tionary groupings is making rapid headway. The reaction is gathering all of its forces to crush the revolutionary people. The "left" national reformism covers up its treacherous work by "left" manoeuvres.

Seeing that Gandhism alone will not carry it very far, the bourgeoisie, apart from new "left" manoeuvres designed to strengthen the authority of the National Congress and of its leaders, is seeking to make use of the "left" detachments of national reformism including its most dangerous variety, the Roy group.

The toiling masses are drifting towards the left, while the bourgeoisie, under the cover of "left" manoeuvres, is moving towards the right. The class struggle is sharpening, the differentiation is proceeding at a rapid pace, ever greater sections of the toiling population, under the blows of the crisis and influence of the lessons of the class struggle and emancipation movement, are beginning to adopt the revolutionary methods of struggle, seeking a revolutionary programme and leadership, and breaking the hold of counter-revolutionary Gandhism.

OBSTRUCTIONS AND HINDRANCES TO THE FACTORY WORK IN ENGLAND

By M.M.

THE British Party which, despite a number of decisions and efforts, has made little progress in its work in the factories, has now begun intensive work in this field. At the commencement of January, 1932, the Party decided to concentrate the best forces of the Central Committee and the D.P.C.'s on the work in 52 selected factories in different branches of industry and districts in London, South Wales, Manchester and Scotland. The experiences of the first months of this special concentration have shown that by means of a correct usage of the Party forces, a systematic control of its activities, and above all, the organisation of the struggles of the workers of each factory on the basis of concrete demands and questions, noteworthy results can be obtained in a comparatively very short time.

By means of this special concentration it was also possible to throw some light on a series of the most important reasons for the weakness of the factory work hitherto. This concrete factory work has in many cases exposed a series of hindrances which constitute, despite all previous acceptances of decisions and resolutions of the Central Committee and the E.C.C.I., in reality

a dangerous misunderstanding of the line of the Party.

In the work in the factories there are a number of difficulties which belong more or less to those of an objective character, and which to some extent, in the present period of development of our movement will not be eliminated; or at least not at once or completely. We have in mind such difficulties as the employers' oppression, dismissals, unemployment, etc. But experience shows that in addition to these kind of difficulties, there exists a series of other obstacles and barriers which can and must be eliminated at once. These hindrances which can be found everywhere in the British Communist Party, although they may seem insignificant and small to some comrades when regarded separately, actually mean in practice a high wall which extraordinarily hinders the development of the factory group work and the work in the factories. These kind of hindrances can jeopardise the entire fulfilment of the correct decisions of the Party on the concentration on the factories if they are not rooted out of the ranks of the Party.

The most difficult thing in overcoming these kinds of hindrances consists in the fact that as a

rule they are not openly and clearly expressed, that they lie deep down and only show themselves in the practical work or, more correctly, in the determined and concrete carrying out of the policy of the factory work, and then often in a very unclear and concealed form.

The most important of these kinds of hindrances are:

The Party work is chiefly carried on in the evening; this Social-Democratic conception is still current among the members of the C.P.G.B. The members of the Party who work in a factory often feel themselves to be a Party member only after work, after they have washed and changed. In the factory itself, during working hours, they speak to other workers about sports, horse-racing, etc., but very little about politics or about conditions in the works. Naturally, there are exceptions, but it is a fact, that the Communists still do not carry out the Bolshevik axiom, that the Party work must be based on the activities in the factory during working hours, on the way to the factory and home, and chiefly on the basis of the questions of the factory, and conflicts on working conditions. There is still no connection between the Party work of the local organisation, between the street group and the work which is carried on, or should be, in the factories. The comrades who work in the locality where they live after working hours, must nevertheless link up with the questions in the factories, and continue the work which has been commenced in the factories through cells or individual comrades.

Ignorance of the situation in the factory, even in the case of comrades who work in factories themselves. At a meeting of London active comrades the secretary of a factory group declared in discussion that he was in agreement with the resolution of the C.C. but that in his factory there are no grievances, no difficulties, no daily conflicts. The comrade from a factory group in North-West London declared in a meeting of the L.P.C. that in his factory the workers have no grievances and that therefore he did not know how the factory group could raise such questions. In the same speech he declared, however, that every worker arriving five or ten minutes late had one hour's pay deducted, without realising that this is also a question in which the factory group can bring the entire staff behind itself for action. Another comrade did not understand that we can take also such questions for the starting point of mobilising the masses as, for example, the fact that the bus does not stop at the factory gate but 50 to 100 yards further up the road, or that no extra buses are put on when the buzzer blows, so that the workers have to wait sometimes 15 to 30 minutes before they can

go home. A member of the D.P.C. in Birmingham said in a discussion on the situation in a certain factory "that the organisation in this factory had gone out of existence because there were no grievances." There are no workers in capitalist society who do not have some kind of grievance either in regard to their working conditions, wages, the foreman, chief engineer or the employer. It is precisely the task of our groups and comrades to acquaint themselves with the concrete reasons and forms of all kinds of discontent, to explain to the workers, and discuss with them the way of eliminating these reasons. Only by the most careful explanation and utilisation of the forms of the struggle for the satisfaction of separate grievances can this dissatisfaction be developed to resist them and our comrades win the confidence of the workers.

We give all these examples to show how often we completely lose sight of the most elementary things in our factory work. Such comrades often give a comparatively good answer to questions about the line of the Party, the latest decisions and documents or questions of international policy, but when one asks them about such small questions one immediately perceives that even our comrades themselves working in factories often know very little about the organisation of the workers, opponent organisations, the existing or possible factory institutions (shop stewards, etc.), about the employer, or his profits.

In close connection with these facts is the *under-estimation of the radicalisation of the workers and their readiness to struggle.* When it is a matter of formulæ and points in the resolutions, all comrades vote unanimously that the workers are becoming radicalised, that they are ready to fight and so on, but when it is necessary to undertake the actual preparation of the struggle, drawing the necessary conclusions from this correct estimation, it is very often the case that our comrades do not know the feelings of the workers in a definite concrete situation and consequently tend to under-estimate their readiness to struggle. This opportunist expression is to be found in all the great struggles of last year, for example, the strike of the miners in South Wales in January, 1931, the woollen workers in Bradford and Shipley, July, 1931, the first, and especially the second, miners' strike in Scotland, July and August, 1931, the strike of the miners in Cumberland, the lightermen's strike in London, etc. The strike of the hauliers in a pit in South Wales (February, 1932) was a surprise to our comrades. Even in the most recent period, after the resolution of the C.C. and its discussion in the lower organisations, such tendencies are not completely overcome. The District

Secretary in Manchester wrote the following in a report on the ballot of the Lancashire weavers in March, 1932. "The result of the ballot was 9 to 1 for the strike. It was clear that the weavers are against the more loom system. One or two comrades from North Lancashire (where there are chiefly weavers) have so under-estimated the radicalisation of the masses that they thought it would be possible that the reformists would nevertheless 'cook up' a majority in the ballot, against the strike."

All kinds of "let them starve" theories are deeply-rooted in the Party. When after the last parliamentary election the increase in our Party's vote was found to be much below all estimates, there was a dangerous tendency in many Party organisations to make the workers responsible for everything; which was fairly popular. "Let the workers starve," and then they will realise that they must support the Communists. This theory, which has nothing in common with Bolshevism, is an expression of the non-Bolshevist conception of the rôle of the Party and leads to the justification of every kind of mistake, the concealment of all shortcomings; to a throttling of self-criticism, and is a great hindrance in the development of Bolshevik mass work in the factories and during strikes, etc. During the last seamen's strike, which was a failure, there were comrades among our sailors who declared that the employers have not cut wages sufficiently, that one must let the workers starve and then they will strike and fight.

In the report from Manchester it is said that the theory of "let them starve" is prevalent among many members in the most varied form. "In Salford, Burnley and in the N.U.W.M., our comrades call those workers who will not buy the 'Daily Worker' under the eye of the employer, cowards, and curse those workers who stand on the pavement during demonstrations." Another variation of the opportunist "let them starve" theory is the attempt to place the responsibility for an unsuccessful action or passivity in the Party chiefly on the shoulders of the workers. Instead of trying to find out after every action, our own weaknesses, errors and shortcomings, there are cases when our comrades endeavour to place all the responsibility on the workers; "their attitude," etc.

In Birmingham a comrade stated at a meeting of the active comrades that the workers are "absolutely apathetic" in a factory where a few weeks previously we had successfully carried out a splendid action against the Bedaux system. The District Secretary of Birmingham declared that after the workers had won such an easy victory they had apparently returned to the old situation of disorganisation. An active comrade

of the D.P.C. said, in regard to these workers, that she had noted an over-estimation of the desire of the workers to create a factory committee. Thousands of expressions of such extraordinarily harmful conceptions can be encountered in every organisation. How foreign such expressions and theories are to Communists and where they lead is shown by the fact that Fenner Brockway, the chairman of the Independent Labour Party, devoted a great deal of time in his chairman's address at the last conference of the I.L.P. to "the apathy and hopelessness" of the workers.

The Party leading committees are not connected with the factories. This point appears to us especially important, because the division between the Party and the feelings of the workers in the factories is extremely alarming. As we have said, there are Party cells in 40-50 factories; there are Party members in hundreds of factories, but there are very few cases where these cells and members inform the Party leading committees on the humour, the tendencies and conceptions of the workers. The Party, from the Central Committee downwards, determines its tasks and policy on the basis of international decisions and on the general situation, which one chiefly acquaints oneself with (when not exclusively) through the medium of the bourgeois and reformist press. Information of our own does not exist. The connection between the cells and members who are in factories, on the one hand, and the Party as a whole, on the other, is only organisational and administrative. The task of the cells does not simply consist in carrying out the line and tasks of the Party in the factory, but also in supplying the Party with a wealth of material for defining its line and tasks. The fulfilment of this function by the factory cells and those Party members who work in factories is an important pre-condition for fixing the correct line and tasks of the Party, as well as for the rapid reaction of the Party to all events happening in the factories.

No inclusion of the forces from the factories in the active work. This hindrance also is not to be regarded as a generality. There are factories and branches of industry where we have individual comrades who have in their locality a great personal influence. For example, a number of the organisers of the revolutionary miners' union in Scotland. These comrades are very well known in the villages and at the pits, and if the workers have any complaint they go to these people personally, requesting advice and support, etc. Usually the following takes place: such comrades immediately intervene, go to the Exchange, the employer, or the Council offices, and, in the majority of cases, they are very successful. It is for this reason that workers come

to them who have nothing to do with our movement. It is very often the case, that, for instance, in Scotland the employers refuse to negotiate with these people when they appear in their capacity as officials of the U.M.S. But when they declare that they have come as a representative of the worker in person and not as an official representative of our organisation, the employers deal with the case. The work of such comrades is very valuable for the Party, and there can be no doubt that the situation of our movement in England would be much more satisfactory if we had such comrades in every large factory and working class quarter. But, on the other hand, it must be said, that in the majority of cases, these comrades have not so far understood how to educate the workers sufficiently for struggle, or how to utilise every complaint for bringing the worker concerned into the organisation, awakening their activity and developing it.

Failure to concentrate on one's own factory. There are cases, especially in Scotland, where good, active comrades are employed at the pits as checkweighmen and men's deputies, but they are used too much for the general agitation and organisation work in other districts, and neglect the work in their own pit. They are good organisers; speakers; they address meetings everywhere, on how one should work, but they are so occupied with this job that they do practically nothing in their own works. In London a certain comrade worked in a factory who was very active in the local organisation. For a period he was even the secretary of the largest local organisation numerically in London, but in the factory he did practically nothing and the factory cell has practically collapsed. When the decision was made that his chief duty is his work in the factory cell, the cell obtained quite good results in a few weeks.

There is no special attention to members from the factory. This reflects the failure to steer a course to the factories. All members are important for us, and all have the same rights, but those members whom we must win from the factories, especially to-day when 70 per cent. to 80 per cent. of the Party members are unemployed, must be paid special attention. One must educate them, give them Party work, attract them to responsible Party tasks, also when they will be "weaker" at the start than some comrades with more experience, their development must be closely supervised and a situation of responsibility for the loss of each member from the factory created. One can only expect the course to the factories to be seriously carried out in reality when such an "atmosphere" is created inside the Party on this question. This is connected also with the question of the super-

vision of all members and the rapid utilisation of registration forms and questionnaires. It is often the case that factory workers enter the local organisation, who live in quite a different district, and if a factory cell exists in their factory, often months pass before this is discovered and the worker concerned attached to the cell.

An incorrect way of overcoming various prejudices. Very often workers who are already on the way towards us will not, at the commencement, openly and directly link up with us. It is often the case that our approach to such workers is too rough, tactless and harsh. Instead of a careful and painstaking explanation, we often put forward exaggerated demands, which will not attach such people to our movement. For example during the last weavers' strike in a town in Lancashire we were in contact with an active striker who was also an influential trade union man. He did not desire to meet our comrades in the street or at their houses because immediately he was seen he would be stamped as a Communist. For this reason he proposed that our comrades visit him in the evening, at his house. Our comrades sent a woman comrade to him and he was very dissatisfied because he had to remain in the passage with her, as his wife was not at home, and he dare not allow her into the house. Such prejudices are the influence of the bourgeoisie and their "morals" and ethics, but we must take this into consideration, and overcome such prejudices with the greatest forethought.

Bad internal situation in the local organisation, is a significant hindrance to the local factory work. In many local organisations there are small personal and group struggles, mutual accusations, suspicions, etc. There is an element among the older members which is often pessimistic, and does not believe that the decisions can be carried out, who adopt a supercilious attitude, "have seen everything," who make impermissible jokes and ironical remarks about the Party, who, in a word, often create an atmosphere which for work in the factories, or in general, is absolutely impossible. This cannot be generalised. On the whole, the old members belong to the most tested fighters of the C.P., but there are elements among them who have become pessimistic through the isolation of certain organisations year after year from the masses. The question must be placed before such members with the greatest sharpness, that they alter themselves, befit themselves to carry out the line of the Party also in practice, and utilise their experience in a correct manner to assist the development of the factory work.

Under-estimation and neglect of the work in

reformist trade unions belongs to the most important hindrances to the work in the factories. We are in a position to supply a few pages of quite concrete examples of how under-estimation and neglect of the work in reformist trade unions had led to the weakening of our positions in the factory. A crass example is Burnley, where our comrades lost two months before the trade union conference and did nothing in the branches. When actually this work was commenced it was then discovered that the comrade whom we had nominated for a trade union position had paid no contributions for a long time and therefore was disqualified. In South Wales an old fighter, Comrade Jack Davies, was not re-elected as chairman of his branch because we did not develop sufficient mass activity in the elections of the trade union branch officials. In Glasgow in a factory there were two members of a factory cell (including the secretary) who only failed to be elected as members of the district committee of their union because they only attended two or three times during the previous year. When this failure was discussed in the cell, the comrades declared that they were occupied with other Party work. A series of similar examples could be cited.

The very low percentage of Party members organised in the trade unions must be called attention to in this connection. The percentage is not only very low but has even decreased, in comparison with the situation three or four years ago. Unfortunately we have not precise figures for the entire Party, but partial figures give the actual situation fairly correctly. In London, for example, of the Party members employed in separate branches of industry the following are organised in trade unions: metal workers 60 per cent., building workers 50 per cent., printers 33 per cent., clothing 80 per cent., railway workers 88 per cent.; only the electricians are organised 100 per cent. in the trade union. The active work in the trade union is much worse. During the recent sessions of the D.P.C.'s in Manchester, Scotland and London, when the resolution of the C.C. of January was discussed, a show of hands was taken of those who were carrying on active trade union work. Of the 30-40 leading comrades from these districts only a few answered this question in the affirmative. These facts merely reflect the division which exists in the English Party between the trade union and the factory work. Even to the extent that any trade union work is done, his work is not organically connected with the activity in the factory. The January resolution of the Plenary session of the Central Committee of the C.P.G.B. points out the great importance of this mutual connection correctly. The creation of this connection is

therefore an important political task of each Party organisation and a condition of existence for successful trade union work as well as the work in the factories.

The conception of all lower trade union officials as a complete reactionary mass is paramount in the C.P.G.B. All elected officials of the reformist trade unions are regarded as a rule, by our comrades, as traitors and Social-Fascists, even when they continue to work in the factory. In this case also there are many concrete examples.

A complete misunderstanding and partly-open opposition against those portions of the C.C. resolution which speak about winning the lower trade union branches and the attraction of the workers to the trade unions for the purpose of strengthening the struggle against reformist leaders. This misconception is a clear expression of the anti-trade union work tendencies which are strong in the Party. These conceptions were in the forefront in connection with the discussion on the Birmingham factory. In the "Daily Worker" of the 14th April, for example, a resolution of the Party organisation at Balham was published which expressed this incorrect attitude very clearly. The chief arguments in this resolution are the following:

"The whole line of the Party at the Leeds Congress, and since, has been to maintain that job organisation can alone be the unit of an 'organ of class struggle.'

"That the very structure, limited scope, organisation, constitution and leadership of the unions make them unsuitable as organs of class struggle.

"That their capture is unlikely because of the bureaucracy, and that our principal work lies in building up the workers' weapons of struggle inside the pits, factories and workshops."

The conceptions formulated in this resolution do not express the line of the Party and the C.I.

Above all, the January resolution of the C.C. does not speak about the capture of the trade unions, but *the lower trade union branches* (transformation of the trade union branches from organs of class collaboration into organs of the class struggle). The Balham resolution speaks continuously of the transformation of the trade unions. It is politically impermissible to mix these two things and the polemics against alleged, invented statements in the C.C. resolution on "the capture of the trade unions" are especially so. This resolution of the C.C. states expressly its opposition to all left reformist tendencies which assume that it is possible to capture the trade unions together with their apparatus. This charge in the resolution of the Balham organisation is either an expression of political lack of

understanding of the difference between the trade unions (with their apparatus), and the lower trade union branches, or an attempt to conceal incorrect anti-trade union policy, by general talk about trade union apparatus. The resolution of the C.C. places the task of the struggle for winning the *workers*, the *members* of the trade unions before the Party, and speaks of the possibility and necessity of winning the lower trade union organisations in this connection.

Apart from this the Balham resolution opposes two inseparable parts of our work for taking the working masses out of the influence of the reformists, to each other. The harmful philosophy that we should not work in the trade unions because the best form of class struggle is the factory organisation must be completely routed out of the ranks of the Party. Naturally the factory form which embraces both organised and unorganised workers, is the best form, but a significant part of the workers *who are in the factories* are organised in the trade unions. Precisely in order to organise them on a factory basis we must work in the trade unions, and endeavour to transform the lower trade union units, from organs of class collaboration, into organs of class struggle. One does not contradict the other. The Communist work in the trade unions can only strengthen our position in the factories.

Concoction of new trade unions and forms of organisation to shirk the difficulties of the daily work in the factories. A comrade from Coventry stated in the meeting of active comrades in Birmingham, already quoted, "the workers demand an all-embracing trade union." "The reason for the failure of the M.M. in Coventry consists in the fact that the M.M. was too small." Such tendencies can be found everywhere. Among our seamen a whole theory has been constructed, that the M.M. itself cannot be a mass organisation, but only a combination of the best

elements for the preparation of a mass trade union. The M.M. (revolutionary trade union opposition) if it is to be built on the basis of the last decisions of the R.I.L.U. can, and must become a wide mass organisation.

Commanding and general talk about the leading rôle of the Party is also a hindrance in the trade union work. Our comrades often come to the workers and declare: *we* are the leaders, the C.P. is the only leader of the workers, etc., and wonder very much when the workers, who have not seen the Communists before the strike, don't grasp this. Our comrades forget very often that their task not only consists in leading the workers, but also in *learning very much from the mass of the workers themselves*. This task must be especially emphasised for such a Party as the British Party, precisely because the Party is insufficiently connected with the masses. There is a further series of such tendencies and hindrances which, in their totality impede the realisation of the course to the factories in practice. In addition to those already enumerated we add the following: opportunist failures in strike struggles, exaggerated demands of the offensive at an incorrect time, under-estimation of the organisation work, failure to carry out decisions and insufficient control over the execution of decisions.

All these tendencies and features can only be overcome through a concrete posing of the question (who, how, when and where) through explanation, conviction and concrete help and instruction. This struggle must be carried out concretely, each individual example must be brought immediately into the light of day and explained. This political struggle against such hindrances to the factory work belongs to the most important conditions for the carrying out of the correct decisions taken by the Party in January, 1932.

Corrections to No. 8.

1. The first portion of the article of O. Piatnitsky published under the title "Lessons the Communist Parties must learn from the C.P.S.U." should be entitled "The Bolshevisation of C.P.s in the capitalist countries by overcoming Social Democratic traditions," as in No. 9.

2. *Comrade Li-Kwei (Obituary).* Page 289, col. 2, para. 2, 15th line, after "Northern Annam" insert "*the revolutionary masses under the leadership of.*"

Page 290, col. 2, line 2, after "establishment of a" insert "*revolutionary.*"

The date should read *March 26th, 1932.*

M. N. POKROVSKY (1868-1932).

WITH the death of Michael Nikolaevich Pokrovsky, the international revolutionary movement has lost one of the most outstanding representatives of the Bolshevik old guard, an active participant in the revolution of 1905 and the proletarian revolution of 1917, an uncompromising fighter for the Bolshevik line of the C.P.S.U. and the Communist International, a Communist scientist of world renown, an organiser and guide in the theoretical work and propagandist of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

M. N. Pokrovsky was one of the most brilliant men of the Bolshevik movement. He was the living embodiment of the unity between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice.

From the underground activities under tsarism to the October victory, to the establishment and entrenchment of the proletarian dictatorship. Through the battles of the civil war period and the difficulties of the first steps in economic construction to the completion of the foundations of socialist economy. From the first small propaganda groups among the workers of Russia and the first attempts to unite the revolutionary elements of the international proletariat against opportunism and its Trotskyist variety on the basis of Bolshevik policies, to the organisation and strengthening of the Communist International and the transformation of the U.S.S.R. into an unconquerable fortress and base of the world revolution. Such is the victorious development of the Bolshevik Party, which would have been impossible without the utmost attention on the part of the whole party to Bolshevik theory, to the unity of revolutionary theory and practice and uncompromising struggle against all deviations from Marxism-Leninism.

M. N. Pokrovsky covered a considerable part of this road in the ranks of the Bolshevik Party, under the guidance of Lenin. M. N. Pokrovsky did commit political and theoretical mistakes in his Party and scientific activities. During the period of reaction, when he was an emigré, he moved away from the Bolsheviks, and joined the "Vpered"* group; but already in 1911 he broke with this group and returned to the Leninist positions. During the period of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty he was

aligned for a while with the group of "Left" Communists. But in all the decisive periods in the history of the Bolshevik Party, in all the decisive historical events, he was in the foremost ranks of the revolutionary struggle. In 1905 he was among the organisers of the insurrection in Moscow; during the world war he was in the ranks of the consistent internationalists, in the days of the October revolution he was on the staff which directed the proletarian insurrection in one of the districts of Moscow. After he had corrected his "Left" Communist errors of 1918, he uninterruptedly waged a consistent struggle for Marxism-Leninism, for the general line of the Party and against all deviations from this line.

Pokrovsky was one of the greatest fighters for the Marxian-Leninist theory, an outstanding Communist scientist as well as populariser of Marxian theory. Comrade Pokrovsky's principal theoretical work lay in the field of Russian history. In 1910, when he lived abroad, Pokrovsky wrote his "Russian History from Its Earliest Period," the first and classical work on Russian history which even at present cannot be replaced by any other work. This work became the guide for the Marxian study of Russia's past and for an understanding of all the conditions under which the proletariat of Russia has developed, has waged the struggle for power and for socialism. Pokrovsky considered his scientific work in the nature of Party and political work, subjecting it fully to the needs and requirements of the Party. He wrote his works in the style of a fighter against the bourgeoisie, and he attacked the Mensheviks and opportunists with great political vehemence and sharp sarcasm. He considered science as a weapon to prepare the proletariat for the struggle for socialism.

The historical works of Pokrovsky contain errors and incorrect generalisations. But no one understood better than he the necessity of re-examining and revising these questions. "There is not a single question in Russian history, starting with its earliest periods, which we would not at present approach in a new way," he writes in the preface to the fourth edition of the "Russian History from Its Earliest Period." However, there is no other work on Russian history which is more Marxian than this one, unsatisfactory as it may be from the standpoint

* Forward.

of a Marxian of to-day. In one of his latest articles, he wrote: "The conception of Russian history which I characterised as Marxian in the foregoing, in its essence of course did not differ from the Leninist conception. . . . But it is perfectly clear that in certain formulations, at times of considerable importance, the old exposition of this conception differed very much from the Leninist, and at times was simply theoretically illiterate." He adds: "For a long time I have been at work with a 'vacuum cleaner,' and I firmly hope that fewer and fewer of these uncleaned spots will be left."

As a result of this merciless self-criticism, Pokrovsky succeeded in consistently overcoming his theoretical errors and in continually progressing as a Communist scientist and Party man in his scientific creative labours. He fully appreciated the limitations of the sources which he utilised as a historian in 1910. He energetically set to work to utilise the archives which were made accessible by the October Revolution, for the purpose of reevaluating the significance of the facts which had been known before, and supplementing them with new facts which throw a new light on the course of development and provide the possibility of creating a really scientific history. He worked on the archives of the tsarist gendarmerie, to present to the masses in a new light the revolutionary movement in tsarist Russia. He gives a new Marxian interpretation to the peasant wars in Russia, which had been distorted by the bourgeois historians. He organised research studies of the history of the Russian proletariat, which, as he said, "is now becoming one of the most remarkable pages of world history."

"The objective logic of the old 'economic materialism' is against us," Pokrovsky said, "but we are moving forward, and this progress is so incontestable that every serious bourgeois newspaper acknowledges our advance as an objective fact which cannot be ignored. . . . Now, the question as to how a working-class of this variety developed, why it is not only consistently revolutionary—the latter perhaps can be explained by the 'objective factor,'—what is the source of its inexhaustible creative power, cannot be evaded.

"Almost all of them (the Menshevik historians.—Editor) are unable to connect the history of the working-class with the history of the Party of the working-class, almost all of

them start with the incorrect conception of a spontaneous movement of the proletarian masses, and owing to this almost all of them are unable to rise above the history of the economic struggles in the narrow sense of this term. Almost all of them depict our worker as a kind of poor relation of the British trade unionist and German social-democrat. But the whole essence lies in the fact that history had side-tracked the British and German worker for many years far away from revolutionary struggle, while our proletariat was becoming the more revolutionary in proportion as it was becoming more class-conscious. So much so that in Russia the terms 'class-conscious' worker' and 'revolutionist' finally became synonymous. The history of the proletariat as a fighting class should be written entirely anew."

And this work of writing the history of the proletariat was organised by Pokrovsky. With equal energy he undertook the task of organising the work on the history of the civil war, this most heroic chapter in the history of the Russian proletariat.

In connection with the approaching new cycle of imperialist wars and intervention against the U.S.S.R., Pokrovsky undertook the study of international relations in the period of the imperialist war on the basis of the diplomatic documents which have been made public and which disclose the "secret of how war arises." The two volumes which have appeared: "International Relations in Documents" are indispensable to-day. Pokrovsky understood perfectly well the international significance and international effect of the Russian revolution of 1905, and in his article "The Revolution of 1905 and the International Bourgeoisie," he demonstrated in brilliant fashion how the international bourgeoisie is organising to combat the influence the Russian revolution exercises upon the proletariat of the West.

"Every great revolution not only affects the country in which it is occurring, its influence extends to a number of other countries. Since the revolution had not yet occurred in the latter, since the ruling classes in these countries consider the revolution as an approaching, threatening calamity, these ruling classes endeavour to prevent the calamity, try to extinguish the conflagration in the house of the neighbour before their

own roof catches fire. Every great revolution therefore engenders *intervention*."

He analysed the first intervention of French imperialism against the Russian revolution in 1906, when it furnished a loan to the Tsarist Government for the struggle against the revolutionary movement.

While carrying on this enormous research work, Pokrovsky at the same time fought against all opportunist anti-Marxian views. In 1923-24 he took issue with Trotsky, proving that the latter, in his defence of the view that Russian absolutism stood above classes, was completely dominated by bourgeois historiography, that Trotsky's defence of his historical views amounted to a defence of anti-Party, anti-Bolshevist, Trotskyist conceptions, that it was an expression of his struggle against the Bolsheviks, against the October Revolution. Pokrovsky also fought against the defeatist policies of the "Right" opportunists, exposing their Menshevist, capitulatory character.

Thus Pokrovsky in his work in the field of Marxian theory was guided by one principle: *to place theory, particularly historical science at the service of the Party and the revolutionary proletariat, fighting for the unity of revolutionary theory and practice, for Leninism and historical science*. "History," he said, "is politics operating with the past."

Pokrovsky continually strove to imbue history with Leninist dialectics. He said: "Marxism minus dialectics means Marxism minus revolution." Holding aloft the banner of Marxist-Leninist theory, Pokrovsky at the same time always bore in mind the mass reader. He warned the young Bolshevik historians: "Beware of people who speak in incompre-

hensible terms. They use incomprehensible language not for the purpose of demonstrating their knowledge, but to conceal the non-Leninist essence of their ideas."

Pokrovsky was an outstanding figure of the Bolshevik Party in the field of cultural development. A considerable share of the work of organising the People's Commissariat of Education must be credited to him. As Assistant Commissar he was the indispensable adviser and guide on questions of science and of Marxism in general (Lenin). He was responsible for the organisation of workers' colleges, of the Institute of Red Professors, of the Communist Academy. His was the largest share in the creation of new theoretical cadres of the Bolshevik Party.

The work and literary heritage of Pokrovsky are of the greatest importance *for the whole international proletariat*. His basic works should be entered on the list of the most valued possessions of the world revolutionary proletariat. They should be translated, as was already suggested by Lenin, into the European languages. The theoretician and fighter Pokrovsky, must serve as the model to the younger generation of how to combine revolutionary theory with revolutionary practice, how to be at the same time a scientist and a fighter on the barricades, how to engage simultaneously in research work and in the task of organising the proletarian state. They must learn from him how a Marxian approach to any theoretical question, even the most abstract, can be directed against the existing bourgeois system for the purpose of its destruction, how the most profound theoretical truths and new theoretical discoveries can be made popular and comprehensible to the widest toiling masses.

British readers write for

COUNTER ATTACK

WORKERS BOOKSHOP, 16, KING ST., LONDON, W.C.1

WAR IS CREEPING ON!

CHINA. *By H. Rathbone.* 1d.

Gives the facts about the Chinese workers' and peasants' position. Shows how they are exploited by the imperialists, whose interests it exposes. Gives a fighting lead.

JAPANESE IMPERIALISM
STRIPPED. 1d.

The whole of the long Tanaka Memorandum—the *secret document* in which the Premier of Japan outlined the imperialist policy of aggression against China, Russia and the world. With an introduction.

HELL OVER SHANGHAI. *By Eye-witnesses.* 1d.

How the imperialist attack broke. The horrors of modern war and the outstanding brutality against the workers. CHAPEI IN FLAMES. 1d.

A vivid account of the ghastly terror reeked on the workers' quarters of Shanghai, which is a city of the extremes of imperialism and revolutionary activity. The significance of the attack and the menace from it to Chinese and Russian workers and the workers of all the world. Chapei was a foretaste of what they are planning!

CHINESE TOILING WOMEN. 2d.

Full details about the terrible exploitation of Chinese women and a description of how they are freed in the Chinese Soviet areas and how they fight for the workers' armies and the Chinese Soviets.

CHINESE WAR. *By Dietrich.* 2d.

What the full significance of the outbreak of war in China is. A deep warning full of facts.

JAPAN IN MANCHURIA. 3d.

An examination of the imperialist aims and methods of Japan in the area torn from China and bordering on U.S.S.R.

THE CHINESE SOVIETS. 6d.

The Soviet Union is not the only place

where Soviets exist. This gives us details about the Chinese Soviets.

WAR IN CHINA. *Stewart.* 6d.

A survey of the position.

ROAR CHINA! *By Tretiakov.* 1s. 6d.

This is a play of a real incident on the Yangtse, between the Navy and the Chinese dockers. Shows in dramatic form the outlook of the imperialists and of the workers. A Canton stoker tells the way out: "Roar China!"

THE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN.
1d.

The resolution of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which sums up the achievements of the First Five-Year Plan and outlines the objectives of the Second.

THE RED ARMY. *By A. Alfred.* 3d.

The truth about this "bogey" of the capitalist world. The working-class army. Why the Soviet State has it and the comradely basis which distinguishes it from every capitalist army.

THE SOVIET'S FIGHT FOR DIS-
ARMAMENT. 6d.

Litvinov's speeches at Geneva, containing the offer which the Soviet Government made for real disarmament, and defining the attitude of the workers at the war parleys which are called Disarmament Conferences. An introduction by Lunacharsky, and documents making a sequel to—

THE SOVIET UNION AND PEACE.
3s. 6d.

A full documented review with an introduction by Barbusse, of the Soviet Union's endeavours for peace, from the "stop the war" manifesto of 1917 to the offer for complete abolition of armaments.

THE SUCCESS OF THE FIVE-YEAR
PLAN. *Molotov.* 6d.

BE ARMED WITH FACTS!