

V. b. b.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 64

13th August 1925

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

C O N T E N T S

Karl Radek: The Tactics of World Imperialism in the Fight against the Chinese Revolution.

The Balkans

G. Dimitrov: The Situation in Bulgaria.

Politics

Victor Stern: Before the Elections in Czechoslovakia.
Maurice Spector: The Anglo-American Rubber Conflict.
Edmondo Peluso: Mussolini's Battles.

The Labour Movement

H. Y.: The Mining Crisis in Great Britain.
To the Aid of the British Miners!

Anniversary of the Death of Friedrich Engels

Hermann Duncker: 30th Anniversary of the Death of Friedrich Engels.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement

Fritz Heckert: The Split in the Japanese Trade Unions and the I. F. T. U.

The Youth Movement.

The Young Communist Leagues of Europe and the E. C. Y. C. I. to the Working Youth.

The Young Communist International on the International Children's Week.

The White Terror

R. Albert: The Police Provocations in Poland.
A. Draugas: From the Lithuanian Torture Chamber.

In the Camp of Our Enemies

N. Bucharin: The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostle III. and IV.

The Tactics of World Imperialism in the Fight against the Chinese Revolution.

By Karl Radek.

The first wave of the Chinese revolution has shaken the ranks of world imperialism. It has revealed the existence of profound antagonistic interests among the imperialist powers. Of these we will only mention the most important. British and Japanese imperialism are defending the positions they have captured and the rights they have acquired. American imperialism, on the other hand, which before the world war had relatively insignificant interests in China, is now following an uninterrupted upward line of development. It is now beginning to penetrate economically into China and can therefore, far more than the English and Japanese, rely upon the growing force of its economic powers. The simple fact that Japanese goods cannot compete with American goods in quality and in price, the simple fact that the extent of the capital, which is decreasing with every year, that England can invest abroad, renders her incapable of successfully competing with the United States — these facts show how different is the situation of these two main groups of world imperialism.

As regard the other imperialist powers, as for instance France and Italy, they consider their positions in the Chinese

struggle as objects of exchange in their European affairs. The Germans who by the Versailles Treaty have lost their extra-territorial rights, display a certain amount of malicious joy. They make a virtue of necessity and make use of the position forced upon them by the Versailles Treaty to extend their influence.

But even among those powers who have the greatest interest in maintaining the status quo — England and Japan — one cannot speak of unity of aims and unity of tactics. The English press, with the "Times" and the "Daily Telegraph" at the head, is attempting to push Japan into the forefront as regards the defence of all the robber privileges which imperialism has wrung from China. The "Times" of 6th of July published a long article under the title "Japan and China" which attempts to prove that here it is a question of life and death for Japan. In this article the whole Chinese revolution is represented as a Russian threat against Japan.

"It is not the hostility of the Bolsheviki to England with which Japan must reckon but the growth of Russian influence in China."

In what manner does the growth of this influence threaten Japan?

First it threatens Japan's military security; secondly it threatens Japan's attempts to transplant her surplus population to China. Experience has shown that Manchuria and Korea are not capable of supporting this surplus population; thirdly, Japan needs Chinese cotton, coal and iron. A third of Japan's exports go to China. The Chinese market is the most important one for Japan, as access to it is not made difficult through customs duties.

These are the arguments of the "Times", which, in the opinion of this organ of English Imperialism, must compel Japan to become the chief champion of the imperialist interests in China.

The "Daily Telegraph" which sings the same tune, even went so far as to claim that there existed a danger of war between Japan and America, should America support the Chinese demands. The Americans, when they read this article, probably laughed in their sleeves at the idea that honest John Bull is now attempting to compel Japan, whom only three years ago he betrayed in Washington at the first demand of the United States, to fetch the chestnuts out of the fire for England. Of course, at present a Japanese-American war is impossible for the simple reason, that Japan, who has been weakened by the earthquakes and is dependent upon American credits, is incapable of carrying on a war. But even regarded from the standpoint of future development we must ask: has Japan any interest in being the champion of English interests in China?

We doubt very much whether the more or less far-seeing Japanese politicians view the situation in China with the eyes of the "Times". As regards Japanese security, there exists not the least doubt that the Chinese revolution which has aroused the masses of the Chinese people and which has filled the Chinese troops with a new spirit, is decidedly changing the relations of power in the East. Japan must decide: with China or against China. Should Japan decide to go hand in hand with the European imperialists against China, then of course the endeavours of China would mean a great danger for Japan. But to go hand in hand with the imperialist powers of Europe and America against China means not only to risk the danger of a war with a great and awakening people, to lose popularity throughout all Asia, but to incur the decided danger of being on the losing side. Among the robbers who are preparing to plunder China Japan would not be the strongest. Not only that, American capital will stake all its cards upon the uniting of China, upon the economic exploitation of the whole of this enormous country, and the Japanese policy of dividing up China could lead in the future to a conflict with America.

It is much more probable that Japan, after certain hesitations, will play the role of that power which would enable the Chinese bourgeoisie to organise a powerful State, that Japan will not play the role of the champion of the dividing up of China, but of the policy of co-operation with the Chinese bourgeoisie.

The economic arguments of the "Times" will not hold water. China is still less suited for the settlement of Japanese than Korea and Manchuria, as it is a very thickly populated country. Japanese emigration is tending towards the islands of the Pacific Ocean and not to China. It is true Japan needs China as a market for her manufactures. Should Japan however take part in the fight against China, she will only render more difficult her situation in this country, owing to the lack of any possibility of a new division of China. Japan would be very severely hit by a Chinese boycott. On the other hand she has everything to gain by co-operation with the Chinese bourgeoisie, as she is best acquainted with the Chinese market and Chinese habits, and can in many respects promote the industrial organisation of China.

There is no doubt that the Japanese government has not yet decided upon a sensible policy towards China. It has not yet quite realised that the time of the 21 demands is already past, it is still under the influence of those Japanese cliques which are immediately interested in the plundering of China. The further development will enlighten the Japanese bourgeoisie as to the growing strength of the Chinese revolution and will compel it to abandon its present policy. The Japanese franchise reform, which is bringing wide circles of the commercial bourgeoisie into contact with State power, will also contribute to this end. At present Japanese policy is vacillating, but the English will hardly succeed in completely harnessing Japan to their chariot.

With regard to the policy of America, it would of course be a great mistake to believe that the Americans would simply renounce the special Foreign Courts which secure a privileged position to the foreign capitalists. The majority of American capitalists think just as the English capitalists and are of the opinion that the holy work of the capitalists cannot be under the jurisdiction of a court of "Chinese barbarians". The Americans however are less keen upon the outward form of foreign prestige in China and are ready to grant a number of concessions regarding small and minor questions which do not affect the American money-bags, but which, to some extent, pacify Chinese public opinion. The Americans are making a great fuss over the fact that they are studying the question of ex-territorial rights, in order to show the Chinese the prospects of a way out of the present situation: "Introduce proper laws and then we will gladly meet your demands for the abolition of capitalist privileges in China."

As a matter of fact however, the Americans are endeavouring to get two trumps into their hands: the first trump will consist in allowing the Chinese customs duties to be raised. This question is exceedingly important for the Chinese bourgeoisie and for the Chinese government. For the Chinese bourgeoisie, because the present low and uniform tariff has permitted the foreign bourgeoisie to overflow China with its goods. The raising of the customs duties however will render it possible for the Chinese bourgeoisie to build up its own industry. This however is not dangerous for America. By means of free competition America will be able to beat the capitalists of other countries. And as regards the growth of Chinese industry, the American bourgeoisie, which has sufficient capital for export at its disposal, is beginning to set up, at a rapid rate, industrial undertakings under the protection of the new Chinese customs duties.

The second American trump is the granting of loans to China. The present American Ambassador in Peking, MacMurray, former Chief of the Far Eastern Department in the American Foreign Ministry, shortly before his appointment, published in the April number of the American periodical "Foreign Affairs" an article on the problems of foreign capital in China. In this article he develops the idea of the creation of an international bankers' Consortium which would provide China with the necessary funds for the purpose of constructing railways and for other economic undertakings. Such a consortium, declares MacMurray, would free China from the danger of separate actions on the part of the various capitalist groups, who combine the efforts to build railways in China with the effort to divide up China. As at present however there is no power apart from the United States which is capable of granting big loans to China, the international consortium would only constitute an indication of the growth of American property in China.

"As regards the abolition of the privileges of the foreigners, the opposition of the foreigners against this demand is based on the fact that the Peking government is weak and that the anarchy which prevails in China renders the immediate abolition of these privileges impossible. It must not be assumed that they will be soon abolished. But the simple fact of the discussion of the possibility of such a reform opens up to China the prospect of attaining a speedy independence from foreign control*.)"

Thus wrote the "Journal of Commerce" an influential New York financial paper, on the 3rd of July.

American diplomacy is fighting for this programme in the negotiations which it is conducting with English and Japanese diplomacy. For the time being all are agreed that the central problem for them consists in the setting up of a Chinese government which will be capable of fighting the growing national movement.

In the article from the "Times" of the 6th of July which we have already quoted, the way is indicated which the great powers will in all probability follow. This article states that Japan does not think of the possibility of setting up a strong Chinese government by means of a national Conference.

"Who is to take part in this Conference? The military governors who have brought China, into its present situation! Many of them are not even endeavouring to consolidate their own power. They only collect funds with which they then settle in the Treaty ports. The Peking politicians on the other hand only represent themselves and their wishes. They would

*) Retranslated from the Russian.

very willingly sell themselves as well as China. The students understand neither the outer world nor China with her 400 million peasants. The officials, bankers, business people would give expression to patriotic views, but which they cannot realise*)."

Where then is the point of support to be found? Now such a point of support exists:

"Chang-Tso-Lin possesses certain qualities which win him respect. He governs Manchuria well, he is at present the strongest military governor of China. Should he succeed in arriving at an agreement with Wu-Pei-Fu, then he could break the influence of Feng-Yu-Hsiang and rule over Northern and Central China. As an open problem there would then remain the red government in Canton. It is true, one cannot solve all the Chinese problems at once. Should a Chinese government arise, possessing authority in Northern and Central China, this would mean a great step towards the stabilising of China*)."

This programme is put forward by the "Times" as the programme of Japan. But in reality it is the programme of England, and forces are already to be seen which are endeavouring to make it also the programme of America.

The plan of the imperialists therefore, consists in opposing the Chinese revolutionary movement with a military government which is to be supported by the upper section of the Chinese bourgeoisie, which has been bought with loans and concessions, and which would be capable of suppressing the revolutionary movement.

THE BALKANS

The Situation in Bulgaria.

By G. Dimitrov.

The present political situation in Bulgaria is characterised by the preparation for the dissolution of the Zankov government. This dissolution is unavoidable on account of international reasons and as a result of external pressure. The furious terror exercised against the masses and the wholesale murder of workers' and peasants' functionaries have not by any means led to the pacification of the country. This policy of bloody revenge has only increased the desperation among the working and peasant masses and also added to the anarchy and insecurity in the country. In spite of the ruthless war which the army, the gendarmerie and the militia have carried on against the insurrectionary movement, in spite of the draconic laws against those who harbour or support the persecuted revolutionaries, the groups of political insurgents — according to the reports of the government press — continue to exist and are active in various parts of the country. In the place of the crushed groups of insurgents fresh ones spring up out of the ground.

The bourgeois circles are already exhausted and disappointed. They realise that their bloody victory over the masses has only been a Pyrrhus victory. The reign of terror has not fulfilled the hopes which had been placed in it. The bourgeois newspapers are compelled to admit that even the most cruel and horrible acts of violence have not been capable of destroying the united front of the working and peasant masses.

As a result of this the disintegration in the camp of the "Democratic Union", the government party, is increasing. This is now breaking up into its constituent parts, which never succeeded in welding themselves into a united party. The contradictions and mutual hostility within the government camp have already made themselves apparent in parliament. These differences of opinion have even disintegrated the only real force of the government, the officers' clique. One section of the officers is going over to the side of the oppositional National Liberal Party and another, although a smaller section, is inclined towards the left bourgeois parties. The National Liberal Party itself, which is supported by some sections of the big bourgeoisie, is now experiencing a split. The old adherents of Stambuloff and the followers of the murdered Dr. Genadiev are withdrawing from it and forming a separate liberal party. They naturally reckon that in the near future they will constitute an important factor in the government combinations. The main strength of the new liberal

party consists in the fact that General Lazareff, the chief of the Sofia garrison, one of the most prominent organisers of the putsch of 9th of June 1923 and the leader of that section of the officers who are dissatisfied with the Zankov government, and particularly with General Russeff, is in their camp.

The so-called left parties (Democrats with Malinoff at the head, the radicals and the social democrats) are very weak, as they have no masses behind them. The masses are hostile towards them on account of their participation in the putsch of 9th of June and the mass murders in September 1923, as well as on account of their support of Zankov in his recent bloody campaign of vengeance against the communist and the peasant movement. Conscious of their weakness the Left parties are afraid of seeking a way out of the present situation by means of new elections. They realise that such elections would not only lead to the defeat of the "Democratic Union", but also to their own defeat and render it possible for the working and peasant masses to make the strength of their united front again felt on political and legal ground. For the same reason the Left parties cannot decide to form a common block, which would take over power in the country.

On the other hand the English diplomats who have hitherto supported Zankov and his extreme-terrorist regime, and who are fully acquainted with the actual situation in the country, are likewise convinced that the continuation of this regime can only strengthen the "Bolshevist danger" in Bulgaria and in the Balkans and lead to dangerous surprises. According to the opinion of the English diplomats, only the replacement of the Zankov government by a more moderate rule can avert the otherwise unavoidable danger of the outbreak of the fury of the people, and they are already energetically advocating such a change of government.

The outlines of the coming change of regime are assuming more and more clearer form. In the present situation this change can only be realised by a fresh grouping of the military forces combined with the chief sections of the Democratic Union which is ruling today. The bourgeoisie could under no circumstances venture to place their fate in the hands of the weak Left parties. It is therefore turning its eyes to Laptcheff, the leader of the parliamentary majority, and General Volkoff, the present Minister for War, the organiser and inspirer of the military league.

It is probable that there will be a grouping of Right bourgeois forces round Laptcheff and Volkoff which will also attract the newly formed liberal party and the Right wing of the Agrarian Union. This group would then, although it would still be based upon military forces, moderate, at least outwardly, the present terrorist bloody regime. This combination is the one most likely to take over the government under the conditions obtaining. It renders possible the continuation of the English orientation in the foreign policy of Bulgaria which the Zankov government has followed hitherto, the completion of the rapprochement to Yugoslavia which came about as a result of English initiative, and will thereby render more easy the setting up of that anti-bolshevik front in the Balkan States so eagerly longed for by the English diplomats.

Among the preparations for the approaching change of government, which would bring about the abolition of the state of siege and the cessation of the murdering of communist and peasant politicians on the open street, the winding up of the numerous legal actions against the "united fronters" (communists and members of the peasants' league) and the annihilation of the "dangerous" workers' and peasants' politicians who are still left alive, play an important role. Thus six arrested communists and members of the peasant league were recently murdered in the prison of the town of Samokoff. Nikola Gabrovsky, a former communist member of parliament, one of the founders of the old Social Democratic Party of Bulgaria has been murdered in his house. A number of other functionaries are threatened with the same fate. At the same time the military courts are working with feverish haste. In addition to the numerous death sentences and sentences to life-long imprisonment which are already known, similar sentences are being imposed in the towns of Sliven, Chaskovo, Berkowitz, Sistov and other places. At present there is proceeding in the town of Schumen a monster trial of 500 accused communists and members of the Peasants' League. The Public Prosecutor demands the death sentence against 130 of the accused, life-long imprisonment against 100 and against all the others 10 to 15 years penal servitude. In Sofia there is taking place a trial

*) Retranslated from the Russian.

of the "military organisation of the C. P. of Bulgaria"; the death sentence is demanded against all the 22 accused. At the same time preparations are being made for a similar trial against another 20 accused. The government is endeavouring to bring to trial 500 followers of the Peasants' League, who are accused of having, under the government of Stambulisky, prevented the preparation of the meeting of the bourgeois opposition in September 1922 in Tyrnov. At that time certain excited supporters of Stambulisky, in order to frighten them, forcibly shaved off the beards of several leaders of the bourgeois parties.

Zankov therefore is hastening to complete his bloody work and to open the way for the "more moderate and civilised regime" demanded by London.

But only those who are blind fail to see that, in view of the horrible bestialities which have been practised against the working people of Bulgaria, it will be impossible by means of such "changes" to deceive and pacify a single worker or peasant in Bulgaria. A real pacification and a normal life will only be possible in this country which has suffered so much when the terror against the masses finally ceases, when the political rights and liberties of the masses are entirely restored, when an amnesty is granted to the condemned and persecuted workers and peasants, when the Communist Party and the Peasants' League, the Trade Unions and Co-operatives of the workers are rendered legal, when the working masses obtain the possibility of controlling their own destiny and when they are fully compensated for the numerous costly sacrifices and for the indescribable sufferings which they have had to suffer under the bloody rule of Zankov.

POLITICS

Before the Elections in Czechoslovakia.

By Victor Stern (Prague).

The fear of the coming elections has led to absolutely grotesquely chaotic conditions in the Czech Government Coalition. The new elections for the National Assembly must take place at the latest in the first half of next year, and for many months already the Coalition has been trembling in its shoes with the most desperate fear of the result of these elections. As a matter of fact, the history of this Coalition to which all Czech parties, with the exception of the Communists and the very small sham-opposition Artisans' Party, belong, was nothing but an uninterrupted series of crises, which each time were settled by compromise at the cost of the proletariat, just because new elections had to be avoided at any price.

In quite recent times however, the crises have become more and more frequent, and at the present moment we can even speak of the coalition crisis as a permanent condition. Each party belonging to the coalition is already thinking much more of the necessity of effective election issues than of preserving the Coalition, with the consequence of course, that new contradictions and conflicts are constantly occurring. The fact that the last three crises have led to a pretended resignation of Ministers belonging to the different Coalition Parties, shows more clearly than anything to what degree the nervous tension of the Government Parties has increased. Thus Clerical Ministers resigned temporarily when public holidays were being regulated by law, Social Democrat Ministers when the customs duties were introduced, and just now National-Socialist Ministers because of the events in connection with the Huss celebrations. Needless to say, the Coalition was patched up again after a short time.

The fear which the Government Parties entertain with regard to the elections, is easily understood. An abundance of reactionary laws against the interests of the workers have been passed in a very short time, and the terrible wide-spread distress among the masses of the people, affecting not only the workers but also the numerous small peasants and the petty bourgeois, naturally does not help allay the indignation felt against the Government which does all in its power to intensify the distress and to protect the exploiters.

Apart from this, the fact alone that at the conclusion of peace, Czechoslovakia, with the help of the Entente, incorporated within itself so many groups of foreign nationality, would make it difficult to create, by the methods of bourgeois democracy,

a Parliamentary majority which would ensure the supremacy of the Czech bourgeoisie.

Only about half of the inhabitants are Czech. There are no exact official statistics as to their number, because the State does not recognise the Slovaks as a separate nation and only acknowledges and counts "Czechoslovaks". The Slovaks are oppressed and exploited in the most unprecedented manner and are therefore embittered opponents of the Government, so that even if all the Czechs voted for the Government, there could be no effective majority for the present system of Government, if a real equality of franchise existed.

If, in spite of this, the Government really has an effective majority, it is due to the circumstance that the franchise is in reality not equal, and that the Czechs have an advantage over the other nations through the unequal distribution of the number of mandates among the individual electoral districts, and through wily election geometry. Furthermore, the Slovaks could not, at the last election, foresee how they would be treated in this Republic as a so-called "part of the ruling nation".

In addition to all this, the greatest danger which threatens the coalition is that many hundreds of thousands of the Czech workers who, at the last election, voted solid for the Government under the guidance of the Social Democrats, will now vote communist.

It might be thought that in these circumstances it would be absolutely out of the question to guarantee a majority to the present Government. The Coalition however, including the so-called Socialists, has learnt from Mussolini how to save the situation in such cases, and is trying to perform the mathematical conjuring trick of turning a half, less at least 30, into a sufficient majority, and that by "democratic" methods. It has seemed for a long time as though the Czech bourgeoisie only had two alternative ways by which it could preserve its majority beyond the new elections: either open Fascism or inclusion of the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats of the oppressed nations in an apparent participation in the power of the government on the Yugoslavian model. Both ways however may become dangerous for the Czech bourgeoisie, and it is therefore trying to find a third way of escape, the way of Fascism under a democratic veil. This is the real object of the election reform which the Coalition has worked out with the approval and active collaboration of the Government Socialists.

The new electoral reform is a monstrous and incredible moulding and intensification of the election fraud which the former election scheme already contained. The concealed plural franchise for Government electors is still further developed.

The wily swindle of election reform is further supported by a large-scale development of election geometry.

All this however is far from calming the Government parties. In order to make sure, they are planning to take the country by surprise. It is evident that the Coalition cannot hold together much longer. Thus they intend at least to issue the writs for the election so suddenly that the opposition parties have no time for preparations. In order to make this surprise as effective as possible, all the periods are being cut short in the most impossible way. Writs are to be issued four weeks before the day of election. The lists of candidates must be presented within a fortnight, and the signatures of the candidates must be officially confirmed. Lists of candidates against which any objection is raised, must be corrected within two hours (!!). (How for instance is it possible to get official confirmation of new signatures within two hours?)

Finally the Government makes things sure for itself even for the time after the election by a regulation according to which deputies who resign from or are excluded from a party lose their mandate, the electoral tribunal deciding whether the exclusion was justified according to the statutes of the party.

It is characteristic of the brazenness of the Government Socialists that their Press, exactly in the same way as the Czech bourgeois Press, expounds in a long article, that this election reform is particularly "democratic", because it makes the formation of a Parliamentary Government possible, i. e. in plain words, because it is intended to make it possible for the present Government to continue in power, with all its hostility towards the workers, regardless of what the electors want or think.

The Anglo-American Rubber Conflict.

By Maurice Spector.

Rubber has loomed up as a rift-in-the-lute of the Anglo-American Accord. Why shouldn't British and American Workers be called upon some day to die for Rubber? Would it be less glorious than to die for Coal or Iron or Steel? On the American side at least, it could be made a veritable "War for Democracy". There are over 15 million automobile tyre purchasers in the United States. What a chance for a second Woodrow Wilson to preach the gospel of force without stint to make Rubber safe for democracy!

Despite the late W. J. Bryan, the Rubber Position affords yet another example of the mess the good Lord made of Creation working on a six-day schedule. He gave the Americans the biggest rubber appetite in the world — they consume 75 per cent of the whole supply. But alas, he gave the rubber plantations of Malaya and Ceylon to the British. You will say that He gave them in the first place to a lot of coloured Coolies. Yes, but British Capital, always adept at interpreting the Lord's real will, obtained a mandate for these territories long before the "League of Nations" was invented. So the discordant jazz note in the Anglo-American Concert is the result of this little hitch between the forces of Supply and those of Demand.

Last year the price of rubber was about one shilling a pound. This year it has been as high as 4 shillings and sixpence a pound. A rise of only a penny a pound means a rise on Rubber of £2,500,000 per year. Most companies made about sixpence per pound profit last year. Now they are making 3 shillings and sixpence, or seven times as much. This extraordinary rise promptly evoked a big squeal from the United States which proceeded to make rubber a political and international issue. Taking the Rubber Association of America under his wing, the U. S. Secretary of Commerce launched a diplomatic protest through the American Ambassador practically inviting Great Britain to so alter the laws of her rubber-producing colonies as to permit double the quantity of rubber to be exported and exports to be regulated according to the conditions of the world-market. The Americans assert, what everybody knows, that the rise is due to the manipulation of the British Government.

The British authorities don't deny it — altogether. They explain profusely that four years ago, the rubber industry in Malaya and Ceylon was in a very bad way. There was an accumulation of stocks beyond the then capacity of the world market. It was then that the Stevenson Scheme of Restriction was introduced to secure a "stable and reasonable" price.

The Scheme had this advantage that it worked. It provides that only a certain proportion of the standard production as fixed at the inception of the scheme (1919—20) shall be released in any quarter, this proportion being regulated by the average price of rubber over the previous quarter. This original proportion was 60 per cent. of the standard. As the price rises above one shilling, an extra five per cent. is released. If it rises above one shilling and sixpence, an extra ten per cent. But if it fell below a certain point, restriction would be increased. We have here a classical illustration of monopolist restriction of production for the deliberate purpose of raising prices.

The Colonial Secretary tried as best as he could to deny the responsibility of the British Government and Restriction for the rise. In the House he claimed that the price of rubber had on more than one occasion during the last two years fallen below one shilling and threepence. An official memorandum issued by the Secretary of State, humorously declares that "a planter is free to produce and to export as much rubber as he pleases. All that is done is to establish a graduated scale of export duties..." But speaking authoritatively as former Colonial Secretary in the MacDonald Government, the notorious "Jimmy" Thomas cut right through the veil of Amery's innocent disclaimers and shed desired light on the real motives of the Scheme. Restriction, he emphasized, had been introduced as part and parcel of British foreign policy bearing in mind the position of the pound sterling and of the dollar before the return of the Gold Standard, with two objects in view, — to help pay the British Debt to the United States and to forestall the plans of American Capital for buying up the insolvent estates and ruling the rubber industry.

The American protest had its effect. It was of course unpleasant for the British Government to be pulled up so sharply and so publicly. Open and direct diplomatic intervention on

behalf of economic interests and policy is a form of procedure we are accustomed to see applied more frequently in the relations of imperialist powers with colonies like China or Dawes colonies like Germany than in the mutual relations of dominant imperialist powers themselves. The London "Times" meaningly writes that "a new terror to existence would be added if it became a diplomatic custom for one country to protest against the high prices charged in another country for its products". Less restrained, the "Investors' Chronicle" terms the U. S. representations, a "rather impertinent interference in the internal affairs of the British Empire". But distasteful as it was for British Imperialism to swallow a dose of the medicine it habitually serves to those weaker than itself, it has had to beat a retreat on this question for fear of over-reaching itself. Chamberlain stated in the Commons that he "would take it (the protest) into his most serious and immediate consideration". The release of six thousand tons of rubber held up ever since 1923, the raising of the percentage of standard production to 75% for the next quarter and the decline in the price of spot rubber from 4/6d. to 3/8d. are all eloquent testimony that he has.

The British Restriction policy already gives the Dutch Rubber Industry a chance to develop unrestricted production. The British Imperialists fear that the American manufacturers, if pressed too hard, might with their ample resources secure a greater foothold in the Dutch East Indies and furnish powerful and dangerous competition. British Capital takes its Empire and the East generally very seriously. In the same speech discussing the Rubber Issue, the Colonial Secretary declared that "in the development of the Tropical Empire there were economic possibilities greater perhaps than anywhere else in the world" — and, we may add, possibilities of international and imperialist conflict equally great. Labour must become as fully seized of this as are the Imperialists. Labour can then assure itself success in the struggle for social emancipation and world peace by making an ally and partner of the hitherto despised Eastern Coolie through the slogans of self-determination and international trade union unification of the Workers of the East and the West.

Mussolini's Battles.

By Edmundo Peluso (Rome).

When history repeats itself, the repetition is invariably a caricature of the original event. Mussolini has looked on whilst the Soviet Union successfully fought the battles of the grain and of the rouble, and this has now induced him to declare that he is going to fight the battle of the grain and of the lira.

He has called together his general staff, in order to discuss the strategy of the campaign. His officers are nothing more nor less than the Italian **big landowners** and **big peasants**, and the object of the campaign is to discover how agrarian production can best be carried on at the expense of the Italian proletariat. One can see how much resemblance there is between the battles fought by Mussolini and those fought by the Soviet Union! In the Soviet Union the grain battle was fought by the working and peasant class to their own advantage. In Italy precisely the contrary is taking place.

What decision must a general staff of big agrarians, under the chairmanship of the leader of Fascism, inevitably arrive at? Could they come to the conclusion that the right method of obtaining more corn is to increase the area under cultivation, to improve the methods of cultivation, to provide the peasantry with more efficient agricultural stock and implements, to sell them fertilisers at possible prices, and to ease the heavy load of taxation — the methods taken by the government of the Soviet Union? Such a decision cannot be expected from such a body, for the big agrarians are only capable of drawing up a strategic plan defending their own interests and privileges, and thrusting the whole of the burdens of the struggle upon the working peasants.

Italy, as is well known, does not produce sufficient corn for its consumption. It is obliged to buy considerable quantities abroad, and to pay for this in gold. On the other hand, the area in Italy which could be employed for partially covering the deficit is at present cultivated with sugar beets and tobacco. Land eminently adapted for growing corn, and for the production of raw materials required by the textile industry, and entirely unsuited to growing beets and tobacco, is still being used for this latter purpose. But what does that matter? The government has to support the sugar industry, and pays high premiums to the

cultivators of sugar beets and tobacco. The big agrarians abandon all patriotism when their money bags are threatened!

Thus Mussolini will not take away from the big agrarians a hands breadth of their land in order to force them to change the kind of crops they cultivate. He will continue to pay them high premiums, but has at the same time issued the order that the yield per hectare of land under corn cultivation has to be increased. The peasant may moisten the earth with the sweat of his brow; he may buy machines if he can; he may purchase fertilisers if the prices dictated by the trusts permit him to do so; the Fascist government has a heart for the big agrarian only. The protective tariff has rendered the price of agricultural machinery unattainable for the majority, and where the peasants co-operatives have contrived to buy a machine, the Fascists have destroyed the co-operative by fire and sword. The taxes, made so easy for the big agrarians, have been increased again and again for the poor peasantry, until many of them have fled to France, where conditions are not quite so bad. Manures and fertilisers have become the property of a monopoly in the hands of the Società Montecatini, and this company sells them at prices almost equal to that of bread.

Briefly stated, Mussolini has lost his battle before he has begun to fight it at all. But perhaps it was merely a demagogic bluff. The big agrarians and the big industrialists of Italy paved the way for Fascism, called it into existence, and now they are not likely to allow Mussolini to carry on a fight against them, even if he had ever had any intention of doing so.

The other battle, that of the lira, is closely bound up with the grain battle. The depreciation of the lira, now very serious (during the last few weeks the dollar has risen to 27/29 lire as compared with a pre-war par of slightly over five lire!), though partially to be ascribed to the enormous debts owing by Italy to America and England (about 100 milliard lire!), is also greatly due to the adverse foreign trade balance consequent on the purchase of grain and other indispensable raw materials and necessities of life, and on the general mistrust felt towards Fascism, and spreading even in bourgeoisie circles.

The depreciation of the lira in July was such as the exchanges of Italy have never before experienced. The small investors and petty bourgeoisie, living on a few million lire invested in state bonds, have been seized with complete panic. The medium manufacturers are equally alarmed. Mussolini, and even more the notorious party secretary Farinacci, were at first of the opinion that the best means of allaying the panic was to attack it with a cudgel. But though Farinacci regards historical events with no more comprehension than felt by a cow looking at a picture of Raphael's, in this case he has been obliged to see that he was on the wrong track.

A better means had to be sought. High finance has pointed this out. First of all it has demanded the head of the minister of finance, Stefani, as scapegoat, and has insisted on his being substituted by the confidential agent of high finance, count Volpi.

The dismissed minister of finance and the exchequer, Stefani, is a university professor. He is in favour of theories harmless to bourgeois interests so long as they remain theories; but as soon as the interests of capitalism are endangered, the bourgeois industrial magnates lose their respect for even their university professors.

What crime did Stefani, a leading Fascist, then commit? After having balanced the budget at the expense of the working class, reducing or abolishing the taxes paid by the owning classes and, discharging tens of thousands of officials, he was seized with the idea of increasing the value of the lira by restricting the bank notes in circulation. The ceremonies which he performed in the Banca d'Italia, where he caused millions in bank notes to be burned before a large number of spectators, verged on the ridiculous. The Italian banks, whose steel chambers contained tons of industrial papers bought at high prices, and accumulations of state bonds, found themselves obliged to throw quantities of these papers on the market in order to have necessary bank-notes for their operations. This meant considerable losses to the banks.

The fall of the lira in July filled the cup to overflowing. In view of the rebellion on the part of high finance, Mussolini had to sacrifice his minister and to accept as confidential agent Count Volpi, one of the mightiest profiteers of Italian capitalism, a leading manager of the Banca Commerciale, and possessing in-

terests of his own in all the great capitalist undertakings of Italy. The aid of the Banca Commerciale is a much mightier aid to Mussolini in his battle than the strokes of Farinacci's cudgel. The co-operation of the Banca Commerciale with the Fascist regime signifies a strengthening of this regime, and the transition of Italian high finance to Fascism. But the economic battles to be fought by Fascism are much more difficult to win than its fraction struggles. There is no doubt whatever that the field of economic battle is more likely to witness Mussolini's defeat than the field of political battle.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Mining Crisis in Great Britain.

By H. Y. (London).

The mining crisis has been temporarily postponed, by the granting of a Government Subsidy to guarantee 13 per cent profit to the coal owners on the proceeds of the Industry.

The Government has already agreed to vote £ 10,000,000 for the Industry and to the principle of further grants should they become necessary.

The Government estimates that the cost of this measure may vary between £ 7,500,000 (the best) and £ 24,000,000 (the worst) for the nine months period upon which the present agreement is to be based.

The miners' leaders have agreed to continue working on the present basis, the 1924 agreement, based upon the Minimum Wage, i. e. the 1914 wage plus 33 $\frac{1}{3}$, plus 9% (2s-Sankey Award) for lower paid men.

The Cause of the Dispute.

In July the owners posted up notices of a Lock-out failing acceptance of the new terms of agreement as follows:

1. Guarantee of 13% profits on the proceeds of the Industry in every district.
2. Therefore, abolition of Minimum Wage.
3. District Settlements (District Boards to settle agreements).

According to this, the District Mineowners' Associations made varying District offers, e. g. South Wales, abolition of "bonus turn" by which miners drew wages for six shifts for five for night work, abolition of house coal at cost price to miners, eight hours shift.

In effect the owners' proposals meant reductions of wages from 10sh- to 6sh-per shift for skilled men on the average, and proportionately for lesser paid grades and boys, or reductions varying from 47% to 14.8% in various districts.

These reductions would be unlimited in the event of acceptance, because the principle of the 1924 agreement, the guarantee of a Minimum Wage to the men, made up from profits when necessary, would be lost.

It is clear that their acceptance would have meant starvation for four millions of workers and their dependents in the industry, to be immediately followed by the workers in the other big industries, all of whom are faced with demands for reductions in wages from their employers.

The owners declared that the Industry was economically incapable of paying present wages on the basis of present hours (7 per shift). They brought forward figures to prove that the export coal trade had fallen. In one district alone (South Wales) export has fallen 50% compared with 1913. A. J. Cook stated at the Trades Union Congress in London that 500 pits have closed down and that 300,000 workers in the industry are unemployed.

The Miners' Federation in a special statement to the T. U. C. also agree as to the universal crisis and the collapse of the British Coal Industry.

The Intervention of the Government.

Matters were swiftly approaching a crisis, one week before the termination of notices the General Council of the Trades Union Congress appointed a special committee of five of its members to take charge of the dispute for the whole Trade Union movement. The special Trades Union Congress on Friday

July 24th heard a statement from Cook and Smith who frankly declared that their backs were to the wall.

On Wednesday 29th July the Cabinet appointed **Bridgeman**, First Lord of the Admiralty, as mediator in the dispute, declaring that the workers had got to realise the necessity of reductions in wages in order to restore British foreign trade and that the government had definitely decided against a subsidy to assist the industry. Friday's "**Daily Herald**" issued instructions to all Trade Unionists for a embargo on coal, while the Councils of Action were instructed to organise a complete stoppage of coal transport throughout the country. The Transport Workers Congress pledged solidarity, and the Miners' International was prepared for action. On Friday evening the press announced that negotiations were in progress and on Friday night telegrams were despatched to the coal fields announcing a settlement.

The press then announced that the government had decided to grant a subsidy to the Industry for a period of nine months. Baldwin was forced to eat his words amidst a storm of protest from the right wing Tory press. The "**Daily Mail**" declared the government's action a "surrender to force" and a "victory for violence".

The owners agreed to two weeks postponement to discuss terms of the subsidy which were thereupon agreed on, under protest of some of the most influential owners, e. g. South Wales, on the ground that prices would be fixed and that they would have no "free hand".

This result was hailed as a great victory for labour by the General Council and the "**Daily Herald**" announced it as "Red Friday".

Victory or Defeat.

The most important feature of the situation is that four conferences of the Miners Federation of Great Britain held during the last four months have decided in favour of action for increased wages and the six hour day — which has been entirely forgotten by the Miners' Executive and the General Council. Cook has endeavoured to re-establish himself by stating in the "**Sunday Worker**" that the time is now ripe for a new offensive — but hails the status quo as a victory.

Meanwhile speculation is rife in the coal fields. "The government had the wind up" is the miners' estimate of the situation. The miners have accepted the settlement with some misgiving — the active elements, and especially the Minority Movement, are already ablaze with dissatisfaction.

The Miners' Minority is propagating:

1. The Minimum wage plus 2s-Sankey Award.
2. Six hours day.
3. Nationalisation without compensation, and workers' control.

The Parliamentary Debate.

On Thursday 6th of August the government asked for £ 10,000,000 to make good the owners' profits. **Baldwin** defended his action on the ground that the Cabinet was unprepared at this stage for a national stoppage which would have cost at least £ 100,000,000. He condemned those who said "you are bound to have a strike, have it now and get it over". That was a counsel of despair. A royal commission would investigate methods of improving the efficiency of the Industry and reducing production costs. He closed his remarks with a warning to the trade unions that when the community has to protect itself with the full strength of the government behind it, the community will do so, and the response of the community will astonish the forces of anarchy throughout the world".

Vicount Cecil speaking for the government in the House of Lords, declared that "there was no member of the government who doubted that if it came to a definite issue as to whether one section of the population were to be allowed to hold up essential national services, the government would be able to remain masters of the situation".

Lloyd George charged the government with cowardice, declaring that nobody knew where the government's financial commitments would end, and twitted **MacDonald** on his lightning change of front. **MacDonald** had already opened the attack on the government by charging it with failure to nationalise the

industry and declaring that no Labour Government would have allowed such a crisis to develop. He was strangely silent when negotiations were in progress, but when speaking at the I. L. P. Summer School on the methods of socialism versus communism, he informed his hearers that the government had surrendered the victory to reactionary forces, inferring that no Labour Government of which he was Prime Minister, would have done any such thing, which from bitter experience we know only too well.

John Bromley, the secretary of the Locomotive Engineers and Firemen's Union openly declared that the granting of public money to private enterprise was a victory for capitalism and voted against the subsidy.

The Present Position.

The Mineowners' Association has already fired its first shot in its campaign, declaring its dissatisfaction with the "settlement", which it declares will only produce a worse crisis next May. In a special statement issued by its propaganda department it declares that profits are not guaranteed and that individual collieries can still undergo losses. "Nothing is settled", it declares, and asks "shall we be governed by parliament or Soviet", urging that the Royal Commission do not confine its investigations to questions of technique, but enquire into the Miners' Minority Movement, which has captured the machinery of the Miners' Federation, and announced that during the peace period it will devote its attention "to exposing the methods by which the extremists control the Miners' Federation and their policy as to Industry and the State".

The Next Tasks.

The next tasks are the preparation of the Miners' Offensive. The recent events are of world significance. They mark a definite stage in the decline of British Capitalism and a corresponding advance in the Minority Movement. The policy of the Mineowners will be to endeavour to smash the miners by local disputes. Our reply must be a mass Minority movement, into the task of building up which the Communist Party and the Young Communist League will throw their whole energy.

To the Aid of the British Miners!

To the Workers of the World!

Comrades!

In Britain great events are about to take place. With the support of the whole of the British bourgeoisie, the mine-owners have begun an **organised attack on the vanguard of the British proletariat, on the mine workers.**

When after the Black Friday of 1921 craft interests took priority over class interests among the workers, the British bourgeoisie succeeded in considerably lowering the standard of living of the entire British working class. In the person of the coal owners, the ruling classes of Britain are to-day making a fresh attack directed against the **Miners' Federation**, the biggest and strongest organisation, but weakened by the present economic crisis. The strategy of the British bourgeoisie is obviously to deal a powerful blow, exactly as in 1921, at the miners first of all, and then beat down the workers in the engineering and metal trades, textile workers, railwaymen and other workers and force them to retreat. This perfectly natural and usual mode of waging war by smashing the enemy, section by section, has been utilised to good effect by the British bourgeoisie, but until recently has been made but poor use of by the British proletariat and its leaders. Hence the lack of co-ordination among the unions, the rivalry that exists, the efforts made to keep their unions in port during the storm, and the absolute inability of many leaders to grasp the fact that the present conflict in the coal industry is a trial of strength between the British bourgeoisie and the British working class as a whole, and that any defeat of the miners means defeat not only for the British, but for all the European proletarians as well.

But the lessons of 1921—1922 have not been without their effects. The pressure brought to bear by the coal barons on the mining workers has created sullen discontent among the broad masses in Britain. The General Council has promised to support the miners. For the first time in the history of the British labour movement a section of the workers engaged in the struggle are

being given not only moral, but also practical support by the trade union movement as a whole. This has entirely changed the aspect of the whole matter and altered the correlations of the opposing forces: against one another we have not only the miners and the mine owners, but the many-millioned proletariat and the splendidly organised bourgeoisie — class against class! Thanks to this, there is at present in England a tense situation among the miners in the struggle, despite the fact that the workers have many deserters — Thomas & Co. — ready to strike at their own class from behind.

The conflict in the British mining industry is far from being confined to Britain only. It directly affects the miners of Germany, Belgium and France, after whom there come other categories of labour and the workers of other countries. It has to be openly admitted that the European proletariat lags far behind the bourgeoisie of Europe in respect to organisation and class consciousness. If the workers had truly understood their own interests, could they ever have supported the Versailles Treaty, the reparations and the Dawes Plan? For, when all is said and done, the Dawes Plan represents a "brilliant victory" gained by MacDonald's government; the same celebrated plan of the American bankers was supported by the Second and Amsterdam Internationals; while the position of the British miners and the whole of the working class in Great Britain has steadily deteriorated, thanks to this wonderful invention of world bankerdom. The consequences have been far from satisfactory: assisted by the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, the international bourgeoisie has transformed the German proletariat into a European coolie class which by its lengthened working day and cheap labour is burdening the whole world labour market by lowering the standard of life of the European and in the first place, the British working class. Such are the brilliant results of the activities of both reformist Internationals and their affiliated national sections. The leader who does not understand the connection between the Versailles Treaty, reparations, the Dawes plan and the systematic lowering of the standard of living of the working masses, is either a hopeless fool or a hanger on of the bourgeoisie.

Men and Women! Workers all!

The British proletariat has difficult fights ahead of it. The more unsettled the position of British imperialism in China, India, Egypt and elsewhere becomes, the more concessions it is forced to make to the economically and politically expanding Dominions, the more it is forced to retreat before American imperialism, then the more bitterly will the British bourgeoisie attack the gains of its working class at home. The ruling class of England want to throw the whole burden of their failures and defeats on the shoulders of the masses. A long and stubborn struggle lies ahead: and the British proletariat will suffer defeat until such time as it reorganises its unions on the industrial principle, gives up its craft sectionalism, and as a whole comes round to the view of the need for a relentless class struggle. What is now happening in Britain is only one of the episodes in the struggle for real power, and not for the fake power presented to MacDonald by the King.

The workers of all countries, and especially the workers of Germany, France and Belgium, are directly interested in the struggle of the British miners: their victory will be our victory, their defeat, our defeat. The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions makes a warm and urgent appeal to all those workers in whom there beats a true proletarian heart to support the British miners in their difficult struggle. Those who either directly or indirectly help the British bourgeoisie by their work to smash the miners, will be real strike breakers. The workers' organisation that does not render active assistance to the British miners will be an enemy and traitor to the working class. In order to render real help to the British workers in their fight, there must be an immediate uniting of all our forces irrespective of individual views; we must set up a united front which will serve as a practical step towards the establishment of unity in the trade union movement.

Help the miners!

Forward to the United Proletarian Front against the offensive of the capitalists!

Long live world trade union unity!

Executive Bureau of the Red International
of Labour Unions.

A. Lozovsky, General Secretary.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRIEDRICH ENGELS

30th Anniversary of the Death of Friedrich Engels.

By Hermann Duncker (Berlin).

Thirty years have passed since the death of Engels (on the 5th of August 1895). Thirty years full of the greatest developments and changes. During this time free competitive capitalism has become monopolist capitalism; from an exuberant, uprising, great economic State, Germany has become a slave plantation of the Entente powers, while the revolutionary social democracy of Germany has become a counter-revolutionary petty bourgeois party — but Tsarist Russia, which to every sincere revolutionary appeared to be the most powerful stronghold of every form of reaction, has become the first proletarian State of the world: the refuge of all the homeless proletarian revolutionaries of the bourgeois world, the motherland for all further communist research work, economics and politics.

The two chief features of this enormous transformation: the degeneration of the old capitalism into imperialism and the degeneration of the old social democratic labour parties into reformist opportunism had already been anticipated by Engels, who survived Karl Marx for twelve years.

In the last edition which he himself issued of his work: "Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science" (1891), Engels strongly emphasised the tendency to monopolist capitalism. Here he again repeated what he had already formulated very precisely in his first economic work "Outline of criticism of National Economy" (1844): "competition gives place to monopoly". The concentration of the means of production in the hands of capitalist joint stock companies now assumes the form of huge trusts:

"Every branch of industry is now being converted into one great joint stock company, competition at home gives place to a home monopoly of this joint stock company". (Development of socialism etc.) Page 45.

And in the scheme of development which is given at the conclusion of this little work, Engels clearly characterised the most essential feature of the imperialist phase of the last epoch of capitalist revolution before the proletarian revolution. It is true, not with the completeness with which Lenin did later — at that time the dragon of imperialism had only just emerged from the eggshell — but Lenin had only to take up the threads of Marxist investigation which death had taken out of the hands of Engels in 1895.

Marx and Engels in their forty years of common work together never lost sight of the opportunist dangers in the development of labour parties. In England in particular they were able to study at its sources the connection between monopolist profit and colonial exploitation and the bourgeois corruption of certain sections of the proletariat. (See Lenin: "Imperialism" 1916).

In the division of fields of activity in their communist work there fell to Engels the task of safeguarding the purity of the Marxist-revolutionary policy. In innumerable letters and articles Engels, from his English watch tower, gave warnings of deviations from the Marxist line from the symptoms of petty bourgeois and philistine politics. With his virile optimism he again and again opposed the right tendencies in the socialist party of Germany. He had confidence before all in the sound revolutionary sense of the German worker and the powerful will of his leaders, such as Bebel and others. As however Engels was only able to follow events in Germany from a distance, it resulted in his submitting now and again to the "real politicians" of the Continent, where energetic opposition would have been more in place. His good nature was rewarded in the worst manner when, in 1895, the cowards in the social democratic Central Committee, by basely making deletions in Engels' preface to the "Class War", distorted it into an unconditional laudation of lawfulness. Engels in his private letters gave vent to his anger over this.

But the death of Engels which followed shortly after this, came to the aid of the German publishers and since then quotations from this treacherously garbed preface of Engels adorn

every work of revisionism; it became the theoretical main support of the reformist policy of the social democratic party from 1895 up to the present day. Engels was obviously here a victim of the "moderate" tendencies of the socialist Party of Germany and it appears monstrous that such a capable socialist historian as Max Beer could write:

"After the death of Marx, Engels strongly influenced the tactics of the socialist movement, and on the whole exercised a moderating effect".

And in his latest "Allgemeine Geschichte des Sozialismus" (General History of Socialism) (1924 page 460) Beer has unfortunately spoiled his otherwise very valuable work by his characterisation of Engels. In this work Engels is summarily branded as a reformist and an adherent of parliamentarism. "He also weakened the materialist conception of history". Revisionist Marx-philosophers on the other hand reproach Engels for his obstinate clinging to materialism! In face of the almost spiteful manner in which Max Beer deals with Engels "the adjutant of Marx" — "who only had a talent as Hess, Grün, Lüning, Proudhon, Blanc etc." we should do well to call to mind the testimony of Mehring who has examined and investigated the works of Marx and Engels as no other. He states in his wonderful chapter "Ein Bund ohne gleichen" (an alliance without parallel) (see Mehring's Biography of Marx page 236):

"Engels was at no time a mere exponent and assistant of Marx, but an independent collaborator, a spirit different from Marx but on an equal level with him."

No, the reformists cannot purloin Marx from us, they cannot divorce Marx from Engels.

But today we recognise more than ever how Marx and Engels have written and worked beyond their own time for a later generation. It was the great tragedy of the two founders of scientific communism, that they lived in an all too petty era. And thus, after 1848, they encountered the most bitter disappointments. After the defeat of the revolution of 1848 there arose within the Communist League the dispute with the ultra-left (Willich-Schaper fraction). There was the reformism in the Lassalle movement and also a good deal of naive petty bourgeois ideology even among the "honest workers" under Bebel's and Liebknecht's leadership. Then came the development of the I. International, and here also there was a fight against opportunism which appeared in an ultra-left guise. Engels bitterly attacked the advance of petty bourgeois reformism in Germany in his work "Die Wohnungsfrage" (The Housing Question) (1872). In the Gotha unity programme (1875) Marx as well as Engels exercised an annihilating criticism. There followed the crushing by Engels of the intellectual socialism of Eugen Dühring (1877). Here Engels defended Marxist socialism along the whole line. After this there was scarcely any attempt to oppose Marxism which had not been already previously castigated in "Anti-Dühring". The years of the Exceptional Laws caused to revive, along with the ultra left ("Mostiaden") certain opportunist tendencies. Engels energetically endeavoured to protect the German labour movement against both dangers.

"We have nothing to expect from a policy of indulgence, that is, of concessions to our opponents. Only by dauntless resistance have we won respect and become a power. Only power is respected, and only so long we are one are we respected by the philistine. Whoever makes concessions to him, is despised by him and has no longer any power."

These are lines of thoughts which at that time often came to Engels. Along with these there were polemical discussions with Brentano and other professors who sought to distort Marx. The huge number of new editions of Marx's writings, the completion of the second and third volume of "Capital" etc. imposed a enormous load of work upon Engels' shoulders. In the year 1884 there appeared from the pen of Engels the "Origin of the Family, of Private Property and of the State": a popular interpretation of the greater work of Morgan. It is true that the sociological research work of the later years has brought to light much material, as a result of which the Morgan-Engels scheme of the development of the family has been corrected in certain details.

But "our teaching is no dogma but a guidance to action"! It is in the light of this Marxist slogan that the life work of Engels must be considered and appreciated. What guidance have the Bolsheviks, in particular Lenin, derived from Engels? One can discover the most important points of Leninism theoretically outlined, to the question of nationalities, to the role of

the labour parties as a result of the workers of the imperialist countries enjoying a share of the surplus profits derived from the colonial countries, the attitude to religion etc. It was a purely bolshevist doctrine which Engels formulated already in 1884 in the following words which have often been quoted by Lenin:

"In any case our only opponent in the day of the crisis and the day after is the united reaction which groups itself round pure democracy."

Ten years ago, in the intoxication of the world war, the German social patriots brought forward old quotations from Engels in which a war against Russian Tsarism was justified. Unfortunately they forgot to add that Engels had only in mind a war on a revolutionary basis. Engels was of course not a "pacifist", just as he was never a "social democrat" in the real sense of the word. In the last year before his death the old communist once again declared how "unsuitable" the word social-democracy is for a party,

the economic programme of which is not merely generally socialist but a direct communist programme, and whose political final aim is the overthrowing of the entire State, including therefore democracy" (1894).

In these days when the III. International is carrying on a vigorous anti-war propaganda, we may conclude with a prophetic word of Engels uttered in the year 1891:

"Only a victorious revolution in Russia, which will place the destiny of the country in the hands of the people, is capable of preventing the threatening world war... Only a victorious revolution can preserve humanity from the world war."

Engels has in no way become "historical" for us. His ideas continue to inspire, his slogans are still to be discerned in the formulations of Lenin!

We do not know what attitude the II. International will adopt towards the 30th anniversary of Engels in view of his revolutionary passion and his steady pursuance of aim. Do not these gentlemen perceive the enormous chasm between Noske-Scheidemann-Kautsky on the one side and Marx-Engels on the other? But as a matter of fact we are still faced with the spectacle: Karl Kautsky will solemnly appeal to the shades of Marx and Engels as witnesses in support of his appeal for a "righteous war" against Russia. And there is nothing to defend our Marx and our Engels from such desecration.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Split in the Japanese Trade Unions and the International Federation of Trade Unions.

By Fritz Heckert (Berlin).

A member of the Executive Committee of the Japanese Trade Union Federation, on the occasion of his journey through Europe, recently paid a visit to the Amsterdam Trade Union Federation, with the alleged object of effecting the affiliation of the Japanese Trade Unions to the I. F. T. U. He utilised the opportunity for submitting to the astonished world a report on the conditions in the Japanese labour movement, and on the anxiety of this movement to join the I. F. T. U. The most interesting part of this report was the information furnished by this Japanese boss to the effect that in Japan too the trade unions are being disturbed by the communists; in Japan the communists have even been striving — most criminally! — to politicise the Trade Unions. The Japanese reported however further that short work had been made of the communists; they were simply thrown out of the Trade Unions — in emulation of the example set in Europe.

It need not be said that the I. F. T. U. showed every anxiety to embrace excellent opportunity of entering into connection with the East. The privilege hitherto held by the Red International of Labour Unions was thus to become undermined. The I. F. T. U. therefore proclaimed that a Pan-Asiatic Trade Union Congress would shortly be held in Europe. Why in Europe? The question is natural. The answer is however plain enough: in the Far East there is no opportunity for a undisturbed conference. It will seem obvious to every working man that some place in Asia would

be much more suitable for such a conference than even the most magnificent hall in Europe. Considering the great influence exercised by Oudegeest on the Dutch government, it would for instance be easy enough to find a suitable place in Java. Or Jouhaux could arrange for somewhere in French Indochina. The geographical position of English Singapore, or of Hong Kong, Calcutta, or Madras, is also well adapted for the holding of such a congress.

But although the report issued by the I. F. T. U. shows that the Federation is willing to entrust the leadership of the Asiatic trade union movement to thoroughly reliable reformist Japanese, the Japanese delegate could not name any suitable place in Japan for the conference. No place was safe enough. This in itself is somewhat suspicious. And yet another point must be taken into account. At the present time a mighty strike is going on in China, participated in by millions of workers. These workers — as also the RILU and the CI. — have called upon the I. F. T. U. to devote some attention to their movement, and to aid them. This would be a much better opportunity for the I. F. T. U. to enter into communication with the proletariat of the East than the projected Pan-Asiatic Conference in Paris or Amsterdam. And a participation on the part of the I. F. T. U. in this mighty movement would make the best possible impression not only on the Chinese workers, but upon all the wage slaves of India, Indochina, and Indonesia. But the I. F. T. U. decided at its recent conference to postpone the discussion on Chinese affairs until — August.

August appears to these gentlemen to be a more suitable term than the present month of July. They hope that by August the strike will probably be at an end, and the opportunity will be given to announce that the strike could not possibly have been successful, since the "tried" tactics of Oudegeest, Leipart, Thomas, and Jouhaux were not employed. And above all, by August the I. F. T. U. will be able to see what the imperialist capital of America, England, France, and Japan, intend to do to put a stop to the movement in China, so "disturbing to the trade of the world".

Having thus slightly lifted the veil concealing the practices of the I. F. T. U., we may go a step further. We shall scarcely be mistaken if we take this tried and tested member of the Japanese Trade Union Federation to be simply an agent of the Japanese Government. It was just during the ominous negotiations, at Geneva, of the International Labour Office, that this gentleman came to Europe. He did not however seize the opportunity for making an effective attack upon the Japanese government and its antisocial and reactionary plans; he even preserved silence on the reactionary announcements made on the eight hour day by the Japanese delegate in the Labour Office, and praised the new Japanese suffrage law, although this is not to come into force until 1928, and excludes wide strata of the working class from the suffrage. This law he designated as a great advance for the workers. Seen from the standpoint of the Japanese government, a Pan-Asiatic Trade Union Conference in Europe, all revolutionary elements being excluded, is an excellent idea. But to a sceptical spectator it looks remarkably like the similar founding of Russian Trade Unions by Subatov, the gendarmier officer.

The I. F. T. U. itself confirms our suspicions, as witnesses the following notice:

"Splits everywhere".

(I. F. T. U.). As early as March, on the occasion of the conference of the Japanese Trade Union Conference at Kobe, there were considerable disagreements between the communists and the anti-communists, leading to the splitting off of the communist organisation "The Local Council of Trade Unions". Now comes the report that the Japanese Union Federation has split into two independent organisations. The "Japan Council of Labour Unions" (communist wing) has separated from the "Japan Federation of Labour" (Japanese Trade Union Federation) and has set up its headquarters in Osaka. Its programme is as follows: The formation of a political Labour Party and the organisation of industrial unions possessing complete independence. In view of the greater industrial significance of this place, the Japanese Trade Union Federation has transferred its headquarters from Tokio to Osaka. Thus the schism appears to have been carried out in a similar manner as for instance in France, where the communist wing is well known to have separated from the national organisation in connection with a Congress. (The similarity is truly conspicuous. F. H.)

It is here admitted that the Japanese trade unions have been split. By the communists, of course. By whom else? But on the

other hand the I. F. T. U. assures us that the communists have no influence whatever, and were besides (!) thrown out of the unions in "good time". This notice makes it a fact that the split in the Japanese trade unions is either the work of Japanese governmental agents or that it has been carried out at the instigation of such obscurants as Oudegeest, Sassenbach, Albert Thomas, etc., in order to prevent the formation of a United Trade Union International based on class warfare. The English and Japanese delegates at the International Railway Conference at Bellinzona were right indeed in giving condemnatory expression of their astonishment at the methods employed by the reformists in dealing with the problems of the East and of Trade Union Unity.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

The Young Communist Leagues of Europe and the E. C. Y. C. I. to the Working Youth.

Never since the great war came to an end in 1918 was the fearful danger of a new world slaughter so near to us as at the present moment.

War is raging in Morocco. Thousands are falling as victims to the robber-greed of the French and Spanish bankers. All the means of destruction of modern warfare are being brought into the field by French imperialism in order to crush the brave free Riff people and convert their land into a colony.

It appears as if this war is only being carried on between French imperialism and the people of the Riff. But behind the scenes of this war it is already clear that a number of other imperialist States, even if only indirectly, are involved in this conflict and that therefore the Moroccan War bears the seeds of a great international conflagration. This war will not be of short duration. The precarious situation of French imperialism compels the French bourgeoisie to mobilise fresh and new classes of young workers and peasants who are doomed to perish in the tropical heat of Africa.

China is all ablaze. A people numbering hundreds of millions is carrying on its struggle for emancipation against the imperialist invaders, before all against the yoke of English and Japanese rule. One can already see England and Japan again at work in order to plunge this unhappy country again into a fresh civil war from which the imperialists hope to gain advantage. But divided as they are among themselves and jealous as to who is to have the greatest share of the booty, the various powers can at any time come into collision with results which cannot be foreseen.

The struggle in Morocco, like the events in China, are only the commencement of a fresh wave of imperialist conflicts, of a new and frightful world war.

The socialist working youth who only a year ago expressed their (pacifist) attitude in innumerable demonstrations (No More War), in all countries are marching at the tail of the Second International, are marching hand in hand with those people who just recently, in the French Chamber, voted for the war credits for the Moroccan war. Only the Young Communist International and the Comintern are at this moment fulfilling their international proletarian duty, true to the attitude of the Bolsheviks during the world war, as their various sections in all the imperialist countries, in the event of a new war, are endeavouring with all means to do what Lenin and his followers did in their time: to organise the defeat of their own bourgeoisie.

Behind all this there looms the new attack upon Soviet Russia. For many months past the reactionary English government have been systematically making every preparation for this purpose. Sometimes it seems that the matter is postponed for a time but the danger, the facts still remain and are becoming ever more threatening. A new war against the first workers' Republic of the world is being prepared.

Fellow workers, comrades!

Shall the lives of hundreds of thousands be again sacrificed on the battle fields of an imperialist war? Do you wish to be used as cannon fodder in a war against your beloved Workers' Republic of Soviet Russia? We call upon you: **No, and again no!** Fight against the imperialist war! Peace for the Workers' Republic! Freedom for the peoples of Morocco and China! Forward to a powerful demonstration against the imperialist war in the week of the anniversary of the last world war.

Forward to a great week's campaign before the International Youth Day from the 31st August to 6th September 1925!

**Forth to the fight against war, now, in this very hour!
Young socialist workers!**

Your leaders and organisations, what are they doing?

Feeble resolutions here and there, demonstrations in order to keep up appearances. But in reality? Support of the robber war in Morocco by the French socialists. Approval on the part of the German social democracy of the Security Pact and war against Soviet Russia. Shameful indifference towards the struggle for freedom of the Chinese people. Complete inactivity in the face of the real danger of fresh wars. 1914 is coming again, is already here.

Comrades,

Put an end to this! Set up the united front against the imperialist war, whether you are workers, apprentices, soldiers or peasants!

Down with the imperialist robbers!

All for Soviet Russia!

**The Conference of the Young Communist Leagues
of Europe.**

**The Executive Committee of the Young Communist
International.**

Berlin, 21st. July 1925.

The Young Communist International on the International Children's Week.

(30. August to 6. September.)

No neutrality is possible in the tremendous and decisive struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Even the children are not inactive. It is of great importance whether they play a revolutionary or a counter-revolutionary rôle. For the future of our struggle depends on the nature of the education now being received by the children. The bourgeoisie and its servant, social democracy in every country, is fully aware of the extraordinary importance of the revolutionary children's movement. For this reason they exert their utmost endeavours to keep the children out of the communist children's groups, and to induce the children to join children's organisations in which the children are kept out of the class struggle. Where they do not succeed in doing this, they get the police to prohibit the communist children's movement.

But in spite of all prohibitions, the communist children's movement is not to be suppressed. The greater the difficulties, the more determinedly we stride forwards. Young pioneers, march forwards on the path of class war and class education of the children! Form school nuclei and transform every school into a communist fortress, fight for the abolition of corporal punishment in schools, for the abolition of religious instruction and patriotic doping by reactionary teachers. But at the same time you must do all you can to win over the teachers for our cause, to convert them into participants in the revolutionary struggle.

In a number of countries, especially in the United States of America and in the East which is oppressed by the imperialists, children are kept at work in the factories from the tenderest age, under the most inhuman conditions. Raise your millions of voices, in the International Children's week, in protest against child labour, against the brutal exploitation of the little ones of the proletariat!

The capitalists of the whole world are preparing a fresh war against the first workers' state, the Soviet Union. Let the cry of the young pioneers be: "Down with war! For peace with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics!"

Almost one and a half million young pioneers are united under the banner of Communism in the Soviet Union, and are working towards building up a new life, under the leadership of the glorious Russian Leninist Young Communist League. Our young Russian pioneers, besides their social and educative work, accomplish much work in the family. They induce their parents to join the Party, their brothers and sisters to become members of the Young Communist League. Pioneers of the whole world, follow the example set by the Russian comrades, and learn by their experience. You too must win over your parents, brothers, and sisters for the great struggle, for the emancipation and victory of the workers.

Remember that you are to be the worthy followers of your elder brothers, that you must form the reserves for the Young Communist Youth League and for the Party, and that it is only possible to create a real fighting organisation in co-operation with the Young Communist League and under its leadership.

During the International children's week we think of our brothers who have been murdered or thrown into prison, and we send greetings to those still living, promising them to hold out in the struggle.

During this week the young pioneers remember the thousands of comrades working and fighting in other countries.

During this week the whole world will re-echo with the cry:
Form a communist children's union in every country, under the leadership of the Communist Youth!

Go to the masses of worker' and peasants' children!

Found nuclei in all the schools!

Down with child labour and corporal punishment in schools!

Long live the alliance with the millions of pioneers in the Soviet Union!

Against fresh wars, hands off the Soviet Union and China!

Pioneers of all countries! Be prepared for the fight for the revolution and for the victory of the proletariat!

Moscow, 25. July 1925.

**The Executive Committee of the Young Communist
International.**

THE WHITE TERROR

The Police Provocations in Poland.

By R. Albert.

The atrocities being committed in Poland, though arousing less sensation and coming less into the foreground than the atrocities in Bulgaria, are scarcely less horrible. An ominous silence is preserved on the subject. The great news press does not publish one line referring to it.

Chinese walls have been raised between the oppressed peoples by the international bourgeoisie. To the bourgeoisie it is a matter of life and death that the peoples should hear nothing of one another, that the sighs and cries for help out of the prisons of Lemberg or of Lodz should not be heard anywhere. The governments make mutual agreements among themselves, such as are customary among accomplices: "When it is your turn to kill yours off, we shall keep quiet about it, if you say nothing about us." This is their law and order, their civilisation, their peace, their international understanding!

In the course of a single year innumerable ulcers on the body of Poland have broken out. Cruelties are being practised in the Polish prisons which have even called forth a protest signed by Messrs. Herriot and Painlevé among others; this took place a few days before these gentlemen got into the government; upon which they politely withdrew. Poisonous gases were employed against revolutionary workers, who were surrounded and killed, like wild beasts, in the heart of a workers' town. Two communist officers, intended to be exchanged for prisoners in the hands of the Soviet Union, were murdered at the last moment. A youthful worker named Engel, 18 years of age, who had shot down a spy, was executed. And there are so many such "episodes"! We do not know of them all; we do not know anything whatever.

Four communist workers were recently arrested in Warsaw, despite their desperate resistance.

In order that the proletariat of the capital might not be aroused to indignation, the police represented the arrestants to be "bandits". Wounded, lynched by the mob, they were martyred for a long time in hospital. A telegram from Warsaw on 24. July states laconically:

"They will be killed".

We give warning! Four prisoners of class war, fallen into the hands of the Polish police; four comrades wounded by the enemy class, seized upon the field of battle and then martyred; they are still alive, but to-morrow they will be dead if our warning is not heard!

Bandits? A shameful lie! Insurgents? Perhaps! In any case they are sincere comrades, victims of the class war. Their names are of no importance, nor are the details of the affair of any significance. Similar cases occur daily in the Polish republic.

These four comrades, destined to be executed in the prisons of Warsaw, are accused of having conspired against the life of a spy, an agent provocateur. These four victims may be added to the hundreds already sacrificed to the deliberate provocation of the police.

Is it not time that a red hot iron is thrust into this ulcer? Must it not be cauterised in full view of the working people? Poland has become the classic country of police provocation. There is no trade union, no workers' association, no workshop, no office, no secret communist group (communism is outlawed, membership in the Party punished by penal servitude), which has not its denunciators members of the police force who play the rôle of the most active "fellow-fighters" and who beg their fellow workers to take care of the box of bombs "for one night" — the night arranged for the searches! —, who draw up the plans of assassinations, and store bombs on the premises of the labour newspapers, all this of course on the orders of the head of the security police. This actually occurred in Warsaw a few months ago. Such a denunciator is the agent of the demoralised ruling class within the working class, and is the worst — and not always discoverable — enemy of the proletariat. If he is caught, this oily tongued Judas, who calls the workers "comrades", and carries at the same time in his pocket the last thirty pieces of silver which he has received from the police, those whom he has deceived will destroy him as they would a viper.

The majority of the dramas which stain the pavement of the towns of Poland week for week with blood take their rise in struggles between the workers and the agents provocateurs.

The youthful Engel, who has been executed, had fired at a provocateur. The two Dombrova, killed by poisonous gas, had struck down a provocateur. Baginsky and Vieczorkiewicz were killed by a provocateur. The four present victims are to be killed on account of a provocateur. The two alternative possibilities in all these affairs are either that they happen on account of a provocateur, or are committed by one.

The republic of Poland, diseased and condemned to death like the old Russian regime, has inherited from this regime the system of police provocation. The provocation system of the Ochrana (the Czarist secret police), characterised by such personalities as Azev and Malinovsky, leaders of revolutionary parties and at the same time agents provocateurs, has now permeated every stratum of society in Poland.

Police provocation is the favourite weapon of a decaying and demoralised regime, which has sunk so far that it has to resort to the lowest means for preserving its existence. The extraordinary extent to which this system has spread in Poland is a sign of the utterly desperate position of the Polish bourgeoisie. It is high time that the public opinions of the workers of other countries interfere. The workers are only too well aware of the evils arising in every country out of the system of police provocation. The agents provocateurs have thrown themselves in hundreds upon the Polish proletariat, and it is the task of the international proletariat to assist to the utmost of its power the revolutionary proletariat of Poland in its heroic struggle.

From the Lithuanian Torture Chamber.

By A Draugas (Kovno).

The White Terror of the bourgeoisie is raging with special brutality in the Baltic border states. Created by the rapacious dictates of Versailles in order to act as a "barbed wire against Soviet Russia", and to serve as a buffer protecting democratic Western Europe from the attacks of culture-destroying Bolshevism, these republics seek to justify their existence by the most relentless persecution of class-conscious workers and peasants.

This band of truly democratic states extends from White Guardist Finland to executioner-ridden Poland. In these states the working masses are subjected to inhuman sufferings. The history of these republics, though only dating from 1918, is the history of furious White Terror, and of a revolutionary movement advancing forward in spite of everything.

The international proletariat is following with rapt attention the mass murders of proletarian fighters in Estonia, and the war being waged on the proletariat by the bourgeoisie of Poland. But hitherto it has heard but little of the sufferings and tortures undergone by the working people in Lithuania; for it is but seldom that the voice of a fettered class champion can pene-

trate the dark walls of the dungeons in which thousands of Lithuanian workers are languishing. The Lithuanian bourgeoisie treats the workers with the utmost brutality. The catastrophic economic crisis, and the capitalist greed for profit and exploitation, unrestrained by any law, have plunged the workers, the landless peasants, and the small holders into the deepest misery. A ten to twelve hour day, starvation wages, enormous unemployment, and gaols — this is what the "Free Independent Democratic" Republic of Lithuania has to offer its suppressed classes.

There is no thought of freedom for the press. The Communist Party has for years been forced into illegality, and the trade unions, in so far as they attempt to withdraw from the influence of the black clericals, the "Christian Democrats", are being subjected to the severest persecution. The prisons of Lithuania are overcrowded with workers who can only be accused of the "crime" of trade unionist activity. Only recently a meeting of railway workers at Kurschanai was surrounded by a huge force of police, and all the participants were thrown into prison, where they will most likely spend one to two years "on remand" before they are brought up for trial.

The executioners of Lithuania are directing their efforts and exercising their greatest brutality, in combatting the champion of the exploited working masses of Lithuania, the Communist Party. In this struggle the Lithuanian bourgeoisie has contrived to combine the barbaric methods of the Tsarist Ochrana with the highly civilised methods of the West European bourgeoisie.

Although Poland's war against Russia has been at an end for five years, martial law still obtains, signifying nothing more nor less than a dictatorship. Whenever there is an election to the Sejm (Parliament), or the municipalities, the police take the opportunity to arrest the whole of the candidates of the labour party and their speakers. The election of representatives of the proletariat is annulled. An army of spies worms its way into the labour movement, provoking the proletarians into actions enabling them, and above all their leaders, to be delivered up to the police. Those arrested are tortured with the utmost cruelty. (By electric current, driving of wood splinters beneath their finger nails, etc.) A "hearing" invariably means being beaten into unconsciousness. Women are vilely maltreated. A women elementary school teacher was recently driven mad by the inhuman treatment.

At the beginning of September another great trial of communists will be held before the Lithuanian court martial against the members of the communist secret organisation who were discovered and arrested in the spring. At that time over 100 persons were arrested, 50 of whom have now to stand trial. Among these are several women and girls.

The arrested are herded together in narrow and filthy rooms. Here they remain for years, subjected to the basest and meanest treatment. The following notice, published recently by a bourgeois newspaper, tells its own story:

"Lunatics in Kovno gaol. At the present time there are three lunatics in the hospital of the Kovno gaol: a clergyman sentenced to a long term of penal servitude for publishing an anti-religious book; a communist sentenced to seven years' imprisonment, four of which he has already served; and the communist Leibas Bayas, sentenced to death for distributing communist proclamations in the army (at the time of the Reval insurrection), the sentence being commuted to imprisonment for life.

These lunatics are kept in chains."

This is the manner in which the Lithuanian democratic republic tortures its proletariat, its revolutionary peasants and intellectuals...

But the bourgeoisie is making a mistake if it imagines it can suppress the revolutionary movement by means of Terror. Despite all these persecutions and tortures, the working masses of Lithuania will not hold back from the fight. Under the leadership of their Communist Party, however brutally persecuted, the exploited masses of Lithuania are marching forward against this republic of exploitation and torture. They know that the international proletariat and the International Red Aid will support them in their struggle against the capitalist executioners, and will help them to go forward towards a free Soviet Lithuania of workers and peasants.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostle.

By N. Bucharin.

III.

Bolshevist Terror, the "Socialists" and the Masses.

We must now turn to an analysis of the internal political situation of the country, as Kautsky sees it and as it really is. We are, however, first of all compelled to spend a little time upon one or two considerations concerning the terror, for Kautsky has been once and for all flung off the lines by this question and despite all the enlightenment that he has received, he goes back anew to the old arguments which are rotten through and through.

Everyone who is acquainted with the facts knows that the terror in Russia is no longer, so to speak, "upon the order of the day" at all. Its time has passed, for the forces of the people have broken the ring of intervention and raised the blockade. Just as long as Herr Kautsky is unsuccessful in his incitement of foreign capitalism against the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union (this is however, as we shall see later, the chief aim of the mean booklet of Kautsky) so long will there be no terror in Russia. Despite this however, one must answer the "scientific arguments" in this connection also, because on the one hand Kautsky "develops" this argument, and on the other it is easily possible to show by this "development" how absolutely dishonest the author is, and how deep he has sunk into the morass of dirty bourgeois apologetics.

"More than a hundred years ago the feudal-absolutist powers made the commencement (towards an international association. N. B.); the democratic revolutionaries working against them in the various countries felt themselves driven also to an international approachment and sympathy in their struggle against the international reaction. The proletariat then created the first permanent international of a modern character!)"

The "Holy Alliance" was above all an alliance against revolutionary France, which, even after the Thermidor, was a revolutionary country in comparison to the other reactionary states. Revolutionary France was in the literal sense of the words above all, the France of the **Jacobin dictatorship**. The Jacobin dictatorship found its sharpest expression in the **Reign of Terror** which was made necessary by the blockade, the intervention, the war, the conspiracies, the hunger and the general confusion.

But why does Kautsky commence his genealogical table with the revolutionary democrats? Why does he not call for an insurrection against them? Why does he not place himself on the side of the white royalists or the Girondist emigrées who fought with fire and sword against the dictatorship of the Jacobins?

Or perhaps there was no terror in the time of the French Revolution? Or perhaps there was no dictatorship on the part of the Jacobin clubs?

A short time ago the well-known historian of the French Revolution, the "left" bourgeois professor **A. Aulard**, issued a new brochure upon the role of force in this revolution¹⁾. In the preface to the Russian edition the white guardist **Mirkin-Getzevitch** writes as follows:

"Aulard has delivered a lecture upon the theory of the application of force which Moscow seeks to attach to the historical examples of the French terror. The speech of the famous historian, who is it the same time an ideologist of French democracy, develops into a form of programme Aulard

¹⁾ Karl Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia". Page 58.

²⁾ A. Aulard: "The Theory of the Application of Force and the French Revolution". The brochure was immediately issued in the Russian language by the white guardist publishing house, "J. Potolovsky & Co." in Paris, and supplied with a preface by the not-unknown "private university lecturer" **Mirkin-Getzevitch**.

has condemned the application of force chiefly because (stressed by me. N. B.) Moscow, which practices the terror and the application of force, attempts to justify the blood of the Tcheka (In what language is that said, Mr. "private lecturer"? N. B.) with the terror of the Convention".

The "clever" **Mirkin-Getzevitch** has done a service of friendship". The "clever" **Mirkin-Getzevitch** has blurred out the secret of the false "refutations". These refutations are "chiefly necessary because Moscow" etc.

But how is it with the "objective truth" about which — in words — the "unprejudiced investigators" make such a fuss about?

In the Summer of 1793 the Girondists were thrown out of the Convention and the Jacobins became a dictatorial party. On the 5th December there is the Petition of **Chaumette** which declares that the only method of struggle against the rich is the terror.

"Let the Mountain be for France a Sinai! Enough of mildness, we must destroy them or they will destroy us".

Moniteur, XVII., No. 250. Page 521.)

The representatives of the 48 Sections of Paris and of the Jacobin clubs declare:

"Make the terror the order of the day! Let us be on the watch for the revolution, for the counter-revolution is dominant in the camp of our enemies." (Moniteur, XVIII., No. 250. Page 526.)

• Danton:

"The revolutionary tribunal is acting too slowly. An aristocrat and one evil-doer must pay for their crimes with their heads every day." (Moniteur, XVII., No. 250, Page 523.)

Barère:

"The royalists want blood, and so we will give them the blood of the conspirators also... the royalists wish to disturb the work of the Convention! Conspirators! The Convention will disturb your work. You wish to destroy the Mountain. Good, the Mountain will crush you." (Moniteur, XVII., No. 251, Page 531.)

Thereupon the "law upon suspects" was issued and the guillotine commenced to work without ceasing. On the 18th October 1793 the Convention passed a law according to which the revolutionary committees in the provinces were instructed to make known to the arrested the reasons for their arrest. But already on the 24th October this Decree was abolished for, as **Robespierre** said, "it would only have compelled the revolutionary committees to perform useless formalities." (Moniteur, XVII., No. 35. Pages 215—216.)

Of the terrorist decrees **Robespierre** said:

"The revolutionary government supports the good leaders' it only uses the death sentence for the enemies of the people." (Moniteur, XIX., No. 97. Page 51.)

And further:

"Those who call this law tyrannical (Remember the "absolutism" and the "despotism" of Kautsky! N. B.) are stupid sophists or corrupted people... In the ultimate they want only the re-establishment of tyranny and the destruction of the Fatherland." (Moniteur, XIX., No. 97. Page 51.)

Saint Just on the 10th October:

"You must not only punish criminals but also the indifferents. You must punish also those who are inactive in the Republic and who do nothing for it... Justice and love of peace are good means for the friends of freedom, but for its enemies there is nothing but the sword. On must rule with iron when one cannot trule with law." (Moniteur XVIII., No. 23. Page 106³⁾.)

If Kautsky had taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the facts, he would, for instance, have learnt that, according to the Decree of 23 Ventose (13th March 1794), the death sentence was provided for even an attack upon the dignity of

³⁾ We take the quotations from the "Moniteur", as we have not the time to take them from the original source, the works of comrade **R. Awerbuch**: "The Reign of Terror in France in the Years 1793—9." ("Herald of the Communist Academy" 1925, No. 11.) **R. Awerbuch**: "A. Aulard and the Theory of the Application of Force" ("Press and Revolution" 1925, No. 1.), and **Monossov**: "The Application of Force and the French Revolution" ("Under the Banner of Marxism" 1924, Nos. 8 and 9. Russian Edition.)

the Convention; according to the law of the 22nd Prairial, the most extreme terrorist law, all guarantee for the "rights of the accused" at the trial is abolished: The hearing of witnesses, the defence etc. is abolished and the only punishment is the sentence of death, and at the same time the extent of the term crime is extended to its utmost. It is true that this law is already directed against the "left", against the "frenzied" etc. But not to see that the dictatorship of the Jacobins was a terrorist regime of the first water, means, to understand nothing, to consciously refuse to see what must be seen.

The language of the "revolutionary democrats" (sic! N.B.) was, as we have seen, very little like the hisping and counter-revolutionary language of the old "stupid sophist" Kautsky.

In relation to the French Revolution therefore, Kautsky's genealogical table cannot come from the "revolutionary democrats but in the best case from the counter-revolutionary Girondists, not from the "Mountain", but from the "Gironde". That is the first conclusion. Worthy sir, dont mix yourself in the ranks of the great democrats, and keep your hands further away!

In his time, Plechanov, an incomparably more capable man than Kautsky, said prophetically that as soon as it came to a real revolution, then socialism would fall into a "Mountain" and a "Gironde".

Plechanov wrote:

"Actually, the year 1793 is characterised by the embittered struggle of the Mountain against the Gironde. If this struggle of the French revolutionaries did not prevent them from offering good resistance to the common foe, so it means that the unity of the revolutionaries was not a necessary condition for their success. But when one also takes into consideration the fact that the victory of the supporters of the Mountain over the Girondists increased the possibilities of resistance for the revolutionary fraction ten times over and that the reconciliation of these two parties would only have weakened it, then it is clearly to be seen, that in the work of the revolution a good fight is often better than a had peace⁴⁾.

All this was written by Plechanov on the occasion of a speech of Vandervelde upon the necessity for unity amongst the socialists.

The prophesy has fulfilled itself completely. And therefore it was necessary for us to fight against so-called "socialist" parties (in actual fact, counter-revolutionary petty bourgeois organisations) not alone with "ideological weapons".

We must also raise this question, for we shall see soon how Kautsky hesitates, how the unholy counter-revolutionary goes astray in his miserable sophisms, with what criminal carelessness he deals with facts, with what shameful ignorance he approaches questions which mean life or death for the proletarian movement.

His chief argument against us he considers as the persecutions of the "socialists" (that is, the Mensheviks and the S. R's.) and similarly, the terrorist regime as a whole. The "horrors of the Tcheka" and the other similar things, here is the unshakeable basis upon which all the further discussions of Kautsky rest.

"Already since 1903, writes this hero, they have (that is the bolsheviks) quite in the spirit of Netchaiyeff, considered as justified, lies betrayal, violence etc., against their former Party friends (! N. B.). This has increased to a tremendous extent since they have been in power so much so that they have turned machine guns without any hesitation against Social Revolutionaries and against Mensheviks, who formed the majority of the Constituent Assembly⁵⁾."

The bolshevik regime

"is built up upon a forcible repression of the masses and it cannot surrender this use of force. It must rather increase it⁶⁾."

We have therefore conquered power because we have driven out the Mensheviks from the Taurische Palace. These S. R's. and mensheviks however supported themselves upon a majority of the people. We, however, are a band of terrorists who must be wiped from the face of the earth.

Good, in what year was this "greatest act of violence" committed against the Constituent Assembly? Does Kautsky know?

That was in January of the year 1918.

And what does Kautsky write in his brochure on other pages? Let us listen!

We learn for instance upon page 56 that Kautsky and Co. were against foreign intervention (he writes "we") and he gives the reasons for this as follows:

"We rejected this in the beginning of the revolution, because it would have been undertaken by at that time reactionary governments against a regime which was at that time still revolutionary. It meant therefore a war of the reaction against the revolution." (stressed by me N. B.)

On page 48 we read to our surprise the following:

"To-day however, the situation is different than it was in 1920 at the time of the war with Poland, At that time the bolshevik regime in Russia had still masses of workers and peasants enthusiastically behind it. Now (in the year 1925!!! N. B.) it is meeting everywhere with embittered resistance which flares up at every moment in local insurrections" ⁷⁾ 8).

What would however have followed from this (if all the contentions of Kautsky were correct)?

First of all that the epoch of the terror was just the epoch of the "bolshevist enthusiasm" of the "great masses of the workers and peasants". Kautsky pays so little attention to the facts that he doesn't even see how disjointed everything of his is.

When did the "persecutions of the socialists" begin? When the front of the civil war and the intervention began to develop. When did the terror reach its highest point? In the year 1919 when Koltshak was in the Urals and in Siberia, and Yudenitch marched on Petersburg and Denikin on Moscow.

All this was however, before the year 1920 when "great masses of the workers and peasants enthusiastically" supported the bolsheviks.

How did it happen then, honoured renegade, that the enthusiasm for the "hangmen" was greatest when it had shortly before reached its highest point? The answer is clear: it happened because the terror was a weapon of the broad masses of the workers and peasants against the white guards. The terror was a weapon of the revolution in its war of defence against the reaction. With his malice Kautsky has fallen amongst the fools! His readers may judge of this themselves.

Secondly: the intervention, according to Kautsky, was a struggle of the reaction against the revolution. But the "interventionists" supported the Russian generals and others who were fighting against the Red Army of the soviets. That is to say that Kautsky agrees that these generals also are to be counted in with the reaction which was attempting to strangle the revolution. Is that not so?

Now we ask ourselves (and also Kautsky): Had not the "revolution" the right to fight the "armed reaction" with all means, not only with "ideological weapons"?

The answer, it seems, is yes.

But now let us go farther! Is Kautsky aware that the "socialists" were directly in a block with the "interventionists"? We will leave for the moment the mensheviks and their slippery attitude on one side. But is Kautsky aware that the Party of the Social Revolutionaries which had had the greatest number of votes in the Constituent Assembly, so dear to the heart of Kautsky, acted directly in one block both with the foreign states and with the Russian generals? They took money from foreign powers, carried on an armed struggle against the soviet troops in the middle of the troops of the intervention, they were in permanent connection with foreign consulates and arranged on their instructions conspiracies, insurrections and terrorist attempts. All this is proved. Can one deny facts? Did not the social revolutionary Lichatsch sit in the Archangel government? Did not the S. R's of the Volga carry on war with our troops? Did not the S. R. Kaplan fire upon Lenin? Did not the Central Committee of the S. R. prepare also other terrorist attempts? Was it not in connection with Noulens? Did not the S. R. have a white "centre of administration" from which both money and instructions for the armed struggle were issued?

Or will Kautsky say perhaps that the S. R's. fought together with the Red Army against the troops of the reaction? May he attempt this! We challenge Kautsky publicly to quarrel with all these far-reaching and well-known facts.

⁴⁾ "Sarja" ("Dawn") No. 1. Page 231 and following.

⁵⁾ Kautsky Ibid. Pages 14—15.

⁶⁾ Ibid. Page 17.

⁷⁾ Ibid Page 56.

⁸⁾ Ibid. Page 48.

Now however we ask: If in the war of the reaction against the revolution (the formulation of Kautsky himself) the "socialists" who had the power in the Constituent Assembly, fought on the side of the reaction, what should the revolution have done?

It was compelled, honoured sir, to do the same with these "socialists" as the supporters of the "Mountain" did with the Girondists.

In this way proceeded also the party of the "proletarian Jacobins", the party of the bolsheviks.

Kautsky has not merely over leapt himself, but he has shown a tremendous ignorance. As he knows no dates and doesn't know the basic facts, as he has only the spleen of an injured dog in his inkpot, it is naturally difficult for him to produce "scientific arguments".

Now we would like to say a few words upon the general line of the development and the relations between the classes in our country. According to Kautsky it would seem that in the years 1918, 1919 and 1920, great masses of workers and peasants went behind our party and the soviet power, but now however, we have no one behind us and everywhere insurrections are breaking out etc.

Everyone who is only in the least acquainted with the situation in our country will see when he reads these lines of Kautsky what sort of nonsense the sophist Kautsky produces under the appearance of "scientific arguments".

Everyone who is acquainted with the facts knows that it was just the years 1918 and 1919 which were most difficult, because just in those years the peasantry wavered and just in those years there took place insurrections of the type of the Vendée. But nevertheless, both classes in general both workers and peasants, defended with real enthusiasm, barefooted and hungry, the young soviet power against the block of the foreign interventionists and bourgeois, large landowners, generals, cadets and ... "socialist" supporters of the Constituent Assembly.

Everyone who is acquainted with the facts knows that to speak of "insurrections" now shows that one is in no connection with the real life of our country. The proletariat has never had such confidence in our party as it has to-day. The peasantry was never so friendly towards the soviets as it is to-day. The Soviet Government was never so firmly established internally as it is at the present time. And at no time were there so few reprisals as there are in this present span of our life.

If Herr Kautsky would only take the trouble to learn something; if he would examine his sources when taking them; if he would take the trouble to read the great mass of material which is also to be obtained abroad, then he would not be able to create such senseless "legends" with a wave of the hand as he has brought together in the limited space of one small brochure.

We are proceeding ever more quickly to the standpoint of "revolutionary legality". This is by no means an agitational slogan, but an actual political line of our party and of the soviet state which is being carried out in practice. This can be seen by everyone who follows our laws, the judiciary, the campaign at the elections of the soviets etc. Does Kautsky perhaps study the documents, does he go through the books, does he learn to read Russian? Why does he need all that? Such foolishness was only carried out by such Utopians as Marx and Engels who learnt the language of a people which lives "further away from Europe and nearer to the Tartars". The brilliant Kautsky will find other "scientific arguments": well-known S. Rs., mensheviks, "Russian in general", Georgian princes and aristocrats who will always send Kautsky copies of those documents with the same great readiness with which they supply them to the great powers of this world.

There was a time when Kautsky showed great indignation at the bourgeois writers of history who with the greatest zeal slandered the Taborites, the supporters of the "Mountain" and the Levellers. To-day he repeats word for word the same dirty ideological hack-work about the party of the revolutionary proletariat. He charges us with all the deadly sins, including even the nationalisation of women (equally a "scientific argument" upon the basis of some venal police document or the other). And he conceals criminally from his readers all those endless crimes which were committed by the foreign troops, the white guards and the "socialists".

Beginning with the year 1918 Kautsky has written his sickening works against us. Now, afterwards, he speaks of the

bolshevik enthusiasm in the year 1920. But he becomes indignant over the present terror. We will experience that later also here (only later) everything will be said the other way round. For the objective "recognition" of facts is not of any importance to Kautsky. He needs a great mass of mud to throw at the proletarian government. Therefore he is straining all his forces, it seems that the heavens are becoming once again overclouded and he must once again render service to the bourgeoisie. Perhaps the reader does not know that this is also a "Way to Power"?

IV.

Proletariat, State, Party.

The bolsheviks — declares Kautsky — from the beginning made no attempt to let the proletariat free itself, for that it regarded the proletariat as too incapable. The proletariat is only useful as a blind tool of its leaders chosen by Heaven to shepherd it into Paradise.

"The latter expectation has evaporated, but their (the bolsheviks' N. B.) low estimation of the proletariat, their estimation of it as merely cannon fodder for the bolshevik power has remained!"

Let us examine this "thesis" of Kautsky, who, let us say, has the "courage" in his pitiful senility to appear before the whole world.

"Low estimation of the proletariat", "From the beginning (!) the bolsheviks made no attempt to let the proletariat free itself." How much insolence must one have to use this high and mighty tone.

In all probability it is known to the author of the "scientific arguments" that just the bolsheviks in our revolution defended the hegemony of the proletariat from beginning to end. They called this idea into life and maintained it in the middle of unceasing, hard and systematic struggles against the "Girondist" socialists, the "economists" the mensheviks and all forms of the narodniki, above all the S. R.'s.

What was the gravamen of the quarrels between the bolsheviks and the opportunists? It would do no harm to remind Kautsky what it was, for it was none other than he himself in his own person who once wrote a brochure upon the "Driving Forces of the Russian Revolution", in which he came near to the standpoint of the bolsheviks against the mensheviks. Does Kautsky not remember what it was all about then?

We recall it to his memory with very great pleasure, it was about the different relations to the liberal bourgeoisie and at the same time about the different estimation of the role of the proletariat.

What was the essence of the differences? It was this, the mensheviks regarded the proletariat as a force which "pushed forward" their liberal allies, the bolsheviks on the other hand rejected such an estimation of liberalism definitely and regarded the liberal bourgeoisie as a counter-revolutionary force. They were of the opinion that the proletariat did not "push forward" the bourgeoisie, but that it must march at the head of the revolutionary peasantry and struggle against, expose and defeat the bourgeoisie.

It is not necessary to speak of the narodniki who never understood the "historic mission of the proletariat" and only mocked at it.

Who then, oh "scholar" in the image of Gold, underestimated the proletariat? Was it not, and is it not your present colleagues who regarded and regard the proletariat as cannon fodder for the liberal bourgeoisie?

But hold on, that is not yet everything. Kautsky did not only write, as we have seen, the brochure upon the driving forces of the Russian revolution, he also substituted the theory of the coalition government with the bourgeoisie for the theory of Marx upon the proletarian dictatorship.

Kautsky carried out this theoretical treachery against Marxism (which had also tremendous practical results) quite cynically in broad daylight.

"In his famous article: A criticism of the Social Democratic Party Programme, Marx says:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds also to a political transition period which can have none other State but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

1) Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia". Page 25.

"On the basis of the experiences of the last few years in the question of the government, we can to-day vary this paragraph so that we say:

"Between the time of the pure bourgeois and the pure proletarian ruling democratic State lies a period of the transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds also to a political transitional period which as a rule will have as its government a form of coalition government".

Kautsky writes that as a commentary to the new programme of the social democracy in which the one-time marxists have surrendered their positions completely in favour of the open and insolent reformism which is to-day dominant in the ranks of the social democracy.

I consider it necessary to call to mind here what G. W. Plechanov wrote in a commentary upon the programme of the Russian social democracy:

"What has altered since the time when the banner of social progress went from the white hands of the bourgeoisie over to the horny hands of the proletariat? — asks Plechanov — Why has the dictatorship which was useful and necessary in the hands of one class, become useless and unnecessary in the hands of another? All that has altered is the relation of the bourgeoisie to social progress. Formerly they defended it and were full of revolutionary endeavour, to-day they oppose it and fear like fire everything that bears the stamp of such endeavour. Therefore their ideologists who once spoke such beautiful words about the "war of the classes" and upon the revolutionary role of force, now speak flattering words about "social peace" and about the uselessness of a class dictatorship as a "solution of the social question". But "the advice of the enemy is certainly bad". When the defenders of the present order of society and the petty-bourgeois "Marxian critics" fight against the idea of the proletarian dictatorship, they do it just because this dictatorship is a necessary political pre-condition for the social revolution".

The "Marxian critic" Kautsky draws in the proletariat only to link it up with the bourgeoisie and through this linking he wishes to replace the courageous work of the proletarian dictatorship.

When the bolsheviks "from the beginning" declared for the hegemony of the proletariat, that was an "under-estimation" of the working class. When however, the mensheviks put the bridle of the liberal bourgeoisie upon the proletariat, then that is, naturally a "high estimation" of proletarian forces.

When the bolsheviks fought for the proletarian dictatorship, that was an "under-estimation" of the working class.

When however, the mensheviks took up an attitude in favour of the coalition, so this attitude came from a "deep belief" in the power of the proletariat.

When the bolsheviks appealed to the workers for civil war in answer to the imperialist war, they "under-estimated" the independence of the proletariat, they made the proletariat cannon fodder for its leaders.

But when the social democrats appealed to the proletarians to break up into their various nationalities and to go and rot in the trenches to the glory of their bourgeois governments, to cut one another's throats mutually from patriotic motives, oh, then that meant the struggle "for the freedom of the proletariat".

And so on and much more of the same sort.

One could quote such examples a thousand fold. The Party of Kautsky converted, converts and will convert the proletariat into cannon fodder for the bourgeoisie. And therefore it shouts and howls against those who seek to win the proletariat away from the influence of the social democratic traitors. Just the social democratic leader clique follows its own aims: the aim of the suppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. That has been proved up to the hilt by the experiences of the last years from the outbreak of the war up to and including the Zankov terror against the communists.

And after all this the pen does not fall from Kautsky's hand, for he then wrote down the sentence about the under-estimation of the role of the proletariat. What a moral depth is really necessary to be the present-day Karl Kautsky!

²) Kautsky: "The Proletarian Revolution and its Programme", Stuttgart, Dietz, 1922. Page 106.

³) Plechanov: "Commentary upon the Draft Programme of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. Collected Works. Russian. Edition Volume 12. Page 227.

It is just Bolshevism which estimates the proletariat at its highest, "believes" in its mass power, in its creative capacity, in its leading role, in its dictatorship. And it is just the mensheviks of all varieties who lower the proletariat, force it to serve the bourgeoisie, it is just the mensheviks who serve as the "intermediators for the bourgeois influence upon the proletariat". That is the first conclusion.

The bourgeoisie and its police, its spies, its publicists have long ago adopted a "wise" demagogic method: when they see that a party, no matter how small, comes into existence which threatens their rule, they say to the workers: the "Bonzen") want to use you as cannon fodder.

And thus Kautsky also proceeds, the present defender of the holy basis of capitalism, the bard of the League of Nations, the Pindar of English "democracy", the great hater of the bolsheviks.

Let us attempt to analyse this ("scientific" naturally, not a police one — oh God defend us!) argument also.

The question of the general estimation of the proletariat we have already answered, nevertheless Kautsky writes that the bolsheviks "from the beginning made no attempt to let the proletariat free itself".

What does this, at first glance, innocent phrase mean, what is its actual significance?

Must the affair so proceed that the proletariat "frees itself" whilst its party stands upon one side and claps its hands when the proletariat has succeeded "in freeing itself", and cries and mourns should it not succeed.

Must the affair go like this?

Naturally, such a conception would be nonsense. The theoretical error here is that the Party is considered as something apart from the class. The party is represented as a force standing aside somewhere outside the ranks of the class. The party, however, is the advance guard of the class, it is that part of the class the existence of which first changes the proletariat from merely a class into a conscious class. Therefore the formulation which presupposes a "self-freeing" of the working class and which leaves out the active role of the party just in this process, is a stupid and anti-marxist formulation and subject to internal contradictions.

If on the other hand however, the party is not left out of this process, if it is not considered as something apart from the working class, but as an integral part of the working class, then the question arises, what is its role?

To this question, only one answer can be given without leaving the basis of marxism: The role of the party is a leading role, it is the role of the leader.

One would think that that was as clear as daylight. It was also Plechanov (we refer intentionally just to him) who wrote in the commentary on the programme from which we have already quoted previously:

"We have stressed with care and not without "orthodox" intentions the rôle of the social democracy as the **advance guard and at the same time the leader** (stressed by me. N. B.) in our draft. From the standpoint of a correctly understood Marxism that is self-understood. The "critical" confusion however has already spread a haze around this, and in consequence the Russian social democrats of an "economic" tendency have deceived themselves into believing that the duty of the social democracy is not to develop the class consciousness of the proletariat as quickly as possible, but simply to express that which the proletariat has already reached without any help from the side of the "revolutionary bacilli". Unless the social democracy wishes to commit suicide it will never agree to this absurd and shameful role of the fifth wheel".

The "Marxian critic" Kautsky now spreads a thick haze or better still, whole clouds of poison gas around the clear question of the relations between party and class. How does that happen? Very simply.

If the party leads the class, so to a certain extent and in a limited sense, it stands above the rest of the proletariat. On the other hand it is generally known that also the exploiters stand above the proletariat. It is only necessary to put a mark of identity between these two "aboves" and the trick is done. It works out: "Party - exploiters". The bolsheviks stand "both above capital and above the working class" etc. etc.

⁴) Contemptuous German term, for leaders.

⁵) Plechanov: Ibid Page 228.

It is true that one could pass a similar judgment over any party, but upon that point there is silence. It is a question of undermining the significance of the bolsheviki and not of "any party".

The essential solution of the question presents no difficulties at all. The error in the judgment is that the word "above" used in two absolutely different connections, is given exactly the same meaning.

At the grave of Marx, Engels said that humanity was a whole head shorter in consequence of the death of this leader, this genius. In this sense, that is to say, in the sense of his mental advantages Marx stood "above" other people and also above the proletariat. For this reason he was their leader. Only a madman could say however, that this "above" expressed the same relation as that between capitalists and workers. The capitalists form another class to that of the proletariat. The party of the proletariat is a part of the class and its "higher" (leading) role does not express any relation of exploitation, it expresses a leading relation.

It is however understandable that the enemies of the working class aim at the head of the proletariat, at its advance guard: to destroy the advance guard means to behead the class. The class will be incapable of a real class struggle until it "grows" a new head, that is to say until it forms a new revolutionary advance guard, a class party of the proletariat which will lead it.

The question is as clear as crystal if we take not the leaders of the proletariat but the leaders of the bourgeoisie. It occurs to no one for instance to declare that Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Chamberlain exploit the bourgeoisie, oppress it etc. It occurs to no one to write that it is a dictatorship of a party and not a class, it is the dictatorship of Chamberlain and not of the bourgeoisie etc.

In connection with our party however, Messrs Kautsky and Co., advance just this nonsense. Why that is done is another question: because it is very useful to the bourgeoisie.

The class of the proletariat as a whole is not identical with its state organisation as an apparatus, the state organisation (dictatorship) is not identical with the organisation of the party. The party however, leads the state apparatus which on its side represents an extremely broad organisation of the class. Without the leadership of the party, the proletarian dictatorship could also not exist. Without the leadership of the party, the self-freeing of the proletariat is also unthinkable.

Naturally, the situation of the party of the proletariat which is in power is such that there is a permanent danger of a separation from the class, of bureaucratic degeneration, of ossification etc. Our literature deals with this question in a very detailed fashion. Our practice has always regarded as one of its central tasks, the task of the struggle against bureaucracy. Theoretically, a degeneration of a part of our party and its amalgamation with the Nep bourgeoisie and the specialists and the formation of a new capitalist class as the "upstarts" is possible. The mensheviki, the Kautskys etc. urge us to this when they demand a return to a "healthy" capitalism. Our party, however, which maintains its position as the only revolutionary proletarian party in our country, will never agree to that. Kautsky has never taken the trouble nor expressed the wish to examine any data on any field of our social life. That would have been naturally, no "service" to the bourgeoisie. In place of this however, he flings whole loads of inqualified lies and the basest slanders at us.

"Its (bolshevism's N. B.) regime gets into ever and ever greater conflict with the interests of the masses of the people; it is forced ever more and more to rely upon bayonets and hangmen for its support. A small minority which forces the whole state into ever growing misery cannot rule otherwise".

"This regime is to-day not merely an enemy of all non-bolshevist parties, but it has become the most dangerous enemy of the proletariat. The proletariat in Russia remains condemned to helplessness and ignorance".

"The bolsheviki do not spread enlightenment for the proletariat, but depress it to a blind instrument".

The working class of Russia "falls into disappointed and embittered apathy" (all stress by me N. B.).

We have gathered this fragrant bouquet intentionally from the Parnassus of our "critic" so that the toilers of our country

can see into what Kautsky has developed. For our foreign comrades however, even for such who are still in the ranks of the social democracy, we will oppose the empty statements of Kautsky with a number of facts and figures. "Facts are proverbially obstinate things" as Lenin liked to say.

Kautsky contends that the influence of the communists is permanently on the down grade.

The facts show that this influence is ever growing. Kautsky says for instance not a word about the "Leninist recruitment". During the week of the "Leninist recruitment" approximately 200,000 workers and soon after another 55,000 joined the party. Through this the percentage of the shop and factory workers in the Party altered greatly and rose to 40 percent¹⁰⁾. (It may not be forgotten that the great percentage of former workers in the shops who are now party and soviet officials, is not included. Ed.)

In 1925 the number of party members also grew without interruption. According to the statistical reports of the party committees, in the first three months of 1925 the number of members increased by 64,233 and the number of candidates by 41,815. The total number of party members and candidates increased to 850,000, and within this figure the percentage of the worker nucleus grows steadily¹¹⁾.

This is "similar" to the hair raising fairy tale of Kautsky, is it not? This "corroborates" the growing hate of the workers for the communists, the growth of "apathy", of "bitterness" and much more of the same sort, doesn't it?

Let us take the Young Communist League which is directly attached to the Party. We get the following figures:

1922 October (Vth Congress) . . .	206,000	Members
1923 January	303,944	"
1924 January	500,700	"
1925 January	1,140,706	"
1925 April	1,432,608	" ¹²⁾

To-day the membership is already above 1,500,000. Really, a peculiar "apathy". We have before us an unparalleled stormy and extraordinary organisational development. The angry witch-doctor of the social democracy however, shouts at the top of his voice about "apathy". The facts say one thing, Kautsky says the other. So much the worse for the facts, apparently.

Let us turn to the working class children's movement, the movement of the "Young Pioneers" (12 to 16 years. Editor) and the Octabryatin ("October children." Under 12 years. Editor) who develop completely under communist influence and leadership. This movement first began to develop properly in 1924 (1924 was the first year of quick economic development¹³⁾). In January the number of the Young Pioneers was 161,349. In the course of 1924, this number multiplied itself by six—take note of that Herr Kautsky! The movement began also to extend its influence to the village, it forced its way into the uttermost corner of the country, it won a firm footing amongst those peoples who were allowed no form of organisation under the bourgeois regime. Now let us look at the figures for the growth of this movement:

	Number of Children's Groups	Number of Pioneers	Number of October Children
1st January 1924	3,000	161,349	—
1st July 1924	3,704	200,000	—
1st October 1924	12,000	760,000	50,000
1st January 1925	19,814	1,000,032	100,325
1st April 1925	25,866	1,209,519	? ¹³⁾

¹⁰⁾ "The Leninist Recruitment of the R. C. P. Russian Ed 1925. Pages 4 and 5.

¹¹⁾ "Report of the Statistical Department of the Central Committee of the R. C. P. No. 134.

¹²⁾ "The Young Communist League of Russia in Figures" III. Moscow 1925. Page 7.

¹³⁾ "The Communist Children's Movement in Figures." II Series. Moscow 1925.

⁶⁾ Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia", Page 14.

⁷⁾ Ibid. Page 11.

⁸⁾ Ibid. Page 26.

⁹⁾ Ibid. Page 30.

The pioneers have approximately 15,000 wall-newspapers, that is to say, 74 percent of the groups issue newspapers. The percentage of illiterates is 3,2%. (Think of it, this is a country where eight years ago Czarism ruled.)

Do these figures show a picture of "embitterment" and "apathy", a furious struggle against enlightenment, and similar fruits of a sick imagination distorted by senility?

Now what is the situation with the workers trade unions? A long time ago we left the method of automatically organising the working class in the trade unions; as we did during the period of war communism, and went over to the method of individual voluntary membership. Nevertheless, this did not result in a decrease in the numbers of the union membership, on the contrary it resulted in an increase. On the 1st January 1924, the percentage of the entire working class organised in the trade unions was 95,9%¹³⁾.

At the time of the Vth Trade Union Congress, the unions had a total membership of four and a half millions. And the VI Trade Union Congress was able to show an increase in the total membership of 30 percent; the total membership then being over six millions¹⁴⁾.

However, what does the "scientific" Kautsky care about that?

In Russia there has arisen a tremendous network of active and extraordinarily lively nuclei of the so-called "soviet publicity". The work of reconstruction proceeds so quickly, with such an energy that there is a lack of leaders, advisors, helpers. And Kautsky... Kautsky, will he ever grasp anything of all this?

Let us look for instance, at the organisation of the "worker-correspondents" and at the "village-correspondents". Their numbers are also growing at an extremely great speed. There were in:

	Worker- Correspon- dents	Village- Correspon- dents	Total
March 1924	32,570	24,800	57,370
August 1924	43,200	57,500	100,700
December 1924	63,280	79,780	143,060 ¹⁵⁾

This growth is now proceeding at an even greater speed forwards. In connection with this is the appearance of wall-newspapers in the factories, shops, mines etc., and villages. A year ago this number was 3000. To-day it is many tens of thousands¹⁷⁾.

Does Kautsky know that a single edition of our newspapers and magazines is seven and a half millions, that the daily edition of our daily papers is five millions (as compared with two and a half millions before the war). Naturally, he has heard nothing about it.

The societies of workers for promoting culture in the villages, this splendid example of the amalgamation of the culture

¹³⁾ Report of the Central Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union to the VIth Trade Union Congress. Page 13.

¹⁴⁾ "The Tasks of the Trade Union Movement and the National Congress of Trade Unions": An article of Dogadov "Experiences and Perspectives". Page 8.

¹⁵⁾ "Our Press". Moscow. Publishing House of the Journalist Institute. 1925.

¹⁷⁾ Ibid. Page 31. See also the stenographic report of the IInd National Conference of the worker and village-correspondents published in the "Pravda".

of the town and the country — quite a new phenomenon in our daily life — to-day number over a million members. In what other country has the working class recognised its cultural-revolutionary role towards the villages to this extent? Four and a half million members of the Red Aid, two and a half million members of the Association of Friends of the Air Fleet, one and a half million members of the Society for Chemical Progress, and further the masses membership of the "Radio Friends", the "Godless", the "Hands off China", society the Society of Friends of the Children (over a million members) and innumerable other organisations, circles, associations etc. — all this is naturally the sign of a "deep apathy". The peasant Societies for Mutual Assistance, the growing co-operative movement, the soviets with their numerous commissions, the conferences of the non-party workers, the immense role of the Red Army as a school and as a great propaganda centre, the work of the Women's Sections and the organisations connected with them etc. — has the attacker of the soviet power Karl Kautsky an idea of all this?

Thousands of workers' and peasants' children complete their studies for the first time in history in the higher schools. But what does Kautsky, the renegade socialist, know about that?

The present period of the development of our country is a period of immense and intense organisational work: from below tremendous masses are raising themselves slowly, they are learning, sometimes they overstrain their strength; they learn at work, they learn in the party, they learn from the great experience of life. Naturally, our inheritance from barbarism was so unlimited, the illiteracy was so hopeless, the destruction caused by the wars, the blockade, the intervention was so tremendously great that we cannot drag ourselves from the morass with one movement. And the process of progress does not go on without internal conflicts. We develop, we grow amidst contradictions. But we are growing! Our class is growing, the class which has become the leader of society. Innumerable organisations group themselves around the co-operatives, the trade unions, the youth organisations, the soviets, the party. In various combinations amongst themselves, in various relations they are building up the new society and forcing the old forms step by step, to give way: in politics, in culture, in science, in daily life. And all this organisation is bound together by the unity of the will of the advance guard of the working class, our great (great, Herr Kautsky!) Party.

There has never existed a state form which widened the boundaries of real democracy for the toilers, that is to say, which really drew the toilers into the process of social construction, like the soviet state form. And there never existed such a tremendous concentrated force which has led the masses forward with such a tremendous swing, which has awakened them, as our party.

We can see our short-comings very clearly. We can see also however, how the human avalanche moves forward. And we know that our party has contributed something to this great historical process.

Correction.

In the report of the Agitprop Conference in No. 58 of the Inprecorr. Comrade Bell is reported as saying that "since its institution the 'Sunday Worker' has reached a total number of 250,000". Comrade Bell writes us that this is incorrect. What he said was, "there had been a print of the first edition of 100,000 copies, but that from orders that were coming in it would appear that there would be a print of 250,000 copies next edition".

The "Sunday Worker" is, of course, not an organ of the Communist Party but represents a section of the Left Wing in the English Labour movement.