

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 67

27th 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

G. Valetzki: The 21 Points of the Second International.

Hands off China

Tang Shin She: The Working Class as the Leader of the Chinese Struggle for Freedom.

Politics

Imperialism and Labour.

J. B.: The Revolt in Syria.

R. Loyal: The International Prison Congress.

The Balkans

P. F.: From the Torture Chambers of Roumania.

The Labour Movement

Karolski: The Approaching big Struggles in Poland.

The Youth Movement

The XI. International Youth Day.

The White Terror

Down with the Confederates of the Polish Hangmen!

Our Martyrs

Anton Maroun.

The Peasant Movement

Get Hold of the Agricultural Co-Operatives!

The Negro Movement

Lovett Fort-Whiteman: American Negro Labour Congress.

Enlarged Executive

Convocation of the Enlarged Executive Committee for the Late Autumn.

In the Camp of Our Enemies

N. Bucharin: The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostle. V. Conclusion. VI. and VII.

The 21 Points of the Second International.

By G. Valetzki.

In the following article, which is conceived upon the basis of the statutes, the resolutions and the discussions at the Foundation Congress of the Labour and Socialist International in Hamburg, as well as on the basis of the resolutions and discussions which have taken place in the course of the years 1923 to 1925, I desire to give a complete picture of that mental and political capital which the leaders of the II. International are exhibiting at the Marseilles Congress. G. V.

1. In the Labour and Socialist International (L. S. I.) socialist labour parties, are united, which see the aim of the emancipation of the working class in the substitution of the capitalist system of production by the socialist system of production. In view, however, of the fact that the opinions of the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. regarding what is the capitalist and what is the socialist system of production are very sharply divergent, and also in view of the fact that every attempt to alter the existing system of production would cause fresh disturbances of production, which has already without this been brought into

disorder by the consequences of the war and by the revolutionary excesses, it is the highest duty of all socialist parties to support, in every possible manner, every effort in the interest of the reconstruction of capitalist production. In this the socialist parties must never forget for a minute that, in promoting the reconstruction of capitalism, they have only in view the interests of the working class, of the widows and orphans, and that the approaching socialist order must inherit from its predecessor not blood-soaked ruins, but flourishing economic life.

2. The class war serves as a means for the emancipation of the working class. The class war is a sociological theory, a scientific hypothesis, which seeks to explain the Past and the Present by the conflict between the constituent parts of human society. In the civilised countries the class struggle assumes the form of periodically occurring parliamentary elections.

3. The employment of force in the social and political struggle is emphatically condemned. Force is still employed now and again by the bourgeoisie, who, unfortunately, are too often moved to do so by excesses on the part of irresponsible elements. In acting in this manner the bourgeoisie only compromises

itself in the eyes of the whole civilised world. The working class, as the bearer of the great ideals of the future, must not soil its hands by acts of violence. Its best weapon in the struggle against the acts of violence of its bourgeois opponents is moral indignation. (In exceptional cases the social democracy can be compelled to appeal to force in order to avert a greater evil, as, for example, for the purpose of suppressing mutinies of criminal "left" elements, who could provoke the bourgeoisie to cruel reprisals).

4. **Democracy is the best form of State.** Universal suffrage with the secret ballot and the various election campaigns — in which every party endeavours to convince, with the help of arguments and reasons, the non-party masses of electors of the correctness of its election programme — leads to the election of a representative body of the people which faithfully reflects the thoughts, feelings and the will of the electors. The education of every inhabitant of every country to such a democracy is the task of the parties affiliated to the L. S. I.

5. A difficult problem is the question of the **participation of socialists in coalition governments.** This question is difficult because, on the one hand, old prejudices against such participation still make themselves felt, while on the other hand the experiences of the last few years have, apparently, not shown those brilliant results which might have been expected from the self-sacrificing activity of socialist ministers.

The L. S. I. therefore declares the problem of ministerialism to be an **open problem.**

In accordance therewith the L. S. I., as the central organisation, would, in the event of the social democracy in this or that country being offered the possibility of participating in a coalition government, adopt a neutral attitude to the matter and tolerate it. It only demands that nobody should act in the capacity of a minister and at the same time in the capacity of a member of the Executive of the L. S. I., and that a Party which allies itself with a bourgeois government by sending a portion of its leaders into the government, should remain connected with the Executive of the L. S. I. by sending other leaders into the Executive. It must be declared with all emphasis, however, that this decision can in no way be regarded as an anticipation of the solution of the coalition problem, but only constitutes a **practical measure**, by means of which the Executive Committee defines the limits of the problem of ministerialism.

6. Another complicated and difficult problem is the problem of the **defence of native country.** This is likewise declared to be an **open problem** for the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. The socialdemocratic parties are called upon to study carefully the rich and many-sided experiences of the last world war, so that it will be possible, in the future, to discuss these experiences at one of the international congresses. Should, in the meantime, one or the other parties be faced with the dilemma whether it should or should not defend its fatherland, then it will, on its **own responsibility and danger**, have to arrive at a decision without involving the whole International in the affair, which in this manner enriches itself by a new experience regarding the solution of this delicate question.

7. The decisions of the L. S. I. in international questions are **binding** upon all affiliated parties. This means a voluntary limitation of the independence of the individual parties. Should it transpire, however, that one or the other of the international questions which stand upon the agenda is so complicated and full of contradictions, that the L. S. I. has little prospect of carrying through an unambiguous decision by all the interested parties, then it is expedient to **postpone** the drawing up of decisions, for the purpose of an extended study of the material, or to formulate the decision in such a cautious and elastic manner that one cannot violate it, even with the best will in the world. In extreme cases, those parties which are compelled by circumstances to actions which are diametrically opposed to the decisions already arrived at by the L. S. I. can be allowed to withdraw temporarily from the L. S. I., in order not to place the L. S. I. in an embarrassing situation.

8. The L. S. I. is an instrument, not only for the tasks of peace but in a like measure is also an instrument **during every war.** In view of the fact, however, that in every war at least **two native countries** are engaged in conflict with one another, and that the problem of the defence of native country could not yet be solved, the final solution of the question as to how the L. S. I. shall be employed as an instrument in war time,

will only relate to wars which arise after the solution of this problem.

9. **Wars in general are to be avoided.** War means the employment of force which, both in home as well as in foreign policy, cannot result in any good and is therefore to be condemned. The L. S. I. must unceasingly remind the **whole of humanity**, but in particular the interested governments and the **financial groups** standing behind them, that it is much more practical by means of conferences to arrive at an understanding regarding every kind of disputed question, than to conduct wars. It is the task of the L. S. I. and the parties affiliated to it to act as disinterested and self-sacrificing mediators between the hostile parties, to prepare every sort of agreement between them, even if it involves **temporary damage** to the interests of the working classes of both states or groups of States. There is **nothing worse than war.** The sacred hate against war is so strong in the L. S. I., that from time to time it assumes the form of plans for a **general strike in the event of a declaration of war**, whereby it must not be forgotten that such a strike, desirable as it may be, is **impossible.**

10. There can be several parties in one State who are affiliated to the L. S. I. They can carry on the most **bitter political struggle** against each other, under the sole condition, that they carry out the **general political line** of the L. S. I. Should it happen that one of these parties takes part in the government of its country, and passes penal laws against another party which is also affiliated to the L. S. I., then it is the duty of the Executive Committee of the L. S. I., to send a **commission** to this country in order to **study all details of the problem on the spot** and, so far as it is possible, to endeavour to bring both parties to adopt a **compromise resolution.**

11. For the mutual information of the parties affiliated to the L. S. I., the Executive Committee will issue a **weekly bulletin**, containing material which in principle is intended for the organs of the affiliated parties. Nevertheless the various party editors are justified in publishing some facts in an **abbreviated or altered form**, or in **suppressing** them altogether, if an action or a publication would be inconvenient from the point of view of the interests of the party or of the country concerned, or if the **prestige and the inner unity** of the L. S. I. as a central organisation would suffer by their publication.

12. Although the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. must, in the interest of their own country, attentively follow what is proceeding in other States of the world, they must devote special attention to that State known as the **Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.** The social democratic parties, on the ground of the general principle of non-intervention in foreign affairs, repudiate every interference on the part of their governments, particularly the very expensive and futile **armed intervention**, in the inner affairs of this State. On the contrary, they will demand the recognition by their governments of the Soviet Union, not only de facto but also de jure, as this, in general, is the **best means of defending the interests of their fellow citizens who are residing in that State** and also opens up the way for a **peaceful civilising influence** upon this country. The peaceful policy of the social democratic parties towards the Soviet Union is based upon the thesis that this State is governed by a handful of adventurers, who have robbed the workers and peasants of all human rights; that it is an imperialist State which desires to conquer by force all the free nations of the world; that for this purpose it has set up the blood-thirsty Red Army, the chief hindrance to general disarmament; that this State obstinately refuses to enter into the League of Nations, which, although in an imperfect form, embodies the principle of the equality and fraternity of the peoples; that finally, it regards it as its highest aim to weaken the labour movement in all countries of the world in order to further the reconstruction and the strengthening of capitalism. In view of this it is the sacred duty of the L. S. I. and all parties affiliated to it, to **support morally and financially** those Russian parties which are striving with all means to **overthrow the government of this country** and after its overthrow to set up the empire of sound, flourishing, and, for the time being, still capitalist democracy. The question whether **armed revolt is the most expedient means** for achieving this aim remains an open one, although, while at the same time maintaining the deepest repugnance towards the employment of force in general, it would be absurd to reject the armed revolt in principle, in so far as it should prove **unavoidable.** The question of the expediency of the the defeat of the Soviet Power in a

foreign war as a means for the overthrow of this power also remains open. The choice between this or that form of indirect furtherance of a change of regime in the Soviet Union (while at the same time fully maintaining the principle of non-intervention) will be rendered by each of the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. dependent upon which policy best corresponds to the interests of its own native country at the given moment.

13. There is another country to which the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. must give special attention i. e. to **Georgia**. This country, which in an embittered struggle against all the imperialist powers of the world had gained its complete independence and had defended this independence under the protection of the most democratic and noble Great Britain, was conquered by force by the Northern barbarians and forced to bow beneath a yoke more horrible than any known in history. The liberation of this country from the Bolshevik yoke constitutes one of the chief aims of the L. S. I. Every true social democrat has two native countries: his own and **Georgia**.

14. The Communists must be combatted with all available means. The L. S. I. will only be capable of coping with those historical tasks, for the fulfillment of which it has been established, to the extent to which it succeeds in promoting the destruction of communism. It is necessary to abandon the illusion that Communism can be overcome by mental means, as it is not in the least rooted in the masses, but only constitutes a product of the activity of millions of agents, who are well paid by a foreign great power. The Communists are endeavouring to set up a cruel dictatorship in the place of the wonderful achievements of democracy, in the place of the empire of liberty, fraternity and equality. Communism scorns the right of self-determination of the proletariat, it treads underfoot the will of the working masses, in order to bend them beneath the yoke of a handful of leaders who are greedy for power.

15. The united front with the Communists must not be permitted in any circumstances. The parties affiliated to the L. S. I. are allowed to form a united front with all bourgeois parties of their country in order to preserve the interests of the nation as a whole, particularly against the foreign enemy, or with some of the bourgeois parties, in order to defend democracy or the Republic. The common front of all classes of the nation is also necessary in the struggle for increasing the economic power of the country by means of increased output on the part of labour etc. The united front with the communists is inadmissible: firstly, because this presupposes participation either in an inopportune struggle, or in an opportune struggle but conducted with dangerous and undesirable means; secondly, because the alliance of social democratic workers with Communists involves great danger of infection, in the same way as does all illicit sexual intercourse; thirdly, because the Communists are professional splitters of the working class and enemies of the solidarity of labour. The tactics of the united front on the part of the communists is, according to their own declarations, only a manoeuvre for the purpose of exposing and annihilating the social democratic leaders. The leaders of the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. must neither be exposed nor annihilated.

16. The L. S. I. perceives in the unity of the trade union movement represented in the I. F. T. U. (Amsterdam) the necessary condition for the successful carrying out of the class struggle. In order to preserve this unity, it is necessary, systematically, to expel all those elements from the trade unions whom the leaders of the trade union movement regard as dangerous elements which threaten unity. The splitting of the trade unions is a more useful means of achieving unity than unity with the doubtful advocates of unity. In particular, the idea of an amalgamation of the I. F. T. U. with the R. I. L. U. — the greatest danger which ever threatened the working class of all countries — must be repudiated with all energy for the reasons quoted in point 15 (on the united front) and in point 12 (on the Soviet Union).

17. The Versailles Treaty must be improved, extended, and developed. Like everything fashioned by human hands, the Treaty of Versailles has its light and dark sides. It is the task of the L. S. I. to strengthen the light sides and to weaken the dark sides, but in no circumstances must the Treaty itself be abolished, as it is far easier to destroy than to create. The best extension of the Versailles Treaty would be a "protocol", which recognises all the national frontiers laid down by this Treaty, and which would morally and legally bind all the States to submit to courts of arbitration and to disarm. In view of the fact, however, that some States are not inclined to do this, and already reject the

"Geneva" Protocol, a number of guarantee treaties must be concluded, each of which must, where possible be based upon the principle of justice and shall under no circumstances threaten peace. The greatest danger to peace would arise when any power (for example the Soviet Union), should endeavour to persuade the powers bound by the Guarantee Pact on the basis of the Versailles Treaty, that this guarantee Pact is directed against it: they would finally be able to believe this.

The League of Nations is imperfect. It does not constitute the realisation of the old slogan: "proletarians of all countries, unite!", but it is without doubt a serious step in this direction. The League of Nations, just as its foundation, the Versailles Treaty, must still be improved in the spirit of democracy and justice. Among others those powers who are still opposing it: disarmed Germany and the Soviet Union, which is doomed to decay, must be brought into it; should the last-named power not be inclined to this, then it must itself bear the responsibility for the consequences. The L. S. I. regards itself as a social democratic fraction within the League of Nations, in which it will work with the same means of persuasion with which the social democratic fractions work in the parliaments and coalition governments to influence the state apparatus of their countries.

18. The L. S. I. loudly declares before the whole world, that the German people is bound to pay reparations, and that the Dawes Plan adopted in 1924, in spite of its shortcomings, which accompany every work which has not been fashioned by god, possesses great advantages. It is the task of the L. S. I. to reduce, where possible, the shortcomings and to strengthen the advantages.

19. The colonial peoples are neither to be exploited nor suppressed by the metropolises. On the contrary, it is the duty of the civilised governments of the metropolises gradually to educate these people, who stand upon a lower cultural level and in part are still perfectly savage peoples, so that in time they will become ripe for self-government. The Parties affiliated to the L. S. I. must, on their part, gradually educate their governments in this spirit. The attempts, forcibly to drive the representatives of civilisation and of culture out of the colonies and out of the Asiatic and semi-colonial countries by means of strike boycotts, armed conspiracies, revolts etc. constitute a great misfortune for the international working class, who, while sincerely sympathising with the awakening of the savages, are fearful of the terrible consequences of fresh upheavals and wars. To incite the inexperienced colonial masses to such acts is a crime. The L. S. I., whose activity is based on the idea of international solidarity and which opposes every nationalism except that which defends itself, is pledged to combat with special energy the Asiatic and African nationalism of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

20. The women's question is a difficult question. It is necessary to study this question honestly from all sides and to place this question upon the agenda of one of the next congresses, as about the half of the population of the earth consists of women. As a proof of the complexity of the women's question, can be mentioned the necessity with which some of the parties affiliated to the L. S. I. (as for examples the Belgian and French parties) saw themselves confronted of opposing the enfranchisement of women, but which however must in no way be regarded as a precedent which in any way runs counter to the unshakable principle of the equality of women.

21. A general amnesty is declared. It is strictly forbidden to rake up details from the past of the parties at present affiliated to the L. S. I., and in particular of their various leaders. It is forbidden to make use of the words "Scheidemann", "Noske" or "Vandervelde" as terms of abuse. It is forbidden to use expressions towards the II. International — which arose after the war and which, in Hamburg, concluded a perfectly legal marriage with the 2½ International — such expressions as "a lady with a past", as happened at a labour Conference in England, at the time of the world Congress in Hamburg. It is likewise strictly forbidden to remind people of the fact that only recently the leaders of the 2½ International, imitating the Communists, made use of the most abusive expressions regarding the heroic leaders of the II. International. The past is passed. An amnesty is granted to: the Barmat social democrats in Germany; the Hungarian social democrats, who indiscreetly signed a pact with Horthy, although such a pact should only be concluded by word of mouth; the Bulgarian social democrats, who supported Zankov much too openly; the Polish social democrats, who are far too clumsy in concealing their direct connections with the secret

police, and all other social democratic parties who have made difficulties for the L. S. I.

In order to assure the correct development of the new L. S. I., similar amnesty decrees will also be issued periodically in the future.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Working Class as the Leader of the Chinese Struggle for Freedom.

(The Blood Bath of Tientsin a further Proof of this.)

By Tang Shin She.

Who will have the leadership in the event of a Chinese national revolution? This question has played a great role ever since the commencement of the present struggle for freedom, just as this was the case in Russia before October 1905. It was only possible to raise this question because up to now in China the class antagonisms had not made themselves very much apparent. A national revolution always bears a bourgeois character; but in the midst of present-day world capitalism, which has already developed to its highest stage, to imperialism, the young Chinese bourgeoisie cannot achieve merely a national revolution. It has been said on the other hand that the national revolution is no the affair of the working class, and that the latter, owing to the fact of its weakness, would be unable to undertake the leadership.

The Chinese communists have declared right from the outset, that the working class must take part in the national revolution, because national liberation from the domination of foreign imperialism must precede the emancipation of the proletariat. Even if the working class is weak, it can nevertheless, in relation to the Chinese bourgeoisie, be regarded as a considerable force. Hence, only the working class in China can take over the leadership of the national revolution. How right the Communists were in their view has been proved by the recent events in China.

It is necessary to call to mind the reasons for the outbreak of the present struggle for freedom. Already in February of this year there commenced in Shanghai the strike of the textile workers against the foreign imperialists, and which was followed in April by the strike in Tsingtao. On the 15th of May the Japanese carried out a blood bath among the Chinese working class in Shanghai, and on the 23rd of May the Chinese feudal military leaders, at the command of the Japanese, did the same thing in Tsingtao. This was followed by the shooting down of Chinese on the part of the English in Shanghai on the 30th of May. It is therefore quite clear that the present struggles for freedom were commenced, and will be continued, by the working class. The bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie have been compelled to fight under the flag of national revolution, for the emancipation of the Chinese people from foreign rule.

But every day the counter-revolutionary character of the Chinese bourgeoisie becomes more and more apparent. They declared at first that the area of struggle must be limited to Shanghai, and that there also the fight should only be directed against the English police in the foreign quarter of the town. The workers, however, extended the strikes so that today the movement already extends right through the lower Yang-tze valley from Shanghai to the upper Yang-tze at Sz-chuen, through the Hoang-Ho up to Honan, and through the Che-kiang district to Canton and Hongkong. Meanwhile the bourgeois have again opened their shops and offices in Shanghai, which amounts to a sabotage of the struggle for freedom. The working class, driven by necessity, agreed to the re-opening of the shops and offices, but on condition that the English and Japanese were boycotted. Thereupon the bourgeois came forward with the argument that English trade in China only amounts altogether to 1%, and that the Chinese merchants, by boycotting the English, would do more damage to themselves than to the latter. As a matter of fact the boycott can only be carried out under the control of the workers and by the strike of the seamen and transport workers.

Now the bourgeoisie is quite openly appealing for support to the tools of the imperialists, the Chinese military rulers. Chang Tso-Lin in particular is fulfilling with the greatest care these instructions to suppress the strikes and dissolve the fighting organisations. At the end of July he caused numerous fighting

groups to be dissolved in Shanghai and Tientsin, and in Mukden even the group of the Kuomintang.

The imperialists in China are making use of every means in order to crush the struggle for freedom. Although they all stand in one united front against the Chinese, they are attempting, one in this way and another in that, to suppress the movement for freedom. The English are proceeding with the most brutal means, whilst the Japanese, who were the main originators of the unrest, are attempting to cast all blame from themselves and to win the sympathies of the Chinese.

The Chinese bourgeoisie, the tool of the imperialists, at the instigation of the Japanese, is only opposing the English. The workers called a meeting for the 30th June in Peking in which a resolution was adopted condemning the action of the bourgeoisie. The workers are demanding a fight against the English and Japanese imperialists, and not against one party only. Thereupon, on the 18th of July, the bourgeois convened a meeting in Peking, which again opposed the demands of the workers and only proposed the boycott of the English. The result of this was a collision, regarding which the bourgeois papers naturally reported that the people with the red flags were the cause of the disorders.

On the same day the Communists issued the slogan: "fight against the tool of the Japanese and against the betrayer of the people, Chang Tso-Lin", and put forward the following demands:

1. Abolition of the unequal treaties.
2. Disarming of the military rulers who do not wish to fight against the imperialists.
3. Guarantee of freedom of speech and press, and right of combination.
4. Abolition of the unequal treatment of women in the juridical, political and economic sphere.
5. Abolition of the Likien system and other taxes.
6. Fixing of a maximum amount of landed property which can be held; any landowner possessing more than this quantity must give the same to the poor peasants and small holders; establishment of a maximum rent for land; abolition of the present custom of paying taxes on land several years in advance.
7. Unrestricted freedom for trade unions, right of strike for the workers; establishment of a minimum wage according to prices of food; legislation for the protection of labour.
8. The right of the workers and peasants to possess arms for their own defence.
9. Deposit of a definite sum in a bank for educational purposes.
10. Convocation of a real National Assembly.

These demands represent the new fighting programme of the Communists for the national revolution. The last horrible blood bath which took place on the 12th of August in Tientsin was the first onslaught on the part of Chang Tso-Lin and his crew in the struggle against the Chinese proletariat. The workers in Tientsin have again turned against the Japanese and against Chang Tso-Lin. The answer was the blood bath. Tientsin is known to be the headquarters of Chang Tso-Lin in inner Shanhai-Kwan. When Chang Tso-Lin left Tientsin on 20th of July, he did it mainly as a result of the slogans issued by the Communists on the 18th of July. The dissolution of the fighting organisations in the different districts of China and the prohibition of the Kuomintang in Mukden mentioned above — all this took place after the 18th of July. Shanghai, Tientsin and Tsingtao are the most important industrial centres in China. In Shanghai there are Chinese, Japanese and English textile factories. In Tsingtao they are mainly in the hands of the Japanese, and in Tientsin these factories are, for the greater part, owned jointly by Japanese and Chinese. As regards the Chinese proprietors, the only difference is that the Chinese factories in Shanghai are mostly in the hands of the bourgeoisie, while those in Tientsin are in the hands of the military rulers. In most cases the textile factories in Tientsin belong to members of the party of that military ruler who exercises the greatest power in the locality. Previously they belonged, for the greater part to the Chihli people (the Party of Wu-Pi-Fu), today to the Aufuists (Tuan She Sui Party) and Chang Tso-Lin. The factories of Tientsin are, therefore, to be regarded not only as economic factors, but also as political and personal-political factors. Hence, the oppression of the workers is particularly brutal. In Tientsin there are, in all, nine textile companies with 400,000 spindles and 20,000 workers.

The facts given above enable us to judge for ourselves in whose hands lies the leadership of the national revolution. Not only can the bourgeoisie not take over the leadership itself, but it is already counter-revolutionary; it is the faithful henchman of the imperialists. To-day only the petty bourgeois and the peasantry and the students who have sprung from the peasantry can take part in the fight, and then only as the auxiliary forces of the workers.

POLITICS

Imperialism and Labour.

An Appeal to the British Proletariat.

In his recent statement in the House of Lords the Secretary of State for India has outlined a policy of strong hand. The gist of his speech is: India was conquered by the sword and will be ruled by the sword. The Indian Nation shall remain in the present state of tutelage for an indefinite period. Even the paltry administrative reforms grudgingly promised in the Government of India Act 1919 (Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms) shall be held in abeyance until every resistance to British absolutism has ceased. 320 millions of human beings, not in a state of barbarism, possessing as high a level of culture as could be attained in spite of a long period of foreign domination, and counting among their leaders not a few eminent men of letters, science and politics, are treated as so many dumb driven cattle. It is not for them to decide how they shall progress. They must act like good school boys to induce their British overlords to grant them constitutional promotion some time in the future.

Lord Birkenhead, however, has said nothing new. He has only recapitulated the traditional politics of British Imperialism in India. Nor has he spoken in behalf of any particular party. He was the spokesman of the British bourgeoisie and their henchmen in the Labour Movement. After Lord Birkenhead had been heard, the motion for papers was withdrawn by Lord Olivier. Obviously, the latter, as the spokesman of the Labour Party in the Upper House, was convinced that there could not be any question of constitutional reform for India. In the subsequent House of Commons debate the Labour Party did not express any more disagreement with the Government's Indian policy as stated by Lord Birkenhead, than did the Liberals. In view of this situation, Lord Birkenhead was quite justified in glorifying the politics of die-hard Imperialism as a "National Policy". This he did in a speech at Dorset. He said: "The policy of the Government in relation to India, was accepted without question, almost without criticism, in the House of Commons. Col. Wedgwood and Mr. MacDonald accepted the broad principles upon which my speech has been framed. Therefore, I can say to my Indian critics that that which I said in the House of Lords represents not only the considered policy of a party, but the considered and deliberate judgment of all parties in the British nation." (Italics are ours).

This is indeed a grave charge which calls for a reply from the Labour Movement. The attitude of the leaders has certainly committed the Labour Party to the support of a policy of strong hand in India.

Now, what are the "broad principles" of Lord Birkenhead, accepted by Col. Wedgwood and Mr. MacDonald in behalf of the Labour Party? They are the following:

1. No further constitutional reforms can be granted to India in the near future. No such step can even be contemplated just now;

2. "One constitution or another might, at one time or another, be attempted." "An amendment here or an advance or a variation there" can eventually be made. But no guarantee can be given that the undertaking of the Montagu Act will be acted upon — that a constitutional advance will be granted in 1929 as promised in the above act of parliament;

3. Britain cannot be "diverted from her high obligations" in India by the "tactics of restless impatience" on the part of the Indian nationalists;

4. The Indians must give up all resistance to foreign domination, and meekly do the bidding of the British masters who, as it were, are providentially anointed to decide what is good and what is bad for the Indian people;

5. The policy of repression carried on by the Government of India and several provincial Governments during the last years,

is justifiable. To override the wishes of the legitimately elected members of the Legislatures is not a violation of the Constitution;

6. The bankrupt and clumsy system of dyarchy, the prerogative of the Vice-roy to override the verdict of the Legislative Assembly, the right of Provincial Governors to dissolve the Legislative Councils whenever the latter become untractable, the right of the Executive to hold people indefinitely in jail without trial, the Criminal Laws Amendment Act (practically a civil version of martial law), the Bengal Ordinance and many other similar administrative and judicial monstrosities shall remain in force;

7. Even such partial demands as "the Indianization of the Public Services", "Indianization of the Army", "Provincial Autonomy" etc. shall not be granted;

8. The standard, by which India's fitness for self-government will be measured, is the unconditional readiness of the Indian people to cooperate with the existing system of government;

9. The people of India is denied the right of self-determination; British Imperialism usurps the right to determine the future political status of the Indian Nation;

10. The moment for the withdrawal of the British forces from India cannot be foreseen. British domination in India is permanent. No moment can be discerned in "any foreseeable future" when (to quote Lord Birkenhead) we may safely, either to ourselves or to India, abandon our trust."

These "broad principles" hardly require any commentary. They are the principles of Imperialism, thinly embellished by such hypocritical doctrines as "civilising Mission", "White Man's Burden", etc. It is not necessary to explain why the British bourgeoisie are determined to hold India in subjection. India is not a "sacred trust" — she is an invaluable asset. But what is beyond comprehension is how people pretending to speak in behalf of the British proletariat can subscribe to these principles.

Let us see if it is to the interest of the British working class to support Imperialism — how the continued subjugation of the Indian people will react upon the living conditions of the British proletariat.

Apart from important political and military reasons, India is of three-fold economic value to the British bourgeoisie. She is a source of raw materials and food; she provides a market for British manufactures that has unlimited possibilities; and she offers lucrative investment for British capital. Although, looked at from the viewpoint of class-antagonism, it can always be maintained that that which strengthens the position of the capitalist, is detrimental to the interests of the working class, the first two of these three economic factors did in the beginning react favourably upon the conditions of the British proletariat. In other words, easy and abundant spoils derived from colonial expansion enabled the British bourgeoisie to permit the proletariat at home a relatively high standard of living. This apparent economic advantage, coupled with the services of the corrupted labour aristocracy, created in the British proletariat a naive love for the Empire. Glittering gilt hid the real significance of the chain.

The situation, however, has changed. Gone are the days when the proletariat at home could even derive from colonial exploitation an indirect benefit of very questionable value to their class. The change begun in the normal course of capitalist development has been greatly accentuated by the consequences of the Great World War, which in itself, was brought about partly by the scramble over the colonial spoils. If the total loss caused by the war and its consequences to the European working class in terms of the millions of lives lost, of multitudes mutilated, of chronic unemployment and the resultant destitution, is computed, it will more than over-balance the slight advantage gained in the standard of living during the preceding period. Today colonial possession does not bring any benefit to the metropolitan proletariat as a whole. The capitalists are the sole beneficiaries. The cheap labour of the colonial coolie enables them to break down the resistance of the working class at home. By exporting capital to the colonies they can, temporarily, survive the permanent industrial crisis at home. The only remaining share of the metropolitan proletariat in the colonial exploitation is the unemployment dole which corrupts and demoralizes a considerable section of the working class. So long as British capital can hire more than ten men in India with the wages of one man at home, it will be in a position to maintain an army of unemployed as a standing menace to those at work — as a sinister weapon to oblige the entire proletariat to accept a steadily declining standard of living.

India is no longer an exclusive agricultural reserve of and monopoly market for the British industries. She has become a competitor in production, and her markets are assailed from all sides — particularly by Japan, America, Germany, and Belgium. This new situation forces upon British Imperialism a new policy — to transform India into a centre of production. The consequence of this new policy shatters the imperialist doctrine on which the British working class have been fed by the bourgeoisie and their allies in the Labour Movement. This doctrine is that Britain does not produce food, which must therefore be imported from outside in exchange for manufactured goods; if the colonial possessions are lost, the food-supply of the British people will be at the mercy of other nations; and consequently starvation will stare the British people in the face. The other part of the same doctrine is that the loss of India and other dependencies may lead to the exclusion of British manufactures from those countries which will be ruinous to the British working class. The economics of this doctrine are fallacious. Nevertheless, by raising the bogey of starvation and threat of unemployment it did succeed in enlisting at least the tacit support of the working class for the policy of colonial Imperialism. Now, apart from its fundamental economic fallacy, this doctrine has become totally untenable.

British monopoly, even supremacy, in the Indian market can in the future be retained only by reducing the price of British goods. This can be done either by lowering the wages in Britain or by producing in India with cheap native Labour. One means lower standard of living and the other means unemployment for the British proletariat. Not only has the Empire ceased to be beneficial: it can be maintained only at the expense of the home proletariat. Food and raw materials cannot come from India except in payment for manufactured goods exported from Britain. In order to insure the supply from India, the British worker must learn to make his necessity of today a luxury of tomorrow. He must be accustomed to eat less, if he desires to have his food grown within the Empire. He will be forced to accept this condition, because products of industries built in India with capital exported from Britain, will swell the pockets of the British bourgeoisie, but will not cause the flow of food to Britain. What earthly reason is, there, therefore, for British Labour to support the Indian policy of the British bourgeoisie as outlined by Lord Birkenhead? Workers of Britain! will you not repudiate the statement that the imperialist policy outlined by Lord Birkenhead is a "National policy" — "is a considered and deliberate policy of all the parties in the British nation"? Will you not declare that the proletariat have nothing in common with the class of exploiters — that they are unconditionally opposed to the policy of Imperialism?

Capitalism has brought the industrial system of Britain to the verge of ruin. On the old basis, it cannot survive the crisis. It seeks a possible escape in colonial exploitation. But that will make the complication more complicated. Profits will increase while wages will be forced down. New centres of production will grow in the colonies, while the productive capacity of the industries in the metropolis will be artificially reduced. These are the inevitable consequences of capitalism, the most highly developed stage of which is Imperialism. The doctrines of "Civilizing Mission" and "White Man's Burden" are monstrous lies.

When the British bourgeoisie pretend to lead the Indian people on the road of orderly progress and prosperity, can not the Indians retort: Doctor heal thyself? Capitalist greed has sapped the prosperity of the British working class: a people faced with threatening industrial ruin can hardly talk of moral progress. Such being the conditions at home, the British bourgeoisie can be asked to mind its own business, and let India take care of herself. Those elements in the British Labour movement who have a different view of the situation and believe in the beneficence of Imperialism, simply betray the interests of the proletariat. Modern Imperialism is a double-edged sword. It aggrandises the bourgeoisie at the expense of the subject peoples, and enables them to break down the resistance of the home proletariat.

The struggle against Imperialism and its allies inside the Labour movement, therefore, should be inspired not by liberal sentiments, but by the consciousness of class interests. The post-war crisis has conclusively proved that the British industrial system cannot continue on the capitalist basis. Reconstruction is only possible on socialist principles. Imperialism hinders this great revolution at home by creating a new base of capitalist production in the colonies. In other words, Imperialism enables the bourgeoisie to maintain at home a totally bankrupt mode of production which has become a positive social impediment. The

disruption of the Empire is the *sin quo non* for the introduction of a new social system in Britain. A system that produces an ever-increasing army of unemployed when the world is hungering for manufactured goods, that reduces wages when profits soar ever higher, that brings in its train interminable wars of pillage and destruction, certainly demands a radical change. The Empire stands in the way to such a wholesome change in Britain.

Now, we turn to the other side of the picture. It has always been the policy of the British bourgeoisie to proclaim that the majority of the Indian people are so much benefitted by British rule that the nationalist demands are but the voice of a disaffected few. Lord Birkenhead also harped this hackneyed tune. But gone are the days when such statements could pass unchallenged by a crowd of facts. Before the tumultuous events of the last half decade, the "satisfied India", thankfully basking in the glory of the British lion, has become legendary. Therefore Lord Birkenhead was up against an uncomfortable task when he had to give this legend a touch of reality. He stretched his imagination, and thundered that since among the "responsible nationalist leaders" there was not to be found one who advocated the separation of India from the Empire or withdrawal of the British army from India, British Imperialism acquired a moral right to perpetual existence in India. Lord Birkenhead pretends to have arrived at this conclusion on the strength of information gathered from "very divergent sources". Either he is misinformed or he is dishonest. Lord Reading should have given him better information.

The noble Earl argued like a lawyer. The burden of his argument was to prove that the Indians are anxious to have the protection of the British forces. Once this is established, it follows logically that Britain remains in India for the benefit of the Indians. But the ex-Lord Chancellor was handling a bad case. In order to justify the policy of strong hand, he had to admit that there existed in India forces that refused to eat out of the generous hand of British Imperialism — that clamoured for more than the British protectors were pleased to concede. He had the Swaraj Party in mind. Referring to the "restless impatience" of the Swaraj Party, Lord Birkenhead thundered: "The door of acceleration (of constitutional progress) was not open to menace; still less would it be stormed by violence." If the very moderate demands of the Swaraj Party called forth such an ominous warning, it is easy to imagine how those voicing the demand for complete national independence would be treated. Lord Birkenhead good-naturedly intimated that if such men were found, his opinion of those men's judgment would undergo a swift diminution. He would hand them over to the mercy of the Criminal Investigation Department, of the jailors, and to the hangman, if necessary. Still he argues that the absence of "responsible leaders" demanding separation from the Empire conclusively indicates that British Imperialism maintains law and order in India in her interest and with her consent!

To express national aspiration to independence is a criminal offence in India. Nevertheless, all through the history of the Nationalist movement signs of this expression are clearly discernible. Of late the signs have assumed alarming proportions. Had it not been the case, it would not be necessary to shake the mailed fist at such a moderate constitutional opponent as the Swaraj Party. There is a growing determination on the part of the Indian people to gain national freedom in the fullest sense of the term. Free from all coercion, India will disdainfully reject any constitution made for her in Britain. She claims the full right of self-determination. If it were not so, the Nationalist movement would be meaningless. Every British official in India knows that the country is in a great ferment; that the seething discontent of the masses daily becomes more articulate; and that the economic causes of this movement demand a radical change in the present system, the bulwark of which is the British Government.

The "responsible leaders" of Indian nationalism may not desire separation from the Empire. They may even seek the protection of British arms. But they are not India. They mostly belong to and represent the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie, who would rather live under foreign tutelage than countenance a revolutionary struggle which might have more far-reaching consequences than the overthrow of British domination. The "considered policy" of British Imperialism is to buy the support of the Indian bourgeoisie with the cheapest possible price. To render them more tractable in negotiation, the big stick of repression is brandished over their heads whenever they put up any resistance.

The new method of colonial exploitation requires the cooperation of the nationalist bourgeoisie; but Imperialism would not

have this cooperation, except on its own terms. It tells the nationalist bourgeoisie; accept thankfully what I am pleased to grant, in return help me intensify the exploitation of the natural resources and the labour power of your country, and you will be rewarded with a minor share of the spoils. The majority of the Indian bourgeoisie had capitulated. The Swaraj Party was the last of the Mohicans. The "considered policy" of the British Government was to bully them into submission. This policy seems to be on the road to temporary success. But how long will this make-shift last? And what will be its effect not only on the toiling masses of India, but on the living conditions of the British proletariat also?

The reconciliation with the Indian bourgeoisie will open up a new era of imperialist exploitation. The characteristic of this new era will be industrialization of India with capital exported from Britain. This process has been going on for a long time. It is the foundation of modern Imperialism; but now it will be accelerated. The British bourgeoisie have already over one thousand million pounds invested in India. The capital outlay has been recovered long ago. The investment produces dividends often as much as one hundred per cent. This investment has touched but a very small part of the possibilities of India. The rest was held in reserve — as a policy of insurance of the British capitalist system. The catastrophe caused by the war has created the necessity of falling back upon this reserve.

It is remarkable that while British Imperialism has, in the last years, resolutely opposed the political aspirations of the Indian people, it has ceded some economic ground to the Indian capitalists. Naturally the process has been very slow; for Imperialism will never approach anywhere near losing the political control and economic hegemony. Nevertheless, steps of far-reaching importance have been taken, the grant of protection to the Indian iron and steel industry being the most outstanding. This concession to the key industry has not been made out of charity or fairness to Indian capital. Imperialist interests demanded it. In the last two years, iron and steel manufactures imported from Germany and Belgium flooded the Indian market. British goods were undersold. Production in India behind high tariff walls was the only remedy to save the situation. Huge metallurgical combines are in the process of formation. They are closely connected with British banks and steel trusts. In ten years, India will supply not only her own market, but will reach out to the entire East. Along with those from other European countries, British manufactures as well will find a formidable rival in the steel industry built in India with British capital and cheap native labour. Imperialism — "Empire Development" — will aggrandise the bourgeoisie; but the British proletariat will find themselves in a mighty tight corner. Still, not a few leaders of British Labour are great advocates of "Empire Development", in which they find a solution of the chronic unemployment at home!

The key-industry thus protected in the interest of British capital, attention will be turned to the textile trade. Negotiations are already going on to redress the grievances of the Indian capitalists. The handicap imposed upon this industry to prevent it from being a rival to Lancashire, will no longer be necessary, if an ever-growing volume of British capital participate in it. Thanks to the irrigation works, which in their turn, have provided very lucrative investment for much British capital, long-staple cotton will be grown in India. As far as the Lancashire operatives are concerned, India will cease to be the brightest jewel on the British Crown.

It is not necessary to indicate this process in every other single industry to prove that the Empire is an invaluable asset to the bourgeoisie, but a standing menace to the proletariat.

The British working class, therefore, should not only categorically disassociate itself from the imperialist politics of the bourgeoisie. It must go further: it must actively and effectively oppose the attempt to crush the liberation movement in the colonies. The triumph of the Nationalist movement in India, to the extent of separation from the Empire, will deprive the British bourgeoisie of the vast reserve forces which they are planning to bring to bear upon the fight against the revolutionary proletariat at home. Deprived of this reserve, British capitalism will succumb to the present crisis. The doors to socialist reconstruction of Britain will be open.

Workers of Britain! Join hands with the Indian people in the fight against Imperialism. Demand full right of self-determination for the Indian people. Demand immediate withdrawal of the British forces.

The speech of Lord Birkenhead is an insolent challenge to the people of India. The policy outlined therein violates the rudimentary concepts of democracy and constitutional government. His attempt, on the other hand, to glorify the Tory policy as the "national policy" is an insult to the British proletariat.

The present depression in the Indian movement obviously encouraged the British bourgeoisie to an offensive. But this depression will not last long. The coming phase of the anti-imperialist struggle will be more revolutionary than ever, because its basis is shifting from the timid and anti-revolutionary middle class to the toiling masses with nothing to lose but their chains, and a world to gain. Imperialism will endeavour to drown that revolt in torrents of blood, as it is doing in China and Morocco, in the name of peaceful progress and civilisation, Workers of Britain! Prepare for that fateful day by extending the hand of fellowship to the people of India.

Workers of Britain! In conclusion, we must warn you against the insidious attempt to camouflage the Empire as the "Commonwealth of Nations". Here again you will find many of your leaders serving the interests of the bourgeoisie. If the "Commonwealth" is to be a British commonwealth, the non-British subject people of the Empire have no place in it. If it is to be a commonwealth of free nations, let the subject peoples first be free nations. An Empire can be transformed into a "Co-operative Commonwealth" much less than Socialist society can be built within the frame-work of bourgeois state. The Empire is reared upon the right of British capital to exploit the colonial races. By uttering a few meaningless catch-phrases the Empire Labour Conference cannot induce the British bourgeoisie to abandon this right. If you really desire to see the Empire of pillage and plunder replaced by a Commonwealth of co-operation and brotherhood, don't try a short-cut. Begin from the beginning. Join hands with the colonial subject races to boldly challenge the right of exploitation usurped by the British bourgeoisie. Labour must be in power (not in office by the grace of the bourgeoisie), the capitalist state must be destroyed, socialist reconstruction must begin before one can honestly raise the question of reorganising the peoples formerly subjugated by the Empire, into an economic unit of production and distribution. To talk of a "cooperative commonwealth" without challenging the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie at home and in the colonies is hypocrisy. At best, it is an imbecile utopia.

Workers of Britain! Let us organise a united front to meet and break down the imperialist offensive.

Bombay, July 15, 1925.

Communist Party of India.

The Revolt in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

About a month ago there appeared in the Syrian press the obviously "inspired" report, that the situation in the country was so peaceful and orderly, that a portion of the troops stationed in Syria were to be sent to the Moroccan front. . . . The French Left press regarded this success of French administration as due to the work of the High Commissioner, General Sarrail, who, on behalf of the Left Bloc, had ruled the country in a liberal and democratic spirit.

Only a few weeks have passed since the appearance of the above report. A few weeks — bloody weeks. On the 20th of July a demonstration in Beirut against the abolition of the law for the protection of tenants, and which commenced quite peacefully, led to bloody encounters with the French military forces. The result was: 8 killed, 40 wounded and 80 arrests. In the North (in the province of Aleppo) — a great battle with "bands"; the French military interveners, a military court condemns to death 11 Bedouins for having, it is alleged, killed two French officers. And at the same time there commenced the disorders in the South East corner of Syria, in Jebel Drus.

The district of Jebel Drus is hardly 6000 square kilometers in extent; the population numbers about 50,000 souls. The Druse constitute the overwhelming majority. They belong to a Mohammedan sect, possessing its own "mysteries" and which keeps itself strictly apart from the rest of the Mohammedans. The Druse hill tribes can be described as a strong, muscular type of men, bold and war-like, distinguished by their great love of freedom. For many years they fought against the Turks who were

never able really to consolidate their rule in Jebel Druse. In the year 1897 the Sultan Abdul Hamid succeeded in suppressing a great revolt on the part of the Druse. At that time the English government intervened before the Sublime Porte on behalf of the insurgents and gave shelter to the leader of the revolt, the Sultan Al Atrach, on one of their ships. This laid the foundation of a bond of friendship between England and the family of Al Atrach which still continues to this day.

On the other hand the Druse showed open hostility towards the French. The "pacifications" of Jebel Drus could not be brought to an end until the year 1921, that is three years after the capturing of Syria by the French troops; and even this was only done at the cost of considerable concessions to the independence and inner autonomy of the Druse. The Franco-Druse pact of 1921, however, in no way brought about the desired final solution. On the contrary the French, by means of the caoutchouc paragraphs, which are usually contained in such treaties, sought to extend their influence in Jebel Drus by posing as the protectors of the Christian minority (about 4000 souls) against the Druse. The French governor, Captain Carbillet, pursued this policy in such a clumsy manner, that the conflicts between him and the Druse grew continually more acute. Finally, the French government was compelled to give the governor leave of absence for some months.

In July his furlough came to an end. The Druse sent a delegation to General Sarrail in order to request the final removal of Captain Carbillet. This was refused. Not only this, the 26 Druse notables comprising the deputation were forbidden to return home.

Thereupon the revolt broke out. The Druse attacked a French post and disarmed it. The Druse Sheiks went from village to village and everywhere they were joined by their fellow tribesmen. After a few days the whole of Jebel Drus was in the hands of the insurgents. Only in Sueida, the residential town, did the French contrive to hold out, hard pressed by the rebel forces.

It was now necessary to discontinue the transport of troops to Morocco. Instead of this, punitive expeditions were prepared for Jebel Drus. For two days the railways were occupied with the dispatching of troops. The official communications promised that the revolt would soon be brought to an end. This promise could not be kept: The first punitive expedition encountered a well-armed, war-like opponent; it was surrounded and simply annihilated. Only a small number managed to escape. From the surrounding deserts fresh allies joined the Druse: the Hauran Bedouins who saw that the longed-for opportunity for settling accounts with the French had come. The revolt in Jebel Drus had become converted into a regular war.

The insurgents have the great advantage that the French possess, so to speak, no "hinterland". The Arabs are greeting with ill-concealed but none the less profound joy every defeat of the French. The long trains of French killed and wounded, who are being transported via Damascus to the hospitals in the coast district, give a better picture as to the real situation in Jebel Drus than the newspaper reports which, after the introduction of a strict censorship, are confining themselves to printing the official reports. Further revolts in a number of other districts of Syria are reported. Damascus resembles a military camp and is protected by trenches and barbed wire. Sarrail telegraphs for reinforcements and new French troops are landing in Beirout. The revolt in Jebel Drus is calculated to shake the French position in Syria most profoundly.

The International Prison Congress.

By R. Loyal (London).

The International Prison Congress which has been held in London on 3rd of August is now over and the professional torturers and hangmen of Europe who came as delegates from all the white terror countries in Europe have dispersed.

The International Class War Prisoners Aid, British Section, was under no delusions when it made repeated attempts to get a delegate into the Conference in order to draw the attention of the British workers to what was taking place in their midst. We were informed however that our organisation did not come under the necessary category. We have since learned that the

Central Committee of the German Section of the I. C. W. P. A. also made application for permission to send delegates. Permission was granted at first, but later this was withdrawn under the same pretext.

It was a Congress organised for the purpose of perfecting machinery to be used against the active elements of the International working class movement.

The agenda of the Congress was, in the opinion of the I. C. W. P. A., not so harmless as it might appear to be. On the contrary, it can be clearly seen that this congress is a further step for the international bourgeoisie against the rising tide of revolution, and in particular against the communist elements.

Section 1. on the agenda raises the following question, that "the authority charged with the duty of public prosecution should have a free discretion whether proceedings should be taken or not in any case".

This indicates quite clearly that the Congress reviewed the possibilities of a "rising" during which public authority, law and order, should be empowered to use their own discretion whether proceedings should be taken.

Against whom? The revolutionary workers who have risen against their task masters, whilst at the same time leaving in the hands of the judges "discretionary powers" to shield the crimes of fascism.

The full meaning of Section 1. is rendered even more clear by a further paragraph: "should not the court also have the discretion whether or not to record a conviction although the facts are practically proved?"

When we look over a few recent months of history in different countries we can realise the full meaning of these phrases. The murderers of Matteotti in Italy, the murderers of exchanged political prisoners in Poland, and the perpetrators of many other crimes of like character, are all still free by "the discretion of the judges".

The Labour movement will wake up one fine morning to realise the full significance of the clauses quoted.

Some leaders of the revolutionary workers will perhaps be murdered in cold blood and His Majesty's judges will "use their discretion" and decide that those guilty of the murder have committed an act in the "National Interest".

Many acts of this kind have already taken place in other countries and will eventually become a "legal system" in this country.

Did the Conference attempt to raise the question of murder, torture and life imprisonment for political opponents? No, it did not. Not one delegate challenged the representative of Bulgarian terrorism, the land of Zankov the Butcher, where the Bastinado is freely used to break the bones in the bodies of political prisoners, in order to force them to give "information", or was the representative of Italian fascism, the murderer of Matteotti challenged.

As the I. C. W. P. A. indicates, what did concern this meeting of international hangmen was the best methods to be adopted in order to rid the capitalists of those elements who threaten to lead the rising workers to their emancipation, and naturally they did not discuss in public the ways and means of attempting to do this. These people, aided and abetted by their social democratic friends of every country in their nefarious game of extermination, know and understand that the day of retaliation and revenge is fast coming, when they with their Barmat Second International colleagues will be swept away, together with their make-believe Penal Reform Congresses.

In the meantime it is the duty of every active worker to bring before his or her organisation the fact, that an International Class War Prisoners' Aid organisation exists, which seeks to succour the class war fighters, giving them legal aid and assisting their dependents, and at the same time unmasking the brutality practised by the bourgeois terrorists.

THE BALKANS

From the Torture Chambers of Roumania.

By P. F. (Vienna).

For the Roumanian peasants, and also for numerous intellectuals, especially students, hell is known as "Siguranza". The "Siguranza", which was set up about two decades ago, was at first a department of the Ministry of the Interior whose task it was to keep under observation the "subversive" elements dangerous to the State. But it was soon extended to an institution which, like the Ochrana of Tsarist Russia, organised conspiracies and assassinations and spread a whole network of spies over the whole country, in order to stifle and to annihilate the movement of the workers and peasants.

The "Siguranza" reached the highest point of its development in the years following the war. It now exercises far-reaching juridical and executive powers, it maintains a huge apparatus of officials — more powerful than almost any other authority in Roumania —, the amount provided in the budget for its upkeep is enormous and exceeds for example by far the budget of the Ministry for Education. Having regard to the nature of the present Roumanian State this is easily to be understood: the "Siguranza" has to fulfil what is perhaps the most important function in the interest of the Roumanian bourgeois rulers, i. e. by means of the most brutal violence, to master the growing revolutionary movement which is fostered by the policy of national suppression practised by the Boyars. Even the existing bourgeois laws, in so far as they are a hindrance to the system of torture and murder of the "Siguranza", are contemptuously thrust aside. The "Siguranza" is also promoted with all means by the ruling Liberal Party and the government. It is a State within a State. This horrible machine has already crushed thousands and thousands of human lives. For years past it has raged in the most furious manner in Bessarabia, which, bordering on the Soviet Union, constitutes a constant danger to the ruling class of Roumania. For there the overwhelming majority of the population desire to be freed from the rule of the bourgeoisie and to join the Union of Soviet Republics.

The notorious Bessarabian system, which in Bessarabia has already devoured thousands of victims, is being introduced to an increasing extent into the whole of Roumania. The "Siguranza" has set up torture chambers, in the fullest sense of the word, both in Old Roumania and in the "liberated" districts which were added to Roumania after the conclusion of the war. These torture chambers are used against those who are only suspected of being communists or revolutionaries — even if they are entirely innocent of any crime — in order systematically to get rid of them.

Even the conscience of certain bourgeois people is beginning to grow uneasy and certain left bourgeois circles are beginning to voice their protest against this Roumanian system. The former Conservative Minister, C. G. Costa-Foru, General Secretary of the Roumanian League of Human Rights, has, on behalf of this League, collected a number of documents, which expose the horrible crimes of the Roumanian Siguranza*).

He comments upon the numerous documents, the officially recorded declarations regarding the cruel mishandling of hundreds of victims of the Siguranza, in a manner which does honour to his outraged bourgeois conscience, but which at the same time clearly shows that he does not realise the true nature of the Siguranza as being the last weapon in the fight for power between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Therefore his appeal demands before all the restoration of bourgeois-democratic legality. But it is precisely this outlook of the author which will serve as a guarantee that the social democrats and certain democratic parties of the various countries will recognise the objec-

tivity and truth of the exposures of Costa-Foru regarding the White Terror in Roumania.

Costa Foru in his book (German edition page 88) emphasises that he has only given to the public a "fragment" of the "criminal cruelties". The system of tortures itself is to be seen in all its details from the declarations.

An example: **Sender Margulies** of Ismail declares as follows:

"I was arrested on 11th December 1924 in Bucarest and brought to the general State Siguranza. Immediately after my entry into the office of the Siguranza inspector, **Banciulescu**, my ill-treatment began. I was beaten by **Banciulescu** himself for six hours, and as often as the blood streamed from my mouth and nose he sent me to be washed and then the beating began again.

In the same night I was beaten from 9 o'clock in the evening until 4 o'clock in the morning by commissar **Georgescu** by agents and by inspector **Vladimirescu** himself. There were present, inspector **Cristecu**, **Radio**, the Roumanian Vice Consul in Vienna, and **Dr. Demetrescu**. I was beaten with a rubber lash having several thongs and several times fell down unconscious. My hair was pulled out and I was kicked in the head and in the chest. On the 12th I was beaten in the face with a rubber lash for an hour by commissar **Georgescu**.

In the night of the 12th, on the orders of inspector **Vladimirescu**, I was beaten by **Georgescu** and **Popovici** in the most cruel and barbarous manner for five hours, during which time I was questioned concerning things as to which I had not the least idea.

In the night of the 13th I was again beaten for three hours. After this ill-treatment, during which I became insensible and my whole body was covered with blood, I was brought out in order that I might recover, with the help of blows on the part of the sentries who acted on the orders of the commissar. On the 14th of December I was again beaten by four agents of **M. Elefterescu**; I was beaten with the rubber lash on the soles of the feet, my hair was torn out and I was flung against the wall. I was beaten with a chair in such a manner that my landlady who was brought before me on the same day did not recognise me. I was again several times beaten by agents, soldiers, and commissars. The cause of this was my refusal to sign a declaration, which I had not even read, which finally, quite sick and thoroughly broken down by the ill-treatment, I did, without in any way learning the contents of the declaration. In my presence **Miss Lisa Dijur** was flogged with a rubber lash. I also saw how **Zaharescu**, with whom I was confronted, was beaten. He was on the point of collapse. I witnessed for a quarter of an hour the ill-treatment of **Mihai Baumann** by inspector **Vladimirescu** and in the presence of inspector **Cristescu** and the Vice Consul **Radoi**..."

That is one example out of many. There are other reports even more terrible, as before all the fury of the Siguranza in **Arad**.

The torture chambers of **Romulus Voinescu** (that is the name of the brute who is at the head of the Siguranza) resound with the cries of the victims, who are fearfully mishandled. Thousands from whom untrue declarations regarding their revolutionary activity have been extorted, are tortured for months until they are crippled for life. This is the aim of the whole system.

It is easy to understand that in Roumania one mass hunger strike follows the other.

How many have been murdered, "shot while attempting to escape", we are not told.

It is to be hoped that these documents will contribute towards inaugurating a great international action against the white terror in Roumania and in the Balkans generally.

*) Aus den Folterkammern Rumäniens. (From the Torture Chambers of Roumania.) Documents and exposures regarding the crimes of the Roumanian Siguranza. Introduction and closing words by C. G. Costa-Foru, General Secretary of the Roumanian League of Human Rights. Kulturpolitischer Verlag, Vienna 1925.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Approaching big Struggles in Poland.

By Karolski.

Poland stands before great class struggles. Wedged between Germany, which is economically stronger, and Russia whose economic life is on the upgrade, the Polish government is conducting a policy which is bound to lead to ruin.

For months past a tariff war has been raging between Poland and Germany, the whole burden of which both States are casting on the working masses; the consequences are: mass unemployment and increase in the prices of all the most necessary articles of food.

Precisely at this moment the ruling class of Poland, blind to the real relations of political power and of the, present unfavourable international situation for Poland, have commenced with mass expulsions of all those who, under the plebiscite, voted for inclusion in Germany. And this at the very time when the Foreign Minister Skrzynski, after a preparatory campaign lasting many months, is negotiating in America in order to obtain credits for Poland.

Skrzynski is trotting round America; with his siren song as to the fabulous results of the financial restoration in Poland, as to the wonderful harvest and the excellent state of Polish industry, he is seeking to captivate the Boston Stock-Exchange. And this at a time when everybody who has even the most superficial knowledge of the economic situation in Poland, knows that the Polish gold valuta (Zloty), which is only maintained at the cost of the impoverishment of the working class and of their compulsory emigration to France, is in a thoroughly shaky condition. Inflation has become a fact.

Up to the present the circulation of paper money amounts to 150 million Zloty. That is, 30% of the circulation of the legally protected banknotes. In the course of the present year the amount of paper money in circulation has increased by 58 million Zloty. Herr Grabski admitted this in his speech before the Budget commission sitting on the 26th of June; but he sought to console public opinion by saying that it could be still worse... Instead of 58 million he could have put 90 million into circulation. "The law gives me the right to do this".

Practically, the inflation has resulted in a new orgy of speculation on the part of the illegal money changers in Warsaw: the brokers pay 10% less for paper money than for a gold zloty, and for state loans only 46% of their nominal value.

A second fact which has already become an open secret, is the rapidly increasing unfavourable foreign trade balance. How disastrous the situation is already at present is shown by the fact that the unfavourable trade balance for the first quarter of 1925 amounts to almost 180 million Zloty, that is almost as much as the deficit of the trade balance for the whole of the previous year. Thus for example in the present year Poland has imported 17 million Zloty worth more flour and exported 29 million Zloty worth less coal than in the previous year.

According to official returns there are nearly 200,000 unemployed in Poland; the tariff war will have as a result the dismissal of a further 30,000 miners. In Lodz and in Warsaw most of the factories are only working three or four days a week. That is the picture we have of the much vaunted "restoration" of Poland.

In spite of this there is still a possibility that Poland will obtain a "loan", under usurious conditions, by pledging to foreign capital everything still remaining in the possession of Poland.

But one thing is certain: the working class of Poland will not willingly bear all the burdens of the "stabilising" of the economy in Poland.

The cynism and the brutality of the Polish bourgeoisie is having a provocative effect upon the working class. The struggle is commencing.

On the 21st of July the January treaty with the coal barons in Upper Silesia regarding the ten hour day for surface and underground workers expired. The industrialists have announced their intention to introduce a nine and a half hour day for underground workers. It must be mentioned that, in spite of the reduction in the number of workers in the pits by 72,000 and in the foundries by 20,000 there has been no falling off in the output. On the other hand wages have decreased and

amount on the average to only 60 Zloty a month. The capitalists of the Dombrova coal basin are following the example of those in Upper Silesia; they are demanding the eight hour day for underground workers and a 10% wage cut, reckoned from the 1st of July. In Lodz the factory owners are preparing an attack along the whole front. In a memorandum to Heer Grabski they demand: the introduction of the eight hour day, without pauses, the limitation of holidays to six days a year, reduction of overtime rates by 25 and 50% and a reduction of the employers' contributions to the health insurance funds.

In order to avert possible "surprises" on the part of the Upper Silesian working class, the Polish government has placed great sums at the disposal of the industrialists for unemployed support. One can easily imagine how much of this will find its way into the workers' pockets. But this action can have a similar result to that which followed the decree of the Cuno government in Germany at the time of the Ruhr struggle: a new valuta disaster.

The working class of Poland is preparing for serious class struggles. Decimated by the white terror, betrayed by the Polish Socialist Party, it is steadily mobilising its forces for counter-action. The Upper Silesian working class has been the first to take up the struggle.

Under the pressure of the working class, which has been expressed in numerous resolutions at factory councils' meetings and by delegations, the opportunist trade union leaders had to give way and were compelled to convene a general Congress of the Factory Councils and of the Unemployed Committees for the 21st of July.

Over 500 factory councils from all the pits and foundries and of the unemployed committees appeared at the Congress.

Contrary to expectations of the opportunist leaders, they had not come to "negotiate" but categorically to demand the re-introduction of the eight hour day and the election of a new committee of 21 members to lead the approaching struggles.

This fighting attitude of the delegates terrified the leaders of the P. P. S., the N. P. R. (National Workers' Party) and the CHD (Christian Democrats). They hastily declared the Congress to be closed, and as the delegates did not disperse but continued their deliberations and elected a new committee of 21, the leaders of the above named parties sought the aid of the police with the help of whom the Congress was broken up. After this heroic act the trade unions called upon the working class to wait calmly until the government should re-introduce the eight hour day.

But the Upper Silesian working class no longer believes the opportunist trade union leaders, it has had enough of the promises of the government; the government will not introduce the eight hour day, and the foundry workers have decided to win the eight hour day themselves: they are offering passive resistance by ceasing work after eight hours.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

The XI. International Youth Day.

To the Working and Peasant Youth, to the Exploited Youth of the whole World!

Comrades! Brothers!

Ten years have passed since the young workers of the world arranged for the first time a demonstration against imperialist world slaughter. Seven years have not yet passed since the ending of the world war. The gaping wounds caused by the war have not yet healed, the tears of millions of widows and orphans are not yet dried, and the bourgeois governments are hastily preparing a new, still more horrible and more annihilating world slaughter.

China and Morocco are two threatening portents of this war. In China and Morocco the imperialists are again driving the workers and peasants in soldiers' uniforms to a fresh attack against their brothers. Once more blood is being shed and the fruits of peaceful labour are being destroyed. In the imperialist countries the taxes are increasing, the poverty of the masses is growing, young workers are being mobilised in order to compel them to serve the interests of the money bags, and in the parliaments the social democratic Judases are voting fresh war credits.

The only impregnable wall which can resist the attack of the imperialist world robbers is the Soviet Union. Its power is growing from day to day. Its work is rousing belief in themselves in the hearts of millions of proletarians of the West and in the souls of the suppressed peoples of the East. Its name rouses the furious hate of the oppressors. Even Kautsky — this lap-dog of the bourgeoisie — is calling for a crusade against the first Republic of the emancipated working class of the world.

The Soviet Union is the bulwark of the international proletariat. For this reason the imperialists are preparing a new campaign against the Republic of the workers and peasants. The Guarantee Pact, the mobilising of the Border States, the raids and provocations on the borders of the Soviet Union, the basest lies and downright forgeries — all these serve one purpose: to drown the victorious Russian workers' and peasants' State in a blood bath.

In Bulgaria, Esthonia, Jugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia and Poland there prevails a bloody terror, the white terror of the bourgeoisie, of the officers and fascists. Hundreds and thousands of young working men and women have been thrown into prison. Many have been shot or tortured to death. In Italy, Czechoslovakia, in France Germany and other countries, the offensive of fascism in on the increase. Every day the working class and the working youth have to endure fresh sacrifices.

Comrades! Brothers!

Your life is full of misery and suffering. Your wages are systematically reduced in comparison with those of the adults. The social democratic bureaucrats in the trade unions rob you of your rights. They see in you the growing revolutionary force which threatens their rule.

You are kept in ignorance of the conditions of living and work of the young Russian workers. You are told awful bogey stories and lies regarding the situation in the Soviet Union, in order to prevent the trade union unity and the united front of all workers. But the broad masses of the young and adult workers are recognising more and more that only the way followed by the Russian workers and peasants leads to emancipation. The powerful movement for trade union unity, the numerous delegations of workers and peasants who are visiting the Soviet Union are proof of this. The working youth must also learn the truth regarding Soviet Russia and the position of the Russian Youth.

Young Workers in Town and Country!

You, who already to-morrow will be driven to the slaughter for the glory of "civilisation" and of capital, you, who to-day are pitilessly exploited in the factories and mines, in the country and in offices, you, who are yielding up your blood and strength, life and health in slavish toil for the benefit of your masters — raise your powerful young voices in protest against imperialist wars and in defence of Soviet Russia.

We call upon you to assemble in the streets on the XI. International Youth Day, on the 6th of September, when we will unfurl the blood red flag of struggle against capitalist domination, against imperialism, against the suppression of the colonies, against the conspiracy against the Soviet Union. We appeal to your fighting spirit, to your young unbending and irreconcilable heroic courage, to your bitter hate against the bourgeois world. Take your place under the glorious revolutionary flags of the Young Communist International and fight with us:

Against the imperialist wars in Morocco and China!

For the united front of the young and adult workers! For trade union unity!

Down with the imperialist plots against Soviet Russia, the first workers' and peasants' State!

For young workers' delegations to the Soviet Union!

For the economic demands of the young workers!

For the proletarian world revolution!

Moscow, 20th August 1925.

The Executive Committee of the
Young Communist International.

THE WHITE TERROR

Down with the Confederates of the Polish Hangmen!

Against the three Death Sentences!

Workers of all Countries, Raise your Protest against this Shameful Crime!

The trial of comrades Hibner, Knievski and Rutkovski before the Warsaw military court has ended with the death sentence. All three comrades have been shot. For one Judas, a provocateur, who has been killed, the working class of Poland has had to pay with the lives of four proletarian fighters. Botvin, Hibner, Knievski and Rutkovski have been executed. The Polish government is endeavouring by means of ruthless death sentences to terrify the Polish working class; it is thereby endeavouring to defend its system of corrupting the working masses with the poison of provocation. Even the bloody Tsarist regime despised the provocateur and did not venture to demand the life of a worker for the life of a betrayer of the working class. The methods of the Polish government surpass in their cynicism the notorious crimes of Tsarism.

The despicable role which the leaders of the Polish socialist Party have played in this affair beggars description. While the working class of Poland and the working class of every country defended the lives of the proletarian fighters, the press of the Polish Socialist Party denounced our comrades as "bandits", who have shot the "proletarians in uniform", the police. The treacherous leaders of the Polish Socialist Party have had the satisfaction that the Public Prosecutor, in demanding the death sentence, was able to call attention to their articles and appeals. The leaders of the Polish Socialist Party share the guilt for the murder of four workers who fought against provocation.

Workers of all countries! Show to the Polish bourgeoisie that the Polish proletariat does not stand isolated in its fight against the white terror! Protest at your meetings and demonstrations against the criminal blood justice of the Polish counter-revolution towards the workers! Hold up to execration the despicable role of the Polish socialist traitors, who assist in shooting the fighting proletarians!

Honour to the fighters fallen for the cause of the workers!

Down with the white terror of Polish capital, down with its confederates in the camp of the Second International!

Long live the revolutionary struggle of the Polish proletariat!

Moscow, 21st August 1925.

The Executive Committee of the
Communist International.

OUR MARTYRS

Anton Maroun.

The Communist Party of Egypt has to mourn its first victim: on the 1st of August comrade Anton Maroun died in the prison hospital as a result of a hunger strike.

Comrade Maroun, a lawyer of Arabian Syrian nationality, had always taken a keen interest in the Egyptian labour movement. After the war, when the great revolts against English imperialism commenced in Egypt, he devoted his entire powers to organising labour unions. The Egyptian Trade Union Federation, which was affiliated to the R.I.L.U. elected him as secretary. At the same time Comrade Maroun was very active in the Communist Party. In 1924 Comrade Maroun was arrested, along with the other members of the Central Committee of the C.P. of Egypt. The long period in prison while awaiting trial and the abominable treatment which was meted out to the political prisoners, undermined his health to such an extent, that during the trial in September last year the medical experts certified that he was not capable of undergoing the trial. Notwithstanding this, he was condemned to three years hard labour. Soon after being sentenced, comrade Maroun was compelled, along

with the other condemned communists, to carry out a prolonged hunger strike in order to gain something approaching human treatment. This injured his health still further. In spite of this, Comrade Maroun flatly rejected the offer of king Fuad to grant him a "pardon", and preferred to share the fate of the other condemned comrades. The prison administration thereupon sought to take revenge on comrade Maroun for his inflexible attitude; he was exposed to every possible petty persecution and torment, which caused him once again to enter on a hunger strike. Comrade Maroun remained on hunger strike for six weeks. The Egyptian prison authorities did nothing to meet the demands of the hunger strikers; not a word concerning the strike, penetrated to the ears of the public. It was not until six days after comrade Maroun's death that the government published a short communication as to the fact.

"Public opinion" in Egypt passes over in silence this act of murder on the part of the Egyptian Hangman's government. But the young Egyptian labour movement will never forget the martyr death of comrade Maroun.

THE PEASANTS' MOVEMENT

Get Hold of the Agricultural Co-Operatives.

To the Toiling Peasants throughout the World!

Brother and Sister peasants:

The decline of peasant agriculture, which started since the outbreak of the war, is continuing to stifle the broad masses of peasants throughout the world. The great majority of the peasants in all countries are cultivating small plots of land, and they do not raise sufficient to cover the needs of their families. If there be anything left for sale, the middlemen get it at cheap prices. It stands to reason that under such a state of affairs the peasants cannot hope to accumulate any savings. They are always in need. They need credits, they need loans of money, seeds and so on. Even if they get the means for the purchase of necessary implements, seeds, stocks, fertilisers, etc., the middlemen again take advantage of the peasant's need to sell him the goods at exorbitant prices. Thus the middlemen cheats the peasant twice: on buying his produce and on selling him goods.

To obtain credits from private individuals, the peasant has to pay a high rate of interest. The peasant's property is practically mortgaged through the whole of his life. The poor peasant cannot hope to get any credit from the State. Neither can he save up any money by his work. The poor peasants could see only one possibility of liberation from the thralldom of usury and exploitation by mutual credit organisation and co-operative disposal of their produce, eventually leading to the common use of agricultural machinery and implements. Thus arose the wave of the co-operative movement. Poor and middle peasants were rapidly building up their co-operative credit organisations, primarily for the sale of produce and the acquisition of supplies and implements. Millions of poor and middle peasants united for mutual aid and agricultural co-operation. They were joined also by prosperous peasants, usurers, and even by landowners, who saw the growing force of the movement and wanted to "help" the co-operatives.

Brothers and sisters of the co-operative peasant organisations! did you ever ask yourselves why the wealthy peasants and the landlords joined the co-operatives? Of course, not in order to help the poor peasants, not for mutual aid which they did not need, but in order to gain the leadership in the co-operative organisations, and to take advantage of the petty savings of the poor peasants for their own advantage, and also in order to get the poor peasants to follow the political lead of the bourgeoisie.

This they have achieved. Particularly after the war, when the economic crisis gripped both agriculture and the agricultural co-operatives (the credit co-operatives, thanks to currency inflation, had nearly lost the whole of their capital), the latter became financially entirely dependent on financial and industrial capital. This circumstance was particularly responsible for the fact that the co-operatives have fallen under the control of the wealthy peasants, landlords, and their satellites.

This is the situation everywhere, in all countries.

Take Germany as an instance. The German landlords, through their pan-German "Landbund", are grabbing the credit societies entirely into their hands (the so-called Reifeisen banks), either supplying them with capital or covering their indebted-

ness to the different banks. Why, the Central Reifeisen Bank itself has been converted into a limited liability concern. The same is the case with other agricultural co-operative organisations. The Landbund members in control of the co-operative organisations will extend co-operative assistance only to those who are members of the Landbund, which means their belonging to the political parties of the landlords and the bourgeoisie. In economic respect, they are endeavouring to make use of the co-operatives to create for themselves a monopoly in the sale of agricultural produce and industrial products, to the detriment of the large masses of workers and peasants.

If we examine the situation in other countries, we shall get the same picture: the agricultural co-operatives, instead of being a weapon for the building up of the economy of the poor and middle peasants, has become a weapon for the economic and political interests of the wealthy peasants and the landlords.

Even as late as last June, at Warsaw, the leaders of the politics of the bourgeoisie and the landlords tried to create an international amalgamation of the agricultural co-operatives in order to line up the international agricultural co-operation behind the world reaction, against the struggle of the poor peasants for emancipation from the yoke of capitalism and landlordism.

Fellow working peasants!

You must put an end to this state of affairs. You must ask yourselves, what do you get from the co-operatives in which you are in the majority. You get pitiful loans at fair interest and a few purchases at prices that are not exorbitant. But most of the funds and all the advantages of co-operative effort are used to serve the interests of the wealthy peasants and landlords. They get big loans, they sell and buy large quantities of goods, and on the other hand, as shareholders in the industrial enterprises, they draw dividends from the profits obtained on the co-operative purchases. This they are enabled to do not only because the co-operatives are controlled by the wealthy peasants, landlords and their satellites, but chiefly because as long as capitalism exists and the power is in the hands of the capitalists and the landlords, they own also the greater part of the land, and the big means of production, sharing with the industrial and banking enterprises in their profits, which means that they absorb the greater part of the national income, and this enables them to gain control of the State and of the co-operative organisations.

Your task is to turn agricultural co-operation into a weapon for building up the property of the poor and middle peasants, into a weapon of the struggle for the interests of the toiling peasants. This you can attain only by gaining the leadership of the co-operatives into the hands of the toiling peasants.

Brothers and sisters, peasants and peasant women! get hold of the agricultural co-operative organisations, oust the wealthy peasants, the landlords and their satellites from the leadership, do not allow your own co-operative organisations, in which you are in the majority, to serve the interests of the wealthy peasants and landlords, so that the latter might take advantage of the material and political power of co-operation to further their own bourgeois interests. Direct the co-operative struggle against the monopoly enjoyed by financial and industrial capital, which exploits the peasants and their co-operative organisations both at selling and buying. Demand cheap and long-term public credits for the co-operatives; demand a rebate of taxation for the co-operatives, and special State co-operative credits for poor peasants; establish a business connection between agricultural co-operation and the workers' consumers' co-operation, in order to avoid exploitation by banking and mercantile capital; give your active support to the struggle of the toiling peasantry in your own and in other countries for a better life and against war and unbearable militarism. Sincerely working in the cause of co-operation, and relentlessly fighting for these objects, you will gain the leadership in the agricultural co-operatives and get them to fight for the interests of the toiling peasants.

But this is not all. Having gained the leadership in the co-operatives, you will find yourselves confronted with the hostility of the entire apparatus of the capitalist domination. If they will be unable to destroy you by the force of economic action, by withdrawing credit, by intimidating you with an industrial and banking boycott, they will call in the aid of governmental power to wreck the co-operative organisations, as it has been the case in Italy and Bulgaria. Therefore your work and your struggle in the co-operatives, as an organisation of toiling peasants, should go hand in hand with the struggle of the organisations of the toiling peasants and industrial workers who are fighting against

the power of the capitalists and landlords, for the nationalisation of the land, of all the means of production. Only in this manner will be removed the power of the landlords and usurers, which hinders the transformation of agricultural co-operation into a weapon of the toiling peasants for the building up of their economy.

The purpose of co-operation is to build up the property of the toiling peasants, and this can be achieved only after the overthrow of the power of the capitalists and landlords, and the establishment of the power of workers and peasants. Whether working in the existing co-operative organisations, or creating new ones, this should always be your goal!

Long live agricultural co-operation as the builder of the prosperity of the toiling peasants!

Long live agricultural co-operation as the weapon in the struggle of the toiling peasants!

Long live the united struggle of all the organisations of the toiling peasants against the yoke of capitalism and landlordism!

Long live the united front of agricultural co-operation and workers' consumers' co-operation!

Long live the united struggle of the toiling peasants and industrial workers throughout the world against the power of the capitalists and landlords!

Long live the government by workers and peasants!

Peasants and workers of the world, unite;

The Presidium of the International Peasants' Council.

THE NEGRO MOVEMENT

American Negro Labour Congress.

By Lovett Fort-Whitemann.

The American Negro Labour Congress will take place in Chicago, beginning on October 25th and lasting about a week. It will be made up of delegates coming from the various Negro Labor Unions throughout the country, from organisations of Negro agricultural workers and representatives from unorganised industries. The fundamental aim in calling the American Negro Labour Congress is to establish in the life of the American Negro working class an organisation which may serve as a medium through which the American Communist Party may reach and influence the Negro working class, and at the same time may constitute something of a recruiting ground for the Party.

The Negro working class suffers all the social abuses common to the American working class in general, but in addition it is exposed to racial persecution. The social demands uppermost in the mind of the Negro masses of America are that of the abolition of Jim-crowism, that is, racial separatism, political enfranchisement, equal opportunities of employment for white and black, measures on the part of the Federal government against the practice of lynching, large appropriation for educational facilities for Negro children in the southland, the abolition of the lines of residential segregation, etc. The American Negro Labour Congress will take up these social problems for deliberation and action.

The National Committee calling the American Negro Labour Congress has a large Communist nucleus, and this National Committee, sending out organisers throughout the country, has succeeded in organising a large number of local committees of action in many towns and cities for the purpose of popularising and drawing in an increasing number of militant elements into the American Negro Labour Congress Movement. The American Communist Party has not yet gained a foothold in the southern provinces of North America, and through the creation of these local committees for the American Negro Labour Congress in the southern provinces, we see the beginning of the extension of the Communist Party into those parts. In many of these provinces the Negroes are in the majority over the whites, and it is in the south that the Negro is most oppressed. Thus, it will mean that in this part of America, the overwhelming majority in the Communist Party will be members of the Black Race.

It is the aim of the National Committee that out of the Congress to be held in October, plans shall develop for a permanent organisation among the Negro workers and peasants, and that this organisation each year thereafter shall be responsible for calling the American Negro Labour Congress. Further,

we feel it is of the uttermost importance that on this occasion efforts should be made to rally the Negro races of the world: Africa, America and the West Indies, for a struggle against world Imperialism, and the National Committee calling the American Negro Labour Congress will endeavour to get passed at the Congress a manifesto calling a world Congress of the African races to be held somewhere in Europe next year. The Black Race feels the weight of World Imperialism probably more than any other radical group in the world. The American Negro Labour Congress promises to have the greatest revolutionary significance for the Negro peoples, whether in America, the West Indies or Africa. The call has awakened a wide-spread response, and the National Committee is daily receiving communications from Negro Communities, both in Africa and the West Indies.

The American Negro worker, by reason of his historical experience in such a country as America, where capitalism has reached its highest stage of development, seems well-fitted to take the leadership of the Negro Race of the World in its struggle against World Imperialism, and the American Negro Labour Congress aims at being the agency through which this leadership shall find its medium of operation.

ENLARGED EXECUTIVE

Convocation of the Enlarged Executive Committee for the Late Autumn.

Moscow, 24th August 1925.

On the 20th August there took place a meeting of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I., which decided, on the proposal of comrade Zinoviev, to convene the Session of the Enlarged Executive in October or November of this year.

The agenda proposed is as follows:

1. Report of the Presidium and the new political tasks in connection with the changes in the world situation and the danger of war; the tasks regarding the setting up of the united front of the workers etc.

2. The trade union movement.

3. The preparation of the VI. World Congress.

4. Plan of work for the Executive Committee for the next six months.

5. Work in the East (the events in China and their lessons).

6. Questions of the various sections (the Communist Parties of Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Italy, France).

7. Report of the Communist Party of England (since the V. World Congress).

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostle.

By N. Bucharin.

V. (Conclusion.)

The Soviet Regime and its Economy.

But — one could say to us — the system of war communism also did not promote the growth of the productive forces.

Yes, that is true, it did not promote it. We openly admit that. But, gentlemen "critics", without war communism we would not have been able to "beat back the white guards".

Kautsky once wrote in a polemic against Karl Renner:

"Military science is a temporary state and one expects that it will not so quickly recur. And when the war aim demands it it does not shrink back from influencing the process of production in a form which makes its repetition impossible in the same degree and which limits its extent ever more.

"It is the task of national economy to produce the great mass of means of destruction and means to "hold out" in the process of destruction, without consideration of the cost and the keeping up of the productive forces.")

1) Kautsky: "War Marxism". Page 59.

It is true, Kautsky wrote this of bourgeois economy then and against it. As far as it refers to the legality of war economy however, so it is true also of the war of the proletariat. That the proletariat is defending itself and that its war is a "just" war does not mean that this war is accompanied by material prosperity.

The system of **war communism**, the unavoidably narrowing basis of the productive forces, is itself a function of the war, that is, a function of the intervention with all its charm.

If one grasps that, and with a minimum of honesty it is possible to grasp it, then it is quite easy to understand the "peculiar" fact that in a certain period the power of the soviets consolidated itself and in the same period the misery of the masses increased. The misery of the masses was caused by the war. And the consolidation of power was caused by the fact that this power carried on the war well, that this power well defended the land taken from the large landowners by the people, and the factories taken from the capitalists by the proletariat. Hence the "enthusiasm" of the hungry and bare-footed Red Army soldiers who fought on innumerable fronts in the civil war, who fought like lions to defend the new state, to protect and consolidate it and who destroyed the counter-revolutionary armies.

Immediately the war, the blockade and the intervention came to an end, immediately we turned from "war economy" to "peace economy", from the system of "war communism" to the new economic policy, then immediately commenced our economic growth.

The malicious greybeard however doesn't see this. He is convinced (or he pretends that he is convinced?) that our economy is deteriorating the whole time. Let the reader judge.

On page 21 of his booklet he writes:

"In fact, if this collapse of transport and production caused by bolshevik mismanagement goes much farther, then soon a point will be reached at which any democratic movement will be impossible in Russia."

We are not interested in the connection which Herr Kautsky makes between the economic growth and the "democratic" perspectives. (We will come back to this however later.) It is important for us here to observe that Herr Kautsky contends that our economy is more and more declining. Herr Kautsky infers from this even an "approaching catastrophe" (he "infers" this in various places in various manners, but that also does not interest us in this connection), that is an **insurrection** against the soviet power:

"The reckless robbery which the bolsheviki carry out on the economic forces of Russia makes such an end not improbable."*)

Finally, on page 55, Kautsky expresses himself more categorically:

"They (the bolsheviki N. B.) and their government system are based upon methods which lead to the **collapse and not the progress of industry**. It is very well possible that they will never achieve a stabilisation in Russia, **only a ruination**." (Stressed by me N. B.)

In these statements, Kautsky shows such a conscienceless tyranny, such violent, such insolvent ignorance, such blind Philistine hate, that even Herr Dan, the party comrade of Kautsky, cannot stand it. In the article already quoted by us, this Russian menshevik writes the following:

"This (Kautsky's N. B.) pessimistic analysis and these perspectives were to a certain extent correct before 1921 before the introduction of the 'new economic policy'."

"They would become once again correct if the bolsheviki and naturally no one expects it — suddenly returned to 'war communism' (and if they could return!). But these perspectives do by no means correspond to the real development of present day Russia: **The daily experience of every Russian worker and peasant, the famine of the years 1918—1920, all speak against this kind of 'increase of misery' theory. And all economic statistics speak against it also.**"

"Up to 1921, the whole 'economy' of bolshevism really was nothing else but the destruction of the productive forces and the consumption of the existing provisions. And at that time the despair of the masses of the people could in reality find no other way out than the endless chain of in-

surrection which assumed a 'colossal' extent and transformed into the civil war."*)

A pleasant picture! Herr Kautsky says: Before the year 1920 everything was tolerable and even a mass enthusiasm existed. Now however, nothing is of any use more, and an insurrection is approaching. Herr Dan however says: No, approximately up to 1920, everything was so terrible in our country that the masses continually revolted — this was the cause of the civil war; what however Kautsky writes about the present, is contradicted by all "experience" and by all the "statistics".

Kautsky wants to solve the question of the insurrection? Kautsky has submitted to the II International a memorandum having the same contents. Kautsky gives even the imperialist states advice. What is there therefore to surprise us? One calls them "scientific arguments" when the arguments are contradicted both by experience and statistics. Statistics as is known, are no "science", and "experience" is only for the "vulgar empiricists".

From this collision of the two prominent social democratic "leaders" comes the truth that both of them have distorted the facts. Herr Dan distorts them when he only sees the "bad" in the period of war communism (he doesn't see the enthusiasm of which Kautsky speaks for he does not understand the nature of the civil war nor of our whole revolution, nor the necessity of war communism). Herr Kautsky distorts almost everything, for in his brain the laws of the League of Nations and not those of marxist reason are in command. The League of Nations shows itself in its naked reality in Kautsky. The clever Herr Dan covers it shamefully in the social democratic epitaphion (cloak of the orthodox Russian priests Ed.).

But we pay Herr Kautsky too much honour. In his hatred of the proletarian state he has even excelled his masters (this often happens to the so-called "faithful" lackey), for instance the English capitalists. We have before us the well known and most "substantial" paper of the English business world, "The Economist", of the 15th November 1924. Under the title "Problems of the Russian Economic Situation" we read about the beginning of the new economic policy (that is about the year 1921):

"The beginnings of a new, even if limited, prosperity in Russia can be traced from the time of this change".

Referring to the end of 1924, the "Economist" says:

"Some of the more outward symptoms of the improved economic situation that had been reached early this year are well known. Improved transport and improved labour conditions, and, above all, the substituitno of a stable currency in the form of State banknotes (Chervontsy) for the depreciating Soviet paper — a change that was finally completed in the summer — were some of the most noteworthy improvements; but methods in the Finance and certain other Departments, as well as the very definite rise in production, were also symptoms of great importance").

People who are in the least way acquainted with economic literature know that one could suspect the "Economist" of anything rather than of an excessive sympathy for the Soviet Union. But Kautsky! Kautsky has excelled them all!

Let us take the "Frankfurter Zeitung". Here we read of the latest period of the development of our economy:

"Russia is becoming economically active. Even if one harbours doubts about the correctness of the official economic statistics, one must **give way before the facts** (Listen, Herr Kautsky!) which one can see with one's own eyes. The tremendous business pressure in Moscow must impress itself even upon those who are not in a situation to compare it with the decay of the previous years. **Such things cannot be artificially arranged** (Listen, oh listen, Herr Kautsky!). And from the provinces the same news comes to me from non-party witnesses . . . 'Our tremendous growth' — that is the slogan one hears in every mouth").

*) Dan. Chapter I, Page 11. All stressing made by me N. B.

*) "Economist" of the 15th November 1924, Page 766.

*) First morning edition of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" No. 473. Frankfurter Handelsblatt. "The Economic Boom in Russia".

*) Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia", Page 38.

Or do you perhaps believe, Herr Kautsky, that we have also "misled" the correspondents of the "Frankfurter Zeitung"? Are you not ashamed of yourself, you old slanderer?

We could quote a whole number of similar witnesses, but we think the above is enough. Every unprejudiced reader will easily recognise that if one were to rely upon the "evidence" and the "science" of Kautsky, it would be much the same as though one confided the leadership of meteorological stations into the hands of archbishops.

Let us however, look at a few figures.

We will quote the summary figures for agriculture. According to the information of the Central Statistical Bureau, the development can be expressed in the following way:

Movement of the Areas under Cultivation and of Livestock in the Years 1916 to 1924 in the Soviet Union not including Turkestan, Trans-Caucasia and the Mongolian-Buryatische Republic⁶⁾.

Areas under cultivation in thousands of Dessiatines.

(1 Dessiatine = 2,7 acres.)

Year	Total area under seed	Area under seed in Autumn	Area under seed in Spring
1916	87,382.9	27,837.7	59,545.2
1923	70,861.0	26,525.3	44,335.7
1924	77,241.7	28,158.9	49,082.8

Live stock in thousands.

Year	Horses	Cattle	Sheep & Goats	Pigs
1916	31,542.8	50,074.6	84,353.5	19,527.7
1923	21,408.1	41,268.6	58,258.7	9,394.9
1924	22,878.0	47,596.8	69,959.8	17,202.2

As can be seen from these tables, agriculture is rather rapidly approaching its pre-war level, and one must remark that last year, despite the bad harvest, there was a considerable increase of the total area under cultivation. The area under seed in Autumn has, as the table shows, already overtaken that of 1916. How this process went is to be seen from a detailed table. If we examine the movement of the area under seed in Autumn according to years, we get the following picture:

Year	In thousands of Dessiatines
1916/17	27,981.0
1921/22	22,263.8
1922/23	26,582.0
1923/24	27,606.5
1924/25	28,382.6 ⁷⁾

Despite the sighs of Kautsky, we have, as can be seen, a direct improvement both in agriculture and in livestock. If we describe the total area under cultivation in 1916 with 100, so 1923 is 81 and 1924 88.4 (for the Autumn crops the figures are 95.3 and 101.8⁸⁾).

For live stock we would get the following figures:

Year	Horses	Cattle	Sheep	Goats	Pigs
1916	100	100	100	100	100
1923	67.9	82.4	69.5	57.5	48.1
1924	72.5	95.0	83.4	71.5	88.1 ⁹⁾

And in industry the process of reconstruction is still more clearly to be seen. This growth which took on a really violent form in the second half of the economic year 1924/25, is well illustrated by the following table:

⁶⁾ "The National Economy of the Soviet Union in Figures" 2nd year. Moscow 1925. Page 153.

⁷⁾ W. Revyakin: "The Area under Seed in Autumn in the year 1924/25 and its Situation". Moscow 1925. Volume 2. Page 302. The slight difference in the figures for the year 1924/25 as compared with the previous table is to be explained by the fact that the figures for the Ukraine according to the calculations of the Ukrainian Statistical Bureau are included in the latter table.

⁸⁾ "The National Economy of the Soviet Union in Figures". Page 174.

⁹⁾ Ibid. Pages 212 to 215.

The value of industrial production¹⁰⁾

Year	In thousands of pre-war Roubles			Percentage in relation to 1921/22	
	Permanent Branches of Production	Seasonal Branches	Total	Permanent	Total
1921/22	833,284	16,996	850,280	100	100
1922/23	1,199,359	33,497	1,238,856	144	146
1923/24	1,553,367	64,468	1,617,835	187	190
First half of 1924/25	1,174,235	—	—	—	—

We see therefore, that the figures for the first half of 1924/25 have reached almost the total sum of production of the previous year, although the previous year also showed a remarkable upward tendency. If we now compare these figures with the pre-war level, we get the following picture:

1921/22	23%
1922/23	31%
1923/24	40%
1924/25	70% (average) ¹¹⁾

At present we have overtaken this figure also, and the pace of our industrial development is rapidly increasing particularly in the heavy industries, which were the last to be reconstructed but which are now developing at a really tremendous rate.

In connection with this the real wages of the workers are increasing. On the whole, the real wages of the workers for the whole of industry, including the so-called "gratuitous benefits" are 85% of the pre-war standard. In a number of individual branches of industry it already considerably exceeds the pre-war level. To the degree of the development of the productive forces, the wages of the workers will also rise still further, and we can confidently hope that this up war tendency will continue.

Let us quote still a few figures from other branches of industry. The growth of transport can be seen from the following table:

Average daily loading.

(Number of loaded waggons.)

Economic Year	Quarter				Yearly Average
	I. Quarter (I to III)	II. Quarter (IV to VI)	III. Quarter (VII to IX)	IV. Quarter (X to XII)	
1921/22	10,022	8,825	10,020	9,482	9,500
1922/23	11,971	11,809	11,249	11,895	11,744
1923/24	13,514	12,996	13,056	14,525	13,517
1924/25	16,344	16,374	16,637	—	—

With the growth of the general economic circulation in the country, the credit system becomes ever more important, and at the same time the importance of the banks is increasing. As an illustration we give the following figures which characterise the growth of the balance of the State Bank:

The Balance of the State Bank in Millions of Roubles.

1st January 1922	53.0
1st January 1923	131.0
1st January 1924	1,099.1
1st January 1925	2,051.2
23rd June 1925	2,849.3

Finally, we must say a few words regarding the State Budget. Everyone recognises — there can be no quarrel about that — that we have consolidated our financial system and also our State Budget. Our State Budget is developing quickly and expresses the growth of the whole state industry of the Soviet Union in its amount and composition. It is sufficient to mention that according to preliminary calculations, the final sum for the Budget 1925/26 will be 3,560 million Roubles, that is, an increase of 870 million Roubles (32.6%) on the Budget for the previous economic year¹²⁾.

¹⁰⁾ The State Industry of the Soviet Union for the first half of the economic year 1924/25. Statistical Economic Review, edited by Professor L. B. Kafenhau. Moscow 1925. Page 8.

¹¹⁾ Report of comrade Djerjinsky at the III Soviet Congress of the Soviet Union. "Economitcheskaya Shisn" (Economic Life) of the 16th May 1925.

¹²⁾ „Econ: Shisn“ No. 156. „The Budget Proposals 1925/26“.

I believe that these few figures are sufficient for our purpose. What do we see from them? The figures hit Kautsky in the face.

The 'Economist' is in this question against him.

The "Frankfurter Zeitung" is against him.

Herr F. Dan is against him.

The "experience of every worker and peasant" is, according to the testimony of Herr Dan, against him.

These are witnesses of varied sorts.

Nothing, however, matters to our hero. What do the figures matter to him! What does the "information" matter to him! What does he care about the "witnesses"! "Delenda est Carthago". "Moscow, the Red Carthage must be destroyed!"

For this purpose every means is good. If it is the Entente, then let it be the Entente. If it is calumny, then let it be calumny. If the facts are not suited for his, then to the Devil with the facts! If the witnesses are against us — down with the witnesses! Thus rages the one-time head of marxism, the present-day renegade Kautsky, left behind sitting on the great historical highway.

VI.

The So-called "Collapse of Communism", and Private Capital in Industry.

In our previous remarks we have shown what ignorance the "learned" Kautsky evidences when he attempts to form a judgment upon the most elementary facts of our economic life.

He, however, does not permit himself to be in the least disturbed by this. With the thoroughness of a writer who works for good masters, Kautsky proceeds, "courageously and determinedly", to draw up the balance.

"In the meetings it (Bolshevism. N. B.) has been unable to fulfil any of those things (things which it promised. N. B.), for all the promises in which it was so rich and through which it managed to gather such a large following, have one by one been characterised as illusions and errors, even by itself. Naturally, it does not admit even today the complete truth that its regime leads not to socialism but away from it. But it is unable to produce anything better than cascades of abuse which it showers upon its critics."²⁰⁾

"It turns out however, that the bolsheviks are compelled to reconstruct economic life, for each government strives to make the state which it administrates rich and powerful."²¹⁾

And Kautsky continues:

"And so the bolsheviks must also strive to bring the process of production and traffic, which they crippled, once again into working order. On the one hand by sharing the monopoly in the exploitation of the Russian people, upon which their communism is based, with private capitalists who pay well for the privilege and who understand much better how to conduct industry than the business politicians of bolshevism, and on the other hand by breaking down the Chinese walls that they, just like the capitalist governments had erected around Soviet Russia."²²⁾

And further:

"Capitalist concessions and capitalist loans: that is the panacea for helping the seriously sick communism once again upon its feet."²³⁾

This is everything that Herr Kautsky has been able to "produce" as "proof" of our economic "degeneration".

What do the "accusations" of Kautsky that bolshevism has declared its promises as errors and illusions, mean?

That is an accusation that one can formulate as follows: Bolshevism promised the realisation of socialism and attempted to carry it out; very soon however, it gave up its position, capitulated and went over to the so-called "new economic policy". Only in this way can one decipher the Pythian (puzzling) statements of Kautsky.

The further steps in the direction of capitalism are: the concessions and the loans. According to the story of Kautsky therefore, there has been a capitalist degeneration of the soviet power, the state power and the Communist Party, an open

betrayal of the proletariat. The illusions have been dispelled, only the prose of life has remained, and this prose is: the prose of capitalist exploitation! Not only the growth of misery, but also an ever clearer retreat to capitalist positions, that according to Kautsky, is the significance of the whole historical period and the whole evolution through which bolshevism is proceeding.

That Kautsky's words must be understood in this sense can clearly be seen from the commentary of his governess Herr Th. Dan who takes our greybeard out walking in the garden of soviet "reality".

Citizen Dan is not so old, not so silly and not so unacquainted with life as Herr Kautsky. Herr Dan does not deny the fact of our economic reconstruction. He consoles himself with the thought that this reconstruction is proceeding despite the efforts of our Party.

"This progress — writes Dan — has been obtained in the struggle against the bolshevik dictatorship which only retreats step by step before the advance of economy..."

"This growth gives those classes who take part in the process of production, quite other means of struggle against the bolshevik power, and quite other means of pressure upon the bolshevik government than the despairing insurrection which was their only weapon during the years of economic decay. (At this opportunity we wish to remark that here Herr Dan justifies explicitly the insurrection of the Russian Vendée, whilst according to Herr Kautsky, this was a war of the reaction against the revolution. N. B.)

"Just at this moment we are witnesses of how the advance of the peasantry is forcing the bolsheviks to make great economic concessions not only in immediate relation to peasant economy, but also in relation to commerce and industry, which serve the peasantry: Freedom of economic action for the Kulak! (why the ironic exclamation mark? N. B.) permission of leasehold for land, use of wage-labour in the villages, the reduction of taxation, the promotion of home-work industries and small undertakings, privileges for private traders and private industrialists. (Yes, privileges, but in comparison with whom? N. B.) Phenomena which in actual fact are preparing a far-reaching de-nationalisation etc. etc."²⁴⁾

We wish to point out above all, the helplessness, the inconsequence, the hypocrisy and the internal contradictions of menshevist reasoning. According to Kautsky we have on the one hand already sold ourselves to the private capitalists with the new economic policy, recognised our communism as a mistake etc. etc. This statement he needs in order to frighten the workers away from us. On the other hand — similarly according to Kautsky — the bolsheviks do not even think of sharing their right of exploitation with the capitalists; they stand above both the workers and the capitalists. This he needs in order to frighten away foreign traders. In short, rear-guard protection on two fronts. With Kautsky, the practical criterion of truth turns simply into an ideological service of the counter-revolution.

Herr Dan and his band do judge at least somewhat more logically. But the cloven hoof is to be seen all the more clearly with them. Their slogan is: Back to a healthy capitalism. Kautsky however, by the way, raises the accusation, that we are leading society away from socialism; similarly he remarks that in "bolshevik Russia" there are no pre-conditions for the construction of socialism. He is afraid nevertheless to declare openly: "Long live a healthy capitalism!" The mensheviks say that openly; they welcome every extension of capitalist relations. They consider that to be progress. How could they regard that as other than progress when their whole "marxist" ideology forces them into the conception of "healthy capitalism"? They hate the soviet power because this latter gives the development of capitalist relations insufficient elbow-room. They hope that the well-to-do sections of the peasantry, that is above all, the Kulak, plus — as Herr Dan expresses it — the traders "serving them" (the peasantry), will exercise sufficient "pressure" upon the soviet power to force Russia's transformation into a democratic republic. The latter representing already a sufficiently "comfortable" superstructure for free capitalist productive relations. By appealing to the traders, the Kulaks, the nepmen and to a section of the

²⁰⁾ Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia". Pages 13—14.

²¹⁾ Ibid. Page 22.

²²⁾ Ibid. Page 22.

²³⁾ Ibid. Page 32.

²⁴⁾ Th. Dan: "Kautsky Russian Bolshevism" in the Berlin "Socialistic Wiestnik" of the 20th June 1925. Page 12. Stress by me. N. B.

intelligencia, they are attacking us because we are offering resistance to capitalism. At the same time these knights of "healthy capitalism" turn to the workers with an air as though they wanted to protest against excessive concessions to capitalism. And they have even the insolence to speak of a far-reaching denationalisation, for which in secret they long but which they will only experience in their sweet menshevist dreams. Yes, esteemed gentlemen, only in your dreams this will take place!

The question of the "collapse of communism" and the other dream pictures of the mensheviki can be rather easily solved if one looks at the matter without first of all donning the menshevist spectacles.

The system of War-communism was, as we have already pointed out in the previous chapter, a fettered consumers' economy. However, with the productive relations in such a complicated national economic complex where the whole production of cereals and the whole cattle breeding, must be distributed over 22 million peasant holdings, the market is indispensable.

In the war period, the main weight lay in rational consumption. In the period of peace it lies in a maximum of production. If the war period produced the illusion that one could organise peasant economy by a violation of commodity circulation, experience showed that the organisation of peasant economy can and must be organised above all with the assistance of commodity circulation. On the basis of the general advance of the national economy and the increased pace of commodity circulation we must increase the main weight of the state economy in the whole economic life, we must organise the peasantry in co-operatives on the basis of the commodity circulation, work for the growth of this co-operative net into the general system of economic organisation of the proletarian state, and ensure the economic hegemony of the proletariat by means of the proletarian banks, the proletarian industry and the proletarian transport system. Truly, a horrible "collapse of communism"!

It is untrue that we have gone ever farther and farther away from socialism. The exact opposite is the truth.

Yes, Juridically, during war-communism almost everything was in the hands of the state. Practically, however, there was an illegal market, and an illegal "black stock-exchange" etc. And the state undertakings (factories, mines, transport) were in a lamentable state. Cut off from coal, raw material and corn, they were not able to function; small production could work more advantageously than large industry; the illegal small trader could pursue his business more advantageously than the large shops. The system of war-communism however, did really ensure the provisioning of the army and the workers. With the transition to the new economic policy, the economic forces of the country began to recover quickly. Private trade was legalised. Juridically, to-day there is less in the hands of the state than under war-communism, practically however, there is not less but more, for the growth of state industry and the permanent increase of its influence upon the economic life of the country has been assured.

According to tables, one can represent the situation as follows:

Under the system of war-communism (fettered commodity circulation)		Under the new economic policy (free commodity circulation)	
In the hands of:		In the hands of:	
The State	Private capitalists etc.	The State	Private capitalists etc.
I Year 100 a	a	100 a	5 a
II Year 100 a + n	a - b	150 a	6 a
III Year 100 a - xn	a - xb	200 a	7 a
etc.	etc.	etc.	etc.

With the increased rapidity of commodity circulation, with the general increase of the production forces, the significance of the "socialist oasis" in our economy is increased and this oasis ceases actually to be an oasis and changes into the leading principle of our economic life. And this is called "the collapse of communism"!

We step over the market to the victory of socialist production, in consequence, we will outgrow the market — this is the law of our development.

"The chief significance of the process of re-construction of the last three years consists in the ever-growing utilisation

of the existing and concealed amounts of capital of the country, and this utilisation has only become possible thanks to the re-establishment of commodity circulation, the circulation of currency, the system of taxation and the credit system."²⁵)

How it stands with the truth of the statements of Kautsky and the Russian mensheviki as to the "collapse of communism" can be seen from the evidence of a witness already quoted by us, the "Economist".

The "Economist" writes, end of 1924:

"After the death of Lenin in January this year, the situation experienced a further alteration. The more extreme elements in the Communist Party took the upper hand and private employers have once again fallen into disgrace... Industry and wholesale trade are once again almost completely in the hands of the state."²⁶)

It was naturally, not a matter of the "extreme elements", but of "compressing" private trade at a time when we were doing our utmost to develop our net of state and co-operatives trade systems to an increasing extent. Latter we lessened this pressure.

The quotation however is quite sufficient to establish clarity as to the comparative importance of private and state capital. We by no means wish to leave our readers in the dark about the actual state of affairs. For this reason we shall have to analyse certain statistical facts, even although the "scientific arguments" of Herr Kautsky carefully avoid any contact with statistics.

Above all it is of interest to us to observe the relations of state (socialised) to private industry (leases to private persons, and all those undertakings which are the "property" of private persons, and also concessional undertakings, are included here). We will look first of all at the numbers of the wage-workers and their distribution amongst the various groups of undertakings.²⁷)

Movement of numbers of employed trade union members (according to the information of the statistical department of the Central Council of Trade Unions in the Union of the Soviet Republics).

	State Undertakings	Co-op.	Under:	Private	Under:
1st July 1924 . . .	1,846,744	74,122	116,247		
1st October 1924 . . .	2,024,796 (+)	96,949 (+)	130,068 (+)		
1st January 1925 . . .	2,044,928 (+)	115,582 (+)	124,014 (-)		

Expressed in percentages:

90.7	3.6	5.7
	together	
	94.3	
88.9	4.3	5.3
	together	
	93.2	
89.5	5.1	5.4
	together	
	94.6	

What a horrible disappointment we must experience to be sure when we see such figures! A little over 5% of all wage workers are employed by private capitalists of all sorts and conditions. Is that not the collapse of state industry, of the "bolshevik experiment" and so on and much more of the same sort? Is that not the corroboration of Kautsky's "science"?

That is the relation between state and private capitalist industrial undertakings, i. e. those undertakings which employ wage-workers. It is certainly possible to include all private industry (amongst it, non-capitalist private industry) that is, include the home-work industries, handicrafts etc. in the analysis.

The Relation of Private Undertakings to the Total Industry on the Basis of the Realisation of Production.

²⁵) Professor L. Kaffenhaus: "Big Industry in the Economic Year 1923/24" in the "Yearbook of the Supreme Economic Council 1924". Page 5.

²⁶) The "Economist", 15th November 1924. Page 766.

²⁷) In the strict sense of the word, the term "wage-workers" is not applicable to the workers in our state industry. We use the expression only for want of a more fitting one.

(According to the information of the Peoples Commissariat for Finance.)

	Number of Undertakings	Turnover in thousands of Goldrubels	Percentages
1922/23 State Undertakings	3,630	783,293	64,4
Co-operatives	2,915	29,317	2,4
Private Undertakings	97,812	403,848	33,2
Total	104,357	1,216,458	100,0
First Half			
1923/24 State Undertakings	8,868	974,406	67,3
Co-operatives	5,380	29,853	2,1
Private Undertakings	271,921	444,143	30,6
Total	286,169	1,448,402	100,0
Second Half			
1923/24 State Undertakings	5,834	1,280,806	71,3
Co-operatives	3,819	36,634	2,1
Private Undertakings	246,797	476,819	26,6
Total	256,450	1,794,259	100,0

One must naturally remember that these figures are very inexact. There is however, no doubt that they reflect the general picture. And it must be observed that particularly the figures for state industry are too small. On the basis of this calculation, the turn-over of the state industry in the whole economic year 1923/24, was approximately two and a half milliards, whilst in reality, the turn-over of the industries subordinate to the Supreme Economic Council alone, was over three milliards.

In the period from 1922 to 1924 inclusive, the percentage turn-over of the state undertakings rose from 64,4 to 71,3, whilst the respective figures for private undertakings in the same period are 33,2 and 26,6 i. e. a reduction.

We are truly in such a bad situation that our collapse is "quite unavoidable"!

We must point out that the above figures refer to industry as a whole, to the small, middle and big industries. The relations between the turn-over inside the various categories of private industry can be seen from the following table drawn up by the Peoples Commissariat for Finance for the second half of 1923/24.

	Absolute Turn-over in thousands of Rubles	Percentage of total turnover of Private undertakings
Groups I. (Home-work, small undertakings)	201,245	42,2
Groups II. III. & IV. (small industry)	187,057	39,2
Groups V. to XII. inclusive (middle and large industry)	88,516	18,6
Total	476,818	100,0

And when we now look at the relations of these individual groups to the turn-over of the whole of industry, we get the following figures: Home-work and small undertakings 11,8%; Small industry 10,4%; Middle and large industry 4,4%. Total 26,6%. The percentage turn-over of the last group is approximately in proportion with the number of wage-workers employed by it. Everything is proceeding "according to Dan", to a far-reaching denationalisation!

In the article which we have quoted the "Economist" expresses the hope that everything may decline if the share of "private initiative" is reduced. We see however quite a different picture.

We have as yet no inclusive figures for the turn-over of state industry for the first half of the economic year 1924/25. We have only the figures for 150 trusts and a number of private and co-operative undertakings at our disposal. In the second half of 1923/24 the turn-over of these 150 trusts was 453,567,000 gold rubles, and in the first half of 1924/25 it was 642,152,000 gold rubles (an increase of 41,5%). At the same time the turn-over of private undertakings in the first half of 1924/25 as compared with the second half of the preceding economic year (according to incomplete figures) has increased by 5,4%, whilst that of the co-operatives has increased by 61,6%. If we assume that this relation is also characteristic for the still outstanding figures, that

is, take this relation over to all undertakings of the particular groups, then for the first half of the economic year 1924/25 we get the following figures.

	Turn-over in millions of gold rubels	Percentage
State undertakings	1,793	76,2
Co-operative undertakings	58	2,4
Private undertakings	502	21,4
Total	2,353	100,0

If we now add these figures to those presented previously, we see that the dynamics of the relations between the state and private undertakings during the period from 1922 up to and including the first half of the economic year 1924/25 (1st October 1924 up to the 31st March 1925. Ed.) can be expressed in the following table:

Percentage of Total Industrial Turn-over.

	State Undertakings	Fallen (-) Risen (+)	Private Undertakings	(-) or (+)
1922/23	64,4		33,2	
First half 1923/24	67,3	+	30,6	—
Second half 1923/24	71,3	+	26,6	—
First half 1924/25	76,2	+	21,4	—

How "systematically" the state economy "clears the way" for private economy! How great are the far-sightedness, the prophetic vision and at the same time, the honesty of our pretentious democratic writers!

As far as industry is concerned, we see that Kautsky's work has been completely shattered. He always has terrible luck when facts and figures enter upon the scene. He has been unlucky with regard to industry, perhaps he will have better luck with commerce?

VII.

The so-called "Collapse of Communism" and the Private Capital in Commerce.

We will now make an analysis of the relations between state, co-operative and private trade. The role of private commercial capital must at the same time be exactly explained. First of all, however, we must make a number of observations of a general character and with a general significance.

Having regard to the fact that all commerce develops through the market and that there are millions of small producers in the country, the role of the private trader must unavoidably be great. Not every private trader is a commercial capitalist. On the other hand it is quite clear that the existence of private trading — although only in small detailed and subordinate forms — provides the basis for the formation of private commercial capital. This truth can naturally not be denied. It must be an axiom for us.

On the other hand we must bear the following in mind: if the state industry, that is the socialised big industry, is predominant in industrial production, then the role of commercial capital (even of capital) with its distributive functions distinguishes itself objectively from its social role under the relations of a capitalist social order, where the most important and decisive means of production belong to the capitalists. In both cases, trade capital receives a commercial profit taken from the labour of the industrial workers and that of the peasants, as also from small crafts people. But in a social order in which the proletariat controls the means of production, commercial capital acts as a distributive agent between proletarian industry and the various consumers; in a capitalist social order, it acts as this distributive agent between capitalist industry and the consumers. If we take the most characteristic and most typical relation in our country for example, we see that during the capitalist predominance, commercial capital acted as the agent between the industrial capitalists and the peasants. Today, however, objectively seen, it is the agent between the peasantry and the workers' state. Under capitalism, it formed a chain which realised the industrial profit of the industrial capitalists. Under the proletarian dictatorship it "helps" to realise the gains of socialist industry and with this it furthers directly the socialist accumulation.

The elementary truths of political economy tell us that commercial capital has the tendency to develop into industrial capital. The known consolidation of commercial capitalist relations and the great extent of the accumulation of commercial capital changes commercial capital into industrial capital, and the rule of capitalist relations in the process of circulation is influencing the decisive sphere of economic life, the sphere of production. Therefore, generally speaking, there exists a danger in our society: if commercial capital grows more and more, if it goes over to the offensive, if it changes into industrial capital and begins to compete more and more successfully with the state industry and with its "private initiative" storms the fortress of the "bureaucratic" state economy, then we shall be face to face with a process of development which leads away from socialism. In this way a "backward development" would be possible in Russia.

Unfortunately for Kautsky and the whole socialist fraternity of the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries, who long for such a process, there is nothing of the sort in Russia. In the previous chapter we have seen that on the industrial field there can be no question of any new attack upon the part of capital. On the contrary: a picture unfolds itself before our eyes of a firm, certain and courageous forward movement of our state socialised big industry. Now we will see that essentially the same process is going on in the field of commerce. Even although here the relations between the state and co-operative capital and the private capital are naturally, essentially different.

We have already mentioned that even under war-communism, where juridically almost all the functions of production and circulation were in the hands of the state, and private trade was forbidden, in reality, this private trade had an extremely great importance. According to the special investigations of A. Lositzki covering the period 1918—1919 and embracing 26 provinces, agricultural products were supplied to the inhabitants of the towns and to the workers in the villages in the following proportions: Through the state distributive organ ("Komprod") 42%, through small traders 58%. One must bear in mind that industry, as far as it worked at all, worked almost exclusively for the army. The supplies to the population in 1920 in comparison with 1912 were 86.5% lower! The peasantry received 13% of that which it received in 1912.

With the transition to the new economic policy, the government was without an apparatus for the distribution of commodities, whilst the millions of small traders were suddenly let loose. Even in big trade, even in agreements between state organs, the "private distributor" that is, the commercial capitalist played a tremendous role in the first period. The statistics of the Supreme Economic Council observe that in the period of January to March 1922, on an average, one quarter of the total turn-over of from 54 to 63 state institutions fell to private persons. The special investigations of M. M. Schirmunski upon the role of private capital showed how that even this figure was reckoned too low¹⁾.

In May, June and July 1922, 37—38% of the total turn-over of the state organs and 35—45% of the turn-over between state organs and private persons was in the hands of private agents²⁾. In consequence, also here, at the sources of production, they had a considerable part of the distributive machinery in their hands. If we examine a few extremely important branches of production in the period March-November we get a still crasser picture.

Textile industry. Approximately 40% went immediately from production into the hands of private persons — in some months, even from 70—80% of the cotton goods.

Salt trade which at that time played a tremendous role, went to a very great extent through the hands of private large traders.

Rubber. 48.5% went through the hands of private dealers etc.³⁾.

We can say that the situation in commerce was extremely dangerous. Below: a tremendous number of private traders beginning with the peasants, who "chemically secreted" (an expression of Lenin. Ed.) small and very small "capitalists", who on their part "chemically secreted" much more important

"cadres". Above: clever, cunning business friends, for the greater part speculators, profiteers, who obtained freedom to move and who made their way with tremendous energy into all the pores and holes of the state organisations, and who were everywhere present where it was possible to obtain a piratical commercial profit or by speculation to pocket high differential gains.

That was however, quite an exceptional period in which the state organs and the co-operatives had almost no distributive apparatus at their disposal. This time was finally filled up by a double sided Process. On the one hand a certain process of accumulation on the part of private commercial capital and on the other hand a feverish process of organising and choosing of people, the collecting of elementary commercial experience by the state organs and by the organs of the newly formed co-operatives.

The almost exclusive role of commercial capital represented to a certain extent a social "apprentice premium" for the organisations which were gradually built up in the struggle against private capital. Under this obtaining condition, it was possible for the state to commence an — at first slow and almost imperceptible — offensive upon the commercial front. The dynamics of this development can be characterised by the following table made up according to the information of the Peoples Commissariat for Home Trade:

Turn-over of home trade according to the information of the peoples commissariat for home trade, corrected by other information (figures in millions of gold rubles).

	I. 1923—24		Private Commerce	Total
	State Commerce	Co-op eratives		
Absolute sum	3.203,5	1.123,3	3.392,2	7.719,0
Percentage	41,5	14,6	43,9	100,0
	together 56,1			
Reckoning the immediate peasant sales (guiding figures)	3.203,5	1.123,3	4.392,2	8.719,0
Percentage	36,4	12,7	50,9	100,0
	together 49,1			
	II. 1923—24		Private Commerce	Total
	State Commerce	Co-op eratives		
Absolute sum	6.021,3	2.845,5	4.965,7	13.832,5
Percentage	43,5	20,6	35,9	100,0
	together 64,1			
Reckoning the immediate peasant sales (guiding figures)	6.021,3	2.845,5	6.965,7	15.832,5
Percentage	38,0	18,6	43,4	100,0
	together 56,6			

The share of state and co-operative trade has therefore risen from 56,1 to 64,1%, whilst the share of private commerce has fallen from 43,9 to 35,9%. We see a similar rise of the state and co-operative influence when we include the direct small peasant trade.

Despite Kautsky, despite the capitalist apologists in the so-called "socialist" camp, despite everything, we find that in Russia the anti-capitalist forms are growing continuously, also in the sphere of circulation.

We have quoted summarily quite general figures which make no claim to exactitude. But that on the whole they reflect the real picture of the productive process is shown by the fact that all other information shows a similar tendency, a relative decline of the importance of private trade.

Let us for instance look at the information the agents of twelve state syndicates (textile, leather, metal syndicates, "Ural Metal", agricultural machine syndicate, Petrol syndicate, Porcelain syndicate, tobacco syndicate, plant oil syndicate, fats syndicate, starch syndicate):

Distribution of the wholesale turn-over of 12 syndicates to Agents.

Period	Total in thousands of Gold rubels	Percentages				
		State	Co-op.	Mixed societies	Private persons	Unknown
I Half 1923/24	210.829	55,3	22,3	0,5	20,0	0,9
II Half 1923/24	331.127	44,2	39,5	0,1	15,6	0,6
I Half 1924/25	410.856	39,7	46,0	1,2	12,6	0,5

¹⁾ Schirmunski: "Private Capital in Commerce" Moscow 1924. Page 13.

²⁾ Ibid.

³⁾ Ibid. Page 21.

The percentage falling to private buyers has fallen in a short time almost by half (from 20.0% to 12.6%)⁴).

An analysis of the turn-over on the commodity exchange shows a similar basic tendency. The total turn-over of the Moscow commodity exchange and of 70 exchanges in the provinces doubled from the beginning of the first half of 1923/24 to the end of the first half of 1924/25 (that is, from October 1923 up to and including March 1925. Ed.) An increase of 102.9%. The distribution of the turn-over amongst the individual types of agents and the dynamics of this distribution are interesting:

The turn-over of the Moscow commodity exchange and of 70 provincial exchanges to agents in the economic year 1923/24 and in the half year 1924/25 (in millions of Gold Rubles).

I. Sale:

Half Year	State organs		Mixed societies		Co-operative		Private	
	Moscow commodity exchange	70 Prov. exchanges	Moscow commodity exchanges	70 Prov. exchanges	Moscow commodity exchanges	70 Prov. exchanges	Moscow commodity exchanges	70 Prov. exchanges
I Half 1923/24 . . .	637,1	442,1	16,0	16,3	28,3	57,3	59,4	64,6
Percentages . . .	85,9	76,2	1,2	2,8	3,8	9,9	8,1	11,1
II Half 1923/24 . . .	725,2	701,4	17,2	23,4	29,3	90,2	42,6	61,0
Percentages . . .	89,1	79,6	2,1	3,3	3,6	10,2	5,2	6,9
I Half 1924/25 . . .	1.167,5	1.106,5	23,3	38,9	59,8	158,0	51,5	71,6
Percentages . . .	89,5	80,5	2,0	2,6	4,6	11,5	3,9	5,2

The share of the private undertakers in the sale on the Moscow exchange fell from 8.1% to 3.9% and on the provincial exchanges from 11.1% to 5.2%.

II. Purchase:

Half Year	State organs		Mixed societies		Co-operative		Private	
	Moscow	Prov.	Moscow	Prov.	Moscow	Prov.	Moscow	Prov.
I Half 1923/24 . . .	473,7	327,0	2,8	16,8	83,5	123,4	156,8	112,2
Percentages . . .	63,9	56,5	3,6	2,0	11,3	21,3	21,2	19,3
II Half 1923/24 . . .	527,0	432,8	18,2	25,3	179,1	316,7	98,0	106,3
Percentages . . .	64,7	49,2	2,2	2,8	22,0	36,0	11,1	12,0
I Half 1924/25 . . .	935,1	627,2	22,2	59,0	263,0	498,0	84,8	119,2
Percentages . . .	71,5	50,7	1,7	4,3	20,2	36,3	6,6	8,7

The share of private purchases in the total turn-over fell on the Moscow exchange from 21.2% to 6.6%, that is to less than a third, and on the seventy provincial exchanges from 19.3% to 8.7%, that is, to less than the half.

One must also take into consideration the fact that the contracts with private persons were to a considerable extent carried out with the assistance of state credits. In the time from October 1923 to March 1924

"no less than 25% (it is here a question of credit and mixed contracts) of industrial production went into the hands of private capital by means of the granting of commodity credits"⁵).

⁴) The information is supplied by the peoples commissariat for Home Trade.

⁵) S. M. — ow: "On the Role of Private Capital in our National Economy". In the publication "Systematic Economy" April 1925. Page 86.

In analysing the various processes inside the commercial sphere one can observe a series of fundamental characteristics. For instance, General rapid growth of commodity operations; uninterrupted decline of private commerce; particular growth of the co-operative as the chief organisational form of the distributive process etc. The process of supplanting private commerce has also its special characteristics. Above all, private commerce is being driven out of wholesale commerce and remains in retail trade; then it gives up its positions in the towns altogether and the commercial capital flings all its weight into the villages where its chief operation is the purchase of cereals and raw materials. But even here private trade is gradually giving up its still strong positions in proportion to the growth of state trade and particularly the growth of the co-operatives which in our society have special rights and privileges and which keep up the closest connection with the proletarian state organs. The great organisational work of reconstruction has not yet — and that is the chief characteristic of our time — started in our backward villages, divided up as they are into ten million peasant holdings. It is therefore quite understandable that the process of economic organisation will be much longer here. But we can already see how the private trader, the dealer and the usurer are being supplanted by the co-operatives which are supported in their activity by the economic organs of the proletarian dictatorship as a whole.

Also here, when we speak of the role of private capital we must bear in mind that private capital is to a considerable extent financed by us.

"The activity of the private buyers of cereals and raw materials in the year 1923/24 was carried on to a considerable extent with the assistance of the advances made by the state undertakings financing private buyers; the practice of the various state institutions in this connection differed, but in general the average state financing (in the form of direct advances, bank loans, on goods and effects etc) can be estimated at approximately 30% of the turn-over."⁶)

Naturally, with the growth of the co-operative organisations, the lever of state credit will act all the more in their favour, and in view of the combined economic attacks from all sides, private capital will be compelled to give up one position after the other and to retire step by step into the depths of the economic netherlands. But the economic troops of the new order will penetrate here also. In this way the successful socialist offensive is developing and marching forwards.

What sort of objections can the "learned" Karl Kautsky raise against these figures, facts and considerations? What will Herr Dan have to say to such a preparation for a "far-reaching denationalisation"?

What will they say? Just the same, always the same. They will repeat the same words, the same phrases, that they have learned by rote since the October days, just like parrots. They are commanded to do this by the "highest law", the interests of the international bourgeoisie, the hate against the revolution, their preference for peaceful dodderers, their respect of holy property, of the top hat, of the petty bourgeoisie, their love for the favours flung to them, the defenders of "culture and civilisation", by the bourgeoisie.

As Kautsky (the "revolutionary") writes: ". . . what the world needs most to-day is: Order and Stability"⁷).

Slumber on, Herr Kautsky! But why do you write such inflammatory booklets? Listen, Citizen Kautsky, you have made a mistake, in fact a double mistake, both in relation to the favours and also to the "stability"

⁶) Ibid Page 86.

⁷) Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia". Page 38.