

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 5

13th January 1927

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: Inprekorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

- Third Anniversary of the Death of Lenin.
- Kitaigorodsky: Leninist Teachings on the Colonial and National Revolutionary Movement and the Current Problems of the Revolutionary Movement in the East.
- China.
- Tang Shin She: The Fight for Shanghai and the Intervention Work of the Imperialists.
- Against the Fascist Terror in Lithuania.
- A New Provocation on the Part of the Lithuanian Hangmen.
- Appeal of the Red International of Labour Unions.
- The A. U. C. T. U. to the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress.
- Politics.
- Bela Kun: The Situation in Hungary after the New Parliamentary Election.
- M. N. Roy: The Indian National Congress.
- M. G. Babach: The Changes in the Governments of Finland and Latvia.
- Revolutionary Movements in the Colonies.
- Gerard V. Anter: The Revolts in Indonesia.

- Economics.
- Jar: An Attempt at Capitalist Rationalisation in Spain.
- The Labour Movement.
- Catherine B. Cant: After the Lock-out of the English Miners.
- Union of Soviet Republics.
- Z. Leder: Rationalisation in the Soviet Union.
- For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.
- From the Resolution of the Seventh Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union on the Report of the Central Trade Union Council.
- In the R.I.L.U.
- Resolution of the Seventh Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union on the Report of Comrade Lozovsky.
- In the International.
- Ernst Meyer: To the Memory of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.
- Anniversary of the Deaths of Lenin, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.
- In the Camp of Social Democracy.
- K. Le Ski: The Leaders of the S. P. of Poland in the Service of Fascism.

Third Anniversary of the Death of Lenin.

Theses for Reports During Lenin Week.

1. When Lenin died, the bourgeoisie and its Social Democratic lackeys prophesied and hoped for a speedy disintegration and collapse of everything to which the great leader had devoted his life — the collapse of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the Soviet Power, of the International Communist Party, of the Comintern. All important persons will now admit that the expectations of the enemies have not been fulfilled, because the ideological foundation on which the policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern is based, namely Leninism, is firmer than it ever was before.

2. The entire Leninist strategy was built on the assumption that the world had entered into an epoch of proletarian revolutions. The disintegration of capitalism (about the disintegration and parasitism of modern capitalism see "Against the Stream" and the article "Imperialism and The Split in the Socialist Movement"), the fierce rivalry between the individual imperialist groupings, the mass movements and risings in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and the growing acuteness of the class struggle throughout the world — such, in the opinion of Lenin, are the characteristic features of the present epoch. This Leninist estimate, far from being refuted by the events of the last years, has received full confirmation.

3. That modern capitalism is disintegrating and in the

process of its disintegration is calling forth an acute class struggle because it lowers the standard of life of millions, was most clearly shown by the great British Coal Strike which began with the General Strike. The coal strike was a result of the process of disintegration of British capitalism, British industry, which grew up under monopolist conditions and due to the relentless exploitation of the colonies, proved unfit for development under new conditions — under conditions of fierce rivalry among the various imperialist groupings, of capitalist development in the colonies and Dominions, of a powerful development of the national movement in the oppressed countries, which makes it impossible to go on exploiting the hundreds of millions who constitute the population of Asia as easily as it was before. At the same time the classical land of capitalism, Great Britain has least of all the other advanced countries taken advantage of the scientific-technical discoveries of the last decades.

British capitalism, deprived of its monopoly, gradually losing its power over the oppressed countries of the East and employing obsolete methods of production, is disintegrating. But being a capitalist country it is making frantic efforts to maintain its former position among the imperialist countries at the expense of the workers of the country whose standard of life is being

steadily lowered. Such is the historical and economical basis of the offensive of the British bourgeoisie against the working class, and consequently of the British proletariat becoming more revolutionary.

When Lenin predicted that the class struggle in Great Britain would become more acute, that the famous British "liberties" would disappear, that the British proletariat would become revolutionary, and that Communism would grow in Great Britain in the very near future, he was not believed not only by the reformists — (they declared this forecast to be fantastical!), but even by some of the revolutionary workers. The old ideas about Great Britain were too firmly rooted!

Now, everything which Lenin predicted has come to pass. The British bourgeoisie is not only unable any longer to bribe large sections of workers, — on the contrary it is lowering the standard of life of the most advanced section of the British proletariat — the miners. A capitalist offensive on the other sections of the labour army of Great Britain is not only possible, but even inevitable.

The British proletariat, which during the last 50 years was the most conservative section of the world proletariat, is now coming to the forefront. No one can speak of it today as a "bourgeois proletariat". The coal strike is but the first demonstration of its growing revolutionary energy.

This strike has shaken the so-called British liberties to their foundations. British "democracy", so much admired by the social reformists, served as an argument against the Leninist teachings on democracy and dictatorship. But the British strike exposed it as the usual form of bourgeois dictatorship. The collapse of democratic illusions was so great that even Social Democratic theorists like Max Adler, was obliged to refer to it.

The British strike fully confirmed Lenin's teachings on democracy and dictatorship, for it showed British "democracy" in its true light: viz., democracy for the bourgeoisie, dictatorship for the proletariat.

The British strike served also as a test of all the tendencies existing in the British labour movement. It fully confirmed Lenin's estimate of the reformists as "agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement". That Thomas & Co., during the strike deliberately acted as the agents of the bourgeoisie has been confirmed by Arthur Cook, the British miners' secretary. The British strike has shown that the Left and the Right leaders are always ready to form a bloc when the situation is serious, in order to sabotage the mass movement.

The miners' strike has shown that the Communist Party was the only real leader in the struggle. The Communist Party alone has come out of the recent struggles strengthened, more closely connected with the Working Class and with a doubled membership. This growth of Communism in Great Britain was predicted by Lenin. This growth of Communism in Great Britain is a clear proof of the remarkable far-sightedness of the great leader and of the complete bankruptcy of the theories of the II. International which considered Great Britain to be immune from the Communist "virus".

The British bourgeoisie emerged temporarily victorious from the first encounter. But there is no doubt whatever that development in Great Britain will on the whole proceed towards the decline of capitalism, towards new social struggles and towards a further growth of Communism.

4. The Leninist theory of Social revolution has also been very strikingly confirmed by another event of world importance — the powerful development of the National-Revolutionary Movement in China. The rising of the millions of the oppressed population of Asia was foreseen and predicted by Lenin as the component part of the general rising of the exploited masses against the handful of imperialist rulers. In his speech at the Congress of the Communists of Eastern nations, Lenin said:

"The imperialist war has awakened the East, it has drawn its peoples into international politics. Great Britain and France have armed the colonial peoples and have thereby helped to teach them to make use of military technique and improved machinery. But they are using this knowledge against their capitalist masters. The period of the awakening of the East is followed, in contemporary revolution, by the period of the direct participation of the peoples of the East in deciding the destinies of the whole world". (Our italics.)

And he pointed out that:

"The socialist revolution will not be only and mainly

a struggle of the revolutionary proletariat of each country against its own bourgeoisie, — it will be rather a struggle of all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, a struggle of all dependent countries against international imperialism." (Our italics.)

Precisely because Lenin foresaw the upward trend of development of the world socialist revolution he also foresaw the rising of the peoples of the East.

Lenin attached enormous importance to this movement, for he saw in it the loyal ally of the proletariat of the most advanced countries in their struggle for proletarian dictatorship. In this speech at the III Congress of the Comintern, Lenin sounded a note of warning against the old prejudice — under-estimation of the magnitude of the movement — under-estimation of the peoples of the East and of the revolutionary character of the movement.

The whole tactics of the Comintern and of the C. P. S. U. (b) with respect to the national-revolutionary movement in the East have their point of departure in this doctrine of Lenin. Whilst international Social Democracy (see for instance Vandervelde's and MacDonald's statements) looks upon the revolutionary movement in the East from the viewpoint of the manufacturers, bankers and merchants who exploit the oppressed peoples of the East and which sees in the movement of these peoples, a menace to "culture" and "civilisation", the Comintern endeavours to support the revolutionary movement in the East because it is a "component" part of the world revolution and because, for that reason its aims are identical with the aims of the struggle of the international proletariat. Lenin's estimate of the prospects of the revolutionary movements of the East roused optimism in the ranks of the Comintern, even when this movement was suffering temporary defeat. In the Spring of 1925, when the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung" the organ of the theorist of the II International Otto Bauer, wrote about the "1849" of China, namely of the end of the Chinese revolution, the Communist International repeatedly pointed out that a new revival of the movement in the very near future was inevitable.

Now it is clear to everyone that the predictions of the theorists of Social Democracy have turned out to be a complete fiasco. They did not believe in the potential strength of the revolutionary Chinese people, as usual they over-estimated the counter-revolutionary forces, they failed to perceive the most important factor in the struggle of the peoples of the East — the antagonisms among the imperialist powers.

The fate of the Social Democratic leaders with respect to the Chinese revolution was very similar to their fate in connection with the civil war in Russia. In both cases they prophesied the collapse of the revolution just at the moment when the revolution was only beginning to bring new millions into the struggle and to throw them against the counter-revolution.

The recent Canton victories, the extension of the power of the revolutionary government to almost one-half of the territory of China has brought nearer the end of open civil war. In the course of a very few months the fate of the Chinese people will be decided, and with it also, to a considerable extent, the fate of the workers of the whole world. Those, who, like the "Vienna Arbeiterzeitung" say that the aims of the struggle of the Chinese people are not the aims of the world proletariat, are deceiving the workers of Europe and America with the help of revolutionary phraseology, they are in fact the allies of world imperialism in the struggle of the latter against the Chinese People and against the world proletariat.

The defeat of the Chinese revolution would enormously strengthen world imperialism. By the exploitation of the workers of China, world imperialism would gain strength for the struggle against the revolutionary labour movement in the mother countries. By throwing sops to small groups of workers, World imperialism is striving to widen the split among the working class and to break up its organisations. World imperialism would also take advantage of the defeat of the Chinese revolution to initiate another attack — from the East to the West on the stronghold of the international labour movement — the Soviet Union.

The issue of the open civil war in China depends greatly on the military and financial assistance that world imperialism renders to the Chinese counter-revolution. The present task of all honest revolutionary workers is to prevent the despatch of arms to Chang-Tso-lin, Sun-Chuan-fang and Wu-Pei-fu, not to allow the despatch of fleets into Chinese waters, to expose all

attempts at agreement among the imperialists against revolutionary China. The maximum of activity and organisation must be exercised by the working class in the struggle against the counter-revolutionary plans of the imperialists. The workers must compel their organisations — the trade unions — and the press to fight against intervention in China, and to assist revolutionary China. The proletariat must call to book the MacDonalds and Vanderveldes who are openly supporting Chamberlain's plans, and are concerned about the interests of the British and Belgian merchants and manufacturers who are exploiting the Chinese people.

Social Democrats will sabotage in every possible way this campaign of aid for revolutionary China, and point out that the struggle going on in China is a struggle for the establishment of the domination of the national bourgeoisie. This is a lie. The Chinese revolution, the leader of which is the Chinese proletariat, aims, not at the establishment of bourgeois power, but at the establishment of a national workers' and peasants' power, which will nationalise big industry, will liberate the peasantry from the yoke of the imperialists, speculators in land and the traders, organise the peasants in co-operative and other organisations, will enter into a close political and economic alliance with the Soviet Union and will keep in close touch with the world revolutionary movement.

The Chinese revolutionaries understand a thousand times better than do the so-called Marxists in the camp of the II. International the connection between the destinies of the Chinese revolution and those of the world labour movement.

It is not the workers of China, but world imperialism which is endeavouring, with the aid of the Chinese militarists and the II. International to establish the domination of the Chinese bourgeoisie. It is not the Chinese revolutionaries, but the MacDonalds and Vanderveldes who are advising world imperialism to come to an agreement with the moderate sections of the bourgeoisie, an agreement which, as they think, will secure "law and order" in China, i. e., will establish the usual bourgeois regime.

The world proletariat has no reasons whatever to follow in the footsteps of the MacDonalds and the Vanderveldes. It is in its interest that the population of China which comprises one-fourth of the population of the world, — that the workers' and peasants' revolution, be victorious. It is in its interest that China, instead of serving as the reserve force of imperialism, should be the organised reserve force of the world revolution.

It is only through an alliance between the revolutionary East and the world proletariat, — a union ceaselessly advocated by Lenin, that the victory of the toilers of the East and of the world proletariat, in their struggle with the imperialist rulers, will be assured.

5. The disintegration of British capitalism and the mighty development of the Chinese revolution are striking evidence of the correctness of the Leninist teaching on imperialism and socialist revolution. International Social Democracy is doing its utmost to belittle the importance of these fundamental facts of world history, and claim that the so-called stabilisation of capitalism in Central Europe is a decisive international phenomenon, a proof of the collapse of the Leninist doctrine of socialist revolution.

The apologists of imperialism are doubly mistaken: in their estimate of the so-called stabilisation of capitalism in Central Europe as well as in their prediction of the collapse of the Leninist theory of socialist revolution. The so-called stabilisation of capitalism in Central Europe does not in the least refute the Leninist theory, for Lenin did not only think it possible, but very probable that there would be a temporary stabilisation of one section or another of disintegrating world capitalism. The possibility of a certain period of temporary equilibrium was declared even at the III. Congress of the Comintern, for the Leninist theory of socialist revolution does not provide for a continuous, uninterrupted process of capitalist disintegration. But while admitting the fact of a period of temporary equilibrium, Leninism — contrary to those who sing the praises of capitalist stabilisation — perceives all the contradictions of this partial stabilisation. The stabilisation blocs of the bourgeoisie create:

Firstly, new antagonisms among the predatory imperialists. The temporary consolidation of the German bourgeoisie has already caused the collapse of the old groupings and has sti-

mulated new imperialist blocs, based on the establishment of trusts and cartels. This plethora of international trusts has in its wake not universal peace, as announced by the Social Democrats — the agents of the bourgeoisie, but increased war preparations, more persistent talk about pressure on the Soviet Union.

Secondly, the stabilisation efforts of the bourgeoisie create fresh antagonisms within each separate country, for the bourgeoisie is making these efforts at the expense of the masses and above all of the working class.

The trustification and cartelisation of industry carried on under the banner of so-called rationalisation is nothing but an attempt to set the united front of the bourgeoisie, against the disrupted detachments of the working class, an attempt to obtain surplus profit at the expense of the toilers of the cities and the countryside, by means of raising prices on the strength of a monopolist position on the market. The trustification and cartelisation of industry help the bourgeoisie to carry out the so-called rationalisation by means of shutting down a number of the enterprises, of organisational pressure on the workers for the purpose of still further intensifying labour, increasing the working day and reducing of wages. Millions of unemployed, "American methods" of squeezing the utmost out of the workers, which lead to a premature loss of working capacity — such are the most striking symptoms of notorious rationalisation.

Disintegrating capitalism is unable to develop the productive forces of society one of the principal elements of which is human labour power. The stabilisation efforts of the bourgeoisie result in millions of unemployed and these reactionary efforts of the bourgeoisie are lauded by the Social Democrats as a progressive policy! At a time when the vital class struggle is imminent, the Social Democrats, as historic fatalists, say that we must be reconciled to these efforts at stabilisation. The revolutionary workers cannot accept this servile theory. They cannot forget Lenin's dictum that the destiny of the world depends on the activity and unity of the working class. They cannot forget Lenin's dictum that if the working class remains passive, the bourgeoisie may succeed in consolidating itself until the next imperialist conflict at the expense of the workers by robbing them and lowering their standard of life. That is why the Communist vanguard is advocating, not fatalistic submission, but the energetic welding together of the ranks of the proletariat for the struggle against the capitalist offensive, for the struggle for the proletarian revolution.

The bourgeoisie is establishing cartels and trusts. The proletariat must meet this with the establishment of powerful industrial unions, with more intensive struggle for the unity of the trade union movement, for the inclusion of the unorganised workers into trade unions.

The bourgeoisie is establishing international trusts and blocs. The proletariat must meet this with the consolidation of its own international united front, with efforts to create one trade union International.

The bourgeoisie is throwing millions of unemployed into the streets, it is reducing wages, it lengthens the working day. The reply of the proletariat to this must be: consolidation of the union between employed and unemployed workers, greater insistence in its demands for better provision for the unemployed, increased struggle for higher wages and shorter working day which is an elementary necessity under the new "American" speeding up system. Cartels, trusts, so-called rationalisation are all means for establishing durable stabilisation of capitalism at the expense of the working class. The proletariat's reply to this can and must be: to link up its partial demands with the preparation for decisive struggles against capitalist stabilisation, for the socialisation of the whole process of production, for proletarian dictatorship. Only such a programme of struggle, the Leninist programme of struggle, can be regarded as practical politics in the epoch of disintegrating, parasitical capitalism.

While widely advertising the stabilisation efforts of European capitalism, and trying to prove that these efforts refute the Leninist doctrine of Socialist revolution as the way out of the post-war blind alley, the Social Democrats at the same time ignore the fact of the stabilisation of the Soviet Union, the fact of the practical application of the ideas of Leninism.

6. Lenin's doctrine of world Socialist revolution has stood the test of the results of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union which was created by Lenin.

The basis of the Leninist doctrine, which is the foundation of the October revolution in Russia, was:

Firstly, the proposition that the weakest link in the chain of imperialist powers will give way first, and this weakest link was Russia, where the bourgeoisie was weaker than in Western Europe, where the struggle of the working class was intertwined with the struggle of the peasantry against the big landowners.

Secondly, the proposition of the victory of Socialism in a single country, which he formulated as follows:

"The unevenness of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, Socialism can be victorious at first in a few or even in one separate capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of this country, having expropriated the capitalists and having organised in its country, socialist production (italics ours), would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, rallying to its banner the oppressed classes of other countries, making these classes rebel against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity, come out with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states."

Both these propositions are fully borne out by events during the last decade, in spite of the Social Democratic theory.

The entire international Social Democracy, from Kautsky down to Martov, considered the establishment of proletarian dictatorship in Russia impossible, because of the lack of development of productive forces and of culture in that country. The entire international social democracy therefore prophesied the rapid collapse of the Soviet dictatorship. In 1917, this Social Democratic ideology was to a certain extent reflected also in certain Bolshevik circles as represented by Comrade Kamenev and Zinoviev who were opposed to the seizure of power.

The Leninist theory of revolution was based on the assumption that the International and the Russian situation was such that revolution would be victorious in Russia, in spite of the inferior development of her productive forces as compared with Europe. The Leninist theory was based on the assumption that the victorious proletariat of Russia will be able to create the necessary premises for the development of culture which will enable it to catch up to Europe very rapidly.

Events in the last decade have fully confirmed and borne out this strategical line of Lenin. The proletariat of Russia has not only managed to achieve victory and to resist the counter-revolution, which was supported by world imperialism, it has even managed to reconstruct the national economy devastated by 7 years war, it has managed to draw millions of workers into social activity, it has already managed to create a new social stratum — the workers and peasant intelligentsia. The following proposition of Lenin, used by him in the controversy with Sukhanov, the most Left of the Social Democrats, have already been confirmed by life itself.

"If for the establishment of Socialism a definite cultural level is necessary (although no one can say what this definite cultural level is), why should we be unable, after having seized power by revolutionary means to create, at first the premises for this definite level, and later on the basis of the workers and peasants power and the Soviet system — move forward to catch up with the other nations?" Lenin, Volume XVIII, part 2.)

At present even the Social Democrats are compelled to admit that this necessary cultural level is being reached, at a fairly rapid pace. That is why the centre of the attack of international Social Democracy is now transferred to another proposition of Lenin — to his theory of victory of socialism in a single country, the kernel of which is the idea of the possibility of the organisation of socialist production even in a single country in which the proletariat has seized power. The Social Democrats cannot now deny the fact of the upward trend of development of the U. S. S. R., but they try to prove that this upward trend of development is due to the revival of the elements of capitalism in town and country, to the retreat of the elements of Socialist economics, to the renaissance of bourgeois culture, to the national-reformist deterioration of the ruling party, Social Democracy, which always and everywhere helps the bourgeoisie to consolidate its social order, dons a "Left" toga when the U. S. S. R. is mentioned, and flaunts ultra-revolutionary phrases, for it knows full well that at the present time the international

proletariat can only be deceived by parading as ultra-radicals.

It would be a mistake to close our eyes to the fact that this ideology of the Social Democrats finds a certain echo in some upper circles of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. The comrades, who in October 1917 opposed the seizure of power by the working class, are now acting as the mouthpiece of the Social Democratic doctrine of the impossibility of the victory of Socialism in a single country. But the tiny opposition group in the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. no more reflects the frame of mind of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. than the panicky attitude of comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev in 1917 reflected the frame of mind of the workers, who were mounting the barricades.

The proletariat of the U. S. S. R., and the workers' delegations sent by the European proletariat, to visit and inspect the U. S. S. R. can see that the whole trend of Socialist construction vindicates entirely the Leninist theory of the victory of Socialism in a single country. The proletariat of the U. S. S. R. has succeeded in reconstructing its national economy much quicker than even Lenin thought it possible. Even at the end of 1922, Lenin dreamed of the stabilisation — even if only for a few months — of the Soviet valuta, of an accumulation of twenty million for the development of heavy industry, of the completion of the Volkhov Power Station, of some improvement in the co-operatives. Even in 1922 Lenin thought that the retreat begun in connection with the introduction of N. E. P. had only just come to an end.

But what do we see now?

The Soviet valuta has been stable for close on two years and is more stable than the valuta of the victorious countries. Capital expenditure this year amounts to billions, while in 1924—25 it only amounted to 400 million roubles. In addition to the Volkhov Power Station, the new hydro-electric station in Georgia and a number of other places are now functioning, — the construction of the following has been taken in hand:

1. The great Dniepr (Ukraine) Combine, part of which — the hydro-electric station is from four to five times as powerful as the Volkhov station; 2. the Siberian-Turkestan Railway (to cost over 100 million roubles) which will connect the corn region of Siberia and cattle breeding region of Kazakstan with Turkestan, which is rich in cotton; 3) a number of hydro and other electric stations, various industrial combines in Armenia, on the Volga, near Leningrad, etc.

The growth of industrial production shows at the same time that the elements of Socialist economics are growing relatively as well as absolutely not only at the expense of private industrial enterprises leased from the State, but also at the expense of the small home industries.

In the course of these years, the working class has shown that it has completely familiarised itself with Lenin's injunctions that it is necessary to "learn to trade". The correlation between the State-co-operative and the private trade has undergone the following change during the last years: whilst in 1923—24 the share of private trade was 3,976 million roubles and the share of the State co-operative trade 5,775 million roubles, i. e. 41% and 59% respectively, the correlation in the past year 1925—26 was as follows: the turnover of private capital shows an absolute growth, (to 4,860 million roubles) but its share in the general turnover fell to 23.7%, while the share of the State and co-operative trade increased up to 66.3% (15,608 million roubles).

In the last articles he wrote, Lenin pointed out that building up Socialism in Russia means to establish co-operative societies. And certainly the co-operative movement has achieved truly gigantic successes during the last two years. The number of members in Consumers' Co-operatives has risen from 7,100,000 in 1923—24 to 11,400,000 in 1926. The number of members in Producers' Co-operatives has risen from 2,000,000 in 1923—24 to 6,000,000 in 1926. The number of members in hunting, fishing, etc. co-operatives during last year increased from 519,000 to 590,000, i. e. an increase of 11%.

On the basis of this economic development, the working class has consolidated itself, raised its economic and cultural level, its trade unions have grown (at present about 9½ million workers are organised in trade unions in the U. S. S. R.), increased its social activity, and strengthened its connection with the advanced peasantry.

The question arises: if the problem of socialist construction can be considered from the point of view of the internal possi-

bilities of the U. S. S. R., what can prevent the proletariat of the U. S. S. R., from continuing to lead the country along the path of socialist construction, along the path of further successful struggle against the elements of private ownership in the economic system of the U. S. S. R.?

Any honest revolutionary worker will say — and this has been said by the numerous workers' delegations which visited the U. S. S. R. — that the internal possibilities of the U. S. S. R. — as the experience of the last year has shown — are such that the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. is well able to construct Socialism.

Can we claim to have complete guarantee of the victory of Socialism in the U. S. S. R.? The answer is in the negative, for the U. S. S. R. is encircled by the imperialist powers. Complete guarantee for the victory of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. cannot be thought of until proletarian dictatorship has been established in a number of advanced European countries. That is why the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. and its Party look upon their revolution as only a component part of World Revolution, that is, why the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. is deeply interested in the support of the revolutionary movement and of the oppressed peoples of the East and also of the working class of the western countries.

The Social Democrats endeavour to represent the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R., and with it the proletariat of the Soviet Union, as "narrow nationalist". But what is the evidence of the miners' lockout in Great Britain and of the struggle of the peoples of the East? That the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. and its Party are the most responsive and consistent allies of the struggling masses. It was the Social Democrats, for instance in Poland, and Germany, who, during the British strike, preached that "charity begins at home", and advocated the rejection of a solidarity strike, of active material support, etc. It is the Social Democrats (see for instance the "Vienna Arbeiter-Zeitung") who are propagating the theory that what is going on in China is a bourgeois revolution and therefore, is no concern of the proletariat of Europe. The more outspoken Social Democrats (of the MacDonald and Vandervelde type) show their "internationalism" by supporting the idea of a united policy among the imperialist powers with respect to the revolution of the Chinese workers and peasants.

The victory of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. cannot be the final victory, for Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. is always under the menace of imperialist interventions. This menace has considerably increased during the last years, for

world imperialism (and its lackey — international Social Democracy which deceives the proletariat by fairy tales about the deterioration of the U. S. S. R.) knows full well that the success of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. is a menace to its domination. The most serious menaces to their domination is the fact that the proletarians of the advanced countries are beginning to believe in the possibility of the victory of Socialism in a single, and therefore in their own country. This conviction is encouraged by the fact that they have the example of a powerful ally who is building up a social order — the Soviet Union. This conviction is beginning to be associated with the idea that outside the Proletarian Revolution there is no way out of the blind alley into which the world (and the given country) has been driven by the imperialist powers.

Therefore the growth and consolidation of the U. S. S. R. will be accompanied by increased efforts on the part of world imperialism to put a stop to the further development of the U. S. S. R. by open intervention or by inciting the small countries, adjoining the U. S. S. R. against her. That is why one of the fundamental tasks of the revolutionary workers throughout the world is to establish the united front for unity with the proletariat of the U. S. S. R., for the defence of the stronghold of world revolution.

7. Three years have passed since the death of the leader. During these three years the Communist vanguard of the working class has experienced victories as well as defeats. But on the strength of the experience of his country every proletarian can say that Lenin's Party, far from disintegrating has become consolidated and has improved its connection with the masses during the last years.

The Communist vanguard, and with it the world proletariat, have lost their leader. But the ideas and the doctrines of Lenin live! Every year brings with it fresh confirmation of the virility of Lenin's doctrines. The disintegration of British capitalism and the growth of Communism in Great Britain, the mighty development of the Chinese revolution, the success of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R., the growing acuteness of class antagonisms and the consolidation of the Communist Parties in the countries of Central Europe — all these facts are the best proof of the virility of Lenin's ideas.

Long live Leninism!

Long live proletarian unity under the banner of Leninism!

Long live the world proletarian revolution!

Agitprop of the E. C. C. I.

Leninist Teachings on the Colonial and National Revolutionary Movement and the Current Problems of the Revolutionary Movement in the East.

By P. Kitaigorodsky.

For the solution of national and colonial problems, Leninism starts from the following conceptions:

1. The imperialist world is divided up into two camps: on the one hand a handful of civilised nations possessing finance capital and exploiting the tremendous majority of the world's population, and on the other hand the suppressed and exploited peoples of the Colonies, and also of the dependent and semi-dependent countries.

2. The dependent and semi-dependent Colonies exploited by finance capital form a tremendous reserve and powerful source of strength for imperialism (India, China, etc.).

3. The revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples of the Colonial and semi-Colonial countries against imperialism is the only means of their emancipation from oppression and exploitation.

4. The most important Colonial and dependent countries have already entered on the path of the emancipation movement, which is bound to lead to a crisis of world capitalism.

5. The interests of the proletarian movement in various countries and of the national-emancipation movement in the Colonies, demands the unification of these two forms of the revolutionary movement into a common front against the common enemy, against imperialism.

6. The victory of the working class in the advanced countries and the emancipation of the oppressed peoples from the imperialist yoke is impossible without the formation and strengthening of a common revolutionary front.

7. The proletariat of the oppressing nations should give decisive support to the emancipation movement of the oppressed peoples against their "own" imperialism; this support means the energetic defence of the slogan — **right of nations to separation**, and to independent state existence. The realisation of this slogan is the best means of establishing fraternal collaboration of nations in a single world economic system comprising a material basis for the victory of Socialism.

Such, briefly are the main conceptions of Leninism as established in the resolution of the II. Congress of the Communist International passed, on the report of Comrade Lenin. The II. Congress of the Comintern, on the basis of the experience of construction in the Soviet East and the growth of the national-revolutionary movement in the Colonies, gave an extensive theoretical presentation of the national and colonial problem during the epoch of protracted struggle between imperialism and the proletarian dictatorship.

Since then, the struggle against the imperialist yoke in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, not only has not subsided,

but, on the contrary has greatly increased on the basis of the present day capitalist crisis.

First of all the imperialist war of 1914—1918 and then the post-war crisis of capitalism, above all European capitalism, weakened the economic and political rule of the imperialist powers over the Colonies.

On the other hand the same circumstances, which led to the narrowing down of the economic basis and sphere of political influence of European capitalism, intensified imperialist competition for the Colonies, thus still more disturbing the equilibrium of the entire world imperialist system.

It is just this enfeeblement of imperialist influence on the Colonies which has served and still serves as the starting point for the development of native capitalism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, where it is outgrowing and overgrowing the narrow and restraining bounds of imperialist rule. Hitherto the capitalism of the big powers, defending its monopolistic rights and the receipt of surplus profits from trade and the industrial and fiscal exploitation of the backward countries, endeavoured to isolate them from the world economic system. The slogan for **national state independence and economic autonomy** put forward by the national-revolutionary movements of the Colonial peoples during the present epoch, are an expression of the conscious requirements of bourgeois development.

The **Communist International**, with clear cognisance of the fact that the most varied representatives can express the will of the nations for state independence under various historical conditions, **supports every national-revolutionary movement against imperialism**. However, it at the same time does not lose sight of the fact that only a consistent **revolutionary policy** calculated on drawing the broadest masses into the active struggle and an absolute rupture with all partisans of compromise with imperialism in the interests of their own class rule, is capable of leading the oppressed masses to victory. The connection of the native bourgeoisie with the feudal-reactionary elements permits the imperialists to make wide use of the feudal anarchy, the rivalry of various leaders, clans, or tribes, the antagonism between town and village, the struggle of castes and national-religious sects in disorganising the national movements (China, Persia, Morocco, Syria, etc.)

In the majority of Eastern countries (China, India, Egypt, Syria) the **agrarian question** has primary importance for the process and issue of the struggle for emancipation from the yoke of imperialist despotism. In expropriating and ruining the peasantry of the majority of the backward nations, imperialism deprives them of the elementary means of existence while at the same time weakly developed industry, only existing in a few main centres in each country, is incapable of absorbing the increasing surplus of the agricultural population which cannot even emigrate. The peasants remaining on the land are paupers transformed into semi-serfs and **declassed proletarians** who, as in China, fill the ranks of various militarist bands. Whereas in the advanced countries industrial crises before the war played a certain role in regulating social production, in the Colonies famines play the role of such a regulating factor. Imperialism supports as much as possible the feudal-money lending forms of exploiting labour power in the backward countries, being vitally interested in getting the maximum profit with the smallest outlay of capital. In some countries, such as India, it takes upon itself the monopolistic right of the native feudal state to the land and gives the poll tax the effect of feudal dues to the imperialist capitalists and their overseers, while in other countries it extracts land rent through the native organisation of feudal big landowners as for instance in Persia, Morocco, Egypt, etc. The struggle to liberate the land from feudal requisitions and enclosures thus acquires the nature of a national-emancipation struggle against imperialism and feudal big landlordism. **Only an agrarian revolution aiming at the expropriation of the big landed estates is capable of arousing the broad masses of the peasants, who are destined to exert decisive influence on the struggle against imperialism.**

The short analysis we have made above shows that the East is not a single unit, but must be examined in a differentiated manner. The Eastern countries can roughly be divided up into 3 categories in respect of economic development.

The first group consists of the **most backward states** where industry is undeveloped, where there is no working class, and where pre-capitalistic relations completely dominate. Such are

Morocco, Afghanistan, Mongolia and Tannu-Tuva. In these countries cattle-rearing is the main occupation. In agriculture communes are still in existence; there is practically no bourgeoisie and no labour movement. Here the whole "nation" struggles against imperialism. The task of Communist elements in these countries consists in supporting a united national-revolutionary movement.

The second group of countries is distinguished by the fact that **agriculture is the main economic type**; but at the same time these countries have already got on the track of capitalist development, factories and works are already beginning to be constructed there, and an industrial proletariat is being born. This group includes **Egypt, Turkey, Persia, and Korea**. In these countries the main force in the national-revolutionary movement is the **petty and middle bourgeoisie**, mainly representing merchant capital. The working class of these countries organising itself into an independent party supports the national bourgeoisie in the anti-imperialist struggle.

And, finally, in the **third group of countries we must place India and China**, i. e. those countries where a stormy development of capitalism is to be observed, particularly during the past few years after the war. In these countries we already observe a powerful development of the **labour movement**. Here the working class has already separated itself from the common mass of toilers and become conscious of itself as a separate class. Therefore here the Communist Party is confronted with separate tasks. Here the bourgeoisie does not represent a single unit. The upper, big bourgeoisie, through fear of the labour movement in their own country, has already gone over to the side of the imperialists, has already come to agreement with them and in substance are playing a counter-revolutionary role. Therefore, in China, for example, where capitalist development takes place at an enormous rate, it is possible for the working class to realise hegemony in the revolutionary struggle. Last year's strike in Shanghai, and the Bombay strike in India which effected 150,000 workers are facts illustrating the strength of the wave of the labour movement.

The national-revolutionary movement in China has become the largest of all the movements in the Eastern countries.

From the viewpoint of the **struggle for peace**, revolutionary China, which has become an active factor in Far Eastern policy, can become, in alliance with the U. S. S. R., a tremendous factor of peace in the Far East. The future war in the Pacific will have a rear of 400 million Chinese. This fact and China's position in this war represent a tremendous factor which the imperialist states will have to take into consideration and examine in calculating all the chances of an armed conflict. The Workers' and Peasants' China linking up her fate with the October revolution and closely welded with the world proletarian movement will become a fighter against imperialist wars in the Pacific Ocean.

Revolutionary China is also a most important factor in the disintegration of capitalism. The imperialist states once again are most sharply confronted with the problem of foreign markets, and the falling away of China from the influence of foreign capital will mean a most serious blow to the imperialist regime.

Foreign capital has seized the most important part of industrial production in China. The collection of customs duties and various monopolies (salt for example) are entirely in the hands of the foreigners. The tax system is also almost exclusively under the control of the foreign rulers. China is a huge reservoir of raw material, a huge market for the investment of capital and for the realisation of manufactured goods.

Although the Chinese revolution, at its present stage of development historically is of a bourgeois-democratic nature, it is bound to acquire the nature of a broader social movement. The Chinese Revolution is not bound to result in the creation of such social political conditions as will lead to the capitalist development of the country. The Chinese Revolution which has taken place during the period of the decline of capitalism is a part of the general struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. "The structure of a revolutionary state is determined by its class basis. It will not be a purely bourgeois-democratic state. The State will represent a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat, peasantry and other exploited classes. This will be the revolutionary anti-imperialist government of the period of transition to non-capitalistic (socialist) development". (From the resolution of the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I.)

The subsequent development and perspectives of the Chinese Revolution in the first place depend upon the role of the proletariat. The events of recent years have shown that a fighting revolutionary national front can only be organised under the leadership of the proletariat. The fight against the hegemony of foreign capital can only be successfully conducted under the hegemony of the proletariat. This is the main principle determining the tactics of the Chinese Revolution.

In the resolution passed by the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I. on the Chinese question, we find the following definition of the role of the Chinese proletariat in the Revolution:

"The feudal-militarist cliques, wielding political power in a considerable part of the country, represent the forces of reaction and are the agents of imperialism. The native bourgeoisie, as a class, is relatively poorly developed and weak. The economically stronger strata of the bourgeoisie (financial bourgeoisie and merchants) are also closely connected with foreign capitalism by commercial and financial ties and by the fact that they have never taken part in the whole of the anti-imperialist struggle. The industrial bourgeoisie was together with the national-revolutionary movement as long as it was of a purely democratic nature, but at the first signs of revolution, it either stands aside or else tries to sabotage it. The petty-bourgeoisie (petty bourgeois intelligentsia, students, artisans, small traders, etc.) in such countries as China is revolutionary. It has played an important role in the past and will continue to do so in the future, but it is incapable of acting independently, it must go either with the proletariat or with the bourgeoisie. When the bourgeoisie retreats from the Revolution or conspires against it, the exploited middle classes fall under the revolutionary influence of the proletariat. In such a situation the driving force of the Chinese Revolution in its forthcoming stage is a revolutionary bloc of the proletariat, peasantry and petty bourgeoisie, which can and must be headed by the Chinese proletariat."

Lenin wrote:

"Whereas before the epoch of world revolution the movements for national emancipation were part of the general democratic movement, now, however, after the victory of the Soviet Revolution in Russia and the commencement of the period of world revolution, the movement for national liberation is a part of the world proletarian movement."

The programme of the Chinese Revolution in the structure of the revolutionary state created by this revolution, should be determined from the viewpoint of this conception. The process of class differentiation, which accompanies the development of the revolutionary movement, confirms this conception. The Canton Government, despite its bourgeois-democratic nature in the main objectively contains the embryo of a revolutionary petty-bourgeois state — the democratic dictatorship of a revolutionary bloc of the proletariat, peasantry and urban petty-bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeois democratic movement in China becomes revolutionary because it is an anti-imperialist movement. The Canton Government is revolutionary especially because of its anti-imperialist nature.

"Being above all anti-imperialist, the Chinese Revolution and the Government created by it should strike at the roots of imperialist power in China. The abandonment of the unequal treaties and the abolition of territorial concessions is insufficient for weakening the position of imperialism. The blow should be struck at the economic basis of imperialist power. This means that the revolutionary government should gradually nationalise the railways, concessions, factories, mines, banks and enterprises belonging to foreign capital. By this act it will immediately extend the narrow bounds of bourgeois democracy and enter into the stage of transition to the revolutionary dictatorship. The Chinese Revolution cannot destroy imperialism unless it emerges from the confines of bourgeois democracy. Under the existing conditions, the proletariat will lead the peasantry to the revolutionary struggle. The movement for liquidating feudalism proceeding under the hegemony of the proletariat must of necessity be transformed into the agrarian revolution" (See resolution of the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I. on the Chinese question).

The Chinese Revolution is becoming a centre of attraction for the awakening masses of the Far East. This has been proved

by the rising which has just taken place in Indonesia against Dutch imperialism. And even in neighbouring India, where, a certain "tranquility" has apparently been reigning, the subsequent offensive trend of development of the national revolution in China is bound to have its reflection also in India, the industrialisation of which will inevitably bring the role of the Indian proletariat more and more into the forefront.

For this reason Canton is becoming a kind of "Red Moscow" for the awakening masses of the Asiatic Colonies.

The task of the Communist International consists in helping the success of the Chinese Revolution with all its forces since it constitutes a tremendous factor in the disorganisation of the capitalist order. All Communist Parties in the imperialist countries should conduct agitation against military intervention in China. There must be a ruthless denunciation of the provocative policy of imperialism in China, and its financial and military aid to the Chinese militarists. The Western Sections of the Communist should develop extensive campaigns for the evacuation of foreign military forces from Chinese territory. At the same time demands must be put forward for the immediate recognition of the Canton Government as the national revolutionary government of the whole of China.

Workers' and peasants' China in alliance with the U. S. S. R. and the international proletariat is a powerful factor of peace in the Far East and a revolutionary "hinterland" of the world proletarian revolution.

CHINA

The Fight for Shanghai and the Intervention Work of the Imperialists.

By Tang Shin She.

"Shanghai for the Shanghaiers"! This slogan was raised by the population of Shanghai already in the year 1924 on the occasion of a fight between two military rulers for this town. At that time there was demanded self-government, withdrawal of all troops from the town and the closing of the arsenal. In the year 1925 the cunning Sun Chuan-Fang made use of this slogan in order to drive the troops of Chang Tso-Lin from the lower Yangtse area and to create a position there for himself. Sun Chuan-Fang gradually allied himself with the British imperialists and broke all the promises which he had previously given to the people. Soldiers again marched into Shanghai and the recently closed arsenal was again opened. Sun Chuan-Fang made himself Tupan of Shanghai, a post which had never previously existed in this town. His representative, permanently residing in Shanghai, was a certain Dr. Djin, proposed by the British, who had studied in England.

The various municipal bodies for Shanghai were dissolved; the President of the Chamber of Commerce, a well-known bourgeois democrat, was removed and his place taken by an agent of a British firm. The militia set up by the merchants, was also suddenly prohibited. This meant that Sun Chuan-Fang, on the command of the British imperialists, wished thoroughly to crush the Shanghai bourgeois-democratic movement, which is an enemy of the feudalistic military rulers and imperialists.

On the 23rd October 1926 a revolt of the workers broke out in Shanghai which was immediately crushed by means of the bayonets of Sun Chuan-Fang. Nevertheless the cry: Shanghai for the Shanghaiers! was heard more powerfully and insistently than ever. When on the 5th of November, Sun Chuan-Fang was defeated at Kiukiang and fled to Nanking, the inhabitants of Shanghai, from the working class up to the rich merchants (with the exception of the compradores), formed various organisations for the self-government of the town. The trade unions did magnificent work by winning hundreds of thousands of artisans for their organisations. A tremendous number of business employees were likewise organised.

After the 18th of November, when Sun Chuan-Fang went to Tientsin for the purpose of submitting to Chang Tso-Lin, the people of Shanghai openly demanded his withdrawal from the town. All the many associations for the organisation of the self-government of Shanghai, from the workers up to the rich merchants, were banded together in a "League of Shanghai Citizens". Bands of propagandists, consisting of workers, mer-

chants and students, were sent through the streets of Shanghai every day in order to enlighten the population. On the 30th November the trade unions, which up to then had been illegal, declared themselves to be legal.

On the 4th December 1926, Sun Chuan-Fang, returning from Tientsin to Nanking (as under-general of Chang Tso Lin and Vice commander of the Ngan-Kuo Chun army for safeguarding the country), immediately reinforced the occupation troops in Shanghai, prohibited a great demonstration under the slogan: "Shanghai to the Shanghaiers!", and again closed the premises of the trade unions. The people of Shanghai were not disturbed by these measures. The work of propaganda was eagerly continued.

The workers, after the closing of the trade union premises, at first, wished to enter on a general strike. The Shanghai citizens' organisations made the proposal that the strike be postponed to a suitable occasion when all citizens could take part in it, and in the meantime to open the trade unions again without permission. The workers agreed to this, joyfully cleared out the trade union premises and opened the office in another building. The "Union of Workers, Students and Merchants", founded in 1925 for organising the general strike, after the blood bath, was again called into life. It was arranged not to pay any taxes and to declare a general strike should Sun Chuan-Fang proceed against the population.

In addition to the "Shanghai for Shanghaiers!" movement, the efforts for autonomy of the three provinces Kiangsu, Anhwei and Chekiang gained great ground in Shanghai. In addition to the peasants, workers, merchants and students, they were supported by prominent personalities who were chosen in Shanghai as representatives of the "League of the Three Provinces". This league formed two committees: a military committee and a diplomatic committee. It has raised a protest against the return of Sun Chuan-Fang from Tientsin to Nanking and against the entry of the troops of Chang Tso-Lin into the Yangtse district; it has summoned the leaders of the provincial troops to the fight against Sun Chuan-Fang and for the self-administration of the three provinces, and sent protests to the diplomatic corps in Peking and to the British customs overseer, in which it opposed the supplying of weapons to Sun Chuan-Fang by various countries and demanded the confiscation of the weapons arrived from Germany. The League intends to organise a general taxes strike in all three provinces.

The League is working together with the Kuomintang and the trade unions. Chang Tso-Lin has issued orders for arrest against several of its leaders. On the 20th December 1926, Chekiang, as a result of the propaganda of the "League of the three provinces", already declared itself independent of Sun Chuan-Fang. Chang Tsung Chang has set out along with his hordes from Tsinan to Nanking in order to "pacify" the two other provinces. He was afraid to proceed at once to Shanghai.

The Canton government, at the behest of the population of the three provinces Kiangsu, Chekiang and Anhwei, and of the town of Shanghai, has initiated a relief action for these provinces. It has united the victorious troops of the Fukien and Kiangsi fronts and despatched them to capture the Shanghai-Nanking railway line. Already in November the Kuomin armies marched from Shensi in West Honan to the support of the Canton troops. They intend to seize the whole of the Lunghai railway line of which they already hold possession of about a fifth. The Lunghai railway line crosses the Peking-Lankow line and the Tientsin-Pukow line. Once it is captured the northern troops of Chang Tso-Lin are cut off. Chang Tso-Lin can then be completely driven out of Central China.

According to the latest reports the troops on the Chekiang side are already before Shanghai, while those of the Anhwei side have captured Wufu, a town in the neighbourhood of Nanking. That is already a great step towards capturing the Shanghai-Nanking line. As regards the attacks of the Kuomin armies on the Lunghai line, Chang Tso-Lin has already had to take good care and to send reinforcements in order to protect Tsinan and Peking. These transferances of troops again mean a tremendous advantage for the Canton armies on the Shanghai-Peking front.

So much for the military situation round Shanghai. The general strike planned by the workers up to the merchants has, according to latest telegraphic reports, been decided on by the inhabitants of Shanghai. Thus the population and the military

revolutionary forces are working hand in hand, a fact which brings still nearer to realisation the liberation of the five million inhabitants of Shanghai and the neighbourhood from the imperialists and counter-revolutionary military rulers.

The capture of Shanghai — a town which annually receives 40% of the total of the Chinese customs revenues and receives annually over 40 millions income from opium smuggling — and Peking, where sits that tool of the imperialists, the so-called central government, and the diplomatic corps, means an enormous danger for the imperialists. The attack of the English on the Chinese demonstrators in Hankow on the 3rd of January means an attack of the British imperialists against the headquarters of the revolutionary troops. The entry of the Chinese soldiers into the Hankow British "Concession" (which in fact is only a British quarter in the same sense as the Chinese quarter in Berlin, Paris or London) was already agreed upon by the English after the Hankow bloodbath of 1915. The present occupation of Hankow by Chinese troops was so loudly announced to the world by the English and so strongly criticised, in order thereby to create a pretext for sending warships up the Yangtse river, to provoke the Chinese population and to prevent the advance of the Canton troops to Shanghai and Nanking.

The British imperialists are despatching as many warships to the Yangtse as they possibly can. According to the latest reports the Japanese are also mobilising in South Japan an expeditionary force for Shanghai. The so-called democratic United States, which has enough work for its warships to do in Nicaragua, has also sent five destroyers to China. It looks as if the international imperialists are agreed upon the third point of the British Memorandum to China, according to which protest shall be preserved for important cases, but must, however, then be made effective by common action. The concentration of warships in the Yangtse is a first test. Upon its issue depends the fate of the Chinese revolution.

The international working class and the suppressed peoples must unite in thwarting the intervention of the imperialists.

AGAINST THE FASCIST TERROR IN LITHUANIA

A New Provocation on the Part of the Lithuanian Hangmen.

Moscow, January 4th.

Comrade Miskievitch-Kapsukas, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, writes the following article in the "Pravda":

Four Lithuanian communists have been executed by the Lithuanian fascists allegedly for preparing a Bolshevik insurrection, the proclamation of the Soviet Power in Lithuania and for attempting to join Lithuania to the Soviet Union. With regard to one of the executed, the 24 years old Tcherny, it is said that he was the organiser of the "Lithuanian Tcheka" which wished to murder above all, the chief of the Lithuanian secret police, Raczis and his assistants and other prominent "statesmen".

This stupid provocation was supported before the court by Raczis himself who was compelled under the government of the People's Party and the social democrats, to fly abroad to avoid the danger of being arrested and called to account for systematic provocations, the brutal maltreatment of political prisoners from amongst the workers and peasantry, for "electrical torture", etc. His criminal provocative and inquisitorial activity as chief of the Christian democratic secret police was so exposed during the May elections for the Lithuanian parliament and during the process against the 92 members of the so-called "Workers Group" that he preferred to fly abroad instead of facing the court. This criminal and professional provocateur is now sending the best representatives of the Lithuanian working class to their deaths.

The Lithuanian fascists now wish to place thirty communists and Left wing workers in Kovno, Schaulen, Poneviesh and Memel before the same court martial on the basis of the same provocative accusations.

However, also these victims do not seem to satisfy the bloody Lithuanian hangmen. The provocation of the alleged

Bolshevik insurrection, of the organisation of the Lithuanian "Tcheka", etc. is so crass a lie that it will not suffice alone to organise a blood bath amongst the Lithuanian working class. Therefore another and still greater provocation was necessary in order to give the Fascists complete freedom of movement and the possibility of drowning the working class movement of Lithuania in blood. To this end Lithuanian provocateurs organised Pitches and terroristic acts. In this respect the experience of their Italian friend Mussolini who greeted their coup d'état most warmly, was of great assistance to them. They hoped that their plans would be successful on account of the bitterness against the fascists which exists amongst the soldiers of Lithuania.

The Communist Party of Lithuania warns the workers and peasants against this new provocation. Any ill-considered outbreaks, any terrorist acts, can only consolidate the fascists and give them the possibility of decisively weakening the working class and the poor peasantry of Lithuania and also give Poland the possibility of intervening in Lithuania. The example of Bulgaria has clearly shown the result of terroristic acts in such a situation.

The Communist Party of Lithuania decisively condemns all terroristic acts or Pitches. It appeals to all its members to expose the provocations of the fascists and to prevent them everywhere.

The chief tasks of the Communist Party of Lithuania in this most difficult situation are: The mobilisation of its forces, the exposure of Lithuanian fascism and an agitation against it, the creation of a united fighting front against it, the mobilisation of all parties and all the toilers who are honestly prepared to struggle against fascism, the strengthening of the Left anti-fascist wing in the ranks of the social democratic and the People's Party and lastly the exposure of the treacherous role played by the leaders of the Social Democratic and of the People's Party during the fascist coup d'état.

Appeal of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Moscow, January 7th, 1927.

The Red International of Labour Unions has issued the following appeal to the working men and women of the whole world:

Down with the Lithuanian Fascists and Murderers!

The International revolutionary movement has once again received a heavy blow. Once again active members of the working class movement have been slaughtered by fascist murderers.

The fascists who have seized power in Lithuania, have begun to destroy the working class movement and to annihilate its leaders. Four active comrades have been executed and many more flung into prison. Many are threatened with death. The Lithuanian fascists are acting openly, they do not even consider it necessary to go through the comedy of a trial. The selection of the victims is completely left to the officers.

Working men and working women of the whole world! The fascist coup d'état in Lithuania proves once again that a united front of the world bourgeoisie exists. British imperialism, the leader of world reaction, is behind the Lithuanian fascists. The fascist coup d'état in Lithuania has once again proved that the reformists, by their tactic, aid and facilitate the seizure of power by fascism.

The workers of the whole world must carry on an untiring campaign against the orgies of fascism in Lithuania and other countries. The victims must be wrested from the hands of the Lithuanian hangmen. Workers of all political opinions must commence a struggle against the offensive of capitalism and fascism.

Down with the fascist rule of blood and provocation!

Down with the traitors and supporters of fascism in the ranks of the working class movement!

Long live the unity of the international trade union movement and the victory of the working class!

The A. U. C. T. U. to the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress.

Moscow, January 5th, 1927.

Comrades Tomsky and Dogadov have sent the following telegram to the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress in the name of the Presidium of the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions:

The Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions expresses the greatest indignation concerning the violence of the fascist reaction against active fighters in the political and trade union movement of Lithuania and appeals to the General Council to raise its voice against this new advance of capital in Lithuania.

A list of the twelve victims from the Lithuanian trade union movement is then appended.

Greifenberger, the secretary of the distributive workers union, **Tscheriny**, a member of the food workers union — both executed.

Abramovitch, an active member of the printers union — sentenced to hard labour for life.

Doctor Domashevitch, an active member of a trade union in Poneviesh, an old man, a member of the working class movement since 1890, for years one of the leaders of the transport workers union; **Visas**, an active member of the printers union; **Gashka**, an active member of a union in Poneviesh, — handed over to a court martial.

Stasyu Konis, a member of the railwaymen's union; **Yuchnevitch**, active member of a union in Poneviesh; **Daubaras**, an active member of a union in Bishan; **Tomashevski**, chairman of the building workers union in Memel and **Kaminski**, a member of the railwaymen's union.

POLITICS

The Situation in Hungary after the New Parliamentary Election.

By Bela Kun (Moscow).

I.

At the time of the December elections, the Horthy-Bethlen Government — a government of the large landowners and the big, industrial capitalists, brought together by the banks — again increased their terror to the utmost. As far as the Government terror allowed polling to take place, Bethlen had the overwhelming majority at the election. He won a decisive victory over the Parliamentary opposition parties, both the small democratic fractions and the Social Democratic party. The Social Democratic party lost ten of its twenty-four mandates. It lost all the mining districts, the trade union bureaucracy having previously succeeded in disrupting the trade unions in those districts. In Buda Pest, the S.P. of Hungary lost about 80,000 votes.

The left Socialist Labour Party had collected about 17,000 signatures for its list of candidates in Buda Pest. These 17,000 open signatures mean not only a veering to the Left of the Labour movement, they also indicate that this trend of the Left is already so strong that in Buda Pest alone many thousands dare — in spite of the terror — to profess their adherence to the consistent revolutionary class war. In the provinces, of course, the terror was much stronger; nevertheless the list of candidates of the Socialist Labour Party was signed by some thousands of workers and peasants. There was no voting for the Labour party, as everywhere the election commissioners of the Government found "legal reasons" for rejecting the lists of candidates.

Bethlen's victory and the defeat of the Social Democratic Party do not mean the defeat of the working class in Hungary; not only because the defeat of the S.P. was balanced by the success of the Left Socialist Labour Party, but also because the Social Democratic Party did not make the slightest attempt to oppose the class front of the workers and peasants to the Bethlen Government.

On the other hand, neither the Socialist Labour Party nor the Communist Party succeeded at this election in making such an organised stand that, in spite of Social Democracy, the worker and peasant front could have been formed in opposition to the Government of the large landowners and large capitalists. In consequence of the election terror it was not possible to spread the slogans of the class war through so large an area as would have been necessary for the organisation of broad masses of workers and peasants in resistance to the unbridled Government terror. Even the Government papers which celebrated Bethlen's victory, stated in many cases that the victory was only possible because either there were no such slogans or because such which would have been suitable were not spread widely enough for the organisation of the resistance of the working masses "to the well organised masters and authorities". Bethlen's election programme also was of such a nature that after the victory, pro-Government circles were obliged to state that it was only possible to see "for whom the country had voted, whilst no one had any idea for what, for what programme the country had voted."

There is no doubt that Social Democracy lost the overwhelming majority of its adherents not only in the provincial districts, where the voting was public, but also in the urban election districts where there is the secret ballot. Large masses of workers remained passive at the election because it was not possible for them to vote for the Communist Party or for the Socialist Labour Party. Thus, by means of terror, Bethlen succeeded in raising that large Parliamentary majority which is now faced by the solution of the Habsburg question without the Government having once raised this question during the election.

II.

The strange situation has arisen in Hungary that the Government did not actually publish its programme before the election, but that the announcement of its programme is only expected now, before the opening of Parliament. Even now however Bethlen is trying to evade having to take a stand on a definite programme. There is no doubt that the Government will set the new Parliament the following tasks:

1. The "completion of the political consolidation" of Hungary by solving the question of the monarchy in that some scion of the House of Habsburg is placed on the throne.

After the State Budget has been restored to health, capitalist private industry is to be restored by smothering the resistance of the trade unions and the working class.

Both tasks are closely linked with one another within the scope of the strategic plan of the Bethlen Government. In the Hungary of to-day, the rule of large agrarian capital and of large industrial capital has almost reached its pre-war dimensions. This rule, which was not only shattered in Hungary by the revolution, but which even the counter-revolution had no intention to re-establish, as the counter-revolution wished to replace the proletarian dictatorship by the rule of the corps of officers and the bureaucracy supported by the rich peasants and the petty bourgeoisie — this rule has been so far restored by Bethlen that in his opinion nothing is wanting for the consolidation of the Hungary of to-day but the bestowal of a king on "the kingless kingdom". On the other hand, Bethlen wishes to create an economic basis for political consolidation by establishing the equilibrium of private capitalist industry, since the restoration of the National Budget has been brought about by plunging the masses of workers into misery. With this object in view, Bethlen has driven all opposition out of Parliament and is also preparing to prevent any movement of opposition outside Parliament, which might resist the restoration of the Habsburg monarchy or the reconstruction of capitalist private industry.

He has therefore stifled all Parliamentary parties which have themselves announced that they represent the workers, petty bourgeoisie or small farmers. In doing so he not only stifled those parties which had carried on, "from the Left", a sham fight for Democracy in Parliament, but also the so-called Nationalists on his Right who represented the interests of the leading classes and groups of the counter-revolution. Undeniably, Bethlen may achieve great success as regards the consolidation of the rule of the united industrial and agrarian large bourgeoisie. At the same time however it is a fact that he succeeded even less in

nullifying the revolution, than he did the counter-revolution, as, in spite of the election terror, a trend towards the Left, in sharp contradiction to the Parliamentary victory of the Government, was clearly expressed in the ranks both of the workers and peasants. This veering to the Left has not yet brought the Left Labour parties any ripe fruits; the discontent of the working masses however is growing at such a rate and, in spite of "legalised terror", is so rapidly beginning to assume organised forms, that Bethlen is compelled more and more to use "illegal" methods of terror, in contradiction to the policy of consolidation which he has repeatedly announced.

The police is employing methods of provocation on a large scale against the Communist Party of Hungary. In order to arrive somehow at the centre of the Party, they let loose a whole swarm of agent provocateurs on the Communist organisations. They overdo this stupid policy of provocation to such an extent that they try to lay all sorts of attempted deeds of violence at the door of the Communist Party. Another aim of the police methods of provocation is "to expose a connection between the C. P. of Hungary and the Socialist Labour Party". As however, no such organised connection exists, the police are, under the instructions of the Government, "constructing a connection".

The terrorist behaviour towards Social Democracy has the aim of using the defeat of the S. P. at the election in order to compel its leaders to accept a cheap compromise, and also to persuade them to "unmask" and turn out of the party the elements of opposition which are fairly strongly represented in the party and which take a more and more aggressive attitude.

At the present time the trade unions are the chief target of the offensive. Neither the open counter-revolution nor the counter-revolution consolidated by Bethlen succeeded in developing a Christian Socialist trade union movement in addition to the Socialist trade unions. It was the Social Democratic leaders themselves who drove the trade unions from the platform of the class war, and it was only the Social Democratic trade union bureaucracy which succeeded in disintegrating the organised front of the workers; this they did firstly in that, through the ill-famed pact with the Government, they consented to millions of agricultural labourers being deprived of the right of coalition and betrayed the railwaymen, who were organised illegally, and secondly in that they destroyed the unity of a whole number of trade unions by the wholesale expulsion of members who were in opposition (the unions of metal workers, miners, leather workers etc.). Bethlen believes that the time has now come when he, independently, without the help of the Social Democratic leaders, can draw tight the noose round the neck of the trade unions. He demands that the trade unions should be carried on "on non-party lines", he demands that the trade unions should renounce the class war and take their stand on a national platform.

In the most cowardly way the Social Democratic Party is funking the organisation of a real fight for the protection of the trade unions. In spite of this despicable behaviour of the Social Democratic leaders, the efforts to restore a united front of all the Labour parties and of the trade unions for the protection of the latter, meet with the complete approval of all organised workers, including the masses of workers affiliated to the Social Democratic Party. The Hungarian workers clearly understand that the attempts of the Bethlen Government to reconstruct private industry is only to a very small extent based on long-period industrial credits; the Government intends to carry out the whole reconstruction and rationalisation, as one of its component parts, chiefly by stifling the resistance of the working class. Just for this reason, the working class will defend its trade unions with increased vigour, conscious that, through their fight in self-defence, the trade unions will again become instruments of a relentless, consistent class war in Hungary.

The Hungarian workers are now, since the election, combining the fight for the protection of the trade unions with the fight against the restoration of the Habsburgs. The Bethlen Government still observes secrecy as to which scion of the House of Habsburg it wishes to place on the throne. There are three serious suggestions: Otto, the son and "legitimate" heir of the last Habsburg King, Albrecht, the son of the former Commander-in-Chief of the Austro-Hungarian army, the archduke who was

actively concerned in the franc forgery affair or — as third suggestion — the "Hungarian" Habsburg, archduke Josef, one of the chief and worst murderers of soldiers in the Great War, is to mount the throne.

Bethlen of course wants a king over whom he has a firm hold, and who, through his home and foreign connections, is most suited to be a reliable support for the allied large landowners and large capitalists. The Bethlen Government is of the opinion that, through the election, it has cleared out of the way all the obstacles to the Habsburg restoration, and it is trying to overcome all the difficulties in foreign politics connected with the Habsburg question.

In this respect, Bethlen is cleverly turning to account the dissensions between Italy and Yugoslavia and the progressive disintegration of the Little Entente. He tacks between friendship with Yugoslavia and Italy. In all the neighbouring countries, Yugoslavia, Czecho-Slovakia and Roumania, he has persuaded the Hungarian bourgeois minority parties to enter into a pact with the Government; he has not only energetically suppressed the Irredentist movement, but he is preparing to crush any movement against the Treaty of Trianon and every attempt to defend the Hungarian minorities living in the neighbouring States. The British Government has long had nothing to object to in a Habsburg restoration. Several years ago, Briand secretly expressed his benevolent neutrality towards an attempt at restoration, and has now recalled the French Ambassador and an attaché of the French Embassy who, at the time of the franc forgery trial, were not inclined to agree to Bethlen's attempts to hush up the affair. Mussolini recently negotiated personally with Albrecht, one of the pretenders to the throne; rumours have also been in circulation that he would not be disinclined to the selection of Otto. Even during the putsch in favour of the King in 1922 Roumania was the country which offered the last resistance to the restoration of the Habsburgs; now there is even talk of an alliance by marriage between the Habsburgs and the Roumanian Hohenzollern, and the Bethlen Government is promising Roumania every support against Soviet Russia. Negotiations are also being carried on with Yugoslavia, and only the behaviour of Czecho-Slovakia seems to be a specially uncertain factor amongst the foreign political factors which may influence the fate of the restoration of the Habsburgs in Hungary.

An agitation against the Habsburg restoration set in in the course of last Summer amongst the masses of Hungarian workers and peasants; the Social Democrats are the only ones amongst the Labour parties who refuse to recognise the danger it involves. This struggle is centred round the slogans of the Republic and of the Worker and Peasant Government. No sacrifice is considered too great for the intensification of the fight. Propaganda for a bourgeois republic is even forbidden by law in Hungary. In consideration of this, the Social Democratic Party is not carrying on any republican agitation and contents itself with demanding that the law prohibiting republican propaganda be revoked. Hundreds of thousands of brochures and pamphlets — partly legal and partly illegal publications — have in recent times been agitating against the Habsburg danger, and for the Republic, for the Worker and Peasant Government. Every week Communist workers and other workers on the Left are thrown into prison and interned because of this agitation. Nevertheless the agitation has continued to increase since the election. The prospects of developing a united front to fight against the Habsburg danger and in protection of the trade unions are steadily increasing. Increasing numbers of Social Democratic workers are becoming convinced of the necessity of the united front, and the two slogans of the republic and the worker and peasant government are finding an echo even among the peasantry.

The Habsburg Parliament will meet at the end of January. The Hungarian workers, who are consistently carrying on their fight in defiance of all persecution, expect that our brother Parties in foreign countries, especially in Czecho-Slovakia, France and Britain, in which countries they are represented in Parliament, will hasten to their aid in the fight against the national and international danger of the Habsburg restoration.

The Indian National Congress.

By M. N. Roy.

The 41st Annual Session of the Indian National Congress was celebrated during the last days of December. The annual session of the Congress is the most important occasion in the annals of the Nationalist movement. Important political decisions are taken there which govern the conduct of the movement during the following twelve months. The character of this year's session is indicated by the following quotation from the presidential address:

"No scheme of self-government will be acceptable which denies full control of the civil service, the military, naval and air forces, and political relations with the Indian States, and which refuses India Dominion status upon the same terms as those determined by the Imperial Conference."

This can be taken as the programme of the Indian Nationalist Movement for the immediate future. The programme formulated in these words may be extreme or moderate according to the interpretation that will be put upon them eventually. But in the midst of this ambiguity one thing is very clear, that is, that the leaders who are very definitely against a revolutionary struggle are being pushed unwillingly towards a more extreme position under the pressure of the rank and file.

In spite of this general left tendency the Congress, as a whole, presented not a very encouraging spectacle. While three years ago as many as thirty thousand delegates attended it, this year the number of delegates dropped to two thousand five hundred. In other words, from a gigantic mass demonstration — the annual session of the national congress has become a meeting of a certain section of the nationalist movement.

Traditionally and theoretically, the National Congress is not a party organisation; it is called the National Parliament. As a matter of fact, since its foundation in 1885, up till the stormy years immediately following the imperialist war, the National Congress represented the political platform of the native bourgeoisie. In the period of 1919/22 the Congress was a gigantic mass organisation focusing the revolutionary will of the entire people to become free from imperialist domination. But even during this revolutionary period the Congress essentially remained under bourgeois leadership. Its political outlook was reformist and its social ideology was decidedly reactionary. Although the conscious representatives of the big bourgeoisie left the Congress, the petty bourgeois nationalists who led the movement actually represented the bourgeoisie. They tried to use the revolutionary mass movement to further the reformist demands of native capitalism. This contradiction eventually led to the collapse of the movement. The Swaraj Party which, during the last two years has captured the National Congress arose out of this collapse of the revolutionary mass movement.

The Swaraj Party, itself, embodied the two conflicting tendencies inside the Nationalist Movement. The leadership was reformist while the rank and file inclined towards revolution. The central slogan of the nationalist movement during the acutely revolutionary period of 1919/22 was the refusal to co-operate with the British Government in any way. Essentially this was a very revolutionary slogan and, in reality, it did develop into revolutionary action. The National Congress in 1920 decided to boycott the pseudo-parliamentary institutions introduced by the reforms of 1919. That was the central pivot of the non-co-operation movement. The Swaraj Party was born in the opposition to the programme of boycotting the parliamentary institutions. In other words, the Swaraj Party was born by practically repudiating the programme of refusing to co-operate with the British Government. It proposed to fight imperialist absolutism through constitutional parliamentary ways. The essence of this programme was not an unconditional fight against imperialism but to negotiate with imperialism for the best possible terms of self-government within the British Empire. In comparison to this essential reformist nature of the Swarajist programme, the demand contained in the above quotation from the speech of the President of this year's Congress is indeed extreme. When the Nationalist movement demands a control of the military forces a compromise with imperialism becomes impossible. It is doubtful whether the President was fully aware of the gravity of his pronouncement. He might have said those words in order to pacify the rank and file which are becoming very dissatisfied with the policy of compromise; but the fact

remains that the National Congress has officially committed itself to such an extreme position.

Apart from this, this year's National Congress has practically taken no decisions. This undecisive character of it is all the more remarkable because never in its history has the National Movement required more urgently and clearly a determined lead. The big bourgeoisie has definitely gone over to the side of imperialism. The policy of parliamentary opposition advocated by the Swaraj Party has gone bankrupt. The interests of the masses demand a decisive struggle against imperialism. The British rulers are laying clever plans to intensify the exploitation of the Indian masses in conjunction with the native bourgeoisie. Under these circumstances the Nationalist Movement is faced with two clear alternatives, namely: capitulation to imperialism, or a bold revolutionary fight. The National Congress was expected to choose one or the other of these two alternatives. What it did, however, was to adopt the policy of "wait and see". But even this should be considered a victory for the revolutionary forces. The leaders had the intention of forcing upon the Congress their programme of compromise with imperialism. Obviously, they have not succeeded in this. Although they have not come out squarely in favour of a revolutionary fight, they have not been able to carry through their programme of capitulation. Of course, the present bourgeois leaders will never go with the revolutionary forces. As soon as they see that their following is getting out of their control, they will go over to the camp of counter-revolution where they really belong.

The undecisive and ambiguous position taken by this year's Congress has been determined by the results of the last elections which took place immediately before the Congress met. The Swaraj Party was split into not less than four factions by the controversy over the election programme. The general demand was for abandoning the tactics of parliamentary obstruction and assuming the responsibility of office. The official Swarajist leadership, however, could not agree to this demand. To do so would be tantamount to committing political suicide. The tactics of parliamentary obstruction was the one feature which distinguished the Swaraj Party from the other bourgeois parties. There is no difference in essentially political demands, the common demand being: self-government within the British Empire to be attained by stages.

Consequently, the official Swaraj Party contested the elections with the programme of non-acceptance of office. This programme does not mean anything unless by not accepting office the Swarajists can render the formation of a ministry impossible. This implies that the Swarajists must have a majority in the legislative bodies in order to carry on their programme. The Swarajists lost the elections. — Only in one province they won the majority and that also of one of the elected states. This means even in that province a ministry can be formed with the help of the government and nominated members. In other provinces as well as in the central legislative the position is much worse. The Swarajists hoped to win the elections but they could not even maintain the position they had in the last parliament. In a number of provincial legislative councils their number has dwindled to half. In the national legislative assembly they have lost considerable ground.

Under these circumstances, the policy of parliamentary obstruction has become entirely untenable. Everywhere the right wing bourgeois parties and the dissident Swarajists are ready to form ministries which could not be opposed successfully. In consequence, the Swarajists will be practically eliminated from the political picture. In view of this situation the Swarajist leaders are naturally eager to change their policy. As a matter of fact, already before the elections, they had declared that it would be necessary to change the policy if the country so demanded. By "the country" they meant, the electorate representing two per cent of the entire population. "The country", as represented by the electorate did not approve of the Swarajist policy of obstruction. Therefore, if the Swaraj Party had a free hand to conduct the nationalist politics at the bidding of the fortunate few enfranchised by the grace of British imperialism, they would have the National Congress declare that the interests of the nation demanded acceptance of office. This they could not do and herein lies the significance of this year's National Congress.

The revolutionary potentiality of the Nationalist Movement becomes still more noticeable when it is remembered that the

President of the Congress had himself declared on the Eve of the Congress that non-acceptance of office could not be a policy applicable under all circumstances. He even secured the assistance of Gandhi for his programme of capitulation. For some time, Gandhi had preached the theory that to accept office was the logical conclusion of the Swarajist policy of entering the legislative council. He argued that the Swarajists could not honestly refuse to participate in the responsibility of administration once they entered the legislative bodies. Obviously, the mood of the Congress was threatening. If the leaders had come out with their programme of capitulation as they desired, they would have been faced with a rebellious following dangerously beyond their control. It would certainly have been more beneficial for the Nationalist Movement had the situation been brought to such a climax. In that case, the petty bourgeois revolutionary forces that constitute the rank and file of the Congress would have been completely liberated from the ideological influence of the bourgeois leaders. The Congress would have become a real fighting organisation. But, as it is, the situation still remains rather unclear.

As in the previous sessions, this year also there was a resolution before the Congress to change what is called "The Creed". The demand was that the Congress should declare complete independence as its goal instead of self-government within the Empire. All the leaders spoke against this resolution — Gandhi being one of them. The defeat of the resolution indicates that the revolutionary wing is still not strong enough to assume the leadership of the movement. But the events in the following weeks, which have been predetermined by the election results, will clarify the situation. The policy of non-acceptance of office and parliamentary obstruction, half-heartedly sanctioned by the Congress, cannot be maintained. The Swaraj Party must make its position clear. There is little doubt which way the leaders will move; except in one province, the Swarajists will not be asked to form a Ministry. In the single province where they had the majority a tacit agreement has already been reached by which the Swarajists will support the ministry formed by the non-Swarajist nationalists. This method will be adopted everywhere. If not formally, the Swarajists will co-operate with the British administration in reality. Attempts will be made to cover this policy of capitulation by radical phraseology, but this will not succeed. The revolutionary following will see through this strategy before long, and what should have been the outcome of this year's congress will be accomplished, if not before the next year's Congress, certainly then.

The Changes in the Governments of Finland and Latvia.

By M. G. Bach.

Almost simultaneously with the Fascist overthrow of the Government in Lithuania, parliamentary changes of Government have taken place in two other Baltic States, Finland and Latvia.

In Finland, the crisis, which had been dragging on for about a month, was solved at the beginning of December by the formation of a Cabinet consisting exclusively of Social Democrats with the well-known Tanner at its head. The former Kallko Cabinet, composed of members of the Right and the Centre, was compelled to resign because of the vote of non-confidence sprung upon the former War Minister by Parliament; he is responsible for the great corruption in connection with orders for the army which has involved a loss of many millions to the National Treasury.

The relation of forces in the present Parliament is as follows: the Rights have altogether 61 mandates (the reactionary party of the Unionists 38, the Swedes 23), the Centre has also 61, (the large peasant "Agrarian party" 44, the Progressives 17), the Lefts 78 (Social Democrats 60, revolutionary "Socialist party" 18). How can it be explained that the bourgeoisie which has an overwhelming majority of votes in Parliament (122 out of 200) has handed over the Government to the Social Democrats? Chiefly because the bourgeoisie has nothing to fear from the Finnish Social Democrats. During the Government crisis which arose at the time of the discussion of the Budget for 1927, the Social

Democrats were the very ones who offered a number of proofs of their complete "loyalty" to the bourgeoisie.

In common with all the bourgeois deputies, the Social Democrats voted for the allocation of a special sum (26 million Finnish marks) for the "protection of the frontiers between Finland and Russia". A section of the Social Democratic deputies had even voted for the inclusion of 30 million marks in the Budget for the support of the Fascist "defence corps", which number 100,000 members and are known throughout the country as a focus of monarchist and anti-labour movements.

It is therefore not surprising that in the Government programme of the new Ministry nothing is to be found which does not correspond with the programmes of all former bourgeois Cabinets. In the question of armaments for instance, Tanner, the Prime Minister, stated that this Cabinet would support "the international endeavours to reduce military expenses." In the question of the Foreign Policy of the new Cabinet, especially as regards the very immediate question of the reciprocal relations with the Soviet Union, Tanner confined himself to non-committal phrases as to his wish "to live in amity with all other States".

As we see, the Social Democrats justify the confidence shown them by the Finnish bourgeoisie. Even for tactical considerations however, bourgeois political circles gladly handed over the Government to the Social Democrats. Within a few months, be it known, a parliamentary election is to take place in Finland. It is quite comprehensible that it is advantageous for the bourgeois parties to leave the Government for a time in order to give the population a chance of forgetting to some extent the corruption affair of the Government which was recently disclosed and in order at the same time to compromise the Social Democrats who had to form a Cabinet composed exclusively of Social Democrats, but which is entirely dependent on the votes of the bourgeois parties.

In spite of the absurdity of the position into which the Social Democracy of Finland has drifted, they have clung to the ministerial posts, and once more shown themselves ready to win the approval of the bourgeoisie.

The situation in Latvia is somewhat different. In that country, Parliament, on December 17th, expressed its confidence in the new Skueneka Cabinet composed of the Centre and the Left which has taken the place of the Albering-Ulmanis Cabinet, consisting of reactionaries and large peasants. The new Cabinet has the support of the Social Democrats, who have 33 out of the 100 seats in Parliament, of the Left bourgeois groups and of a section of the national minorities; the new Coalition commands altogether 52 votes. The Social Democrats hold the majority of the ministerial posts, including the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Finance.

One might have expected that the change of Government would involve a more or less radical change in the political course pursued in the country, but the first steps taken by the new Cabinet show that, to all appearances, everything will remain as it was, and that the Latvian Kerenskys have even less courage than their Lithuanian colleagues. The Government programme which, by the bye, has been drawn up by the Social Democrats, is very liberal. In view of the protest of the Left bourgeois groups, the Social Democrats have desisted from their "most radical" demands — unemployment insurance, reduction of military service, a treaty of guarantee with the Soviet Union. In the questions of foreign policy, the declaration announces that it is essential to create a close alliance with Estonia, Lithuania and Finland, and further announces that the treaty of guarantee with the Soviet Union "will be brought into harmony" with Estonia and Finland. In order to realise this bringing into harmony, Zelens, the Social Democratic Minister has already gone to Reval to discuss the question.

As regards internal policy, it must be said that the overthrow of the Government in Lithuania and the formation of the new Cabinet in Latvia have called forth a remarkable revival of the activities of the Latvian Fascists. The Fascist, and semi-Fascist Press of Latvia has greeted the overthrow of the Government in Lithuania with great enthusiasm. Kliewe, the leader of the "Peasant League" of the large peasants, who has been in power the whole time, stated in Parliament that "the Right group in

the Latvian Parliament would do all that was necessary in order to shorten the days of the new Cabinet". The numerous Fascist organisations — "The Latvian Nationalist Club", "The Watch over the Fatherland", "The Latvian Patriots", the students' associations, in which 2000 persons are organised in Riga, and finally the "Latvian Defense Divisions" numbering 20,000 to 25,000 under arms — are undoubtedly preparing for action at the present time under the pretext of opposing the "Left" Cabinet, but actually with the object of establishing a Fascist regime in Latvia.

We see that the present situation in Latvia is, in many respects, reminiscent of the situation which existed in Lithuania a few months ago. In Latvia however, just as in Lithuania, the Social Democrats who take part in the Government, are directing their endeavours not to opposing Fascism, but to opposing the revolutionary movement in the country. The persecution of Labour organisations and the arrest of workers on the accusation of Communism are continued just the same under the "Left" Cabinet. On December 18th the administrative department of the district Court of Riga finally dissolved the Jewish Labour organisation "The League for Culture" and the workers' sport organisation "Energy". On the 20th and 21st, wholesale domiciliary visits were made throughout the country at the command of the new Social Democratic Minister of the Interior, and wholesale arrests of persons accused of Communism.

REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS IN THE COLONIES

The Revolts in Indonesia.

By Gerard Vanter (Amsterdam).

The revolt in Sumatra was, as the Indonesia Press maintains, not unexpected. The events however are a bitter disappointment to the Dutch capitalists; for, after the sanguinary victory of the government forces and after the arrest of all the Communists known throughout West Java — although, it is true, many of the leading comrades succeeded in escaping — it was thought that the danger was overcome. And now it turns out that the arrest and deportation of thousands of communists has been to no purpose and that a new revolt has flared up. — The new area of insurrection is in a modern industrial district, in which coal-mining is carried on. This industrial district is now isolated from the port of Padang. The reports of victory given by the Dutch imperialists must be accepted with reserve — what is certain is that traffic on the railway was only possible with armoured trains. All other means of communication are impossible and the railway lines have been torn up again.

The natives with whom the Dutch imperialists have to deal here are of quite a different mentality from those in Java. The Javanese have been called "the gentlest people on earth", the natives of Sumatra are proud and self-confident by nature. Fortunately, too, they are not defenceless; a Dutch officer has already been killed. The fear of the Dutch imperialists that the revolt may spread to the petroleum district of Djambi and the East coast of Sumatra, where a quarter of a million contract coolies live in actual slavery on the tobacco plantations, is not without foundation.

There is no reason to doubt that the era of revolts has set in, that the time of open civil war has come. The Dutch bourgeoisie in Indonesia is already openly mobilising for civil war; according to the reports of the "Nieuws van den Dag van Nederlandsch Indie", a daily paper in Batavia, of November 24th, two battalions of voluntary militia, 1,130 strong, had already been formed. By the next day, this number had already increased to 1,396. The Dutch personnel in the sugar factories, the employees etc. in Central Java were armed by the Government. The Indonesian bourgeois Press is agitating in the most incredible way against those in prison. "Why have they not been hanged?" asks the above mentioned paper, "50 gallows in King's Square (in Batavia) and a few similar instruments in the various places in the Bantam district would have had a salutary effect on the population for fifty years to come". This paper also points to the fine example of Shanghai and Hongkong where the volunteer troops are doing excellent work.

"The volunteers in Shanghai and Hong Kong — where they have to deal with the same communist nationalism fanned into flame by Russia, and where British protection is far more powerful and efficacious than is Dutch protection here — have done good and practical work in recent times. What happened for instance in the mutiny of the Sikhs in Singapore in 1915? The scoundrels taken with arms in their hands were simply put up against the wall — as were the Spartacists in Germany by the Social Democratic Government. The volunteers, it is true sometimes fired too high or too low, but this was soon put right by the officers with their revolvers. — It was the most natural thing in the world!"

We see from this, that the spirit of Mussolini and Noske has taken hold of the Dutch bourgeoisie in Indonesia. It is characteristic that the terror is already beginning to turn against the Social Democrats!

Various sentences of death have been passed. The Indonesian Press cannot but admit that our comrades behave in a "self-assured" way before the Court. The "Java Bode" published a detailed report of the "trial". According to the report, the accused said that the insurgents wished to follow the Russian example and would turn the revolution in the first place against the "imperialisme asing", against foreign imperialism. When asked what he meant by this, the accused said: "The foreign rule of the Dutch, that is plain enough. And if, this time, the results have not been what the masses hoped for, the masses will seize power by force." — In the meantime deportations, in an administrative way, without trial, are continuing. The place of banishment in South New Guinea is described by the Indonesian Press as a marshy spot, a deserted district, where nomad tribes wander and in comparison to which St. Helena might be called a Palace Hotel in the centre of the civilised world. Voices have been raised in the Indonesian Press demanding of the Government that those under banishment should found Government undertakings under well armed supervision in New Guinea, and should prepare the soil for the cultivation of tobacco or sugar.

At the same time however as these "practical" exploiters were discussing the matter, new revolts broke out, which warn the bourgeoisie to be on their guard. The Press in Holland, especially the Christian, Calvinist Press of the party of Colyn, the former Prime Minister, the man of the Royal Dutch Shell, speaks in blood-thirsty language. The paper "De Standaard", an organ of the Government party, expresses a fear that the blows of the Dutch military were not vigorous enough. The short trials, the death sentences, etc. are approved of by the paper; it would however be better if the matter were dealt with more thoroughly, if there were no firing in the air, but if care was taken that the bullets hit the object for which they are intended! Any hesitation is criminal!

The Social Democrats declare that Indonesia is not sufficiently ripe for national independence and one must first endeavour by evolutionary means to create the conditions for this independence. It is therefore understandable that the social democratic press ventures to assert that the Government, with its conservatism and cruelty, is equally "responsible" for the bloody deeds against the natives as are the Communists with their stupid slogan of "Separation of Indonesia from Holland!"

The revolutionary attempt to realise this slogan thus met with very little understanding on the part of the Dutch workers and least of all on the part of the aristocracy of labour, which to a certain extent enjoys the privileges which fall to its share from the milliards of profit made by the Dutch bourgeoisie.

The fight of the Communist Party of Holland against all these petty bourgeois conceptions and moods within the working class is not so easy and makes fairly heavy demands on the Party. The C. P. of Holland, together with the revolutionary trade union centre has tried to develop an agitation in favour of the insurgent peasants and workers in Java. Up to the present, however, it has not accomplished anything except that a fairly small number of protest meetings have been held in the most important towns of the country, which, it is true, were fairly well attended, but which have not yet brought us sufficiently into touch with those elements with whom we have not yet been able to establish a connection.

This is largely to be explained by the still quite inadequate influence of the C. P. of Holland in the trade unions. Apart

from its comparatively strong influence in the N. H. S. (the revolutionary trade union centre affiliated to the R. I. L. U., which numbers 14,000 members) the Party has almost no influence in the Reformist unions (the N. V. V., the Reformist trade union centre, which has 200,000 members). Further, it must be taken into consideration that the C. P. of Holland is weakened by fractional conflicts within the Party which have lasted for years, and that the re-organisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei has not yet yielded results, in practice, as regards extending the influence of the Party and increasing the membership.

Some mistakes were also made by the Party, especially at the beginning of the campaign in Indonesia. At the beginning of the struggle, the Party advocated its demands with too little clearness and consistency. It has also shewn insufficient light, in the party Press, on the historical significance of the Javanese insurrection in connection with the tremendous events in the East and especially in China. These mistakes have been recognised by the party leaders, and the Party has corrected them by putting its demands very concretely and in accordance with the instructions given by the E. C. C. I., and by combating and refuting with all intensity the petty bourgeois conceptions with regard to colonial questions, which have clung obstinately to their existence even in the Dutch labour movement.

ECONOMICS

An Attempt at Capitalist Rationalisation in Spain.

By JAR (Madrid).

Spain is at present passing through a serious economic crisis, mainly due to conditions which arose after the world war. During the war the Spanish capitalists enjoyed unexampled prosperity; the European market absorbed all the production, but Spanish industry never thought of renewing its plant adequately. The profits gained by Spanish industry as a result of the world war during the years 1914—1918 are estimated at 8000 million Pesetas; (data obtained by Dr. Bernis, Professor of Economics).

But Spain carried out hardly any measures of economic improvement. In 1913 there were 14,396 kilometres of railway lines, in 1926 there were 15,266. The increase in this respect, is thus quite insignificant. Of all European countries Spain probably possesses the worst means of communication. The smelting industry has not made the slightest progress during these years. Spanish iron ore is shipped at Bilbao, carried to England to be smelted and sent back for the Spanish market just as was done many years ago.

The Spanish industrial crisis is mainly due to 1) the lack of the European market during the world war; 2) backwardness of industrial development. The Spanish industrialists have always enjoyed the benefit of exceedingly high tariffs; they have never had to deal with competition. Consequently industry is deteriorating every day. The Minister for the Navy recently published a "report" in which he states that it is necessary to permit foreign competition in the shipbuilding industry as Spanish industry is working so badly.

The industrial crisis is increasing every day; unemployment is growing, the number of emigrants is greater than ever. The list of figures regarding bankruptcies and government control during the year 1925 published by the Statistical Bureau is as follows: the total number of bankruptcies amounts to 95; the government controls represent a capital of 500 million Pesetas. The bankruptcies involve 2275 creditors, representing 32,784,709 Pesetas.

Since 1923 the Military Directory has been conducting a policy of far-reaching support for the big industrial capitalists and foreign firms. In accordance with this policy a decree was issued on the 4th of November last which represents the first attempt at capitalist rationalisation. The decree provides for: 1) a Committee for the regulation of production, consisting of members of the National Economic Board; 2) after the constitution of the afore-mentioned Committee, no industrial society or business can be formed, nor can those already existing either remove or enlarge their plants without the permission of the

Committee; 3) the Committee will have to compile accurate data regarding all existing industrial firms and their capacity of production.

A leading article of Primo de Rivera's organ "La Nacion", in trying to justify the decree, states that this is inspired by the government's aim to protect industrial development and to avoid production under poor conditions. But the meaning of the decree is exactly the opposite. Primo de Rivera, pursuing his policy of the economic colonisation of Spain, wishes to favour big industrial firms in which foreign capitalists have a share. The result of this decree will be the establishment of big industrial monopolies and the intensified exploitation of the Spanish proletariat.

The decree has called forth an immediate protest by the small industries and business men. They clearly perceive that it only means the protection and the fostering of big monopolies. The Chambers of Commerce of Madrid and Barcelona and the "Circulo de la Union Mercantil" have submitted reports to Primo de Rivera in which they seek to explain that the only way to end the economic crisis is to increase production, that is to lengthen the working day.

Behind the apparent scientific organisation of production Primo de Rivera's government is trying to exploit the working class to the utmost limit. Some days prior to the publication of the decree Primo de Rivera, speaking about the tax reform, stated that the new organisation will establish a salary tax and by this measure the government will "honour" the workers by allowing them to contribute to the State exchequer.

The Spanish capitalists who have proved incapable of developing industry, cannot think of any way out of the economic crisis than to abolish the eight hour day. Last May the mining industry was undergoing a serious crisis. Thanks to the lockout of the English miners and the co-operation of the reformist leaders the mineowners were able to increase output in Asturias. But now the question is just as it was last May; the English miners are returning to work and the mining capitalists have now started a campaign to lower wages.

The Spanish proletariat has not yet realised the tremendous significance of the decree of 4th November. The socialist press has welcomed it, claiming that it represents scientific organisation of industry. It should be borne in mind that ever since the 1923 coup d'état Primo de Rivera's most faithful collaborators have been the socialists. In this new question also they are ready to come to the aid of the Military Dictator.

The Communist Party has endeavoured to point out to the working class the real meaning of the rationalisation decree. But the censor has not permitted the Party organ "La Antorcha" to publish any criticism of it. The Confederation of Labour, that could in the actual circumstances put up a serious resistance to the capitalist offensive, is at present entirely disorganised. Its leaders, mostly anarchists, have not been able since 1923, to set up an opposition front against the military dictatorship.

The present condition of the working class is critical. Many Spanish workers can be seen begging in the streets of Madrid; the press reports numerous cases of suicide, due to starvation and despair. Even the bourgeois press admits that the situation of the working class is really terrible. But in spite of this the government is endeavouring to worsen still more the working conditions of the proletariat. It is only the Communist Party of Spain that points out the way of escape from this situation.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

After the Lock-out of the English Miners.

By Catherine B. Cant.

Now that the mining lock-out is over, the coal owners of Great Britain are punishing the miners and their wives for their stubborn resistance to their slave terms of work.

The effects of the seven months lock-out will not be overcome in a short time. Distress and starvation are still urgently needed. Though the effect of working the extra 8th hour has proved too much for many of the miners after their long starvation and we hear of men "Dead beat, too tired even to wash, to do anything but sleep", of men who drop exhausted

at work, of death from semi-starvation, of men found dead from strain after two days work, yet it would seem that the worst of the effects are falling on the women and children. In Wales 20% of the men are still unemployed, the women are allowed only 7/- per week for themselves and 3/- per week for each child. Since the end of the lock-out all school feeding of children has stopped. Although the men are no longer on strike but are technically unemployed, they are denied unemployment benefit. Even where they are employed the highest wage now paid is £1.2/- per week while the lowest is 18/- The "Workers' Weekly" gives a typical pay slip from South Wales:

4 shifts at 11/- = £ 2-4-0	Deductions: Relief repaid 10/-
	Back rent 13/2
	Sick club 4/0
	Coal 1/0
	Tools 2/9
	£ 1.10.11d

4 shifts at 11/- = £ 2/04/0d
Deductions
£ 1.10.11d
£ 13.01d

The above was the weekly wage of a man with 8 children. In some places the coal companies are deducting 15/- and 16/- per week from such wages for the rent of the "free" houses which has not been paid during the strike.

Under such conditions how can the miners and their wives recuperate from the effects of the strike? They have starved above ground for seven months and now they must work underground 8 hours per day and still starve. In the report of a woman worker in the Forest of Dean we read the following: "A woman came and asked for some clothes for her children. I saw that her own shoes were worn out, and it was a wet and bitter day, so I made her take mine. Is I dried her poor feet she stooped over and I saw her bare flesh between the buttons of her old cardigan. She had used all her own clothing for her children, yet she had not asked anything for herself".

The extra hour's work is a great hardship on the women. "They scarcely ever rest now when they have more than one of the different shifts". The 8th hour's work makes it necessary that the woman rises one hour earlier and works one hour longer, preparing the bath and the food for her man. The miner whom we have quoted already as being "too tired even to wash" said that he had left home at 5 a. m. and was just up from the pit at 4 p. m. the time he took in getting to his working place underground being counted against him.

The "Daily Herald" industrial correspondent says, summing up the situation in Wales: "I have talked with miners, with their wives, with officials and unemployed, and from every-one I hear the same. They have been hounded back to work by sheer starvation, now they only bide their time to fight again and the next time they are determined to achieve the victory".

At the present time, starvation is truly stalking abroad in the mining areas of Great Britain. The conditions under which they are existing now will affect the health and physique of old and young during all their lives, and the present conditions will react on the workers beyond the borders of England and all over the world.

Therefore we must mobilise once again proletarian solidarity for new action on behalf of the British miners. Relief action must go on, and gather to itself new force, must discover new ways and means. The class consciousness of all workers must be awakened to the fact that if the English miners are forced to continue long under the sharp forms of repression with which the coal lords are now grinding them to the earth, the standards of life of the proletariat in all capitalist lands will suffer. The working class of the world must once more gather its forces for active support of its starving brothers in England. Women workers in all countries must find new ways of helping the miners' wives who have endured so long and steadfastly, and who have so encouraged their men in the fight. Help must go on till hunger is defeated and the miners and their wives are ready, heartened for a new fight.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS

Rationalisation in the Soviet Union.

By Z. Leder (Moscow).

At present, rationalisation is the slogan for the capitalist classes in all the "leading" capitalist States. The consequence of this rationalisation is an increase of unemployment and worse conditions of labour. For this reason the masses of workers are resisting with the greatest vigour this swindle of capitalist rationalisation which is crushing the very bones in their bodies. Now the workers hear that in the Soviet Union also rationalisation is the order of the day and is regarded by the Party as one of its most important tasks. How is this to be understood?

The rationalisation of production in the Soviet Union is directed towards: 1. Perfecting the apparatus of production; 2. using it to better purpose and more completely; 3. making full use of raw materials; 4. cheaper production and more complete turning to account of the energy which is used in every factory; 5. making better use of the workers employed in production. As regards organisation and technique, the paths taken by rationalisation are not essentially different from those it is following in Germany, although the perfection of the apparatus of production has played a greater part during the last few years and certainly will do so in the next few years in the Soviet Union than in Germany.

If that is so, it might perhaps be presumed that the social consequences of rationalisation are similar here to those in Germany. This is indeed what the social democrats maintain and those agents of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the Communist Party but who have fortunately been chucked out of it again (Korsch, Maslow, Scholem, etc.) There can hardly be anything more incorrect than this assertion. The social consequences of rationalisation depend entirely on the social Constitution which applies it.

Let us first of all consider the perfecting of the apparatus of production and the better and more complete use made of it. Let us take coal mining as an example. We see that in the Ruhr district the use of mechanical methods has made great progress since 1913. According to the questionnaire which was sent round in July to the pits in the Ruhr mining district, 49.6% of the output is now produced by hand or blasting, whereas in 1913 only 5% of the output was produced by mechanical means, i. e. by blasting. Between 1924 and the end of 1925 the number of coal-cutting machines and mechanical hammers has increased in some places by more than 50%. The length of slides was at the end of 1925 about three and a half times as much as in 1913. In consequence of this mechanisation of production and greater intensity of work, the work done per man has increased from a yearly average of 943 kilos in 1914 and 857 kilos in 1924 to a yearly average of 946 kilos in 1925 and 1105 kilos in May 1926.

What is the result of this rationalisation in capitalist Germany? In 1913 the average number of miners employed in this district amounted to 420,000; in the course of last year it varied in the period from July 1925 to August 1926 between 423,000 miners with 444,000 non-working shifts introduced because of lack of markets and 365,000 workers with 85,000 non-working shifts; this minimum figure of those employed rose in August, in the days of the most favourable juncture of affairs to 386,000 in consequence of the English coal strike. Thus we see that in consequence of increased difficulties in the situation in the international market and of stagnation in the whole market, rationalisation is associated with increasing unemployment. Between May 1925 and May 1926 85,000 workers were thrown out of production. In spite of the increase of the productivity of labour by 17% between 1925 and May 1926, the wages, per shift, of the miners increased in the same period by on the whole 8—9% — whether their monthly income has increased, we cannot say. One thing however is certain — that in some parts the general conditions of labour have become worse.

On the other hand let us take mining in the Soviet Union, for instance in the Don Basin. We see that in the Donugol Trust, thanks to the use of coal-cutting machines, the coal raised increased from 3.05% of the total output in the economic year 1,2 million tons by means of coal-cutting machines in 1925/26, (according to the plan of production). It was planned to produce 1,2 million tons by means of coal-cutting machines in 1925/26, in 1926/27 it is planned that the corresponding amount of coal

gained in this way shall increase to 3,2 million tons; mechanical transport and mechanical loading of coal are also to be used much more generally.

Needless to say, the mechanisation of production in this way makes it possible to dispense with a number of the workers. As, however, the demands made on coal-mining by the market — industry, transport and domestic consumption — are constantly growing, the number employed in mining increases steadily. In 1924/25 it amounted to 96,000, in 1925/26 to 122,000, in 1926/27 to 142,000 (for last year according to the programme of production). At the same time wages increased. In the first half of 1924/25 they amounted to 36 roubles 93 kopeks for workers, in 1925/26 to 49 roubles 60 kopeks, in 1926/27 to 58 roubles 70 kopeks per month.

It is true, that they have not yet reached pre-war wages. It must not, however, be forgotten, firstly that the wages of the German miners do not amount to more than 80—90% of their pre-war wages as far as their purchasing power goes; secondly that the Russian worker receives not less than 20% addition to his wages in that he gets such advantages as social insurance, low rents, contributions from industry for purposes of education etc. for which he has to pay nothing in return and of which he either knew nothing before the revolution or did not benefit in the same measure. We must also emphasise that in 1925/26 the said Donugol Trust spent as much as 5 millions on the provision of safety contrivances, and in 1926/27 as much as 17 millions for building workers' dwellings.

Without going into greater detail as to the above-mentioned measures for the rationalisation of production, which do not directly affect the position of the worker and his conditions of work, we must say a few words about the measures which are directed towards making better use of the workers employed in production. The agents of the bourgeoisie of all shades of party love to point to these measures as a proof that the Soviet Union State sweats its workers just as does the capitalist bourgeoisie. At the best this is nothing but blindness, in most cases, however, it is simply malicious calumny. Of course, even in the Soviet Union there is no heaven on earth where life can be enjoyed without having to work, nay even to work hard! But it all depends on how the product of work is consumed.

If we take as an example the same coal-mines in the same Basin of the Don, we see that the Stalin Centre for Rationalisation which has recently been established there, is engaged in working out the most suitable type of hewing tool, the most rational arrangement of working hours for underground workers, in finding out ways and means for mechanising the transport of coal without the use of motor power, which cannot be employed in all parts of the Don mining district etc. — all of them measures which in the long run increase the productivity of labour, but at the same time are intended to lighten the work of the miner. On the other hand it is well known that the studies of time at present being practised in the Ruhr district have as their only object an increase in the intensity of the work of the miners without granting them any corresponding equivalent.

In what does the fundamental difference between the social consequences of rationalisation in the Soviet Union and in Germany consist? On what is this difference based? This is very easy to understand. In the capitalist States all the economic advantages of rationalisation benefit the bourgeoisie; in the Soviet Union they are employed partly for developing economics and especially industry, partly in order directly to improve the position of the workers. It is clear that this fundamental difference rests on the fact that the means of production and the power of the State are in the hands of the proletariat, that the trade unions are on an equal footing with industry as a whole.

Last year the chairman of the Miners' Union of the Soviet Union, our comrade Schwarz, publicly stated that a few years ago the Committee had removed one of the leading engineers in coal-mining from his position because he had formerly been a leading capitalist and because the Miners' Union regarded it as inadmissible to leave a capitalist at the head of the engineers. In the meantime this man, who had been a specialist, is 66 years of age and has worked for 43 years in the coal industry, has become a Soviet patriot and one of the greatest enthusiasts in the socialist reconstruction of the Don coal-mining district.

Is it not clear that rationalisation which in capitalist countries is the curse and source of deterioration of the position of the masses of workers, becomes a means of improvement under the conditions which prevail in our country? The managers

of the biggest undertakings, whether they are communists or belong to no party, as well as their employees and workers are all servants of the Soviet State, they are under its control and the control of the Party; the unions however which are supported by 90% of all employed persons correct the mistakes and one-sidedness of the economic functionaries. Thus socialist rationalisation — in direct contrast to capitalist rationalisation — becomes a powerful means of technical and social progress, a tool of socialist construction.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

From the Resolution of the Seventh Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union on the Report of the Central Trade Union Council.

(Reporters Comrades Tomsky and Dogadov.)

The Congress finds the line taken by the Central Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union (A. U. C. T. U.) with regard to the development and the consolidation of the R. I. L. U. correct and confirms the necessity of further consolidating the international alliance with all other labour organisations beyond the borders.

The 7th Trade Union Congress entirely approves of the action taken by the A. U. C. T. U. in the field of the international trade union movement, which has as its object the realisation of international trade union unity against the capitalists.

The Congress approved of the formation of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the action of the representatives of the A. U. C. T. U. in that Committee, especially the clear and honest proletarian criticism made by the A. U. C. T. U. with regard to the action of the General Council during the general strike and the lockout of the miners in Great Britain; it also approves of the campaign for fraternal support of the miners of Great Britain which was inaugurated by the A. U. C. T. U.

The Congress considers that the A. U. C. T. U. was right in refusing to disrupt the Anglo-Russian Committee. At the same time the Congress considers it necessary to call attention to the imminent danger of the disruption of the Anglo-Russian Committee by the leaders of the General Council, which is proved by the following facts:

a) The rejection of the proposal that the General Council should call a Conference of representatives of the A. U. C. T. U. and of Amsterdam, although this proposal had been passed by the Anglo-Russian Conference at the instigation of the English delegation, although it had been confirmed at the Congress of Trade Unions in Scarborough, although it had been unanimously passed at the Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Berlin (December 1925) and although it had again been unanimously passed at the Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Berlin (August 1926) and that with the complete assent of the English delegation;

b) The proposal of the General Council of November 30th 1926, which aims at restricting the functions of the Anglo-Russian Committee and finally;

c) The rejection on the part of the General Council of the suggestion that they should send delegates to the present 7th Trade Union Congress of the U. S. S. R., which can only be interpreted as an act of hostility of the majority of the leaders of the General Council towards the proletariat of the Soviet Union and towards the trade unions of the proletarians of the Soviet Union because the latter had actively supported the English miners in their heroic fight.

The Congress, whilst recognising the danger of the incorrect line taken by the General Council in the fight for the unity of the international trade union movement against the capitalists, is of the opinion that the A. U. C. T. U. ought to use every effort in order to realise and further develop the declaration which was passed at the Anglo-Russian Conference: a fight against the danger of new imperialist wars, a fight against the economic and political offensive of capital against the working class, a fight for the unity of the international trade union movement and an alliance of all trade union associations into a uniform, energetic class International of the trade unions.

The Congress expresses its conviction that no vacillations and mistakes and no direct treachery on the part of the individual leaders will be able to dissolve the fraternal bonds between the proletariat of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union. The workers of the Soviet Union still remain the truest friends of the workers of England and are prepared to support their brothers in the fight against capital in every respect.

The correct line taken by the A. U. C. T. U. with regard to the Amsterdam International and in correspondence with the latter, meets with the complete approval of the Congress; the Congress states that this line taken by the A. U. C. T. U. is entirely directed towards creating true unity in the international trade union movement. At the same time it states that attempts are being made by the leaders of the Amsterdam International to undermine the real unity of the international trade union movement, in that they bring up the question of the trade unions of the Soviet Union joining the Amsterdam International, although even the leaders of Amsterdam know perfectly well that the trade unions of the Soviet Union do not intend to leave the Red International of Labour Unions and to join the Amsterdam International, and never had that intention. Such a false way of putting the question is evidence not only that the Amsterdam International is not inclined to agree to the sincere proposal of the A. U. C. T. U. but also that the Amsterdam International directly sabotages the establishment of trade union unity.

Notwithstanding this open sabotage on the part of the leaders of the Reformist trade union movement of the cause of unity, the Congress commissions the A. U. C. T. U. to endeavour with equal energy to establish a real unity of the international trade union movement and to create a united class International of the trade unions with the object of carrying on a real fight against capital. At the same time the Congress considers necessary an increased participation of the A. U. C. T. U. in the activity of the R. I. L. U. as well as further activity for strengthening the R. I. L. U.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

Results and Prospects of the Activity of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Resolution of the Seventh Trade Union Congress of the U. S. S. R. on the Report of Comrade A. Lozovsky.

The 7th Trade Union Congress, having received and dealt with the report of Comrade Lozovsky, states that since the 6th Congress was held great changes and re-groupings have taken place in the international labour movement and in the position of the working class, which must be taken into consideration if we are correctly to determine the tasks of the R. I. L. U. and of the trade union organisations affiliated to it. The fundamental changes and re-groupings in the working class can be summarised as follows:

I. In the last two years, capital has intensified its offensive against the working class. Simultaneously with its direct offensive against the standard of living of the masses of workers, the bourgeoisie has carried through a forced rationalisation of production in order to increase the competitive power of national industry. These new forms and methods of pressure on the working class have been carried through on parallel lines with the trustification of production with the object of fixing monopoly prices and of opposing an organised and concentrated resistance to any demands the workers may make.

II. The economic offensive of capital together with the intensification of political oppression have resulted in the working class losing the political rights and economic achievements which, in a number of countries, it had won through years of struggle. In all European countries the eight hours' day has been practically abolished, social legislation has either been completely revoked or restricted in a great measure, various laws are being introduced one after the other against the working class, and a violent attack has set in against the working class with the object of reducing it once more to the position it occupied many years ago and of reconstructing and stabilising the capitalist system at the expense of the workers.

III. The last two years have been characterised by conflicts which in form were of an economic nature but in reality of

deep-reaching political significance. The strikes were chiefly defensive in character and regardless of the obstinacy with which they were carried through (Great Britain) usually ended in defeat and in the loss of the positions which had previously been gained. The systematic retreat of the workers, often even without a defensive struggle, is chiefly attributable to the repeated concessions on the part of the Social Democrats and of the leaders of the Amsterdam trade unions. In those cases in which those "leaders" were drawn into the struggle against their will, they actually joined forces with the bourgeoisie against the workers and contributed to the defeat of the working masses. It should be remembered that not only the Right but also the so-called Left amsterdamites are taking an active part in the treacherous activity with regard to frustrating the resistance to the offensive of capital.

IV. In connection with the intensified offensive of the bourgeoisie and the systematic frustration of the workers' struggle by the 2nd International and the Amsterdam International, a number of important facts have become evident in the working class, which have determined the tactics of the R.I.L.U. during this period and which may be summarised as follows:

1. International Social Democracy and the Amsterdam trade unions have become one of the most important factors in the stabilisation of capitalism.

2. Wholesale unemployment has increased in a considerable measure, and has assumed a chronic character.

3. The efforts of the masses of workers to realise in practice the united front and the unity of the trade union movement have been considerably reinforced.

4. In the Reformist organisations, the estrangement between the leaders and the members as a whole has increased.

5. Both the independent revolutionary unions and the revolutionary minority movements have increased in numbers and grown in strength.

6. In a number of countries, unity groups have arisen, consisting of workers of various political tendencies who honestly desire to create a united trade union movement built up on the class war.

7. In the Left wing of the Amsterdam International, a differentiation is taking place in connection with the general strike and the miners' struggle in Great Britain and the conflict within the Anglo-Russian Committee, which has developed out of it. Total Strikers' Left workers the question is put: Which tactics are right? — the Reformist (General Council), or the revolutionary (A. U. C. T. U.)?

V. The General Strike and the miners' struggle in Great Britain and also the vigorous action of the Chinese proletariat in its fight for social and national freedom, are of great historical significance as regards the fate of the international labour movement in the future.

These facts indicate a turning-point not only for the working class of the two countries in question but also for the international trade union movement, for:

1. The struggles in Great Britain and in China have proved that the workers in capitalist countries, both old and new, cannot count on either international Reformism or its International.

2. This fight has also proved that the workers who are fighting against the bourgeoisie in their own and other countries, can only count on the international revolutionary labour movement which is united in the R.I.L.U., and in the first place on the trade union movement of the Soviet Union.

The working class of these two countries has drawn the logical conclusion: — the Chinese trade union movement is completely affiliated to the R.I.L.U., and, within the English trade unions, the Minority Movement which is affiliated to the R.I.L.U. is growing both as regards politics and organisation.

VI. An important factor in the international trade union movement is the growing significance of the part played by the trade unions of the Soviet Union as well as the power of attraction they exercise on the masses of workers and the members of trade unions in capitalist countries. The increasing significance of the trade union movement of the Soviet Union, which is the result of the economic development of the Soviet Union and of the improvement in the economic and cultural level of the proletariat in the Soviet State, finds expression in the delegations of workers and in the closer alliance between the trade unions of the Soviet and those of other countries, as well as in various

other facts. International Reformism tried to turn the increasing influence of the trade union movement to account by opposing the A. U. C. T. U. to the R. I. L. U.; but all attempts to sow dissension between the Red Trade Union International and its largest sections are doomed to failure from the very beginning.

The Seventh Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union considers it necessary to develop and consolidate the R.I.L.U. and further to expand its activities for winning over the broad masses of workers, and commissions the Presidium of the A. U. C. T. U. and, through its representatives, to take part systematically and energetically in the activities of the R.I.L.U. and, in common with all brother sections, to advance along the path of the closest alliance within the international proletariat, in order to carry on an organised and systematic fight against capitalism and against its system of exploitation.

The 7th Trade Union Congress formulates the most important tasks of the R.I.L.U. as follows:

1. The creation of a uniform trade union class organisation in every country with the purpose of carrying on a fight against the offensive of capital, against Fascist reaction, against wars and interventions, and for the promotion of a far-reaching social legislation etc.

2. A fight for the creation of a uniform International in every branch of industry through international congresses in the various branches of industry. The consolidation and expansion of the activities of the International Propaganda Committees.

3. A fight for bringing about a union between the Amsterdam International and the Red Trade Union International and for creating an all-embracing uniform international by summoning an international congress for unity on the basis of proportional representation.

4. The formation of an organisation consisting of representatives of the trade unions which belong to various Internationals and to various national general trade union centres, of mixed committees and of unity committees on a national and international scale, corresponding with the individual branches of production, the object of this organisation being to carry on in common a fight against the offensive of capital and against bourgeois reaction.

5. The enlightenment of the broad masses of workers as to the tasks of a true International and making clear to them, especially from the example of England and China, the difference between Reformist and revolutionary tactics in times of serious social conflicts.

6. A fight against the consequences of capitalist rationalisation on the basis of the concrete programme of action: shortening of the hours of work, increase of wages, unemployment insurance etc. A fight against every attempt to employ women and children in order to force down the standard of living of the working masses.

7. The expansion and consolidation of the organisation of the independent revolutionary unions and of the revolutionary minority movements, and the consolidation of the organised political influence of the R.I.L.U. in every country.

8. A fight against all species and forms of Americanisation of the labour movement, against harmony unions and against mixed unions, class collaboration.

9. A mutual approach between the adherents of the R.I.L.U. and the unity groups in every country, common action on the basis of a concrete programme, a united fight against Reformist theory and practice and for a reform of the whole trade union movement on the principle of industrial unions.

10. The further maintenance of the tactics of the united front and of unity, while preserving in full the freedom of mutual criticism.

11. A fight for close alliance between the trade union movements of the East and West and for the establishment of a united front of the trade union movement in China, Japan and the Soviet Union.

12. An alliance of all trade union organisations on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, including the trade unions of the Soviet Union, into a uniform organisation, for the purpose of opposing the approaching conflict on the Pacific Ocean and of creating the preliminaries for an all-embracing International on the basis of the class struggle.

13. A fight for the internationalisation of trade union tactics, for the organisation of simultaneous and parallel actions in the various countries, and an estimation of the value of the

positive and negative experiences, especially with regard to the English coal strike.

14. The establishment of closer alliance between the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the trade unions which belong to the R.I.L.U. Strengthening the alliance between the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the trade unions of other tendencies in order to carry out common action against the offensive of capital, against war and for the unity of the national and international trade union movements.

The 7th Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union, in commissioning the Presidium of the A. U. C. T. U. to carry through in the R.I.L.U., in common with its brother organisations, the lines laid down above, expresses its conviction that the united forces of the revolutionary workers of all countries will succeed in promoting and extending the activities of the R.I.L.U. with the purpose of uniting the broad masses of workers, in order to overthrow capital and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in the whole world.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

To the Memory of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

By Ernst Meyer.

In the year in which the proletariat of the Soviet Union celebrates the fact of its tenth year of victory, the proletariat of Germany thinks of the eighth anniversary of the still unavenged murder of its leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. The fact of the divergent course of the Russian and of the German revolution again and again raises the question as to the causes of this divergence.

The objective situation for Germany in the Winter of 1918/19 was acutely revolutionary. Everything which the master of insurrection, Lenin had indicated as the necessary premises for a victorious revolution was present: The disintegration and splitting of the bourgeoisie, strong sympathies on the part of the petty bourgeoisie with the proletariat, spontaneous mass movements etc. But what was lacking in Germany was a strong Communist Party, firmly welded together, capable of taking advantage of the revolutionary ferment of the masses for a systematic preparation of insurrection. The leadership of the Spartakusbund, before all Rosa Luxemburg, estimated the situation absolutely correctly and soberly, as is sufficiently proved by the report of Rosa Luxemburg at the foundation Party Conference of the C.P. of Germany at the end of December 1918. But the supporters of the C.P. of Germany, which was only established as an independent Party shortly before the January days of 1919, represented in its majority unclear and wrong conceptions, which found expression at the Foundation Conference in decisions which were fatal for the destiny of the revolutionary movement of Germany.

In spite of the fact that the Bolsheviki already had behind them the experience of the first Russian revolution, with them the preparation for the victorious social revolution lasted nine months after the overthrow of Tsarism in February 1917. The Spartakusbund, on the other hand, was by the January fights of 1919, two months after the overthrow of German imperialism, already involved in the decisive struggle for power. In January 1919 many supporters of the Spartakusbund forgot all the tasks of a revolutionary Party for winning the broad masses.

The Bolsheviki, in 1917, not only took part in the elections to the Constituent Assembly, but even demanded the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, in spite of their slogan: All power to the Soviets! The Spartakusbund, on the other hand, decided, against the will of its leaders, to boycott the elections to the National Assembly.

The Bolsheviki, precisely in the year 1917, carried on intensive work in the reformist trade unions in order to implant there their revolutionary ideas. The newly-formed Communist Party of Germany on the other hand almost completely neglected this work and played with the idea of splitting the trade unions.

Whilst the Bolsheviki, by means of systematic quiet work, created a point of support in the army and with the help of these positions prepared the armed revolt according to a carefully worked out plan, the young C.P. of Germany contented itself with a broad agitatory activity and the letting loose of the enraged masses in spontaneous outbreaks of fury in local and

provincial fights, which flared up one after another and — were crushed.

The counter-revolution was able to crush the heroic Spartakus struggles all the more easily as the Social Democracy came forward consciously on the side of the counter-revolution, and was in fact its leader. The social democratic workers were also seized by the revolutionary waves, but they did not understand the great historical importance of the decision of the question: Democracy or Dictatorship. By the refusal to take part in the elections and by the neglect of trade union work, the C.P. of Germany abandoned the important and, in the situation then obtaining, indispensable means for propaganda and for winning the broadest masses. These failures had as a result that the C.P. of Germany was unable to break away from the Kautskyist leadership of the Independent Socialist Party those revolutionary minded Left I.S.P. workers who were thoroughly in agreement with the demand for the dictatorship, and to unite them organically with the C.P. of Germany.

The vacillations of the social democratic workers were increased by the ambiguous role of the leadership of the Independent Socialist Party, which, from Hilferding to Rosenfeld, propagated a compromise between bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship and, in the decisive moment, withdrew from the revolutionary struggle, thereby strengthening the counter-revolution which was proceeding to the offensive.

Within a few months the young C.P. of Germany, under the leadership of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, would have overcome its shortcomings and thereby rendered possible the victory of the proletarian revolution. The counter-revolution therefore planned beforehand to behead politically the young C.P. of Germany by the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg and to bring confusion into the ranks of the Communist movement. The "Vorwärts" knew quite well what it was about when it published the most vile calumnies and the vilest songs of hate and did not in any way oppose the open provocations to murder the two Spartakus leaders. At the same time the counter-revolution which was enraged over alleged acts of violence of the Spartakists, again and again provoked bloody collisions with revolutionary workers who regarded the political and organisatory strengthening of the C.P. of Germany as their immediate aim.

The benefit still remaining from the January fights is, apart from the political lessons, the example of revolutionary courage, self-sacrifice and proletarian fidelity of the fighting workers and their heroic leaders. Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht could rightly declare in their last article on the very day of their death, that the "defeat" of the revolutionary working class was not a defeat but an enduring advantage for the cause of the proletarian revolution, Rosa Luxemburg, by herself pointing out the failures and weaknesses of the leadership and the contradictions of the whole movement, at the same time pointed out the way in which the imperishable self-sacrifice of the proletarian fighters can and must be made use of in a new revolutionary situation in order to obtain lasting victory.

The bourgeoisie and the Social Democracy can be certain that the proletariat of Germany will not forget these lessons.

Anniversaries of the Deaths of Lenin, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

Appeal of the E. C. Y. C. I. on the Occasion of the Anniversaries of the Deaths of Lenin, Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

Moscow, January 5th.

The E. C. of the Young Communist International has issued the following appeal to all Young Communist Leagues.

Eight years ago, on the 15th of January 1919, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered by the reactionary Prussian generals at the bidding of the social democratic Ebert-Scheidemann Government. Three years ago on the 21st of January, the great leader of the world revolution, Vladimir Ilyich, Lenin was removed by death from his post. Under the leadership of the Bolshevist Party of Lenin, the Russian working class has laid through its October revolution in 1917 the foundation for the building up of socialism and the first workers and peasants republic of the world.

The name of Lenin is the banner of millions of workers and peasants, it is the symbol of the struggle of the proletariat of the whole world for its liberation.

The name and the deeds of Karl Liebknecht live more firmly in the hearts of the working class and peasant youth today than ever before. Karl Liebknecht was the pioneer of the Young Communist International.

The Y. C. I. appeals to all Young Communist Leagues to devote the anniversaries of the deaths of Lenin and Liebknecht to increased agitation and propaganda amongst the working youth of the whole world for the teachings of Lenin concerning the proletarian revolution and the struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations for emancipation.

The Russian working class and working class youth freed itself from oppression under the banner of Lenin. The world revolution will be victorious under the same banner.

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The Leaders of the Socialist Party of Poland in the Service of Fascism.

By K. Leski (Warsaw).

In the second half of November 1926, the Socialist Party of Poland (S. P. P.) went into "opposition" to the Pilsudski Government.

This step was denounced by the Communists as a new fraud of the Reformist leaders, and they warned the workers against the deceptions of the S. P. P.

This decision of the Central Council of the S. P. P. was due to the defeat of the S. P. P. at the elections to the health insurance societies in Warsaw and the municipal elections in Upper Silesia. It was an attempt to preserve the influence of the staff of the S. P. P. over the masses and even over the lower strata of their own party, who are more and more resisting the Reformist policy and the servile attitude of the S. P. P. The phrase about "opposition" was intended to appease the discontented workers and to ensure mandates to the deputies of the S. P. P., should there be new elections, and at the same time to make it easier for these gentlemen to work for Pilsudski's programme amongst the workers.

The heads of the S. P. P. did not exclude the Minister Moraczewski from their party, although he remained in the Pilsudski Government in spite of the resolution of the Central Council of the S. P. P.

The "opposition" leaders of the S. P. P. deliberately and cynically support all the deeds of violence of the dictator directed against the workers, peasants and oppressed nationalities, and all his efforts to spread Fascism in Poland.

All the leaders of the Central Commission of the Trade Unions frustrate all the wages struggles of the proletariat. They do this with the help of the National Court of Arbitration, so that the Government may come to appear as a judge between labour and capital above all parties.

The deputies belonging to the S. P. P. — Ziemienski, Diamand, Kwapinski, Szczerkowski and Zaremba, the so-called "Left", joined the "Labour Council" of the Government and factory owners in the name of hundreds of thousands of organised workers, in order to discuss in a select company, how best to suppress the proletariat so that it should not stand in the way of the stabilisation of capital. With this object in view, a whole number of prominent members of the S. P. P. joined the National Labour Commission, and Mr. Ziemienski even became its president!

Holowko, a member of the S. P. P., accepted an invitation to join the National Commission for Minority Questions. In this way the commission consists exclusively of members of the S. P. P., apart from Holowko, they are: Wasilewski and Lewenhertz. Their task is to gloss over the oppression of the national minorities with phrases about "liberalism" and "toleration", whilst at the same time the White Terror is raging against the population of the subjugated districts in Western White Russia and in Western Ukraine, which have been occupied by the Poles.

The S. P. P. has gone into "opposition"! But this Opposition party did not vote against the Budget! It granted to the dictator of Polish Fascism the means for the fight against the revolu-

tionary movement of the workers and peasants, for the prisons, for the political secret police, for the executioners, for the preparation of a war against the Soviet Union!

The political resolution of the Central Council of the S. P. P. of December 1926 shows definitely that the staff of the S. P. P. is even willing to throw the phraseology of "opposition" to the devil and openly to serve Fascism.

The Central Council did not enter into the Moraczewski question at all. What does this mean? This means open approval of the conduct of the "Comrade" Minister, and encouragement for others within the ranks of the S. P. P. who court ministerial portfolios in the Government of the dictator Pilsudski.

The S. P. P. is in "opposition", but the Central Council does not oppose Pilsudski! On the contrary, it admits that it is not even trying to overthrow Pilsudski! "The joyful hope of the National Democrats", said deputy Ziemienski, "that they would find in us an ally in the fight against Pilsudski, must suffer complete shipwreck." The gentlemen of the S. P. P. are in favour of Pilsudski, of his dictatorial Government. These "Democrats", who only a short time ago demanded fresh parliamentary elections, now have only one wish, that Pilsudski would "reform" his Cabinet "by removing all the monarchist and reactionary elements."

The Ministers Meyszowski, Niezabytowski and Kwiatkowski do not mask their defence of the interests of the capitalists and the large landowners with the phrase "democracy". They do not mask the Fascist character of the Pilsudski Government with phraseology about "moral reconstruction", with the ideology of "a State above class"; they refrain from agitating against the National Democrats to whom the leaders of the S. P. P. point as being in the camp of Polish Fascism, simply in order to conceal from the workers the fact that Fascism is identical with Pilsudski. These "monarchist and reactionary" Ministers ought, according to the demands of the leaders of the S. P. P., to go to the devil; their resignation would be proclaimed by the leaders of the S. P. P. as a great triumph of democracy. This would facilitate their work amongst the masses of workers in favour of Pilsudski, for Pilsudski's aims are at the same time the aims of the leaders of the S. P. P.

Pilsudski aims at carrying through the plans for capitalist stabilisation. Not only the capitalists and the large landowners, but also the leaders of the S. P. P. and the other leaders of the Second International are striving towards this aim. Pilsudski's object is to consolidate the bourgeois class State in Poland by consolidating the dictatorship of the capitalists and the large landowners. In connection with the last resolution of the S. P. P., Senator Posner said: "The Central Council of the S. P. P. never forgets that it is backed not only by the delegates but also by the Polish State." The present-day State of course, the bourgeois one! Pilsudski endeavours to realise his aims through Fascism at the expense of the masses of workers. The leaders of the S. P. P. cannot but support him in this, for they know that in view of the bankruptcy of parliamentary democracy, the suppression of Fascism could mean but one thing — the proletarian revolution.

Fear of Communism makes the S. P. P. one of the most faithful lackeys of Pilsudski and his foreign policy, which is preparing to seize Lithuania and to make war on the Soviet Union. The overthrow of the Government in Lithuania which coincided by chance with the Congress of the Central Council, did not accidentally coincide with the S. P. P. calling the retreat from its pseudo-opposition; for, the overthrow of the Government in Lithuania opens up new prospects for Pilsudski's military adventures and, as soon as a war breaks out and it becomes a question of mobilising the masses of Polish workers in the name of the imperialist and counter-revolutionary policy of the possessing classes, the leaders of the S. P. P. will stand firmly on the side of Pilsudski.

The co-operation of the leaders of the S. P. P. with Fascism becomes more and more crassly obvious. The period of this co-operation must become the period of the final rejection of the S. P. P. by the workers and peasants. It must become a period, in which the Communist Party of Poland becomes more and more prominent in the eyes of the masses, as the only representative and defender of their interests, as the leader in the fight of the revolutionary proletariat, in town and country, and of the oppressed national minorities in Poland.