

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 30

22<sup>nd</sup> May 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.  
— Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliessfach 29, Vienna VIII.  
— Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

## CONTENTS

- Leon Trotsky: The Philistine discourseth on the Revolutionary.
- Politics**  
R. Albert: After the French Elections.
- Economics**  
Eugen Landler: The Hungarian Reconstruction Act.
- The Labour Movement**  
International Solidarity for the Striking German Miners.  
How the Reformists sabotaged May Day.
- E. C. C. I.  
Down with French Imperialism!
- In the R. I. L. U.  
The Agenda of the III. World Congress of the RILU.
- The Womens' Movement  
The III. International Conference of Communist Women.
- In the International  
Dimitri Blagoeff.  
The Frankfort Conference of the CP. of Germany. III. Report of the Conference 1.

## The Philistine discourseth on the Revolutionary.

By Leon Trotsky.

The following article consists of a chapter from a book by comrade Trotsky on Lenin which will shortly appear in the Russian language. Ed.

In one of the many books containing pronouncements of prominent men regarding Lenin, I came across an article by the English novelist H. G. Wells entitled, "The Dreamer of the Kremlin". The editor of the book makes the observation, that „even such advanced people as Wells failed to understand the import of the proletarian revolution proceeding in Russia“. It would appear as if this is not regarded as a sufficient reason for refraining from publishing Mr. Wells' article in a book which is devoted to the leader of this revolution. But it is not worth while worrying oneself about this: I at least read some of the pages of Wells not without interest, but this was not the fault of the author as will be seen from what follows.

One can still vividly call to mind those days when Wells paid a visit to Moscow. This was during the cold and hunger of the Winter of 1920—21. There were already premonitions of the complications which were to follow in the Spring. Starving Moscow was wrapped in snow. Our economic policy stood before a sudden and thorough-going change. I very well remember the impression which Vladimir Ilyitch derived from Wells: „Ugh! What a narrow petty bourgeois! Ugh! What a Philistine!“ he repeated, raising his hands over the table with that laugh and that exaltation of the breath which was characteristic of him when he ever felt a sort of inner shame on account of another man. „Ugh! What a Philistine“, he repeated when he again called to mind that conversation. This conversation between Lenin and

myself took place before the opening of a sitting of the Political Bureau and was practically confined to a repetition of the above-mentioned terse characterisation of Wells. But this was quite sufficient. For myself, I had read little of Wells and had never met him personally. But I was able to envisage in a fairly clear manner this picture of the English drawing-room socialist, of the Fabian, of the writer of phantasies and Utopias, who had come to view the Communist experiments. And the exclamation of Lenin, and in particular the tone in which he made this exclamation, enabled me to fill in the remaining features with little difficulty. And now this article by Wells, which in some inexplicable manner has found its way into the pages of the collection of articles on Lenin, not only revives in my mind that exclamation of Lenin's but has also filled it with a vivid content. For if in the article by Wells there is practically no trace of Lenin, one can see Wells in it as plain as plain can be.

Let us begin with the introductory complaint of Wells: He was compelled, just think, to take extraordinary pains in order to be able to speak with Lenin, which „annoyed him (Wells) very much“. Why, pray? Had Lenin summoned Wells? Had he pledged himself to give him a reception, or had he so much free time on his hands? On the contrary. In those extremely difficult days he was occupied every minute of his time; he could not so easily find a free hour in order to receive Wells. This should not have been difficult for a foreigner to understand. But the whole trouble was that Mr. Wells, as a distinguished foreigner — and with all his „Socialism“ a most conservative Englishman of the imperialist type — was filled with the conviction that he was conferring a

great honour upon this barbarian country and its leader by condescending to visit it. The whole article of Wells, from the first to the last line, stinks of unwarranted, smug, self-conceit.

The characterisation of Lenin begins, as was to be expected, with a discovery. Lenin, only think, "is in no way a writer". Who, indeed is better able to decide this question than the professional writer Wells? "The short, sharp pamphlets which appeared in Moscow under his (Lenin's) signature (!), full of erroneous assumptions over the psychology of the western workers, . . . express very little of the real essence of Lenin's thought". The worthy gentleman is of course unaware of the fact that Lenin has written a great number of works of the highest importance on the agrarian question, on theoretical economy, on sociology and on philosophy. Wells is only familiar with "short sharp pamphlets" with regard to which he remarks that they merely appear "under Lenin's signature" that is, he insinuates that they are written by other people. The true "essence of Lenin's thought" is to be found, not in the dozens of volumes written by him, but in that conversation, lasting but one hour, which the most illustrious visitor from Great Britain most graciously deigned to hold.

One could at least expect from Wells an interesting sketch of Lenin's outward appearance, and for the sake of one well-portrayed feature we would have been ready to pardon him for all his Fabian trivialities. But the article does not contain even this. "Lenin has a pleasant brunette (!) countenance, with an everchanging expression and a lively smile. . . ." "He offers very little resemblance to his photographs. . . ." "He gesticulates a little when speaking. . . ." Mr. Wells did not get beyond the banalities of the average reporter to a capitalist newspaper. For the rest, he made the further discovery that the shape of Lenin's head reminds one of that of Lord Balfour's it being long and somewhat unsymmetrical, and that as regards his figure, he is a "small man; when he is sitting on the edge of his chair his feet barely touch the floor". As regards the shape of Lord Balfour's head we are unable to say anything concerning this dignified piece of anatomy and are quite prepared to believe that it is long. But for the rest — what an impolite piece of carelessness! Lenin was a somewhat reddish-blond type of man. He can in no wise be described as being a brunette. He was of medium stature, perhaps a trifle under the average height; but that he gave the impression of being a small man and that when seated he could hardly touch the floor with his feet, this could only be apparent to Mr. Wells who, with the self-confidence of a civilized Gulliver had penetrated into the country of the northern Communist Lilliputians. Mr. Wells further remarks that Lenin in the pauses of the conversation had the habit of lifting the edge of his cap with his finger. "Perhaps this habit arose from defective vision", suggests the very discerning writer. We are quite familiar with this gesture. It was to be observed when Lenin had before him a man with whom he was entirely unacquainted, at whom he took a rapid glance through his fingers while they rested on the peak of his cap. Lenin's "defective sight" consisted in his seeing through and through the man with whom he conversed; through his puffed up self-conceit, his narrow-mindedness, his civilized haughtiness and civilized ignorance, and after he had taken this picture into his consciousness, he long afterwards shook his head and exclaimed "What a Philistine! What a thorough-bred petty bourgeois!"

The conversation took place in the presence of Comrade Rothstein, and Wells, in passing, makes the discovery that his presence "is characteristic for the actual situation in Russia": Rothstein, as one could see, was controlling Lenin on behalf of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, in view of the excessive candour of Lenin and of his dreamy lack of caution. What can one say regarding this precious observation? When Wells entered the Kremlin he brought with him in his consciousness all the rubbish heap of international bourgeois presumptions, and with his lynx-eyed sharpness — oh, of course there was no "defective vision" there! — he discovered in Lenin's study all that he had previously sucked in from *The Times* or some other reservoir of the hair-oil and spats brigade.

In what now consisted the real import of the conversation? As regards this we receive from Mr. Wells some pretty hopeless commonplaces, which show how wretched and barren Lenin's thoughts appear after passing through the prism of another mind, regarding the symmetry of which there is not the least occasion to doubt.

Wells came with the idea that "he would have to enter into a dispute with a thoroughly convinced doctrinaire Marxist, but as a matter of fact nothing of the kind occurred". We are not sur-

prised at this. We of course, know already that the "essence of Lenin's thoughts" was not revealed by his activity, extending over thirty years, as a politician and writer, but in his conversation with the English citizen. "I had been told", continues Wells, "that Lenin was very fond of teaching, but he did not do this with me". How indeed could one teach a gentleman so overfilled with high self-estimation?

That Lenin loved to teach is, in general, not true. What is true is that Lenin was able to speak in a very instructive manner. But he only did this when he was of the opinion that the man with whom he was conversing was capable of learning something. In such cases he spared neither time nor pains. But as regards the magnificent Gulliver, who by good fortune had been able to enter the study of the "small man", after two or three minutes conversation with him, Lenin was forced to arrive at the unshakable conviction — perchance in the spirit of the inscription over the portal of Dante's Inferno — "Abandon all hope!"

The conversation dealt with the subject of large towns. As Wells remarks, the idea first occurred to him in Russia that the outward aspect of a town is determined by the trade in the shops and in the markets. He related this discovery to Lenin in his conversation. Lenin "admitted" that under Communism the towns are becoming considerably smaller in extent. Wells "pointed out" to Lenin that the renovation of the towns entailed a gigantic work and that many huge buildings in Petrograd only retained their value as historical memorials. Lenin also assented to this incomparable commonplace on the part of Mr. Wells. "It seemed to me", adds the latter, "that it was agreeable to him to be able to speak with a man who understood those unavoidable consequences of Collectivism which had escaped the minds of many of his own followers". Here you have an appropriate measure for judging the mentality of Mr. Wells! He regards as the fruit of his own wonderful acumen, the discovery that under Communism the present concentrated urban agglomerations will disappear and that many of the present capitalist architectural monstrosities will only retain their value as historical memorials (if they do not merit the honour of being destroyed). How, of course, should the poor Communists ("the weary fanatics of the class struggle", as Wells calls them) hit upon such discoveries, which for the rest, have long since been set forth in the popular commentary upon the old program of the German Social Democracy. We will not elaborate on the fact that all this was already well known to the classical Utopians.

Now I hope you will understand why Mr. Wells "failed to remark" that laugh of Lenin's of which he had heard so much. It was not a laughing matter for Lenin. I even fear that his jaws were being moved by a reflex action directly opposed to laughter. But here Lenin had recourse to the service of his dexterous and skilful hand, which was always ready to conceal in good time the impolite yawn from a man too much charmed with his own conversation.

As we have already heard Lenin did not teach Wells — for reasons which we consider quite justified. As compensation therefore Wells was most emphatic in teaching Lenin. He imparted to him the very original idea that for the success of Socialism "it is necessary, not only to build up the material side of life, but also the psychology of the whole people". He pointed out to Lenin, that "the Russians are by nature individualists and merchants". He explained to him that Communism was "immoderately hasty and destroyed before it was able to build, and other things to the same effect. "That led us", relates Wells, "to the fundamental point of the differences of opinion between us, to the difference between evolutionary Collectivism and Marxism". Under evolutionary Collectivism one must understand the Fabian concoction of Liberalism, Philanthropy, economic social legislation and Sunday homilies regarding a better future. Wells himself formulates the essence of evolutionary Collectivism as follows: "I believe that by means of a regulated system of education of society, the existing capitalist Order can become civilized and transformed into a collectivist one." Wells himself does not explain who will carry out and upon whom will be carried out this "regulated system of education": the Lords with the long skulls upon the English proletariat, or vice versa, the proletariat upon the skulls of the Lords? Oh no, anything you like, but not the latter! For what purpose do there exist in the World these enlightened Fabians, the men of thought, of altruistic conduct, ladies and gentlemen, like Mrs. Snowden and Mr. Wells, if not — by means of a regulated and prolonged exuding of that which is hiding itself under their own skulls — to civilize capitalist society and to transform it into a collectivist one with such reasonable and

happy "gradualism", that even the Royal Dynasty of Great Britain will not perceive it?

All this was set forth by Wells to Lenin and to all this Lenin listened. "For myself", Wells graciously remarks, "it was downright refreshing (!) to speak with this exceptional, small man". But for Lenin? Oh, long-suffering Ilyitch! He was probably pronouncing under his breath some very expressive and spicy Russian words. He did not translate them out loud into English, not only probably because his English vocabulary did not extend so far, but also out of considerations of politeness. Ilyitch was very polite. He could not, however, confine himself to a polite silence. "He was compelled", says Wells, "to reply to me by declaring that modern Capitalism is incurably greedy and wasteful and that it is incapable of learning anything". Lenin referred to a number of facts which, among others, are contained in a recent book by Chiozza Money: Capitalism has destroyed the English national docks, has made it impossible to exploit the coal mines in a rational manner etc. Ilyitch was familiar with the language of facts and figures.

"I confess", concludes Mr. Wells unexpectedly, "it was very difficult for me to argue against him." What does this mean? Is it the beginning of the capitulation of evolutionary Collectivism before the logic of Marxism? No, no, "abandon all hope!" This phrase, which at the first glance appears unexpected, does not occur by mere chance; it forms part of the system, it bears a strictly outspoken Fabian, evolutionary, pedagogic character. It is expressed with an eye to the English capitalists, bankers, lords and their ministers. Wells says to them: "Just see, you behave so badly, so destructively, so egotistically, that in my discussion with the Kremlin Dreamer I found it difficult to defend the principles of my evolutionary Collectivism. Listen to reason, take every week a Fabian bath, become civilized, proceed along the path of progress." Thus the devout confession of Wells is not the beginning of self-criticism, but merely the continuation of the educational work on this same capitalist society which has emerged from the imperialist war and the peace of Versailles — perfected, moralised and Fabianised.

It is not without a feeling of benevolent patronage that Wells remarks concerning Lenin: "His faith in his cause is unbounded." There is no need to dispute this. What is true is true. This fund of faith gave him, among other things, the patience to converse during those depressing months of the blockade with every foreigner who might be able to serve even as an indirect means of communication between Russia and the West. Such was the conversation Lenin had with Wells.

It was quite otherwise when he spoke with English workers who came to him. He fraternized with them in the most hearty manner. He at once learned and taught. But with Wells the conversation, by reason of its very nature, had a half enforced diplomatic character. "Our conversation ended without definite result", concludes the author. In other words the encounter between evolutionary Collectivism and Marxism ended this time in nothing. Wells took his departure for England and Lenin remained in the Kremlin. Wells wrote a series of choice articles for the consumption of the bourgeois public and Lenin, shaking his head, repeated: "There goes a real petty bourgeois! Good gracious, what a Philistine!"

But, one may ask, why on earth have I, almost four years afterwards, reverted to such a trifling article by Wells. The fact that his article has been reproduced in one of the books devoted to the death of Lenin is no sufficient justification. It is likewise no sufficient justification that these lines were written by me in Sukhum while undergoing a cure there. But I have more serious reasons. In England at the present moment the party of Mr. Wells is in power, led by illustrious representatives of evolutionary Collectivism. And it seems to me — I think not without reason — that the lines written by Wells concerning Lenin reveal to us better than many other things, the soul of the leading strata of the English Labour Party: taken as a whole Wells is not the worst of the bunch. How hopelessly behind the times these people are, how burdened with the heavy leaden weight of bourgeois prejudices! Their arrogance — the belated reflex of the great historical role of the English bourgeoisie — prevents them from penetrating in a proper way into the life of other nations, into new ideological phenomena, into the historical process which is sweeping over their heads. Narrow-minded followers of routine, empiricists wearing the blinkers of bourgeois public opinion, they carry themselves and their prejudices into the whole world and are careful not to notice anything around them but only their own persons. Lenin had lived in all the countries of Europe; had made himself

master of foreign languages; had read, studied, and listened; made himself familiar with things, compared and generalised. Standing at the head of a great revolutionary country, he omitted no occasion to learn conscientiously and carefully, to ask for information and news. He followed unweariedly the life of the whole world. He both read and spoke German, French and English with ease and also read Italian. In the last years of his life, when over-burdened with work, he surreptitiously, during the sittings of the Political Bureau, studied a Czechish grammar in order to come into first-hand contact with the workers' movement of Czecho-Slovakia; we sometimes "caught" him at this when he, not without some slight embarrassment, passed it off with a laugh and apologised... And there on the other hand we have Mr. Wells, incarnating that kind of pseudo-educated, narrow-minded petty bourgeois, who look around with the intention of seeing nothing and who consider that they have nothing to learn as they feel quite assured with their inherited stock of prejudices. And Mr. MacDonald, who represents a more solid and sober puritan variety of the same type, pacifies bourgeois public opinion: We have fought against Moscow and we have vanquished Moscow. They have vanquished Moscow? These are indeed wretched "little men" no matter how tall physically! Today even after all that has transpired, they know nothing whatever about their own tomorrow. Liberal and conservative business people without the least difficulty bait traps for these "evolutionary" socialist pedants who are now in office, compromise them and intentionally prepare their downfall — not only as ministers, but also as politicians. Simultaneously — although far less intentionally — they prepare for the coming to power of the English Marxists. Yes, indeed, of the Marxists, "of the weary fanatics of the class struggle". For the English social revolution will also proceed in accordance with the laws laid down by Marx.

Mr. Wells, with his characteristic, pudding-heavy wit, once threatened to take a pair of scissors and trim the "doctrinaire" hair and beard of Marx and to render him English and respectable: to Fabianise him. But nothing has come of this and nothing ever will come of it. Marx will remain Marx just as Lenin has remained Lenin after Wells had subjected him for an hour to the tormenting effects of a blunt razor. And we venture to predict that in the not distant future, there will be erected in London, in Trafalgar Square for example, two statues standing side by side: Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin. The English proletarians will say to their children: "What a good job it is that no little pygmies of the Labour Party succeeded in trimming the hair or shaving the beard of these two giants!"

In anticipation of these days, which I myself will endeavour to see, I close my eyes for a moment and distinctly see before me the figure of Lenin in his armchair, the same chair in which Wells saw him, and I hear — on the day following or perhaps on the day of the conversation with Wells — the words, accompanied by a heavy gasp: "Ugh! What a petty bourgeois! What a Philistine!"

Sukhum, 6th April 1924.

## POLITICS

### After the French Elections.

By R. Albert (Paris).

Even on the evening of the 11th May M. Poincaré, "the man of the 1,700,000 dead", "the man with the smile in the churchyard", "Poinca-Ruhr", as he was called in Paris, still had reasonable hopes for an election victory. He had good grounds for this. Before all there was the very effective power of the Comité des Forges in the press, in the political world and among the petty bourgeoisie; in addition to this there was the successful restabilisation of the franc; and finally, there were his eleventh hour parliamentary manoeuvres: the sudden dismissal of some of his most faithful ministers and the promotion of certain "luminaries" of a somewhat moderately left brand into his ministry (de Jouvenel). All this appeared to afford him some chance of achieving an election success in spite of the terrible discredit attaching to the National Bloc.

This discredit was due to an augmentation of the public debt by at least 200 milliard francs, to the fall of the franc under the regime of the National Bloc, to an increase in the burden of taxation by 20 per cent, to the considerable worsening of the position of the small bond-holders and annuitants, to the

automatic fall in wages (which in general have not been increased, while the taxes and the cost of living have risen considerably), to the strained relations with England, to the hostile attitude towards Russia (as a result of which French commerce plainly realizes that it is being outstripped by the Germans and by the English), to the cost of the Ruhr occupation and to the realization of its disastrous results (in the political sphere: awakening of German nationalism and of the spirit of revanche etc.).

The burden has proved to be too heavy for the National Bloc. It could not do other than break down under it. It has emerged from the elections with heavy losses in seats and has secured fewer mandates than the Bloc of the Left.

As a result the petty bourgeois parties have apparently gained the upper hand over the big bourgeoisie, high finance and heavy industry. This implies a strong revival of those democratic illusions which, before the war, rendered possible the victory of "Radicalism". For the rest it must be borne in mind that the National Bloc had been nothing else than the "enfant terrible" of "Radicalism". "Radicalism" is only a high-sounding and rhetorical form of the Conservatism of the possessing middle classes. When alarmed and terrified it reverts to the crassest reaction. This will doubtless be seen before the end of the term of life of the present parliament. The National Bloc, which had been formed under the aegis of the ex-socialist and president of France, Millerand, was born on the 19th November 1919 out of the fear of Bolshevism, which had been made a clever use of. The fear of "the man with the knife between his teeth" urged the small bond-holder, the shopkeeper and peasant to vote en masse for the most varied type of reactionary republicans — Poincaré is a "Left Republican" — who were docile to the financial powers. And the National Bloc had for a long time as its premier one of the probable ministers of tomorrow: the tight-rope dancer Briand, who has turned a thousand somersaults.

It must be emphasised that there exists no distinct demarcation between the National Bloc and the Left Bloc. Here and there one will find the same type of features, the same rhetoric and, before all, the same interests. For many politicians the triumph of the Radical-socialists and of the Socialists is only a new garb, with little exterior change, for those factors which cannot be removed: High finance, heavy industry, large land-owners, colonial enterprises. For what purpose is this new garb? In order to please the outraged tax-payer.

This tax-payer was, as a matter of fact, in a very bad mood. This is proved by the fact that rarely have so many "luminaries" and outstanding characters been swept aside as in this election. This is the case for instance with the intimate followers of Clemenceau, — whose policy of the hard fist had been continued by the National Bloc — with their leaders Tardieu, who was playing up to become the chief of the coming government, and Mandel. André Lefèvre, a rabid champion of armed intervention against Germany, was not re-elected; while the same was the case with M. de Lasteyrie, the minister responsible for the fall of the franc. The same fate befell M. Arago, a scandalous leader of the National Bloc and arch-swindler famous for his financial transactions; it is characteristic that the old chamber was called the Aragonian chamber (derived from Arago). The minister for the interior in Poincaré's cabinet, M. Maunoury, M. de Wendel of the Comité des Forges and even a Rothschild were defeated at the polls. The royalist Leon Daudet, whose influence during the last term of parliament had been a very strong one, has likewise not been re-elected.

On the other hand there has been re-elected the pitiable socialist Renaudel — "Jaurès, minus his brains and his eloquence". Further Malvy, who had been condemned by the supreme court in the Caillaux trial, one of the best known victims of the Clemenceau regime. There was also elected Vice Admiral Louis Jaurès, who had become a socialist precisely forty days previously, i. e. at the beginning of the electoral campaign, and whose election is due to his being the brother of the great Jaurès.

And now what will be the result?

Will the Bloc of the Left be able to reduce the taxes and the high cost of living? Will it evacuate the Ruhr? No. Its leader, M. Herriot already before the elections declared that if he had been in the same position as Poincaré he would have acted as he has. He will support the proposals of the Experts' Commission. He will seek by milder though firm methods to compel Germany to pay. Will he continue the policy of armaments? Certainly. Will he endeavour to conclude a treaty with

Soviet Russia? Probably. Without, however, making more concessions than the bankers of the City of London. The ministers and statesmen of the Herriot government will talk a lot about peace, and will perhaps propose to admit Germany into the League of Nations; perhaps they will pardon some of the victims of reaction, whose long martyrdom is a permanent scandal. (Cottin, Gaston Rolland, Jeanne Morand, Goldsky). Perhaps they will grant an amnesty to some former military victims. Perhaps they will consent to the retrial of our comrade Sadoul.

With these slight modifications, the policy of the French bourgeoisie will continue, more ably served by some socialists, who are prepared to accommodate themselves to anything, than by hard and fast reactionaries. In the course of a definite time one will witness the development and the sharpening of the conflict between the democratic illusions of the middle classes and the real power of imperialistic big capital. The Left Bloc will prove itself to be impotent. If the socialists with their 102 mandates venture to take over the responsibility, one will witness the re-emergence of ministerialism, i. e. of the Millebrandism of the past. This appears to be the natural course things will take. This offers good opportunities for us Communists. The smaller middle class will soon learn how expensive the democratic illusions prove to be. This experience will be a deciding one.

The Communists are already faced with the task of pointing out and accelerating this development. It must be emphasised that the Communist Party of France has emerged victoriously from the election which involved a severe test for it. It is true that the united reformist Socialists have obtained 102 mandates while the Communists have only obtained 26. But it must be remembered that the Socialists who have been elected have been elected as candidates of the Left Bloc, that is, before all of the middle bourgeoisie. In many cases they received the votes of those people who in 1919, out of fear of the revolution, voted for the National Bloc.

The 26 Communists of the workers and peasants' bloc represent more than 900,000 votes cast exclusively by workers and poor peasants. They were recorded for a party the majority of whose candidates were workers, and which is courageously swimming against the stream as the party of the revolution and of the dictatorship at the moment of the last flare up of the democratic illusions. In this respect it must be said that its electoral program, in its magnificent intransigence, had something Utopian about it in the face of the present conditions. It was at bottom a program of civil war. 900,000 proletarians have voted for it. There is nothing in the history of the Third Republic which can be compared to this electoral victory of a thoroughly anti-parliamentary party which did not promise anything to the electors. In certain proletarian centres the successes have been magnificent. The Communist Party of France, just as the German Communist Party, has the majority of the active elements of the proletariat. It must be observed that it entered the election campaign when its leadership had passed through a serious crisis. When the working masses come to judge the Left Bloc by its works our time will have come. Socialist opportunism is sowing a seed which will bring in a rich harvest to the Communist Party.

One remark in conclusion: the new Chamber includes 151 lawyers, 53 land-owners, 33 business men and — 30 workers. 30 workers, out of whom about 20 are Communists, while the Socialist Party, the "workers' party" has 102 deputies!

## ECONOMICS

### The Hungarian Reconstruction Act.

The MacDonald—Masaryk—Horthy Coalition.

By Eugen Landler.

The great democrats Macdonald, Masaryk and Millerand have so contrived that, under the pretext of "putting Hungarian finances upon a sound basis", the Horthy regime has been saved for the time being. The plan for Hungarian reconstruction offers us a classic example of how by means of "democratic" international help, one must retain the pronounced counter-revolutionary basis as a support of the international "democratic" reaction in the case of a land that is severely burdened and stirred up by revolutionary tradition, but it is also an example how one in the end merely prepares the ground for revolution.

The Hungarian model reconstruction will at no distant time create a model land of revolutionary and counter-revolutionary struggle, where instead of the hoped-for profit for the international bourgeoisie, an international success of the proletariat will be harvested. The Hungarian reconstruction law provides that in every respect the objective and subjective conditions for that event become more favourable day by day. What is the essence of the law? The League of Nations and the Reparations Commission has suspended the priority of the reparations lien and permits the Bethlen government, under certain conditions, to raise a loan up to the amount of 250 million gold crowns in foreign countries. That is what the act empowers the government to do. For the safeguarding of the loan a lien is placed upon the customs, the sugar tax, the state share of the selling price of sugar, the income from the tobacco monopoly and the salt monopoly. The state budget is to be drawn up for five half yearly periods in agreement with the foreign Committee of Experts. Hungarian finances "must" be put on a sound basis by June 1926. The deficit is to disappear within these five half years by reducing expenditure and increasing income. The loan is exclusively for the purpose of covering the deficit for this period. During this time parliament has neither the right to exceed the prescribed expenditure nor to reduce the income. If the measures contemplated are not sufficient to restore the balance in the state household by the middle of 1926, the government may take any steps it sees fit to reduce the expenditures or to increase the revenue without consulting parliament. During the period of reconstruction the foreign commissioner is the last court of appeal in financial matters. In the Reconstruction Act itself nothing else is said. The essence of the law consists in handing over the working class in general and without reserve to the Horthy government by the help of foreign capital, and through the Horthy government to the highest political power in Hungary, the foreign General Commissioner. In order to save themselves for the time being, the loud-mouthed patriots take over the job of taskmaster for the foreign money-lender, and in the hope of obtaining huge profits by the sweat of the Hungarian workers and peasants, support the "great democratic governments", in the first place the government of Macdonald.

#### The Supplementary Protocol of the Act. The Conditions.

The true import of the Reconstruction Law is concealed, however, in two supplements to the act; in the appendix to the international loan agreement and in the so-called supplement to the act.

The supplementary protocol is a master piece of exaction. It contains the conditions under which the Hungarian government is empowered to raise the 250 million gold crown loan in foreign countries.

These conditions are as follows:

1. Payment of the costs of Reparations to the amount of 170 million gold crowns and deliveries of coal to the amount of 28 millions (Austria pays no reparations costs. The Treaty of Trianon lays down that the question of Hungarian reparations is to be placed on the order of business only when the German reparations have been definitely regulated. During the elections Count Bethlen swore that he would not pay a penny of reparations).

2. Payment of a debt of 133 million gold francs and the overdue interest which Buda Pesth, the capital, obtained in the year 1911 from a French bank consortium at a usurious rate of interest. (At the present moment Buda Pesth is practically bankrupt.)

3. Payment of 55 million gold francs which are claimed by French interests in the Hungarian Land Credit Institute.

4. Debts of a similiar nature are contained in the so-called Anglo-Hungarian and Italo-Hungarian agreements which do not give the detailed figures.

5. Hungary undertakes to hand over to Jugoslavia without payment 80 locomotives and 1185 definitely selected trucks.

6. Hungary renounces all claims for damages of any kind against Roumania. This applies also to the former Hungarian state property which now lies in Roumanian territory, as well as all the goods which were carried away by the Roumanians from Hungary in spite of the raid into the country having taken place against the orders of the Entente. The last-mentioned goods alone are valued at about one milliard gold crowns.

7. Hungary undertakes to "take into consideration" proposals in connection with the abolition of regulations which at present hinder the growth of Czech industry.

This supplement was also made law. The ruling class of Hungary in common with their Social Democratic accomplices have thus pledged the country to gold payments which amount to about one and a half milliard crowns in return for the possibility of begging in the international money market for 250 million gold crowns. These huge payments were not included in the Treaty of Trianon, and added to that they have handed over Hungarian industry.

The Austrian League of Nations loan (650 million gold crowns) was guaranteed. Austria undertook no similar conditions. However, she obtained the loan under such conditions that the capitalist world testified that this deal was a profitable business without precedent. Remember that the Hungarian loan is not guaranteed and that Hungary, by the terms of the loan itself, now enters the world market as a contracting party that is now up to the eyes in debt. If one takes the other conditions into account which are accepted along with the loan, one must come to the conclusion that Horthy-Hungary is credited by both parties with an ability to pay which is only conceivable when one is conscious of the possibilities of exploitation which existed in the darkest days of capitalism. The supplementary Protocol pronounces more clearly the intention to reduce Hungary to a colony than if it were laid down in the wording of the Protocol.

#### The First Supplement.

##### Who bears the Burden of the Reconstruction?

This supplement contains the undertakings in respect to the expenditure and income as well as respecting the regulation of the reduction of the number of the civil servants, the abolition of the Tenant's Protection Act and the regulation of rents. It proclaims the worst enslavement of the working people of Hungary and to this end the conscious strengthening of the counter-revolutionary political basis of Horthy Hungary. Some facts and figures out of this supplement will clearly prove this.

The tendency of the Reconstruction is expressly: "reduction of expenditure and increase of revenue". What does the supplement say however? The expenditure increases (not decreases) during the two and a half years of reconstruction from 241,2 million gold crowns to 387 million gold crowns. The receipts which now amount to 165,5 million gold crowns go to 400,5 million gold crowns. That proves that the reconstruction actually only intends an increase in the receipts. If we wish to understand the reason for the different treatment of Austria and Hungary, we must at once notice the evident intention to consolidate the Horthy government. Austria was obliged to reduce her staff of civil servants by one hundred thousand. In Horthy Hungary the number of civil servants (about 250,000) is to be gradually reduced by 15,000 by June 30th 1926. Present day Hungary has 60% more so-called qualified and highly qualified employees than former Hungary which was 70% greater. All the murder bands which were formerly independent are to be converted into special but official state formations, at the same time retaining their huge number of former members. All that remains as before.

As a piece of camouflage to preserve the appearance of a system of saving, one single ministry will be abolished. Against that the increase in payment of the salaries is arranged for and means have been found to cover the cost of police and gendarmerie who have been increased by 200% to 800% in some places. The expenditure for the maintenance of the apparatus of power for Horthy increases right at the beginning of the period of reconstruction by about 25% and at the end of the reconstruction period reaches an increase of 80% in some places.

With these means of maintaining the present strengthened apparatus of the counter-revolution it is hoped that the increased burdens of reconstruction which are provided for in the supplement can be passed on exclusively to the working class and to the small bourgeois of the town and country. A few examples should be given in order to demonstrate the extent of the crime.

Up to the present the land tax occupied the first place under direct taxes, although it is true the agrarians were up till the present completely favoured in Hungary and the large land-owners were practically exempt from taxes. This tax now takes the next to the last position under the direct taxes. After it comes the company tax yielding 6 million gold crowns. In the first half year of 1924 the land tax is estimated at 6 million and in the same period the most brutal of all taxes on consumption, the sales tax, is expected to bring in 68 million gold crowns. In order clearly to prove the boundlessness of the crime against the workers three factors must be referred to.



The preference shown the agrarians by the low rate of the land tax does not mean an advantage to the small peasants. On the contrary. It oppresses the small owners to such an extent that the small owners must become impoverished thereby. The relation between large and small landowners as regards taxation is one to five and in some cases one to ten in favour of the large landowners. This arises from a so-called land register which was drawn up by the great agrarians themselves in a most fraudulent manner fifty years ago and in which the land in the whole of Hungary is specified in the way which the large land owners wish it.

The city of Buda-Pesth embraces one fifth of the population of the whole country and is completely bankrupt. There the Awakening Magyars rule. The normal budget must be restored according to the law by new special taxes. What that will mean for the inhabitants, first of all for the workers, need not be considered here.

The greatest catastrophe of all will be the abolition of the Tenants Protection Act, which is contained in the supplement, and the measures which raise the rents to 50% of the gold parity between May 1st 1924 and May 1st 1926. The tenant must pay a sum amounting to 75% of his rent as municipal tax and 25% as state tax. If we reckon the peace time rent of the smallest flat consisting of one room and kitchen at 400 crowns, this dwelling will now cost about 7 million crowns including tax. That is about one half of the average wage of a skilled worker.

It goes without saying that the big bourgeoisie was able to avoid any loss to themselves which might follow the favouring of the big land owners. Originally a serious measure was planned against them. The reconstruction plan provided for the surrender of 5% of all stocks and shares for the state. In the Horthy parliament this figure was reduced and the clause was altered into a caricature of a tax for the benefit of finance capital.

These few figures and facts clearly prove that the reconstruction of the big bourgeoisie who are allied with the big agrarians is the placing of the counter-revolution upon a sound basis and which imposes unendurable burdens, not only upon the proletariat of the town and country, but also upon the broadest masses of the small bourgeoisie of the towns, the peasants, clerks and the free professions. The maintenance of the apparatus of the counter-revolution will weigh first of all upon the urban proletariat and small bourgeoisie in the widest sense of the word, but the land proletariat and the small peasantry will also feel the devastating results of this reconstruction most severely. These facts and figures prove that in making the calculations no regard was had to the ability of the masses to pay, but that the sole factor held in mind was the stabilised bayonets and, if the worst comes to the worst, Orgovany and Siofok.

#### The Results of the Reconstruction.

It will not be the first time in the history of the world that someone supporting themselves by bayonets has reaped civil war. How the stabilisation of the crown, the alteration or reduction of industry will turn out and how foreign capital will bite, depends upon the foreign political situation. These are things which cannot yet be accepted as cash. Even if industry is not hindered and foreign capital flows into Hungary, the Reconstruction Law still means the conversion of Hungary into a colony which will be built upon the foundation of unlimited opportunity of exploitations as it was in the early days of capitalism. Since the revolution all the possessing classes, with the exception of the big bourgeoisie who are allied with the big agrarians, have been declassed. This class (the big bourgeoisie) is conscious of its position of power in Horthy Hungary, and the Reconstruction Law is an expression in a most challenging manner, of its consciousness of power. This also looks imposing in foreign countries. Masaryk, the founder of the young Czech imperialism, the former arch enemy of feudal and counter-revolutionary Hungary, is already declaring his readiness to give Horthy Hungary a place in the Little Entente. This coalition that is contemplated is to be concluded against the Bolshevik peril. He speaks against Russian and German imperialism, but thinks all the time of the victorious Russian and the temporarily defeated German and Hungarian revolutions with their traditions, which signify something different for capitalism in Czechoslovakia than Horthy irredenta. And Masaryk is an intellectual! Industrialisation in Hungary has created a proletariat which was able to set up a dictatorship and to defend it for four and a half months against the imperialist robbers. During the raging of the white terror this proletariat has remained true to

the revolutionary traditions and makes it known more and more each day that it will not let itself be fooled by democratic illusions and capitalist deceptions. The struggles of the proletariat are taking a more revolutionary character each day. What is now going on in Hungary, is a terrible struggle between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution. With the Reconstruction Law this struggle enters upon a new phase. The terrible burden of this crime will call forth such misery among the broad masses, and not merely of the proletariat, which has so far not existed. In the economic and political actions of the Hungarian proletariat, which are already beginning and which will swell into mass struggles, this class, even at the cost of terrible sacrifice, will find the way to free itself from the Social Democratic leadership and methods of struggle and, as a revolutionary class, will take the work of reconstructing Hungary into its own hands if it does not wish to disappear completely. Against the united front of the big bourgeoisie and big agrarians it must become more and more the leader of all classes who have been plunged into misery by the measures of reconstruction. And finally the essence of the Hungarian Reconstruction Law is a reminder to the Hungarian proletariat to prepare its second dictatorship better than the first.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### International Solidarity for the Striking German Miners.

All to the Aid of the Striking German Miners!

To the Workers of the World.

The strike of the miners, which broke out in Germany shows how great and inexhaustible are the energies of the German proletariat. The German miners are forced to struggle under the most difficult conditions and the double yoke of German capital and French bayonets. Nevertheless, the miners came out bravely in the defence of their rights, won after bitter struggle, against their enslavement by Franco-German capital. Should the German bourgeoisie, which is preparing the ground for the enforcement of the working class, be successful, it would mean the automatic worsening of the conditions of the miners of all countries, and the other categories of labour would soon have to follow suit. No working man, no toiler can and should stand aside in this gigantic struggle. The cause of the German miners is the cause of the international proletariat. The Communist International and the Red International of Labour Unions urgently appeal to the workers of all countries:

Come to the aid of the German miners!

Do not allow the importation of coal from other countries to break the strike!

Make collections for the strikers and their families!

Do your utmost to resist unitedly the heavy German industries supported by the French bayonets!

There must be no passive or neutral observers amongst the workers in this struggle; all must actively help the German miners if they possess one ounce of proletarian solidarity and the least understanding of their own interests.

All to the aid of the German miners!

Long live the miners of Germany!

Long live the united labour front in the struggle against the bourgeoisie!

Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Executive Bureau of the RILU.

Moscow, May 14th, 1924.

#### To the Miners of all Countries!

The present violent struggle of the German miners raises the question of the recapturing of the eight hour day throughout the whole of Germany. The prolongation of the working day in Germany threatened, and continues to threaten, the whole working class outside of Germany. That is already shown by the attack that has been launched against the eight hour day in Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Poland and France. If the German miners succeed this time in recapturing their post-revolutionary working day, this will mean the victory of the miners of all

countries. Germany is the battle ground for the eight hour day, the German miners are the outpost fighters in this struggle in Europe. The German Amsterdammers have, in December 1923, carried through the prolongation of the working day in Germany, in that they maintained the eight hour day in principle, while through the collective agreements they established the nine till eleven hour working day. The German reformists, and with them the Amsterdam International, wish to repeat this treachery in the present miners' strike. As they were no longer able to prevent the outbreak of the struggle, they place themselves at the head, demanding the recognition of the seven hour shift in principle, but declaring themselves agreed to any infringements of the same by the collective agreements. To this the employers will agree as they practically lose nothing thereby. Thus the strike of the German miners is threatened with the danger of defeat, singly and solely from the side of the German and International Amsterdammers. The fight will in fact be conducted by the revolutionary factory councils, the red trade union opposition and by the revolutionary Union of Hand and Brain Workers. Only these can set up the united and victorious fighting front. The miners of all countries must show that they recognize that the German miners have taken up the vanguard fight for the whole of the international mining workers. They must demonstrate to the German mining proletariat their readiness to give assistance in this fight and if necessary, to take up their place in the fighting front. In all the mining districts of England, Czecho-Slovakia, France, Poland and Belgium, meetings and demonstrations must be held proclaiming international fighting solidarity with the German fighters. Where possible, short solidarity strikes must be carried out as a token of preparedness to fight. Before all however, must the English and Czecho-Slovakian miners, railwaymen and dock workers, by means of the control of the transport of coal, prevent the heroic struggle of the German mining proletariat from being broken by the importation of coal from neighbouring countries.

**Long live the General Strike of the German Miners!**

**Long live the International Fighting Front of the Miners of all Countries!**

**Long live the Fight for the Six Hour Day in the Mining Industry!**

The Executive Bureau of the  
Red International of Labour Unions.

\*

## To the Aid of the German Miners!

To the Workers of All Countries.

The German miners have entered the struggle to check the capitalist pressure upon their wages, hours and conditions of labour. Four hundred thousand workers have quitted the mines, subjecting themselves and their families to great hardships. Should united German capital defeat the striking miners, it will be turn of the miners of England, Belgium, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland etc. to receive the next blow of capitalism; and not only the miners, but the workers of all industries. The struggle of the German miners is the cause of the international Proletariat. Only by the united front of the workers of all grades will it be possible to check the offensive of the brazen magnates of the German heavy industries.

The All-Russian Central Council and the Central Committee of the Russian Trade Unions appeal to the Workers of all countries to come to the aid of the striking miners of Germany. Assistance must be rendered without delay. Especially great is the responsibility of the miners, transport workers and metal workers of England, France, Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland. To the workers of these countries in general, and to the miners, metal workers and transport workers in particular, the entire Russian trade union movement sends out the call:

**To the aid of the German miners!**

Anyone who stands aside in this struggle, who remains a neutral observer of the gigantic battle of our German brethren, is a traitor to the working class, is unworthy of being a member of the proletarian family.

**Long live the struggling miners of Germany!**

**Long live the united front of the international proletariat against the capitalist offensive!**

All Russian Central Council of Trade Unions.

Central Committees of all the Russian Unions.

Moscow, May 14th, 1924.

## To the Miners, Transport, Metal and Chemical Workers' Internationals!

In view of the special international significance of the German miners' strike, we propose the immediate enforcement of the following measures in support of the strikers: Establishment of a complete coal boycott of Germany during the strike. Support of the striking miners by a solidarity strike of the transport, railway, metal and chemical workers in Germany and an international Miners' strike. Joint organization of international relief collections. We are awaiting your reply informing us of corresponding advice given by you to your organizations. Our organizations already advised accordingly.

International Propaganda Committee  
of revolutionary miners.

Kalinin.

International Propaganda Committee  
of revolutionary transport workers.

Shaknovsky.

International Propaganda Committee  
of revolutionary metal workers.

Vorobiev. Vacksov.

International Propaganda Committee  
of revolutionary chemical workers.

Dobrovolsky.

\*

## To the Miners, Transport Workers, Metal Workers, Railwaymen, Seamen and Chemical Workers of England, France, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland!

The miners of Germany are on strike for the maintenance of the seven hour day. This strike is of exceptional importance, not only to the entire German proletariat, to whom it means a fight for the eight hour day in all the other industries, but also for the entire international proletariat. For the lengthening of the working hours in Germany will be used by the capitalists of all countries as a pretext to start a campaign against the working hours on the plea of German competition. We therefore call upon you to show your solidarity with the struggling German miners.

Miners! Hold solidarity strikes and take other sympathetic action in favour of the German miners. See to it that the coal produced by you is not used to break the strike of the German coal miners.

Transport Workers, miners, railwaymen, seamen, establish everywhere, in the mines, ports, docks, railways, control over coal shipments. See to it that these do not go to Germany to be used for strike-breaking purposes.

Metal workers, Chemical workers, workers of all industries! Organize aid for the strikers, for the German miners are struggling for the interests of the workers of all countries.

Proletarians, help the strikers by all means and all your energies.

All Russian Union of Miners: W. Polonsky.

All Russian Union of Railwaymen: Andrejtshik.

All Russian Union of Transport workers: Sadovskiy.

All Russian Union of Water workers: A. Istshenko.

All Russian Union of Metal workers: S. Vorobiyev.

All Russian Union of Chemical workers: Dobrovolsky.

## How the Reformists sabotaged May Day.

To the workers of all Countries.

Comrades: —

No man or woman worker, no honest toiler can or should pass by the brazen treachery to the cause of Labour on the part of the reformists of all tendencies and creeds, shown by the gentlemen of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals on the 35th anniversary of the May Day Celebration.

Every worker must know how the reformists "celebrated" May Day of this year.

The Social Patriots of all countries turned the May Day Celebration from a day on struggle for the eight hour day and against militarism into a day of struggle against the eight hour day and for militarism.

In Germany, by order of the Chief of Police, the Social Democrat Richter, the police clubbed the May Day paraders,

while at Hindenburg, Ebert's and Richters' henchmen fired on the labour demonstration, killing three and severely wounding several other workers. The German Social Democrats have again reddened the streets of the German cities with the blood of the workers. The President of the Republic, the Social Democrat Ebert, issued a decree prohibiting all May Day Demonstrations. The Social Democrats carried on a truly Fascist agitation against the Communist demonstration. Notwithstanding the revolutionary workers of Germany, disregarding the threats of the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats, filed out on to the streets on May 1st, demonstrating their fraternal solidarity with the workers of all countries.

In France the reformists refused to come out for the defence of the courageous workers, devoted heart and soul to the cause of labour, who have been thrown out on the street for daring to leave the factories on May 1st and demonstrating their protest against the imperialist robbers, against the capitalist yoke, the ill-treatment of the defeated, the lengthening of the working hours, and proclaiming the eight hour day, the overthrow of capitalism and brotherhood of the nations.

In England, the so-called Labour Government, headed by MacDonald, introduced its budget into parliament on the eve of May Day, providing for considerably higher military expenditures. While strengthening British Navalism, MacDonald tries to deceive the workers and lull them to sleep by sugar-coated May Day talk to the effect that "by next May Day the League of Nations will become an all-embracing parliament of the peoples". This statement was made by the leader of the Second International about the very League of Nations, known by everyone to be in reality a League of Robbers.

In Italy, where the Fascist knout rules supreme, the reformists refused to take any part in the celebration of the Day of International Labour Solidarity. In this country, where the situation of the working class is particularly intolerable, where the revolutionary labour organisations have been smashed, where by the hands of the Fascisti and with the aid of the reformists, the bourgeoisie deprived the workers of the eight hour day and reduced the wages to a starvation level, the reformists could do nothing better than ignore May 1st and wash their hands of it, so as not to worry the bourgeoisie.

In Bulgaria, where the social compromisers are members of the government, the Communist demonstration in Sofia in which several thousand workers participated, was dispersed by the police.

In Latvia the May Day demonstration was forbidden by order of the government, the Social Democrats having previously agreed to this at a meeting with the government fraction in parliament, and published an appeal to the workers to keep away from the streets.

The same took place in a number of other countries, where the reformists either refused to participate in the May Day celebration, or broke up the celebration and helped the bourgeoisie to disperse the demonstrations of the workers who, in spite of the government injunctions and the decisions of the reformist unions and socialist parties to take no part in the demonstrations, obeyed the call of the communists, as has been the case in Greece, Lithuania, Esthonia, etc.

The Polish reformists, headed by the Polish Socialist Party, outdid all the other reformists in treachery and betrayal. This bandit gang of the Second International issued Fascist appeals on May Day, calling upon the Polish Black Hundreds to beat up all the workers who respond to the Communist demonstration call on May 1st, directed against the rule of capitalists and landlords and the treacherous tactics of the reformists.

In America, the birthplace of the May Day celebration, Gompers and company, anxious to please their masters, the coal barons, the steel trusts, the oil kings and the bank magnates ignored this day. The American reformists, by refusing to celebrate May Day, demonstrate their solidarity with the henchmen of American capitalism, who broke up the May Day demonstrations of the Chicago workers in 1866. This year's May Day again exposed the essence of reformism, again revealed the hypocrisy of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. Never was it more necessary and urgent than on this May Day, on the eve of the Tenth anniversary of the imperialist world war in which more than ten million workers and peasants were slaughtered and twenty million mutilated, to protest against war, against armaments, the incitement of one nation against the other, the preparation for new slaughters, for new wars, more terrible and destructive than the world cataclysm of 1914—18.

Anxious to camouflage the capitalist slavery, the reformists decided to hold a pacifist demonstration on the third Sunday of September. The preparation of a pious pacifist demonstration is designed only as a means of covering the real preparation for war, which the reformists always support in the name of "the defence of the Fatherland". The Second and Amsterdam Internationals, which issued sham calls for May Day demonstrations, actually trying to break up the May Day strikes by every possible means, want to throw dust into the eyes of the working class by their pacifist Sunday, so that the workers might not see how the reformists of all countries support the bourgeoisie in its war preparations. However, the hirelings of the bourgeoisie and the lackeys of the imperialists will not succeed in fooling the workers on the third Sunday in September or any other Sunday. The class conscious workers will tear the mask from the pacifist phraseology of the reformists who reckon on the forgetfulness of the workers regarding the "pacifism" of the Scheidemanns, Renaudels, Hendersons, Jouhauxs, Mertens, Vanderveldes, Leiparts and the other imperialist lackeys of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, shown by them during 1914—18. The working masses have not forgotten and will never forget your treachery, reformist gentlemen!

Down with the corruption of the masses by reformists!

Down with imperialist war and social patriotism!

Long live the international workers' revolution!

Moscow, May 10th, 1924.

Executive Bureau of the RILU.

## E. C. C. I.

### Down with French Imperialism!

Long live the People of Syria!

Twenty years ago French imperialism stretched out its greedy hands towards Morocco, and thereby initiated an era of rivalries and brute cunning in Europe, which led to the world war with its ten million killed and wounded.

The Treaty of Versailles brought much plunder to the French imperialists, but this did not satiate their voracious appetites. This predatory Treaty, which cannot be too strongly condemned, enabled French imperialism to establish itself in Asia Minor, and while fear of Turkey compelled it to abandon Cilicia, it still continues the military occupation of Syria.

The inhabitants of Syria have not ceased to protest against this occupation and the crushing of the weak by the strong. While France is groaning under the burden of a debt of 430 milliards, and the government declares it cannot meet the cost of reconstructing the devastated regions and cannot find the means for providing the social insurance repeatedly promised to the workers, it unhesitatingly squandered over ten milliards of francs in order to ensure the domination of its industrial magnates, financiers and traders in Syria.

To-day the French Government, at the end of its tether, is endeavouring, at the expense of the population of Syria, to recover part of its expenditure by exorbitant taxation. To this the Syrians refuse to submit. To pay taxes to the invader would be tantamount to recognising the yoke which the latter wants to impose on them. Popular risings are reported in all parts of the country. The expeditionary corps, scattered over a vast territory, is in a precarious position. In the course of the last fortnight over two hundred young soldiers have fallen — the innocent victims of the onslaught of the rebels. How many more are destined to fall before the ambitions of the moloch of imperialism are satisfied! Under the pressure of the rebels, important posts in the interior of the country had to be abandoned, and the bulk of the French troops was compelled to retreat towards the coast.

The Communist International is not satisfied with merely denouncing the action of French imperialism in Syria as contrary to the "right of self-determination". It calls upon the French proletariat to fight energetically against imperialism — the instigator of wars. It invites the French peasants to unite with the workers in this struggle against the megalomania of big industry. The peasants have nothing to gain by the French capitalists exploitation of Syria, except increased taxation resulting from increased military expenditure and probably another blood-letting of which their children will be the victims.

Sixty years ago, the Second Empire was compelled to retreat in the face of the insurmountable difficulties of a con-



quest of Syria. This happened in 1860 when the Syrian people were not yet conscious of their strength. Now, however, Arabian nationalism, awakened from its lethargy and inspired by the passionate nationalism of awakened Turkey and of the entire Near East, is determined to fight for its independence and is resolved to reject by force of arms the servitude which a foreign capitalism desires to impose on it.

The Communist International, including its French Section, is on the side of the Syrians who are fighting for their national freedom against the encroachments of French capitalism. It will support with all its might the Syrian peasants in their class struggle against their own feudal landowners. It is on the side of the entire Syrian nation in everything which the latter will undertake to free itself from the abject yoke of the most rapacious imperialism under the sun — the imperialism of the Comité des Forges and of French finance.

The struggle of the rebellious Syrians is identical with the struggle now conducted in France by the metal workers, miners and textile workers for six francs, the eight hour day and the workers' government. The Syrian peasants and French workers unconsciously are establishing an anti-imperialist united front. The task of the Communist International and its French Section is to make clear to everyone this unity of the Syrian and French fronts.

Down with imperialism!

Syria must be evacuated!

Down with colonial brigandage!

Long live the independence of subject peoples and of peoples threatened with subjection!

Long live the union between the workers of the metropolis and the workers and peasants of the colonies in the struggle against the common enemy — capitalism!

The Executive Committee of the  
Communist International.

## IN THE R. I. L. U.

### Agenda of the III. World Congress of the R. I. L. U.

To all Organizations affiliated to the Red International of  
Labour Unions.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. has decided to postpone the III. World Congress for ten days. The opening of the World Congress will take place in Moscow on the 5th July and not on the 25th June. At the same time the Agenda of the World Congress has been completed and the various speakers on the different items on the agenda have been decided on.

#### Agenda:

1. Business report of the Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. (Speaker: Comrade Lozovsky).

2. The next tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement (Speaker: Comrade Lozovsky).

3. The international struggle for the eight hour day (Speaker: Comrade Heckert).

4. Trade unions and factory councils (Speakers: Comrade Nin, the representative of the national committee of the revolutionary factory councils of Germany and Comrade Hercllet, France).

5. Attitude of the revolutionary trade unions to the professional internationals (Speakers: Comrade Jusephovitch, Comrade Sémar).

6. Strike strategy. (Speakers: Comrade Monmusseau, Comrade Foster, America, and a delegate from Germany).

7. Organizational construction (Form of organization of the opposition, relationships between the independent unions and the oppositional minorities etc. The speakers on this subject have not yet been appointed. A committee has been set up which is to prepare the material for this question.)

8. Tasks of the adherents of the R. I. L. U. in England (Speakers: Comrade Tom Mann, Comrade Kalnin).

9. Tasks of the R. I. L. U. in the colonial and semi-colonial countries: British-India, Egypt, Algiers, Dutch-Indies, China, Indo-China, Korea etc. (Speakers: Comrade Heller, Comrade Semaon).

10. The peasants' International and the unions of agricultural labourers (Speakers: Comrades Tchirkov and Dombal).

11. Trade unions and co-operatives (Speakers: Comrades Bittel and Tasca).

12. Report upon the Russian trade union movement (Speaker: Comrade: Tomsky).

13. Emigration question (Speaker: Comrade Rokamon).

14. Fight against the Fascist trade unions. (This question will be dealt with by a committee set up at the Congress.)

All speakers are requested to draw up their reports in writing and lay them before the Executive Bureau.

Moscow 25th April 1924.

General Secretary of the R. I. L. U.  
(signed) A. Lozovsky.

## THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

### The III. International Conference of Communist Women.

To all Sections of the Communist International.

Comrades!

As you already know, after the conclusion of our V. World Congress the III. International Congress of Communist Women will be held. It has not yet been possible to fix a definite date for its assembly. As the World Congress begins on the 15th June, it is probable that it will not be before the first weeks in July.

The provisional agenda is as follows:

1. The World Situation and the next tasks of the Communist women. (Speaker: Comrade Zetkin.)

2. Report on the activity of the International Women's Secretariat and its departments, as well as over the position of international Communist work among women.

a) In the capitalist countries. (Speaker: Comrade Sturm.)

b) In the Socialist Soviet Republics. (Speaker: Comrade Smidovitch.)

c) In the countries of the Near and Far East. (Speaker: Comrade Kasparova.)

3. The work of the Communist Women in the factories and trade unions. (Speaker: Comrade Leonhardt.)

4. Forms and methods of Communist work for getting hold of the broad masses of the women, introduced by a report on the forms and methods of this work in Soviet Russia. (Speaker: Comrade Moirova.)

5. Educational questions. (Speaker: Comrade Krupskaya.)

6. Unemployment among women. (Speaker: Comrade Colliard.)

The agenda shows most clearly the importance and the aim of the III. International Conference of Communist Women. It is to support and further, by conscious, systematic activity, the efforts in all communist parties aiming at getting hold of the broad masses of the women, in order to rally, to equip and train them for the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat.

We are convinced that you will cheerfully do your duty and insure a good attendance at the Communist Women's Conference, in spite of all the difficulties which confront those parties where the ruling powers of the bourgeoisie have driven them into illegality.

In the first place, of course, those women will be delegated to the International Conference of Communist Women who, by reason of their work, have practical experience with regard to Communist work among the various strata of the working class. This requirement can take part in the proceedings as fully empowered delegates.

A special circular from the Executive will be sent to you women. It is of course understood that male comrades who fulfil concerning the sending of delegates.

Comrades! Let it be your care to render possible such a delegation to the International Conference of Communist Women as will be commensurate with the strength of your party and the importance of the matter. Only when the working women self-sacrificingly take part in the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat and devotedly share in its work of communist construction, can the Communist International achieve its aim, i. e. the shattering of the class domination of the world bourgeoisie over the world proletariat and the realization of Communism.

The Executive of the Communist International  
G. Zinoviev, Chairman.

The International Women's Secretariat of the  
Communist International

Clara Zetkin Hertha Sturm.

Moscow, 6th May, 1924.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### Dimitri Blagoeff.

The founder of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, the old teacher and leader of the Bulgarian proletariat, old "Dedo" (grand father), beloved by all Bulgarian workers and peasants died in Sofia in the night of May 6th—7th. After forty years of unbroken, unrelenting devoted work for Communism, Dimitri Blagoeff closed his eyes forever without having lived to see the final result of his great work: the victory of the working people and of Communism in Bulgaria.

Already as a student at the beginning of the eighties he took part in the founding of the Russian Social Democratic Party (later the Bolshevik Party) in Leningrad. The history of his life and activity in Bulgaria is essentially the history of the Bulgarian revolutionary proletarian movement.

Dimitri Blagoeff was the first theorist of revolutionary Marxism in Bulgaria. To him the credit is due that the Bulgarian proletariat remained spared from the poisonous influence of reformism. Along with Kirkoff, who is also dead, he gave the political organization and the political struggle the correct direction right from the beginning. Under his clever leadership the small group of clean-cut Socialists (the real Marxists) developed in the course of the years 1900—1903 into the form of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, into the strongest and best organized political party in the country, to the real leader of the struggle for emancipation of the working people of Bulgaria.

His literary and theoretical activity is just as important. Already at the beginning of the nineties he defeated theoretically the numerous bourgeois critics of Marxism in Bulgaria. The reformist Sakasoff wing of the party which was endeavouring to change the party into a small bourgeois appendage of the bourgeoisie was theoretically liquidated in the year 1903, thanks to the relentless and splendidly argued campaign. After Lenin there was scarcely a second in the international labour movement who fought so relentlessly against reformism and against all diverting tendencies in the labour movement as did Dimitri Blagoeff.

In the *Novo Vreme* (The New Age), a theoretical periodical which was founded by him in the year 1897 Blagoeff illuminated the problem of the class struggle in Bulgaria for the course of 25 years. He was the first who, thirty years ago, placed the labour question upon a scientific basis in Bulgaria and in his book "The Labour Question" he showed the way for the emancipatory movement of labour. The first Bulgarian translation of "Capital" with commentary in popular language came from his hand. A large number of classical works of Marxist literature were translated by Blagoeff. He also wrote some valuable pamphlets and books to popularise Marxism and the Marxist interpretation of Bulgarian conditions. The only serious work upon the history of Socialism in Bulgaria came from his pen. It was under his intellectual leadership and under his influence that the greater part of the intellectuals of the Communist Party of Bulgaria received their Marxist schooling.

Blagoeff was, however, not only the first theoretician of Marxism in Bulgaria, he was the real leader of the struggling Bulgarian proletariat. From the founding of the Party to his death he was always the first member of the Central Committee of the Party elected unanimously in the conventions. Since 1913 he was a member of parliament, chairman, leader and soul of the Communist fraction in the parliament.

Blagoeff was also the founder of the Socialist (after the war, Communist) Balkan Federation in 1910; he interested himself extraordinarily in the revolutionary movement in the Balkan lands and took an active part in the work of the Communist Balkan Federation.

When the Second International committed the notorious betrayal of Socialism and the revolution at the beginning of the war, Blagoeff, along with Lenin, was the first who brand-marked this international as traitorous and who raised his voice for the founding of the Third Communist International.

Blagoeff was irreconcilable and merciless towards all enemies of the proletariat, but he was still more merciless against the hidden enemies of the proletarian movement. He possessed the gift of being able to discover the reformist and

other diverting tendencies in their veiled forms. He always called things by their right name, which caused many people to call him uncouth. All that he did was inspired by a boundless love for the cause of the proletariat. This, characteristic won him many friends but also made many enemies. He was boundlessly loved by one side and just as boundlessly hated by the other. There is perhaps no one person in the whole of Bulgaria who was so hated by the bourgeoisie as he, but at the same time there is no one person who was so loved by the workers and peasants as he.

Right to the end Blagoeff remained true to himself and to Communism. The great defeats of the Communist Party of Bulgaria found him ill. They produced a great bitterness in him, but they did not frighten him nor cause him to doubt. When the bourgeois press, during the September rising, spread the news that the old leader was against the rising, that he characterised the rising as an adventure and that he had cursed Kolarov and Dimitrov, the leaders of the rising, although he was in prison and sick he denied these lies and fairy tales, which were invented by the bourgeoisie, and firmly defended the rising of the people.

Immediately before his death, when the high court was dealing with the question of formally dissolving the Communist Party of Bulgaria, Blagoeff summoned up his last strength to compose and publish a splendid defence of the Party. Blagoeff has died at a time when the blackest reaction has set up its reign in Bulgaria, but the Communist Party of Bulgaria which was founded by him will continue to live and will be led to victory.

The whole of the working class of Bulgaria, deeply touched by the heavy loss of the irreplaceable Dedo Blagoeff who was loved by all, is raising higher and more daringly than ever, the revolutionary banner which he held so firmly in his hand for forty years, and is marching steadfastly towards its final victory over the bourgeoisie.

\* \* \*

Dimitri Blagoeff was born in the village of Zagoritscheni (Macedonia) in the year 1855 (or 1859). At the age of ten he left the village to join his father in Constantinople. His mother wished that he should become a scholar, but his father decided that he should learn shoemaking. However, he showed little enthusiasm for his trade and fortune favoured him to the extent that he was given a scholarship in a Bulgarian school in Constantinople where he held a first place. After finishing his school courses he yearned to go to Russia like the other Bulgarian students. With the help of Slavejkoff, one of the old revolutionaries whom he met in Bulgaria in 1877, he actually succeeded in proceeding to Russia. There he entered a theological college but soon forsook it for matriculation and philosophy in Leningrad. He took an active part in the student organizations where he became acquainted with Marx's "Capital" and organized the first Marxist student group. He was expelled from Russia for revolutionary propaganda and thereupon returned to Bulgaria to devote the rest of his life to the labour movement.

## The Frankfort Conference of the C. P. of Germany.

III.

### Report of the Conference. (1.)

The conference of the CPG. was held under illegal conditions during the second week of April. Following upon a thorough-going discussion, a resolution on "The immediate tasks of the CPG." was adopted unanimously and an Executive was elected whose members were almost exclusively representative of the left wing. On publishing this resolution, "Die Rote Fahne" was prohibited for ten days. We give below the first instalment of a report of this conference which is of supreme importance for the entire international proletariat.

Ed.

Before the agenda was submitted to the meeting the provisional chairman made the following declaration:

"We who are gathered here today solemnly call to mind the tremendous loss that the entire proletariat of the world has recently suffered in the death of Lenin, the leader of Communism. (The delegates rise from their seats.) We feel the magnitude of the loss even more than do our Russian comrades because we are

struggling along new paths, seeking new directions. But if Lenin be dead, Leninism survives and is spreading itself everywhere amongst the proletariat of the world, everywhere where the exploited and the oppressed are to be found.

"We would also call to mind the many comrades who sacrificed themselves in the streets of Hamburg. In the crisis of last October they were alone in blazing forth the revolutionary aspirations of the working class. They took up the fight and met their death in the belief that the last and final struggle with the German capitalists had arrived. It remains our task to ensure that this hope of theirs will very shortly be realised.

"We would also call to mind the thousands of our comrades incarcerated in German prisons, who are thereby unable to participate in the discussions at our conference but who otherwise would certainly be with us. Especially do our thoughts turn to Comrades Urbans, Stetter, Schneck and Pfeiffer, who are only prevented by class justice from taking part in our deliberations.

After the agenda had been drawn up, the opening speech was delivered by

the representative of the E. C., Comrade Ivanov.

On behalf of the E. C. of the Comintern and the C. C., of the C. P. R. Comrade Ivanov welcomed the Conference and hoped that it would accomplish fruitful work. The revolution in Germany would not take the same course as in Russia. In Russia one of the driving forces of the revolution was the contrast that existed between the land monopoly of the big landowners and the land hunger of the millions of poor peasants. The C. P. R. offered peace to the masses of the peasantry that were serving as soldiers in the trenches. It thereby received the support of these masses whose numbers ran into millions. In Germany, on the other hand, Scheidemann's party, the party which had conducted the war, was able to deceive the German proletariat into the belief that it was the party that brought peace. Thus the German proletariat has suffered itself to be lead along a long and sorrowful path to Golgotha. The E. C. and the C. C. of the C. P. G. recognises that the trend the revolution has taken in Germany places the C. P. G. before extraordinary difficulties. These difficulties have been increased by the big blunders that were made by the majority of the Central Committee and which contributed to the great defeat in October. The E. C. is also fully cognisant of the psychological reaction that this defeat has effected among the members of the Party generally.

In the theses submitted by the left-wing majority of the conference, the principles of which were thoroughly discussed with the representatives of the E. C., it was established that

the German Revolution has survived,

and that a new revolutionary wave is to be expected in the near future. But at the same time the possibility of a slow development is also to be reckoned with.

In either case the leadership of the German Party is confronted with difficulties of the first magnitude, difficulties, which would exist for any other group which took over the leadership. In the trade union question, especially, the Party is confronted with decisions of a most momentous character. Large sections of the workers have left the old unions and are resolutely clamouring for the creation of new industrial organisations. Such new revolutionary industrial organisations, moreover, will impose heavy obligations upon the party and the workers will not be slow in imposing these obligations. The E. C. has therefore given the closest attention to this problem, and in view of the fact that it is of international, as well as of national importance, follows the development with greatest concern.

The E. C. herewith declares that the new executive of the Party will receive the unlimited support of the E. C. The E. C. appeals to the minority of the conference to render brotherly support to the new leadership. The E. C. will not tolerate any attempt to undermine the authority of the new leadership of the Party.

For the first time in the Comintern the left wing undertakes the leadership of a big party. There is the danger from the very outset that right wing groups will take advantage of the first false step of the new leadership to launch an attack against it. For this reason it is incumbent upon this conference to put an end to the formation of groups and create a united Communist Party.

The E. C. appeals to the conference majority to work in the most harmonious agreement with the Comintern and to come to the right decisions. On behalf of the Communist Party of Russia, Comrade Ivanov declares that every member of the Russian Party

would rejoice to hear that a close alliance has been formed between the German and the Russian Parties. The Russian Party is fitted to enter upon such an alliance, not only because of the seizure of power in October 1917, but also because the conclusion of the Party discussion found it more firmly consolidated than ever. In January the Party conference decided by 200 votes against 3 in favour of the policy of the C. C.

Long live the XI Congress of the C. P. G.!

Long live the Communist Party of Germany!

Long live the Communist International! (Loud applause.)

## General Report and Memoranda of the Moscow Congress and the Tactics of the Party.

### The Left Wing Representative.

The preparations for this congress revealed the fact that the great majority of the Party members was in favour of the adoption of new tactics. The great majority of the members found itself in opposition to the theory of the Leipzig Conference, and was ready to throw overboard those theoretical and practical ideas that had formed the policy of the Party up to and during October last. This is not the first crisis that our Party has passed through. The Heidelberg split came as a result of the union with the left wing of the USPD., and the first crisis in which the Party was faced with liquidation followed upon this union. Then there was the Paul Levi affair, this being followed later by a second crisis in which the whole organisation threatened to break up. Finally, there was the Friesland case and the dispute with the KAG. (Levi group.) Such movements within the Party, therefore, need not be overestimated and follow almost invariably upon a heavy setback on the part of the proletariat. Such is the present case. It must also not be supposed that the process of development within the Party is thereby brought to an end.

What is the significance of

### the re-organisation of the Party

in favour of the left-wing? It means that among the rank and file of our members there exists a strong desire to reform and develop the Party into a real revolutionary and communist organization. It means that there is a strong demand for real revolutionary tactics. The great majority of the Party endorsed the Saxony policy, and all that has been served up as being the tactics of the united front, solely in the hope that it would thereby lead more rapidly to decisive encounters with the bourgeoisie. What were the fundamental mistakes that were made by the old Party leadership and the old Party majority? The prime mistake was that of converting the tactic of the united front into a tactic of an alliance with the Social Democrats. The second fundamental mistake was made at the Jena Conference subsequent to the Third World Congress: it was that the Party became fixed in the belief that a long period of preparation lay ahead and that consequently it was unable, on the outbreak of the Ruhr conflict, to adapt itself with sufficient speed to a rapid revolutionary development.

The condition of the working class in Germany prior to the October events differs considerably from the present condition of the working class. Before October we were caught up in a growing revolutionary movement within the camp of the bourgeoisie. At the present time we are witnessing the final phase of the Ruhr conflict. The apparent stabilisation of the German mark has allayed the fears of certain sections of the middle class and even of the working class. But

there has been no basic change as regards the objective revolutionary facts.

The reparation crisis is no nearer solution, neither has the German industrial crisis been overcome. The stabilisation of the German mark is such that any day can see a new collapse. Unemployment is as rampant as ever, the German economy is not consolidated, the political conflicts are still extremely acute and the Bavarian question is still to the fore. The separatist aspirations remain a factor of supreme importance, whilst within the bourgeois parties the disruptive process has been intensified by the attempts to keep pace with the agitational methods adopted by the national Fascist Parties. (Splitting of the German Peoples Party.) The Fascist Parties themselves are breaking up. The Hitler process, it is true, gave them many favourable moments for increasing their adherents, but their inner crisis is growing more acute. The Socialist Party and the reformist trade unions are passing through a similar crisis. The only difference between the situation prior to and subsequent to the October events is

that in the former period matters were developing rapidly, whereas now they are taking a somewhat slower course of development. The intensified offensive of capitalism is being met by the working class by a passiveness that threatens to become fatal. The raising of the state of seige by the bourgeoisie is a sure sign of the weakness of the working class. Nevertheless, after months of passiveness we can already see signs of

**a re-awakening of the energy of the proletariat.**

There have been the dock disputes in Hamburg, severe conflicts in the chemical industry in Ludwigshaven, unrest among the railway workers. In short, the workers are beginning to fight for the positions they have lost, for the eight hour day, for a living wage. Before October last the working class of Germany was considerably further ahead: it was then engaged in momentous fights of a political nature and for political ends. Yet in spite of the set-back the worst has been overcome.

Thus although the working class suffered a severe defeat, although there was much amiss within the Party and although there was a series of persecutions and attempts by the Social Democrats, allied with the bourgeoisie, to suppress the Party, nevertheless the communist movement has not been weakened. Sufficient proof of this is given by the factory council elections, also by the parliamentary elections, the increase in our Party membership, the circulation of our newspapers, the spread of our organizations. Our Party is in such sure touch with the masses that nothing can sever this connection.

In October the fight could have been taken up. The leaders of the C. P. G. did not seize the opportunity, because Graupe and Zeigner left them in the lurch, and now they maintain that the objective conditions did not allow of the possibility of an open fight. But up to the present

the attitude of the central group to the October events is still inexplicable to me. Whilst in their first theses they expressly state that it would have been impossible to take up the fight, they now maintain that the challenge could have been accepted. The left wing did not direct its criticism against the methods of winning over the masses. It did not oppose the principle that the communists must always be in the forefront of the daily struggles of the proletariat, but the essential demand of the opposition has been, throughout the whole year, that the Communist Party must understand how to conduct these daily struggles so that they will grow into political struggles; that when and wherever communists take part in these daily struggles the communist views must be put forward clearly and distinctly and kept to the fore in the daily, practical, concrete tasks. The Party believed it possible to win over the masses by making use of the communist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the struggle for power as a kind of sermon, but did not understand how to unite

**the propaganda for the proletarian dictatorship**

with the ordinary daily tasks. It was maintained that an alliance could safely be entered upon with the United Socialist Party. The demand was formulated that the tactic of the united front should be "honourably" carried out and so forth. This conception of the tactic of the united front was bound of course to lead to a revision of the Communist Party's conception of the state and of what constituted revolution. The Workers' Government could only be regarded as a slogan for gaining followers, as a synonym of the proletarian dictatorship. Otherwise the fateful question put to the Fourth World Congress by Smeral as to whether the Workers' Government was nothing more than a form of government of the proletarian party within the bourgeois democracy must be answered definitely in the affirmative, as indeed Brandler did answer it. If it is admitted that it is possible to pursue a real working class policy with the means supplied by the bourgeois democracy, if it is not accepted that democratic rule is merely a mask to hide the class supremacy of the bourgeoisie, if it is maintained that this rule leads to the classless society, then there is nothing in the political field to distinguish us from the Second International. It is this policy that has brought uncertainty into the ranks of our membership, the sound proletarian core that is to be found within our Party has been checked in its growth.

It is consciously maintained that

**Fascism has triumphed over the November Republic,**

but not over the working class, that Fascism and the working class face each other as deadly enemies and that it goes without saying that the November Republic must receive every support in the attempt to crush fascism. November Republic and Fascism are two forms in which the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie manifests itself. The bourgeoisie makes use at different times of the democratic and the Fascist methods to suppress the workers. The differences of opinion within the bourgeois camp can in no case serve as a basis for laying down the lines of our own policy. The Party is united in the belief that the winning over of the middle classes is one of the chief tasks of the communists in Germany. But it must be understood that these middle classes will not be won over with the aid of the Menshevik gospel.

**The policy pursued in Saxony**

was the putting into practice of the democratic theory of intermediate steps. A number of comrades is still to be found maintaining that the policy of Saxony was right from beginning to end. Böttcher has written a pamphlet to prove that the failure of the policy was due entirely to the continual blundering of the E. C. It must therefore be pointed out that at the IV World Congress the majority of the German delegates, against four votes, voted for unconditional participation in the government. Our suggestions were invariably turned down.

**With regard to the Central Group.**

Between that which the central group stands for at present and that which we stand for, the difference is so essential as to justify the further existence of an "own group". The central group will either veer round to our standpoint or it will throw in its lot with the right wing. Every opposition in a Communist Party constitutes a misfortune. The sole justification for an organized opposition lies in the struggle to prevent disruption and to combat dangers from the right. For ourselves, we were always well aware that our opposition was something to be deplored. But we were unable to relent because we should have been swallowed up by liquidationism.

In the case of the central group the whole problem is different and we seriously and emphatically declare that the new Party majority will no longer tolerate any artificial grouping within the Party. Should the districts of Chemnitz, Halle etc. find themselves in disagreement with the decisions of the congress, we shall have to take the matter up with them until the will of the majority of the Party is brought into effect in every instance. But if individual comrades endeavour to retain separate groups for organizational reasons, we shall let them know that such things will not be tolerated. The central group maintains that it is a safeguard against Communist Labour Party deviations. But it will be incumbent upon the Party as a whole to fight against Communist Labour Party deviations. We do not need any specialists for this work. What we need is a united party and that we must and will create.

A full discussion of the future tasks has yet to be held. We must not repeat the mistakes, especially must we be careful of being too short-sighted and of allowing the German Party once again to fix its mind on only one possibility and when events break out, as in the case of the Ruhr conflict, of being unable to rise to the occasion and exploiting the opportunities to the full. It is imperative that the two possibilities of development be kept in view and that clear-headed decisions be arrived at when the crisis comes. At the present moment our task will be to organize the masses in the daily fights and at the same time to conduct an active and thoroughly communist propaganda. But we shall have to conduct these daily struggles in such a way that every communist will know, from our attitude as well as from our action, that the decisive struggle can set in at any moment. The majority of the Party is backing up the new leaders. We enjoy the confidence of the members. The past wounds will heal and the severe crisis being over the really conscious and active elements in the C. P. G. will stand shoulder to shoulder more able and more determined to fulfil the task that confronts them. This task is to create in Germany a really revolutionary Communist Party which will rescue the German working class from want and misery.