

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 71

24th September 1925

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

C O N T E N T S

Karl Radek: English imperialism in Arabia.

Politics.

J. B.: The Spread of the Revolt in Syria.

V. Sturmvoegel: Black Reaction in Lithuania.

The Balkans.

D. Cosma: The Persecution of the Unitarian Trade Unions in Roumania.

V. Kolarov: The Social Basis of the Zankov Government. II.

A New Wave of Terror in the Prisons of Bulgaria.

Hands off China.

L. Heller: The Nationalist Movement and Labour in China. I.

Economics.

Earl R. Browder: Economic Background of the Anthracite Strike in U. S. A.

The Labour Movement.

Harry Pollitt: The Scarborough Congress of the British Trade Unions.

L...ng: The Defeat of the Strike of the French Bank Clerks.

In the International.

Max Bedacht: The Fourth Convention of the Workers' (Communist) Party of America.

Johann Koplénig: The Party Conference of the C. P. of Austria.

Union of Soviet Republics.

A. Lunatcharsky: A Festival in Honour of the Workers' Revolution and of the Genius of Science.

In the Camp of our Enemies.

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

English Imperialism in Arabia.

By Karl Radek.

Whilst the eyes of the whole world are directed to the approaching decisive struggle in Morocco and to the negotiations which are being carried on between the allies and Germany regarding the Guarantee Pact, there is taking place in Near Asia a series of events which are of more than local importance. The most important of them is not the revolt of the Druses in Syria, but the advance of the English in Arabia, which constitutes a fresh, decisive step on the part of the English government towards creating an English Arabian colony which shall connect Egypt with India.

In order the better to understand the present events in Arabia, one must briefly call to mind the history of the Arabian question during and after the war. In 1916 the English concluded a Treaty with the French, according to which France was to receive Syria and a district of Mosul. The whole of the rest of Arabia, with the exception of Palestine, was to come under the sceptre of the king of Hejaz, Hussein, and should constitute a sphere of influence of England. This meant a carving up of Arabia, the population of which the English wished to use as cannon-fodder during the war. After the victory over Turkey the English, taking advantage of the temporary occupation of Syria by their own troops, placed Feisal, Hussein's son, on the throne of Syria and

thereby prepared the way for the scrapping of the above-mentioned Treaty.

At the same time England suddenly displayed a great love for the Jewish people. According to the official legend, which contains just about as much truth as the biblical legends regarding the chosen people, the leader of the Zionists, Weitzmann, convinced the old cynic Balfour of the necessity of putting an end to the wandering life of the Jews and of establishing a home for them in Palestine, which is peopled by the Arabs. It goes without saying that the English intentions to express their thanks to Jehovah for uniting Arabia by placing at the disposal of the Jews a portion of the Arabian territory, can be attributed to very definite imperialist interests. It would hardly have done to state that England took possession of Palestine in order to gain a position from which she could control the Arabian Peninsula. It was therefore expedient to play the role of benefactors who were inspired with pity for the Jews.

It was in this way that England, with the mandate for the creation of the Jewish State, completed her political plans. England, by means of her vassals, the Hussein family, had the whole of Arabia in her hands. But the French checkmated the English plans. General Gouraud, who appeared in Syria on the strength

of the Treaty of San Remo, simply drove his majesty, king Feisal from his throne. Thereupon the English, as compensation for the loss he had suffered, placed this son of Hussein upon the throne of Iraq, after they had previously taken Mosul from the French and had granted them as compensation 25% of the future yield of mineral oil. The English did not, however, regard this solution as final. From Transjordan, where they had set up the second son of Hussein, Abdullah, as king, they carried on an uninterrupted undermining work against their French allies in Syria.

The changes which followed later were due to the fact that old Hussein did not prove himself a thoroughly obedient tool of English policy. The king of Hejaz took seriously the promises given to him by the English agents during the war to create a united Arabia. The friction which arose between him and the English government was solved by the latter in a very simple manner: it brought weapons into use against him, and of these not a few. The English subventions to Iba-Saud, the leader of the wahabite tribe who live in Central Arabia and are least acquainted with European culture, kindled the old enmity between the wahabites and the Hejaz, which represented a fight between the nomadic tribes of Central Arabia and the trade-driving Hedjaz for the possession of the „Holy places“, which for many years have been visited annually by hundreds of thousands of Arabs and which constitute a considerable source of income to the rulers of the places in question.

After Ibn-Saud had vanquished Hussein, he drove him from his possessions. Hussein took flight to the sea coast of Akaba, in the little towns of Man and Akaba. English warships appeared here and conveyed to Hussein the proposal of the English government that he take up residence in Cyprus which is an English possession. No protests were of any avail. The former ally of England found himself one day on an English warship bound for Cyprus. On the 17th of June 1925 England proclaimed the annexation of the towns of Man and Akaba and their incorporation in Transjordan, that means, it placed them under English protection. At the same time the railway running through Hejaz fell into the hands of the English as far as the station of Tebuk.

At the same time there took place a change of government in Palestine. In 1920, to the accompaniment of a universal cry of triumph on the part of the Jewish press, Sir Herbert Samuel, a Jew and a Zionist, was appointed Governor General in Palestine. Regardless of the protests of the Arab population, Sir Herbert Samuel carried out a policy of supporting the Jewish minority, a policy of promoting Jewish colonisation.

Now, after four years of work, Sir Herbert Samuel disappears from the scene. His place is taken by the English General Plumer, a soldier, who only recognises the interests of English imperialism. For the Zionists the appointment of General Plumer was a quite unexpected event. Does there exist any connection between the seizure of Akaba and Man and the change of government in Palestine? Yes, such a connection does exist, and it may be indicated as follows:

The Suez Canal is in danger. Its Western bank belongs to Egypt. It is impossible to tell what will be the outcome of the struggle for Egypt. England must therefore in the first place make sure of a land route which would replace the Suez Canal at least for the conveyance of troops. The railway line which connects the seaport of Jaffa with Akaba, and which is in the hands of the English, constitutes the connecting link between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. In addition to this the English press is talking of the construction of a Canal along this line which could compete with the Suez Canal. All this talk is, of course, mere threats, for the outlay for such an undertaking would be enormous. England hopes, however, by means of these threats to impress the Egyptian nationalists.

Secondly, the construction of a railway line from Akaba through the Arabian desert to Koweit is being prepared, which would form a connection with the Persian Gulf and would mean the creation of a route to India. Both the Jaffa-Akaba line, which connects the Red Sea with the Mediterranean Sea, and the Akaba-Koweit line would possess the enormous importance of being out of danger of being cut off by the French.

Thus at the moment when English imperialism is experiencing enormous difficulties, when the ground in China is trembling beneath its feet, England is working with iron determination at strengthening her position in the Near East and at setting up an English State in Arabia.

The struggle of the English for Mosul, which is now assuming a new phase, arises from the same cause. This is a fight for mineral oil, and not only for oil, but also for Arabia. The mountains of Kurdistan dominate the plains of Iraq. If the whole of Kurdistan were in the hands of the Turks, it would mean a danger for English rule in Mesopotamia, which is disguised under the veil of the independent kingdom of Iraq. The Commission of the League of Nations which was set up to investigate the Mosul question, has announced a very ambiguous decision: if England pledges herself to retain the mandate over Iraq for 25 years, she can retain Mosul; if she does not desire to do so, Mosul may again come into the hands of Turkey.

The „Daily Telegraph“, which gave vent to its fury over the decision in a very indignant article, points out that the mineral oil has played a great role in this decision. It points to the Hungarian Count Teleky. These hints would imply that, in spite of the existing business agreements between Royal Dutch, the English oil syndicate, and the American oil syndicate, Standard Oil, the Americans are continuing to conduct a campaign against the English in Mosul, for there exists no other group of oil interests which could dispute with the English for the control of Mosul.

Of course, it is not that piece of paper known as „the Report of the Commission of the League of Nations“ which is causing difficulties for the English, but the fact that the Arab population of Iraq is opposed to the English mandate, that is, to English imperialism in Iraq. It is only by means of the most cynical throttling of the parliament in Iraq, by means of mass arrests and threats of war, that England succeeded in forcing from Iraq the recognition of the English mandate for four years. The continuation of this mandate for a further 20 years will be very difficult. But the English are not bound by the proposal of the Commission of the League of Nations, and will find sufficient ways in order for the time being to obtain the prolongation of the mandate for a few years, and then it will be possible to see the next step.

Whilst England is strengthening her position in the Arabian Peninsula the position of France in Syria is growing weaker. The revolt of the Druses would not in itself constitute any great event. The Druses, an Arab tribe, who have a not very profound religion and which in fact constitutes a mixture between Mohammedanism and christianity, have a total population of 100,000 to 150,000. But this revolt, of which the world gained the first news through the English press, is taking place at the same time as the revolt in Morocco. The English press is calling upon the English authorities in Transjordan and Palestine to avoid everything that could arouse the suspicion of the French that behind the revolt of the Druses there was the hidden hand of England. But he who excuses himself, accuses himself. In any event the whole situation in Syria goes to prove that France has not succeeded in driving in the powerful wedge which is directed against English rule in Arabia.

The hopes of the English to subjugate Arabia by military measures are, however, built upon sand. The Arabs constitute a highly developed people in regard to culture. The Arab press and the Arab literature bear witness to this. Hitherto the Arabs were divided from each other by the desert and by the difference in the level of culture between the nomadic tribes and the tribes carrying on trade. English imperialism which failed when it staked its card on the most developed section of the Arabs, is now staking its cards upon the most backward section, the wahabites. But to the same extent as England, by the construction of railways overcomes the estrangement existing between the Arab tribes, she at the same time causes the cultural elements of the Arabian world to dominate. There where the railways run there rules, not the puppet king of the nomadic tribes, but the merchant. The more England endeavours, at the same time as she strives to unite Arabia economically, to split it politically, to incite one tribe against the other and one religious sect against the other, the more rapidly will the Arabian national movement, which is under the strong influence of the renaissance of the Mohammedan peoples and their struggle for independence, become united.

POLITICS

The Spread of the Revolt in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The revolt in Syria has now lasted for over six weeks. The French hopes that a small punitive expedition would be able to nip the movement in the bud and to restore order again have not been fulfilled. On the contrary: not only the seat of the revolt, the Druse mountains, has held out in spite of all the attacks of the French, but the excitement in the rest of Syria has reached such a pitch that revolts in other parts of the country are to be expected at any moment. The objective causes of an insurgent movement — the tremendous bitterness against the French, the bad economic situation and the threat of an approaching famine, as a result of the bad harvest, have been taken advantage of in a most energetic manner by the revolutionary parties in Syria, who have been excellently able to judge the importance of the present juncture. In Damascus and in the Alavit, in the North of Syria the anti-French agitation has assumed the form of demonstrations (which have only been suppressed with great difficulty) innumerable appeals, and attacks upon small French outposts. In addition to this the acts of sabotage, which are specially directed against the French lines of communication, are increasing.

Against this General Sarrail is employing a "strong hand". The number of troops guarding the towns, especially those in the disaffected districts, have been doubled and tripled; the press censorship has been rendered impossibly stringent. Any meeting is strictly forbidden; in Damascus a state of siege has been proclaimed which forbids anybody to be out of doors after nine o'clock. Before all, however, the French government is dealing ruthlessly with all those who are suspected of being connected with the revolutionary movement. The "Syrian People's Party" which has been established recently, and whose actions for the rest, all bore the stamp of loyalty, has been dissolved on the ground of having been proved to be connected with the rebels. This was followed by an organised, formal hunt for the leaders of this Party, among whom are to be found the oldest and most respected fighters for Syrian independence. Many of them have been arrested and banished. A trial is being instituted against them on account of high treason and which can end with death sentences. The President of the People's Party, **Dr. Abd el Rahman Schachbender**, barely managed to escape from the clutches of his French persecutors by fleeing abroad. Some of the persecuted nationalists escaped the persecutions of the "mandatory" government by going over into the camp of the insurgent Druses.

Sultan Al Atrach and his followers have now become the centre of the anti-French movement for freedom, not only for the district of Jebel Drus, but for the whole of Syria. In his appeals, thousands of copies of which have been distributed throughout Syria and in which the people of Syria are called upon to revolt against the imperialists, the leader of the Druses states quite openly that only the complete liberation of Syria from the French yoke will satisfy his people. The local revolt has therefore — and this is apart from the fact that the insurgents have been able to hold out so long against superior French forces, and which is one of the most important events of the last six weeks, — grown to a great revolt which is directed against the French mandate in all Syria.

And not only against the French. The Syrian revolt is at present the centre of interest of all the Arab peoples. Whilst the most influential Egyptian newspapers are giving undisguised expression to their sympathy for the Druses and the Arabs of Palestine are using every possible occasion in order to render active assistance, the revolt of the Druses has made a tremendous impression throughout the Arabian Peninsula. The war between the hostile kings: Ibn Saud and Ali is being conducted with decreasing energy by both parties, as the issue of the Syrian revolt is likely to bring about a thorough change of the situation as regards the objects over which these two Arab chiefs are fighting.

It is this circumstance which is causing great uneasiness to the English, who were prepared to maintain towards a local revolt at least an attitude of neutrality, if they did not even feel a certain amount of malicious joy over the misfortunes of their French neighbours. But once the revolt becomes general it is

hardly likely that it will remain confined to the frontiers of the mandatory area. The English fully realise this. The further the movement in Syria extends, the more anxiously the English turn their eyes to the frontiers. And it is not impossible that, in the event of the French not being able to cope with the Druses alone, the Moroccan method will also be applied in Syria: alliance of the two interested great powers against the insurgents.

The French are, of course, doing everything in order to avoid having to resort to this last means. "Day after day", writes the government official Beirut newspaper "La Syrie", "troop ships arrive with reinforcements for Jebel Drus. They are of course received by General Sarrail, whose cheerful and confident appearance indicate that the insurgents will soon find whom they have to deal with. Woe to the rebels and traitors!" The cheerful General of the Left Bloc delivered a speech to the troops in which he emphasised that no quarter must be granted to the rebels. They must be ruthlessly exterminated, root and branch. Any act of mercy is paramount to helping the enemy. The troops are for the greater part Senegal negroes and Moroccans. Syrian troops cannot be employed, as they would go over to the insurgents. Of white troops there are some battalions from Alsace-Lorraine and some companies of the Foreign Legion. Reinforcements of purely French divisions have lately arrived. The number of troops is estimated between 25,000 to 30,000, and these have at their disposal many armoured motor cars and aeroplanes.

The French method of warfare is horribly barbarous. Not only are those insurgents who are captured with weapons in hand put to death, but one of its most favourite means is the bombardment of whole villages. For the past months, for example, the villages of Hauran which border on Jebel Drus, including those which have not yet taken part in the revolt, have been bombarded. Here the bombardment is carried out as a preventative means in order to intimidate the inhabitants. When a village has once been burned to the ground and the entire population slaughtered, then the French have the guarantee that it will not revolt. The number of those killed and wounded by bombardments is estimated at over 5000, among them being very many women and children. The French General Staff, which has been reinforced by General Gamelin, as General Sarrail does not appear sufficiently reliable, is reserving the last trump in the shape of gas warfare. Although the League of Nations has forbidden the employment of poison gas, the French interpret this decision as meaning that the prohibition only applies in the case of war. A revolt, however — according to this argument — can with perfect right and justice be styled in the literal sense of the word. Even pro-French christian Syrians have protested with indignation against the employment of poison gases, which would mean the physical annihilation of the entire population of Jebel Drus.

The fairy tales spread by the French regarding alleged Christian anti-pogroms, plunderings etc. on the part of the Druses, have, on the testimony of eye-witnesses, proved to be absolutely false. Far from opposing the Druses, the Christian population of Jebel Drus have sided with the insurgents and are fighting along with them against the French. This is not to be wondered at. French imperialism has in Jebel Drus, just as in the rest of Syria, ravaged so furiously, that the hostility against it bridges all differences of religion and tradition and is establishing the national Arab united front against the foreign rulers.

Black Reaction in Lithuania.

By V. Sturmvoegel (Kovno).

Reinforced by the advance of international reaction, the black beast is raging in Lithuania in order finally to lay low any movement for liberation on the part of the workers. The power is in the hands of the **Christian Democratic Block**. This is a "trinity" which really consists of three parties: These are: 1. the real "Christian Democratic Party", 2. the "Big Peasants' Union" (Ukininku Sajunga), and 3. the "Workers' Federation" (Darbo Federacija). The whole leadership is in the hands of the Christian Democratic Party which consists chiefly of priests. The whole Block represents the interests of the big peasants, the priests and the reactionary section of the urban (clerical) bourgeoisie but especially of the priest-banker **Vailokaitis** (the proprietor of the "Economic Bank of Lithuania"), who is described as the Lithuanian Stinnes. The Workers' Federation

is under the control of the priests and its task is to split the ranks of the workers and to keep them in the servitude of the bourgeoisie.

Social Democracy and the so-called "People's Socialists" (the party of the free-thinking large and middle peasants and the liberal bourgeoisie) have helped this Black Block to gain the sole rule. Until recently the "People's Socialists" belonged to the Government Block. At the time when not only the People's Socialists but also the S.P. leaders were represented in the Government along with the Christian Democrats, workers and revolutionary soldiers were repeatedly condemned to death merely because they belonged to the Communist Party. With the help of the leaders of the People's Socialists and the Social Democrats however, the clerical cliques have so established themselves that to-day, now that the trade unions, the institutions for education, culture and publishing and the whole legal Press of the revolutionary workers and small peasants have been destroyed and suppressed, they no longer need the lackey services of the leaders who betrayed socialism and, as a reward, have kicked them out. This is no more than they deserved, and we should not call attention to it, were it not a sign of the further strengthening of reaction under which the whole working class and the small peasants have to suffer terribly.

Much has been written about the procedures of the ruling clique and about their government cruelties with regard to the revolutionary workers, about their newest technical discoveries — electrocution etc. — which this band of Jesuits uses for the torture of the arrested workers and small peasants, about their being driven to madness, even to death by ill-treatment, about their violence and so on. In recent times even the bourgeois papers of Lithuania have been obliged to admit this. The most recent events however show that the black beast is determined to rage even more furiously.

In August an attack was made on the political worker prisoners — which however was defeated by a unanimous hunger-strike in the Kovno prison. The freedom of the Press is at the mercy of the arbitrary will of the local governor, which means that papers can, without more ado, be forbidden by the administration. No Labour papers, it is true, have been forbidden recently, as the workers of the Left cannot think of publishing a legal paper in the present circumstances. Even the oppositional bourgeois Press is gagged. Thus in August in Kovno No. 182 of the "Lietuvos Zinios" (the journal of the People's Socialists) and No. 32 of the "Sozialdemokrat" (weekly, Journal of the S.P. of Lithuania) were confiscated. In Schaulen also an oppositional bourgeois paper was forbidden and its editor arrested.

Quite recently in Schaulen, Markelis, the social democrat member of the Sejm, was attacked by the Fascists who are publicly protected by the Government, and who use the organ of the Government party, the Workers Federation "Darbininkas" (The Worker) as their official organ. The S.P. raised no word of protest in reply. On the 11th of August in Schaulen, Balakas, a social democratic magistrate, was, in broad daylight, dragged to the police station and, without any reason, terribly ill-treated by the police commissioner Bielskis, so that he was wounded in the face and bled profusely. Thereupon the social democratic town council (in Schaulen the S.P. has an absolute majority) commissioned the mayor to beg the Minister of the Interior to have the police force reformed. The "Sozialdemokrat" itself wrote that the police commissioner in question had frequently been before the Court for ill-treatment, but it had always ended in promotion and advancement in rank!

The facts mentioned, which prove the advance of the black reaction, are accompanied by a wave of new arrests of workers of the Left which have taken place in the last few days in Kovno and other towns of Lithuania.

Why then does the clerical beast rage so furiously, since it is at present threatened by no danger on the part of the workers, as the workers of Lithuania are far too weak and unorganised and — worst of all — a large number of workers are still following the treacherous social democrats and a large number of the small peasants still follow the "People's Socialists". Reaction rages in order to enable the ruling cliques to take a step which again will only intensify the black reaction. It is a case of an open alliance between the large peasant-and-priest-government of Lithuania with imperialistic Poland.

The C.P. of Lithuania has long warned the workers and the small peasants of the snare which those in power are preparing for them. As is well known, imperialistic Poland has occupied

by force part of Lithuania, the so-called "Wilna district". At one time the Government Press as well as the newspapers of the ruling parties thundered against the deeds of terror of the Polish occupants in Wilna; they declared that without the liberation of Wilna, the capital of Lithuania, there could be no question of an understanding with Warsaw. At the same time however, secret negotiations were being carried on with the Polish Government. The Government tried to deny the fact of negotiations with Poland, but was finally compelled to admit that a delegation had been sent to Copenhagen to negotiate with the imperialistic Government of Poland. As a matter of fact the Copenhagen Conference was only a show, for the treaty between Lithuania and Poland had already been worked out and signed.

The result is that the alliance of Lithuania with imperialistic Poland has already become a fact. This however only means a further intensification of reaction in the country, it means that even the workers of Lithuania are faced by the immediate danger of war. For the small peasants this means further the increase of the burden of taxation and, above all, the return of the landed proprietors of Lithuania who are at present in the service of Poland; the result will be that the few small peasants and agricultural workers who, as a result of the Christian Democratic "land reform" have received a scrap of land under the most difficult conditions, will be dispossessed.

And, unless the broad masses of the workers join in united resistance, the governing clique will carry out its devilish plans. It tried to do so two years ago by attempting to force the so-called Haymans Project on the people of Lithuania, so as to amalgamate Lithuania with Poland. The danger is a very serious one for, as is well known, even the leaders of the "People's Socialists" who are now in opposition, at that time embraced the so-called project with heart and soul. It is only due to the unanimous opposition of the whole people, that this noose was not thrown over the neck of the workers of Lithuania two years ago.

It is still more difficult to organise resistance to-day, as the class organisations of the workers have been destroyed and the best fighters among the workers and small peasants are languishing in prison. The fight is also rendered more difficult by the counter-revolutionary attitude of the S.P. leaders. Nevertheless the working masses will take up the struggle against the alliance of the Lithuanian Government with imperialistic Poland, for this alliance is only one more link in the imperialistic chain which is to fetter the first workers' State, the Union of Soviet Republics, under the leadership of England.

In view of the danger of war and intervention, the C.P. of Lithuania has issued a manifesto to the S.P. organisations, calling on them to form a united proletarian front for a fight against the bourgeoisie, reaction and the danger of war. The S.P. leaders thereupon published a negative reply in their weekly journal. They based their refusal on a statement that socialists are persecuted in the Soviet Union. The S.P. workers however will have to realise that, if they continue to trust in and to follow their treacherous leaders who take under their protection the Russian White Guardists who supported the fight against the workers and against the achievements of the revolution, they themselves will fall victims to the black beast.

THE BALKANS

The Persecution of the Unitarian Trade Unions in Roumania.

By D. Cosma (Bucharest).

Roumania has for long been notorious on account of its fiendish persecution of the working masses of the country. The struggle of the workers against the monstrous exploitation has at all times been bloodily suppressed by means of armed force; the most elementary rights of the workers have been trodden underfoot. Wholesale arrests and brutal treatment in the prisons are the order of the day. Under the law "for the Defence of the Realm" all leaders of the workers have been finally outlawed; they are being arrested en masse and tortured in the prison-hells of the country.

But it would be a mistake to think that all these terrorist measures are only employed against the political parties of the Roumanian working class. Along with the campaign of in-

citement against the C. P. of Roumania, the government has also commenced a concentrated attack upon the trade union movement. The terror against the trade unions is intended to rivet the brutal system of exploitation still more firmly on the proletariat, to restrict still further the right of combination and to hold meetings, and to abolish completely the right to strike.

The revolutionary unitarian trade unions are of course subjected to special repression. In the present situation, when the Communist Movement has been driven into complete illegality, the unitarian trade unions constitute the only possible mass organisations of the class-conscious proletariat. It is precisely for this reason that they are subjected to the most ruthless suppression and are continually being dissolved by the government. For months past the unitarian trade unions have been prohibited from holding meetings; their premises are visited at all hours of the day and night by agents of the "Siguranza", in order to hinder the trade union functionaries from carrying out their duties. In many places the police, by means of threats of physical violence, prevent the workers from entering the premises of the workers' organisations. Of course, all these measures are only directed against the unitarian unions, whilst the reformists enjoy complete freedom, as a reward for their spying activity on behalf of the "Siguranza".

The government has now crowned its work of persecuting the unitarian trade unions by the arrest, which took place on the 31st of August, of the unitarian trade union council, the head organisation of the revolutionary trade union organisations in Roumania.

On the 30th and 31st of August the Unitarian trade union council held its usual plenary sitting in Bucharest. Among the items on the agenda were: the Position of the Unitarian Trade Unions; the elections to the Labour Chamber, the Municipal Elections; the National Congress of the Unitarian Trade Unions; the Congress of the Metal Workers' Union; Trade Union International; Trade Union press; Miscellaneous.

On the 31st of August the Session was raided by a body of gendarmes and all the members of the Trade Union Central were arrested and brought to the Military Court of the III. Bucharest Army Corps for trial. Among the arrested are the President of the Unitarian Trade Union Council, Koloman Miller, the General Secretary of the Woodworkers' Union, Stefan Dan, the Secretary of the Leatherworkers' Union, Géza Nagy, the Secretary of the Unitarian Metal Workers' Union, P. Ghempet, and the following trade union Secretaries: Géza Simó, S. Schein, Franz Bukova, Franz Nix, Josef Reiter and the following members of the Central Committee: Furtanák, J. Csobán, Johann Orosz, Josef Reißer and others.

In the official report of the "Siguranza", the reason given for the arrests is that the session dealt with questions "which do not concern the working class". As a matter of fact, the arrest of the unitarian trade union council marks the commencement of a new and sharper offensive on the part of the government against the whole of the Roumanian working class. The organised working class is to be crushed by a monster trial of the Unitarian Trade Unions, in the same way as the peasantry was crushed by the Monster trial of Kischinev. The unitarian trade union movement is to be suppressed by means of imposing long terms of imprisonment on its leaders, in order thereby to support the recently increased offensive of the employers and also to render assistance to the reformists who are carrying on an undermining work against the unitarian trade unions. On the other hand, the government intends, by arresting the unitarian trade union leaders, to cripple the activity of the revolutionary trade unions in such a manner that it will be impossible for them to participate in the approaching elections to the Labour Chamber. In other words, the government intends to hand over the Labour Chamber as a monopoly to the reformists.

The arrested trade union leaders, 19 in number, immediately after their arrest, entered on a hunger strike, which they intend to continue until they are released. At the time of writing they have already been 16 days on hunger strike, which in the case of several of the strikers has had a disastrous effect on the state of their health. The president of the trade union Council, Koloman Miller, who is seriously affected with tuberculosis, is already in a dying condition; the same applies to the secretary of the Temesvar Metal Workers' Union, Josef Reiter, whilst the secretary of the trade union Council of Timisoara J. Nix has suffered a severe hemorrhage of the lungs.

As was to be expected, the arrest of the unitarian trade union leaders let loose all the indignation, which had hitherto

been held in check, of the broad masses of the organised working class of the country. This provocation on the part of the government has completely exposed the hand of the oligarchic bourgeoisie. It saw, to its great terror, a wave of universal and spontaneous demonstrations of protest such as was only experienced in the revolutionary years 1918/1919. In these circumstances the only thing the government attempted to do was to intensify the general terror and to institute a regular hunt after "communists". Mass arrests were carried out throughout the whole country. On the 16th of September, on the order of the military commander, the premises of the unitarian trade unions in Bucharest were surrounded and all workers found on the same were arrested.

In spite of all this repression the Roumanian proletariat is fearlessly continuing its fight against the despotic rule of the oligarchs. In this however it is reckoning upon the active support of the workers of all countries. The fight of the international proletariat against the white terror in Roumania must therefore be carried on with tenfold energy.

The Social Basis of the Zankov Government.

By V. Kolorov.

II.

3. The Constitutional Parties and the Coup d'État.

The bourgeois and the petty bourgeois parties took, "as such", no direct part in the overthrow.

Not because the leaders of all parties — with the exception of the social democrats — were at that time either already sentenced or were under detention; no, the reasons for this lay deeper.

These parties — even the most open defenders of capitalist interests, amongst them the National Liberals and the Peoples Progressives — had a considerable section of the petty bourgeoisie and a great number of job-hunters in their following. The latter formed usually their most active groups. And this circumstance inevitably stamped its mark upon their politics and tactics.

The capitalist elements in them were clearly body and soul for the overthrow, but were not in the position to draw their parties with them, the organisations of which were in no way suited for a forcible seizure of power; they were only suitable for throwing sand into the eyes of the petty bourgeoisie. The latter willingly followed the large bourgeoisie when it talked about "law and order", "freedom and democracy" and other beautiful things, but could not make up its mind to start with it on the dangerous road of the coup d'État.

An overthrow brought about with the assistance of the Military League had also nothing particularly attractive about it for the job-hunting element. The latter knew that its worth to the parties depended upon its service, and it was therefore particularly active at elections, meetings and such political demonstrations; should however the overthrow come about, then the military would play the chief role in it and would then naturally occupy all the more important posts. And so this rather influential groups which often paralysed party connections and coalitions in its group interests, was also not particularly in favour of the agitation for the overthrow.

But also the general staffs of the parties could not decide to draw their parties into a support of the military overthrow. For they stand upon the basis of "legality" and upon the "constitution", and oppose their "evolutionary theory" and "peaceful methods" to the "fatal" theories and methods of the revolutionary parties. What would remain of their "constitutionalism" and their "legality" if they themselves were to raise the banner of "revolution"? This applied most of all to the parties of the radicals and the social patriots, who preached "democracy" and "reformism" of the first water. Apart from this, an overthrow brings with it a certain risk for the parties engaged in it, as in case of a failure they are then subject to the reprisals of the governmental power. If, on the other hand, the undertaking is successful, then the parties can attach themselves to it without in the least injuring their "constitutional principles" and can proclaim once again the era of "law and order" to calm the frightened petty bourgeoisie.

And so the constitutional parties remained outside the conspiracy also for strategic reasons. But the special organisation which prepared the overthrow — the "People's Alliance" — contained the individual leaders of all parties, including the social democracy. The plans of the adventure of the "People's Alliance" and the Military League went however further: by isolating the old and, in the eyes of the masses of the people, strongly compromised party leaders, they hoped not only to gain these masses, but also to replace the "old statesmen" of the opposition by new men more agreeable to the bourgeoisie.

But the idea of the coup d'Etat first arose when it became clear that the bourgeois parties and their petty bourgeois following were unable to overthrow Stambulinsky. All this time they had conducted an energetic struggle, they had reorganised, united and consolidated themselves and adopted new programmes. For instance, all the liberal parties, there were three, had amalgamated into one **National Liberal Party**; the People's Party and the Progressive Liberal Party had united into a Progressive People's Party. The attempt to extend this amalgamation so as to include the Radical and the Democratic Party was unsuccessful, but nevertheless, these three parties formed the so-called **Oppositional Block**, which in practice also included the mensheviks. The "Oppositional Block" adopted the programme of the National Party as its own and stood at the head of the struggle for the overthrow of the peasant government by "constitutional methods". For this purpose it called meetings, organised demonstrations, issued declarations and called upon the king to exercise his "constitutional prerogatives" and dismiss Stambulinsky. The republican menshevik jurists "proved" convincingly that King Boris possessed this "Right".

With all this, however, the oppositional party leaderships did not boycott the conspiracy. They entered willingly into negotiations with the Wrangel monarchists to ensure the co-operation of the latter in case of necessity. The connections between the Russian white guardists and the Bulgarian bourgeoisie date from this time, connections which were later strengthened by the martial law which was held over the heads of both the Bulgarian working class and the peasantry. The bourgeoisie was particularly intimate with the Macedonian "revolutionaries", whom it later used as the hangmen of the Bulgarian people. The bourgeoisie set the greatest hopes upon them as an armed power. With unconcealed pleasure they received the news of the taking of the town of Nevrokop by the Macedonian organisations, and later also the occupation of the town of Kewstendil, which was actually to form the signal for the insurrection against the peasant government.

The hands of the bourgeois and menshevik "constitutionalists" were by no means free from conspiracy even at the time when they still led the struggle. Even the well-known "Tyrnover events" in 1922, which turned out so sadly for the leaders of the oppositional block, were in close connection with the preparations for the insurrection.

After a series of failures, after the arrest of the oppositional leaders, and particularly after the heavy defeat of the "Block" in the elections of April 1923, the party leadership finally made room for the men of action, the people from the "Alliance". After the coup d'Etat was an achieved fact they attached themselves to it.

4. The grouping of forces and the perspectives.

It is perfectly understandable that the large landowners and large capital to-day inspire the policy of the white-guardist government. The first task of the latter was to abolish the "anti-constitutional" laws. Under this ambiguous term, which the June conspirators presented as the liquidation of the constitution, were all laws passed by the peasant government which directly or indirectly laid hands on the rights of property "laid down" in the constitution. The agrarian law which affected the rights of private property owners was declared as "anti-constitutional" in every paragraph by the bourgeois jurists; further, the law upon the expropriation of private buildings for the good of the state; the law which limited the "freedom" of the house owner to exploit his tenants etc. A tax reform law was carried through which considerably reduced the direct taxation of large capital and unbearably increased the taxation of the peasantry and also the indirect taxes.

The government paid particular attention to the interests of commercial capital. The consortium for dealing with bread cereals was completely abolished and the peasant syndicate which

went with it was liquidated. The credits for the peasant co-operatives were cut off and the means of the National Bank were placed exclusively at the disposal of large capital. Speculation was declared a normal phenomenon and the struggle against it as dangerous demagoguery. When, under the pressure of the suffering masses, a law was passed allegedly against the increase in the cost of living, the leader of the governmental fraction in the parliament Liaptchev, declared that the law was a "law for the fools". Under such conditions speculation naturally flourished and prices rose immeasurably. The cost of living index rose from 3.187 in August 1923 to 4.039 in August 1924. At the present time it is over 5000. Added to this, in the last two years the Bulgarian lev has only sunk 25%. In consequence of their tremendous profits which called forth the dissatisfaction of the masses of the people, the speculators were dubbed "robbers without weapons". To all this, the government naturally remained indifferent.

The government also eagerly attended to the interests of the industrialists. They also received large credits from the state banks. In all strikes the government naturally stands upon the side of the employers, and when necessary sends the armed forces into action. When the laws for the protection of the worker are violated however, the government is blind and the trade unions of the workers have been disbanded. In conflicts between the sugar and tobacco exporters on the one hand and the peasant producers on the other, the government stands upon the side of the former.

It is clear that such a policy of the white-guardist government provides no occasion for a break between it and the large bourgeoisie; and the same applies to the furious struggle which the government has now carried on for two years against the "bolshevist danger" and the "united front of the communist and the members of the Peasant League". On the other hand the failures of Zankov's foreign policy, which endanger the hopes of the bourgeoisie to carry out an economic and financial stabilisation through a revision of the peace treaty and the conclusion of a foreign loan, cause the bourgeoisie to consider seriously a possible change of ministers. This question is also connected with the bloody deeds of the government which have opened up a chasm between it and the masses of the people. In bourgeois circles there are voices in favour of a change in persons and methods which will consolidate the gains of the Zankov government and ensure the continued dominance of their class interests in the administration of the country. The handing over of power to the "left" parties would, however, by no means appear as a desirable change to the bourgeoisie.

The white guardist government has succeeded neither in winning the sympathies of the town and country petty bourgeoisie nor at least in rendering them patient. Regarding the masses of the peasantry there is nothing to be said. They have not reconciled themselves to the new power, but they are full of bitterness against it. The bourgeois parties accuse the peasant government of having incited the peasants against the towns. But no one has done so much towards deepening the chasm which now lies between a powerful section of the peasantry and the bourgeoisie of the town, as the government of the generals and professors. And this has been done, not only by the terrorising of the peasantry, but also by the economic and taxation policy of the government, which makes the working peasant the object of exploitation of a predatory capitalism and loads him with taxes. The handicraftsmen and the small dealers in the towns have also clearly expressed their dissatisfaction with the new government by arranging, for the first time in Bulgaria, a protest strike. The strongest argument of the opposition against Zankov is that his government is driving the petty bourgeoisie into the arms of the "destructive elements", and in this way creates a danger for the state. In the meantime it is more than doubtful whether the legal opposition will be able to raise the sinking prestige of the bourgeois power in the eyes of the peasant masses. The responsibility for the bloody deeds of Zankov lies also upon its shoulders.

A representative of the Social Democratic Party was also taken into the cabinet of Zankov, before all in order to win the workers for the party of the overthrow. But the calculation proved to be false. The influence of the mensheviks upon the masses was very weak. At the same time the government proclaimed itself as the "protector of labour" and even introduced a little later a "labour law", which earned for it the praise of Mr. Albert Thomas. But all these beautiful words and laws remain a

mockery in the face of the inexpressible suffering of the working class against which Capitalism and the government, from the first day on, had declared war with hunger and bullets. The indignation of the workers against the government was so great that even the corrupt Social Democratic Party felt itself compelled to withdraw from it. The proletariat was and remains the deadly enemy of the whiteguardist society; and not even the social democratic syrens are able to win the sympathy of the working class for the government. The hopes which these traitors set upon the dissolution of the Communist Party and the trade unions and the physical extermination of the active communist members — in this latter respect they heartily did their share — have not been realised. The workers have remained thoroughly estranged from their party and nourish a revulsion towards the menshevik jackals which is not to be overcome.

What are the relations between the heroes of the 9th June and the "constitutional" Parties?

The latter triumphantly greeted the coup d'Etat, described it as the "greatest date" in the modern history of Bulgaria, and afforded the government their full support in the suppression of the insurrection of the people which flamed up. But immediately afterwards the conflict began. The old party leaders and their staffs considered the government of Zankov as a temporary revolutionary government and hoped after the consolidation of the situation for the formation of a legal government of the bourgeois parties. The military junta however, which had the actual power in its hands, did not even think of surrendering it to the anaemic bourgeois parties. As nevertheless, they were needed to maintain the appearance of constitutionalism, it was decided simply to requisition them in the interests of the State. Two months after the overthrow the Progressive Peoples Party, the Democratic and Radical Party joined the "People's Alliance" under the pressure of the bourgeois elements in them and under the energetic urge of the Macedonian organisation. A new governmental party was formed, the "Democratic Alliance", under the nominal leadership of Zankov. The National Liberal and the Social Democratic Parties remained as independent parties within the governmental coalition.

That was the culminating point of the amalgamation of bourgeois forces which was necessary in order to set the crusade against the Communist Party into action and to ensure the success of the government at the elections.

Thereupon the process of disruption commenced. First of all, the coalition collapsed: the national liberals left the government and later the social democrats; the Radical Party left the "Democratic Alliance" almost completely, as did also the Democratic Party in its petty bourgeois section. Over and above this, the considerably reduced "great public power" upon which the "unity" of the people and the "renewal" of the state are based, is torn with internal rivalry and dissension, and Zankov, the "arbiter of fate" can at any moment find himself isolated with his fifty accomplices from the old "Peoples Alliance". The whiteguardist government has destroyed the organisations of the workers and peasants, but in the last resort the bourgeoisie is also politically disorganised. In the place of the five legal parties which existed before the coup d'Etat there are now ten legal bourgeois and petty bourgeois groupings (without the members of the Peasants' League and the Communists).

What is the condition of the military forces of Zankov?

The Military League continues to exist. As recent events proved, it is still all-powerful. Its members occupy the most important state posts. But the alterations and re-groupings which have taken place in the country have not passed over the League without leaving traces behind. One section of the Reserve Officers' Corps remained discontented. The split in the "Democratic Alliance" also weakened the internal solidity of the League itself. It is also threatened with a split. The powerful Macedonian Organisation of the year 1923 is today little more than a ruin. After the events of September 1924 it is no longer in a position to place itself at the disposal of the government as a united band of cut-throats. The army remains: with whom does the army go, that is the officers' group? The decomposition and disruption all around unceasingly weakens the unity of the officers' corps also. Zankov can no longer reckon upon the devotion of Volkov, but the latter can no longer under all circumstances reckon upon the certain carrying out of his own orders. Under these circumstances the son of the Coberger Ferdinand is in a situation to pluck up his courage and to exercise his "ruling prerogatives".

Abroad, the government of Zankov has succeeded in winning no new friends, it has even lost the sympathy of the English Conservatives.

The social basis of the white government has thus become narrower and its credit, even with the big bourgeoisie, has been shaken. The old political parties which led the struggle against Stambulisky, are almost completely in the opposition. And the groups which formally belong to the government, in secret fight against it. The military groups have similarly lost very much of their original consolidation. At present Zankov enjoys more fear than respect. His political game is played out. He will, however, not give up the power which he holds. Who will drive him out?

The "Left" legal opposition to which also the social democrats belong, represents no decisive social power. It is not in a position to mobilise a mass movement under its banner, but it still fights against the banner under which the workers and peasants are fighting to the death. It has not even the courage to demand the dissolution of parliament, for new elections under the present circumstances would bring for it a fatal defeat. Its struggle against Zankov is confined to solemn adjurations and hysterical appeals directed to Zankov. And it is quite sufficient for the latter to dangle the bogey of "Bolshevist danger" before their eyes, or to threaten them with a dissolution of parliament, in order to dampen their oppositional enthusiasm. The stubbornness with which the masses fight against the white terror is without doubt the only real factor from below which will force a change in the government of the country. (Conclusion.)

A New Wave of Terror in the Prisons of Bulgaria.

To the International Proletariat!

To all Humanitarian and Cultural Circles!

A new and monstrous provocation is being planned by the bloodhound Zankov.

All those who have been condemned to death and whose sentences have not yet been confirmed or have even been revoked, are to be secretly done to death in the prisons. The lives of all these unhappy victims of the Bulgarian government of murder are in the greatest danger. The hangmen will not allow themselves to be deprived of their prey. When the death sentence against the 32 accused in the monster trial of Varna was revoked, this was done so against the will of the Zankov people, upon whose command within the last few months the Special Courts have imposed 300 death sentences and the authorities had demanded 800 death sentences.

The authorities in Bulgaria are now proceeding to substitute the work of the legal hangman by the work of the illegal hangmen. All political opponents are to be exterminated.

For this purpose the hangmen of Zankov are proceeding as follows: Those who have been condemned to death and whose sentences have then been commuted to imprisonment for life are, under one pretext or another, being simply shot or beaten to death. And these bloodhounds are never at a loss for a pretext.

In Varna this process has already been commenced. Two prisoners, D. Nedev and D. Erebalakov, were killed in prison on the 10th of this month, because, it is alleged, "they offended the guards".

There is not the least doubt that these fresh, horrible acts of murder are only the prelude to a whole number of others of a similar kind.

The danger is exceedingly great, and it is therefore necessary to sound the alarm.

Fresh murders, fresh provocation on the part of the terrorist regime in Bulgaria are being prepared.

A fresh blood bath is to be arranged among those prisoners who up to now have escaped the hangmen's noose or the bullets of the government of professors.

The working class of all countries, the intellectuals, the friends of culture and humanity must once more, by means of powerful and continuous demonstrations, everywhere and at every opportunity exert their whole authority in order again to brand before the world this government of murderers and bandits which is stained with and covered with dirt and shame, and

to raise energetic protest against the new wave of murder in the Bulgarian prisons.

This government of wholesale slaughter which has converted Bulgaria into a wilderness must be made to realise that there is no place for it among civilised people, it must disappear and give place to the rule of those sections who form the overwhelming majority of the country, a workers' and peasants' government!

The Balkan Bureau of the International Red Aid.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Nationalist Movement and Labour in China.

By L. Heller.

I.

The Distinctive Features of the present Movement.

Never, since the Boxer uprising, has China been to such an extent, the centre of political attention of the entire world as during the last three months. Both London and New York, Tokio and Moscow have been watching with close attention the developments in Shanghai and Hong Kong, have been listening eagerly to the crash of events in China.

Only important wars attract so much public interest. Yet it is a mere strike of some 300,000 workers (200,000 in Shanghai and 120,000 in Hong Kong) that is responsible for it now. Why then do the headlines of the world's press refer so persistently to the events in Shanghai? Why such a troubled air among the Honourables of the Lower House and the Noble Lords of the Upper House, who have devoted more than one sitting of Parliament and Committee meeting to the Shanghai strike? Why this overwhelming interest, these passionate sympathies for the Shanghai workers on the part of the workers and peasants of the U. S. S. R. and of the entire world proletariat?

The answer lies not only in that China in the last years has become a most important junction, in which the fundamental problems of international politics collide and cross. This is not new. New is the fact that the Chinese masses have become a nation, acting as a unit, as a single body throughout the length and breadth of that vast country; new is the fact that the leader of the movement is no longer the radical intelligentsia, the Student body, as has been the case in the past five years, but the **working class**; and new is the fact that the workers' strike has become the backbone of the entire nationalist emancipation movement, the fact that the Supremacy of the proletariat in this movement has been recognised by the entire nation.

Social and Ideological Forces.

The national movement in China originated at the end of the past century. Its initiators in China, as elsewhere, were the intelligentsia, the students, teachers, a section of the professors, journalists and some of the elements of the emigrant Chinese commercialists, who rallied around the **Kouming Tang Party** or, to be more precise, around **Sun-Yat-Sen**, its leader. In 1915, in connection with the Japanese 21 demands, and in 1919, as a result of the Treaty of Versailles, which so thoroughly disappointed the Chinese nationalists, who found themselves deceived and betrayed by their own "allies", the nationalist movement received a new powerful impulse. For some months the Chinese public was in a state of uproar and extreme agitation. The Japanese Ministers were forced to resign; the boycott of Japanese goods reduced Chino-Japanese trade by 40%. But the leadership of the movement, the activity on the political stage, the cries of protest at the public meetings, the slogans in the fight — these all came from the student body. The voice of the worker was, as yet, silent.

Soon, however, the situation changed. The industrialisation of China during the last years of the imperialist war and the early post-war period, was proceeding apace.

Side by side with the foreign industries and with the old Chinese trading, go-between (comprador) bourgeoisie, there appeared a new industrial Chinese bourgeoisie.

The industrial centres, Shanghai, Tientsin, Hankow, Changsha, Tsingtao, etc., have been rapidly growing; within them there steadily grew large compact masses of the newly-risen working class. Soon this working class began to display its activity by a series of strikes.

Much has been written recently of the terrible conditions of labour in China. Men, women and children alike work 12 to 15 hours per day; the wages received by them are miserable. Cheap docile labour rendered China a "paradise for employers", to quote the report of the British Council, at China, recently published in the British "Blue Book".

But this capitalist paradise is a veritable hell for the workers. No wonder then that, under the influence of the general rise of the East after the war, under the influence of the November Russian Revolution and of their own national movement, a spontaneous movement for better conditions has developed among the Chinese workers, taking the form of a widespread strike struggle.

During the first period covering about 2½ years — from the beginning of 1920 to the latter half of 1922 — the labour movement, still largely spontaneous, met with practically no serious opposition. The strikes were limited mainly to the foreign industries, and the Chinese public opinion, moulded, as it was, not only by the influential studentry, but also by the new Chinese industrial bourgeoisie, maintained, on the whole, a position of friendly neutrality towards the labour movement. This was quite natural, since in defending their economic interests against the foreign capitalists the workers were indirectly strengthening the position of the native industry, thus also objectively fighting the imperialists and gaining the sympathies of the nationalist intelligentsia and, more particularly, of the students. No wonder, therefore, that the strike of the Hong Kong seamen in the spring of 1922 not only met with a sympathetic response throughout the country, but even received material assistance from the Southern bourgeoisie. In this atmosphere of general support the strikes of that period resulted, in their majority, in complete or partial success.

However, already towards the end of 1922, a change was marked. The strike movement, in its expansion, began to embrace Chinese establishments as well. A change of front immediately took place among the Chinese industrialists who took up an openly hostile attitude towards the workers' movement. This change was already felt during the strike of the Tan-Shang miners in October 1922. For the first time in the history of China not only the police but the army as well were used against the strikers on that occasion. There were casualties in killed and wounded, and the strike was put down by force.

Even more cruel was the treatment of the striking railwaymen on the Peking-Hankow Line, in February 1923, at the hands of the combined forces of reaction. Equally alarmed by the growth of organisation among the railway workers, the foreign and native capitalists, together with the Chinese militarists, joined in a united front against labour. The strike was drowned in the blood of the workers by the military dictator of China, **Wu-Pei-Fu**.

The defeat of the railwaymen served as a signal for a general offensive on the part of all the combined forces of the reaction against Labour. Not only were the recently organised trade unions dissolved, their premises sealed and the leaders arrested, but even the co-operatives, the schools and the clubs were everywhere closed. All over China (with the exception of Canton) the labour unions were driven underground, and only in isolated places were some semi-legal workers' organisations allowed to exist.

Things continued practically unchanged until the latter part of 1924. For about a year and a half quiet reigned in the labour movement of China. The Pacific Conference of Transport Workers, convened in Canton in June 1924, marked the end of this period. The Shameen strike (Canton) which flared up in July and which, like the 1922 Hong-Kong strike, was directed against the foreign capitalists, again demonstrated to all China the significance of the labour movement to the nationalist emancipation movement.

The New Political Situation and the Revival of the Labour Movement.

It will be recalled that in the Autumn of the same year Peking was the scene of a coup d'état in which the Chilhi clique suffered defeat, **Wu-Pei-Fu**, the erstwhile almighty dictator, was

forced to flee to the Yan-Tse-Kiang Valley, and Tuan-Tzi-Jui took over power. This new government has been maintaining itself only by grace of Chang-Tso-Lin and Feng-Yusiang, the heads of two hostile military groups, between which it has been very cleverly balancing. There lies the weakness of the present government, which has no considerable military forces of its own. Yet, its very military weakness is the source of its political strength. Just because Tuan-Tsi-Jui has no army of his own. Chany and Feng, who are not strong enough to capture the entire power, reconcile themselves with Tuan-Tsi-Jui, who is dependent upon both of them.

The disappearance of Wu-Pei-Fu and of his fosterling, President Tsao-Kun, who was extremely hostile towards the labour movement, and their replacement by the "weak" Tuan-Tsi-Jui Government, has created a favourable situation that was promptly utilised both by the labour and the nationalist movements. The Tuan-Tsi-Jui government styles itself as temporary, thus indirectly recognising its "illegal" origin. Tuan-Tsi-Jui in the past has been the chief of the Japanophile Anfu clique, hateful to the people, as was clearly demonstrated during the stormy years of 1919-20. However, Tuan-Tsi-Jui is a very clever politician, and from the very first days of his coming to power he began to talk of a "National Assembly" that was to establish a "lawful" government, while trying, at the same time, to win over the sympathies of the public, for which purpose he appealed to the support of the Kuo-Ming-Tang Party by appointing some members of the Right Wing of that party to certain government positions and inviting to Peking the leader of Kuo-Ming-Tang, Sun-Yat-Sen.

This of course, was merely a chess-move. There could be no agreements between the reactionary Tuan-Tsi-Jui and the revolutionary Sun-Yat-Sen on the fundamental questions of home and foreign policy. Nevertheless, as a result of the new situation, the Kuo-Ming-Tang Party, whose political activity is centred in the Kwen-Tung province in the South, obtained an opportunity to appear on the national arena. Sun-Yat-Sen came north, and in the course of several months, with the aid of appeals and manifestoes in connection with the struggle over the political character of the future national Assembly and of the conference that was to precede it, he carried out tremendous propaganda work in Northern and Central China, noticeably strengthening the nationalist movement in Peking and Shanghai.

This enlivening of the political movement had its immediate effect also on the labour movement.

The railwaymen's and miners' organisations that had been driven underground, began to grow and expand; the recently closed workers' schools and courses were re-opened and new ones established. The propaganda and organisation activities carried out during the early period, as future developments have shown, were not in vain; immediately the unfavourable period had passed and a new warm wave appeared in the political atmosphere, the seeds sown two and more years previously, began to blossom anew. The labour movement, put down after the crushing of the Peking-Hankow strike, again revived. More than that, the beginning of 1925 was marked by the development of a strong movement on the part of the most numerous and backward section of Chinese labour — the textile workers.

(To be continued.)

ECONOMICS

Economic Background of the Anthracite Strike in U. S. A.

By Earl R. Browder (Chicago).

What are the economic facts surrounding the present strike of 150,000 anthracite miners? Knowledge of these facts, in their main outline, is essential for the worker who would judge the importance of the struggle and the degree of correctness of the policies being put into effect. In their details, these facts are available in many large printed volumes, beyond the access of most workers. But it is possible to secure, in brief outline, a picture of the economic position of anthracite, and the relation of forces in the struggle, which will be of value to the thinking worker.

Anthracite and Bituminous.

The coal-mining industry in America clearly divides itself into two sections, anthracite and bituminous. The bituminous branch, employing some three-quarters of a million workers who produce close on 500 million tons annually, is widely scattered geographically, is still undeveloped technically, presents the widest variety of capitalist development, concentration of capital, etc., and is sharing to the full the world-crisis in the coal industry.

Anthracite, on the other hand, on account of its peculiarly favoured position, has not participated to the full in the world's coal crisis. Employing approximately 150,000 miners who produce 80 to 90 million tons annually, it is concentrated geographically in a small section of Eastern Pennsylvania, and is practically a monopoly in the hands of a small, highly-integrated group of capitalists. Thus anthracite presents conditions quite dissimilar to bituminous. While the bituminous miners, for example, have been suffering unprecedented unemployment, the anthracite miners have been working quite steadily.

Concentration of Capital in Anthracite.

Anthracite is in the hands of a small monopolist group, a combination of banks, railroad companies, and coal interests. This combination, dating back sixty years and forming a basic unit in the foundation of American capitalism, is a classic example of that process described by Lenin, in his epoch-making book "Imperialism", when he said:

"Thus on the one hand we have an ever more complete fusion, or as N. I. Bucharin ably puts it, growing into each other, of bank capital and industry, and on the other, the development of the banks into institutions really possessing a 'universal character'."*)

The physical basis for the monopolistic character of the anthracite industry, can be seen in the report of the Geological Survey (1920) which shows that the anthracite field, Eastern Pennsylvania, consists of 374 mines, under 174 producing organisations, of whom eight control more than 70% of the entire output.

These eight monster monopolists of anthracite are organically connected with a combination of great railroads and banks. For example, the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., with \$ 45,000,000 assets, is owned by the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.; the Lehigh and Wilkes-Barre Coal Co., with \$ 53,000,000 assets, is owned by the Central Railroad of N. J., the Reading, and affiliated companies; etc. It is unnecessary to point out that these railroads, and the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, etc., which have great bituminous holdings also, are in organic combination with the great financial institutions of Wall Street.

This great monopoly has long been the object of attack by the petty-bourgeois reformists, in and out of Congress, and its nature very accurately described. As long ago as 1894, we find one of the great leaders of the middle-class declaring:

"Within the last 30 years, 95% of the anthracite coal of America — practically the entire supply, it was reported by Congress in 1893 — has passed from the ownership of private citizens into the possession of the railroads.

These railroads have been undergoing a similar process of consolidation, and are now the property of eight great corporations."**)

The Coal Commission, headed by John Heys Hammond, reporting to Congress in 1923, declared frankly that the industry is completely under the control of "a double-headed railroad and coal combination", which levies monopolistic tribute.

The 174 anthracite producers are capitalized for the sum of \$ 430,000,000, as compared with bituminous capitalization of \$ 1,900,000,000. More than two-thirds of this amount is in the hands of the eight railroad coal companies. When the 174 producers of anthracite are compared with the 6,000 producers of bituminous, one gets a graphic illustration of the extent of concentration of capital in anthracite.

*) Imperialism, the Latest Stage in the Development of Capitalism, by V. I. Lenin, Marxian Society edition, Detroit, page 42.

**) "Wealth against Commonwealth", Henry Demarest Lloyd, 1894.

Monopolistic Profits in Anthracite.

Profits for the capitalists, always large in anthracite, have become fabulous within the past ten years. Most of the increase of profits can be traced directly to monopoly-prices of anthracite, the retail price increasing from \$ 6 per ton in 1913, to \$ 14 in 1921. During that same period, the yearly net income of the railroad coal companies rose from \$ 13,000,000 to \$ 31,000,000. In 1921, the Pennsylvania Coal Co. paid cash dividends of 137%, and in 1922 cash dividends of 168%, which amounted to \$ 1.30 and \$ 2.76 per ton of coal mined in the two years. The Hillside Coal & Iron Co., in 1921, handed to its stockholders a dividend of 205%; while in the same year the Lehigh & Wilkes-Barre Coal Co. declared a dividend of 227%.

In addition to the direct profits of the coal corporations, the railroad companies profit richly on the freight rates of the coal which they themselves control, thus taking profit twice. It is notorious that the railroads which control the anthracite fields yield tremendously increased profits over others not so situated.

There are two more lines of systematic profit-takers in the anthracite system, namely, the wholesalers and retailers. During the years 1913 to 1922, according to the Congressional report, profits of wholesalers, who handle two-thirds of the entire anthracite production, ranged from 20% to 42%. Retail profits were in the usual proportion to wholesale trade.

All of which is not to mention that most of the anthracite fields are operated by leasehold, not by the owners, and that the leases average a royalty to the owners of from \$ 1 to \$ 1.50 per ton.

It is little wonder, therefore, that even the capitalistic Coal Commission, should be made uneasy by this monstrous monopoly, and should comment in the following words:

"Because of the large increase in operator's margins per ton, since the strike of 1922, and the possibility of further increase in prices as a result of the recent settlement (1923), we believe that such current publicity as to costs, margins, and profits, should begin at once. Unless the public is protected by publicity of accounts, we are apprehensive that the concentrated control of the industry may take indefensible profits."

Conditions of the Workers.

Simultaneously with the tremendous growth in the wealth of the anthracite industry, conditions of the workers have grown continuously worse for the past 25 years. In spite of the tremendous struggles, beginning in 1900 when the United Mine Workers first organised the masses of anthracite miners, through the great strike of 1903 which lasted five months and caused the appointment of the first Anthracite Commission by Roosevelt, down to the struggle of 1922 which Lewis compromised, with the small wage increases of 1900, 1903, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1920, yet the rise in wages has lagged always behind the rise in the cost of living.

The annual income of the anthracite miners now runs from \$ 600 to \$ 1300, as compared with 25 years ago from \$ 500 to \$ 600. More than two-thirds of the miners earn less than \$ 1300 per year. The average working year is 248 days, which reflects the more stable conditions of anthracite as compared with bituminous, where unemployment has ravaged the ranks of the miners with terrible effect.

Conditions for organisation, aside from the existence of the more highly organised and militant employing class, are rather more favourable than in the bituminous fields. The anthracite miners do not live in isolated coal camps, "company towns", as do the bituminous miners. Almost all of them live in towns of 2500 population or more, in which they comprise about half of the population. Something more than one half of them are foreign-born, mostly Poles, Russians, Italians, and Lithuanians, the larger part of whom, however, have been in America for many years. More than 90% are organised in the **United Mine Workers of America**, although in the anthracite the Union has not succeeded in establishing the check-off system of collecting dues, which is one of its most trusted weapons in the bituminous fields.

The basic evil from which the anthracite miners suffer has not yet been attacked by the Union, and is not being attacked in the present strike. This evil is the absence of a standard, basic rate of wages. All the wage advances won by the anthracite miners have been based upon the chaotic "scales" in effect at the time of the formation of the Union in 1900, with such chan-

ges in the hundred and one classifications as the employers desire or feel strong enough to put into effect. This has left open the door for the most systematic juggling of wages by the companies to the detriment of the miners, an opportunity which the capitalists have taken full advantage. In every section of the anthracite district, the miners have an enormous accumulation of grievances from this cause, which will not be remedied even if the present strike is successful, and which will remain a running sore in the anthracite industry, until the Union has established that minimum for the beginning of some sort of workers' control over their own working conditions, a basic rate of wages.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Scarborough Congress of the British Trade Unions.

By Harry Pollitt (London).

There can be no further doubt but that the Scarborough Congress has been the most important and momentous in the history of the British Trade Union Movement. For months prior to the Congress there had been a carefully prepared press campaign which indicated how important to the Capitalist class was this Congress likely to be. The essence of the Capitalist comments prior to the Congress was that no doubt the "sane and moderate leaders" would again regain their control of congress, and prevent any further deviations to the left such as has characterised the Movement during the last twelve months.

Not only have their hopes been dashed to the ground, but the whole proceedings at Scarborough have proved that there is now definitely in existence a **growing revolutionary opinion** which no intrigues or appeals to constitutional procedure could stifle.

The decisions reached at Scarborough must be judged in the light of the existing situation; — a steady rise in unemployment and an acknowledgement on all sides that this is a period of truce, only the prelude to terrific conflicts ahead, with the Government making every preparation for the fight next May, when the findings of the Coal Commission will only be the screen used for an all round attack upon the wages and conditions of the whole Movement.

In view of this situation, it is all the more regrettable that the Congress did not take a decision in favour of the affiliation of the Unemployed Workers' Committee Movement to the Local Trades Councils, and the giving of complete powers to the General Council. The discussions on these questions proved how strong the desire for craft and sectional autonomy still is; despite past experiences there exists no general agreement on the need for a single centralised leadership capable of mobilising all the forces of the movement in a common struggle against the exploiters. Yet, underlying the discussion, it was quite clear that the sense of the Congress as a whole was favourable to the New Council exploring every avenue in order that preparations for the coming fight could be made; and if the Left-wing on the General Council had boldly come out and asked Congress for complete power giving the urgent reasons for this step being taken, it would have been a complete counter-offensive to the Right-wing who sought to get a retreat on this question by taking refuge in constitutional procedure and sectional autonomy. The Left could have smashed at one blow this superficial view of the situation.

For the next day, by an overwhelming majority, Congress went on record in favour of a resolution dealing with Trade Union aims, the three fundamental points of which were;

(1) The necessity of the Trade Unions definitely organising in conjunction with the party of the Workers for the overthrow of Capitalism.

(2) A declaration against co-partnership schemes and class-collaboration.

(3) The setting up of Factory Committees as the best means of securing the unity of the workers in every struggle.

This fact alone demonstrates that the majority of the delegates fully realised the new tasks that they are confronted with.

The speeches of Comrades **Brown**, **Tomski** and **Bramley** indicated the importance of Britain to the International Working

Class Movement and showed that **outside Russia the British Movement is the real International leader.** This is a position of great responsibility, but it was clearly recognised when the Congress unanimously and with a mighty roar of approval endorsed all that the General Council had done during the last twelve months, **both in regard to Soviet Russia and secondly in the fight for International Trade Union Unity.** The final decision of Congress that the New General Council must go ahead in its task of building up an **'all-in' inclusive International,** is a tremendous step forward.

It can only mean that the new Council will approach the whole question from the point of view of the unification of all the forces both inside Amsterdam, the R. I. L. U., and the Trade Union centres outside either International under a single International leadership. This is definitely a challenge not merely to the reactionaries of Amsterdam, but to the whole Second International whose whole practice and policy has been to isolate the revolutionary workers of all countries, and particularly of Soviet Russia, from the International Trade Union Movement, in order that the Amsterdam International could be used by them as a weapon against the unity of the workers in the struggle against the Capitalists.

This new orientation inevitably means an attack upon the whole political ground of the Second International with its reparations policy, League of Nations identity, and policy of class collaboration as has been so well shown up by the Social-Democrat Parties in their relations with the Capitalists in every continental country.

The decision of the Congress on the **Dawes Plan and Imperialism** confront the Labour Party leaders with very pressing and grave problems. When the Congress decided to repudiate both the Dawes Plan and the whole basis of Imperialism and what it means to the subject Nations, it did not do it because it desires to have separation from the Labour Party, or in order to pursue new policies as distinct from the Labour Party, but because of the disgust of the workers with the whole politics of MacDonaldism, and the desire and determination to give an entirely new outlook to the whole of the Foreign Policy of the Labour Party.

The attempt to use these decisions as indicating a split between the Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party is only a misrepresentation of the position, for the strength and basis of the Labour Party are the Trade Unions, but there is now a growing recognition in the Unions that it is not enough to grumble and grouse at the policy pursued by Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Thomas and then leave them to carry on as usual, but the experience of the Labour Government has made the Unions realise that they must fight on these issues and then force the leaders to carry out the policy that has been decided upon by the whole Movement, and where this is not done, it simply means that such leaders must be swept aside.

The decisions registered at Scarborough in relation to **China and the sending of delegations to India, Egypt, etc.,** mean the recognition of our responsibility to all Colonial workers. The post-war period has demonstrated the complete break down of the monopoly of British Capitalism, and with the intensification of Imperialist policy more and more are the workers of this country finding that the slave conditions of the Colonial workers are the chief weapons responsible for the worsening of conditions here at home. For this reason, Congress has decided that an inquiry shall be made into the conditions of our Colonial comrades. This, in itself, is a tremendous step forward, when one considers the past insularity and isolation of the British Movement.

These decisions mean that the New General Council has now positive tasks to carry out in regard to Colonial work. They must insist upon the complete freedom of the working class in very subject-country for economic and political organisation; delegations of inquiry and also organisers, must be sent out to the various countries to help in the task of building up an effective working class Movement. Especially should the General Council call upon its affiliated organisations who, from time to time, have members going out to such countries as India, Egypt, China and the Crown Colonies, to insist that such members do not go out to these countries carrying with them the same point of view as the representatives of the bourgeoisie, but that they should use their special position in the various factories and undertakings where they go to work for the

purposes of assisting and aiding their colonial comrades to build up fighting organisations.

The above indicate the **positive results** of the Scarborough Congress, but it of course had its weak side, and in this connection three **chief weaknesses** were as follows:

(1) The failure of Congress to give an organised lead in regard to fighting the Government on unemployment.

(2) Its failure to deal with the seamen's strike which is recognised on all hands as constituting a break in the united front of the Unions against any further wage reductions, and the absence of support to the strikers from the T. U. C. simply means an encouragement to the Capitalist in other industries.

(3) The reluctance of the Left-wing of the General Council to come out openly and fight the Right-wing on every possible occasion, for there could be no doubt that the Right-wing leaders, as represented by Mr. Thomas, Clynes and Cramp, had very effectively marshalled their forces and were organised to take up the battle whenever an opportunity presented itself, and they could have been completely crushed from the first day of Congress to the last if the Left-wing on the Council had seized their opportunity, because one had only to sit in Congress to sense the feeling amongst the delegates, to realise that there was a new feeling permeating the whole Congress which only wanted well organising.

Two incidents during the Chairman's speech support the above statement, one was where he said "Let the employers who think the organised working class can be driven still further back, take warning from this. This Movement of ours has learned many lessons during these years of reaction engineered by the employers, and one of the lessons is that a militant and progressive policy consistently and steadily pursued is the only policy that will unite, consolidate and inspire our rank and file", and again when he said "Many of our good comrades who in the days gone by taught us to believe there was no remedy other than the abolition of Capitalism seem afraid now that the system is collapsing and appeal for a united effort to patch up the system with the aid of the present possessing class". The roar of approval that greeted these sentiments indicated the rising temper of the workers.

To sum up, it is clear that the experiences and the **whole economic situation is slowly revolutionising the masses of this country** and despite every form of intrigue and appeal to constitutional fetishism the Right-wing leaders are unable to stifle this revolutionary growth. There is now the greatest opportunity in our history for those leaders claiming to be Left-wingers to come out boldly and take a prominent place in the Revolutionary Movement — they must do this, or they too will be forced to take up a position no different from that of the Right-Wing, for the Scarborough Congress has demonstrated as clear as day-light that the **Revolutionary workers now organised** under the leadership of the **National Minority Movement** are a force that can no longer be stemmed by intrigue or slander, they constitute the only organised opposition working within the existing Union Movement and their first successes at Scarborough are merely the prelude to greater victories later on.

The Defeat of the Strike of the French Bank Clerks.

By L. . . . ng.

The strike of the French bank employees has ended in a **victory for bank capital.** After a struggle which lasted for 50 days the strike collapsed. Work has been resumed under the following conditions:

1. No victimisation of the employees on account of participation in the strike "with the exception of acts which are incompatible with their position as bank clerks".

2. Payment of a bonus for the purchase of coal, amounting to 200 Francs, and a special bonus of a similar amount.

3. No payment on account of the days when on strike, but on the other hand payment of overtime necessary to clear up the arrears work accumulated during the strike.

4. Examination of the question of salaries towards the end of the year.

Bank capital is, of course, taking advantage of its victory and is victimising the most active elements in the strike movement; in Paris alone over 500 bank clerks have been refused reinstatement. The granting of a coal bonus and the special bonus of 200 Francs, the payment of overtime and the prospect held out of an examination of the question of salaries towards the end of the year are a direct insult in the face of the comprehensive programme put forward by the bank employees in the struggle and are the clear expression of their defeat. The defeat is all the greater as the French bank industry has for long been enjoying a period of prosperity. In spite of the inflation, industry in France is becoming increasingly dependent upon bank capital. In July 1925 the official French rate of discount was 7%; the usual rate of interest varied between 8 to 11%. The net profits of the banks for the year 1924 were as follows:

	Million Francs		
	1924	1923	1922
Crédit Lyonnais	43.9	42	40.5
Compt. Nat. d'Escompte	35.6	34.3	31.7
Société Générale	33.5	28.5	25.5
Crédit Industriel	8.3	7.9	6.6
Banque Nat. de Crédit	31.4	31.2	31.2
Créd. Comm. de France	17.1	14	12.7
Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas	36.7	34.8	32.3
Union Parisienne	17.4	15.3	12.5

How great was the growth of the leading French banks in 1924 is shown by the opening of 39 new branches and agencies of the bank Crédit Lyonnais and 7 new branches and 42 agencies of the Banque Nationale de Crédit. This development was continued in the year 1925. To what extent foreign, and especially American capital has been invested in the French banks it is difficult to say. But it can be stated with all certainty that the French government and the French police are fully dependent on bank capital. The bank clerks have learnt this to their cost.

What is the reason for the defeat of the French bank clerks? The enthusiasm and the energy of the strikers were beyond reproach. As regards their material support, however, right from the outset there was much to be desired, and in the end it was entirely inadequate. Strikers cannot live upon air. **The strike collapsed on account of lack of material resources.** The various trade union organisations of the bank clerks had no or very little, strike funds. A great portion of the strikers belonged to no organisation at all. The strike pay which was distributed was chiefly derived from collections. Collections were made in the factories, solidarity cards were sold, while strikers played and sang in the court yards and cafes of Paris and in this way collected money for their support. Along with this, friendly organisations of the Unitarian Bank Employees Union and the Communist Party of France and the Young Communist League contributed some thousand of Francs. Some of the municipal bodies supported the strikers with a few thousand francs. All these contributions were insufficient in the long run and thus the front of the fighters finally collapsed. In Germany the free trade union of the bank employees organised a collection but the result of this effort was very weak. **The Amsterdam International took no action**, although it would have been possible for it to support the strikers without calling upon its clerical employees' sections. The strike was sufficiently important in order to render necessary active international support.

The lessons which are to be drawn, not only by the French bank clerks, from this defeat, the effects of which will extend beyond the French bank industry and beyond France, can be summed up in the appeal: **build large and financially strong fighting trade unions, establish national and international trade union unity and energetically combat all so-called neutral and christian organisations.** It is clear that the defeat of the strike of the French bank clerks will, for the time being, call forth a certain depression among the bank clerks, and the number of those pessimists who talk of the hopelessness of fighting against capital and the necessity of a humiliating reconciliation with the employers will increase in number. Such elements usually meet with more success among clerks than among

workers. The depression will pass over the more quickly, the more actively the class-conscious bank clerks work at setting up trade union unity, the more active the campaign for the complete organising of the bank employees is carried on, the greater the victimised are cared for and the clearer the continuous rise in prices is pointed out as rendering necessary a fresh and better prepared and organised struggle. **The defeat of the strike of the French bank employees must and will only remain an episode.**

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Fourth Convention of the Workers' (Communist) Party of America.

By Max Bedacht (Chicago).

The Workers Communist Party of America held its Fourth National Convention beginning August 21st. The Convention lasted fully ten days and was significant in more than one respect.

For several months prior to the opening of the Convention, a bitter fractional struggle was carried on within the Party. The basis for this struggle was a fundamental difference that had gradually developed among the leading groups of the Party. Some comrades of the leading strata, mostly engaged in the trade union work of the Party, displayed a distinct trades union ideology. In the terminology of these comrades, the working class is synonymous to the workers organised in trades unions, and the labour aristocracy is synonymous to the labour bureaucracy. But the misconceptions resulting from such confusing premises are not the only ones. These comrades insist, if not in theory, but surely in practice, that the Party is merely an instrument for the conquest of the trades unions.

This trade union ideology resents the "interference" of political policies and campaigns in the trades union work. When a political united front manoeuvre of the Party leads to the unmasking of fake progressives in the trades unions, then these comrades do not so much attack the "progressives" for their treachery, but they centre their attacks on the "politicians" in the Party for having unmasked them.

Such a manoeuvre, that of the conference of July 3rd, 1923 in Chicago, which ended in the formation of the Federated Farmer Labour Party, led to the unmasking of the "progressive" leadership of the Chicago Federation of Labour. Some of the comrades leading in the trades union work of the Workers Party were connected by ties of personal friendship with those Chicago "progressives". The break with them was felt by these comrades not as a politically inevitable event, but as a personal injury to themselves. So these comrades decided that if the political direction of the Party would determine finally the manoeuvres of the Party workers in the trades unions, then they would wrest the leadership of the Party from the "politicians" and thus prevent further interference of "politics" in the Party's trades union work. Consequently, these comrades organised a "revolt" which led to their getting a majority of the delegates at the Third Convention of the Party in the New Year, 1924. In this Convention, the Party witnessed the anomaly that the report of the CEC. was adopted unanimously, that the political theses of the CEC. were accepted almost unanimously, but that the CEC. failed to get a majority in the elections for a new Central Committee. The "trades union wing" had no political programme with which to defeat the Central Executive Committee. But it got the votes. The political unripeness of our Party manifested in this incident, finally led to the recent fractional struggles in the Party.

The new majority of the CEC. elected at the Third Convention suffered from a lack of a unifying concept. It saw all phenomena and manifestations of the class struggle separate and distinct from each other without understanding, or looking for, the inner connections between these events. One of the results of this lack of Marxian-Leninist understanding is a complete misunderstanding and misapplication of the united front policy. Instead of using the united front policy as an instrument of unification, not only unifying the isolated and

sporadic struggles of the workers, but also teaching the workers the inner connections of all the causes for the various struggles, these comrades reduced the united front to an empty phrase. A system of multiple united fronts was initiated which began by promising to set up a new and separate united front for everything, and which ended in destroying the only big political united front movement our Party was engaged in since the "political" CEC. initiated the Labour Party policy and campaign in 1922.

When this somersault was performed by the Central Committee, the differences in the Party crystallized into distinct factional formations.

In October 1924 the majority of the Central Committee rejected the proposal of the pro-Labour Party group to introduce through the left wing in the American Federation of Labour Convention a resolution demanding the formation of a Labour Party.

A few days after the conclusion of the presidential elections in November, the majority of the Central Committee passed, over the protests of the then minority, a declaration that the Labour Party movement is dead.

Finally, later in November 1924, the then majority adopted a thesis declaring against the Labour Party policy and campaign and denouncing the pro-Labour Party group in the Committee as opportunists, liquidators, and reformists.

The differences in the Party were finally submitted to the Communist International. But not after some struggle. The combined experience of our World Party was to help our American Section out of its entanglement.

The Comintern decided for a Labour Party. But that did not settle the controversy. The "trades unionist" anti-Labour Party group of the Central Committee realised that the decision of the Comintern was a political defeat, which in any ripe communist Party would lead to the defeat of the Executive Committee in a convention. To avoid such a defeat our right wing therefore decided to raise false issues and to claim a victory at the Comintern. The C. I. in its decision declared that it had detected errors on both sides. This sentence was ridden to death. The anti-Labour Party group completely forgot its political duty toward the Party. It had submitted to the Comintern a general orientation for judgment; so had the left wing of the party. The Comintern accepted the general line of the left wing and rejected that of the right. While the general line of the left was found correct, the Comintern rightly criticised tactical errors made by that group in applying a correct line. The right wing seized upon these criticisms as the main issue and thus prevented a thorough discussion of its major error. Thus it prevented the Party from really learning to understand not only that the old CEC. majority had made a mistake, but the nature and basis of the mistake. Only a clear understanding of the nature and the basic causes of a mistake is a guarantee against the repetition of it. The right wing prevented this Leninist self-criticism in order to be able to further exploit the prejudices which it had created against the left wing on the basis of its former demagogic accusations of reformism, opportunism, and pink flagism.

But the comrades of the then majority of the Central Committee were not satisfied with a politically dishonest fight against the left wing. They were determined to retain the leadership of the Party at all costs. With this aim in mind, they initiated a campaign of suspensions and expulsions. In Cleveland this campaign found its classic climax. Branches which supported the left wing of the CEC. were changed into supporters of the anti-Labour Party group by suspending from membership as many as thirty left wing adherents in one single branch. When these suspended comrades were reinstated by a decision of a Party commission established by action of the C.I., the District Organiser found new ground for suspension. The District Organiser in this district, to assure his domination took upon himself even the right of two votes in committees.

With such actions as a preliminary the Fourth Convention of the Workers Communist Party began under dangerous auspices. Dual delegations presented themselves from the most important districts, like Boston New York, Philadelphia, and Cleveland.

The political theses and resolutions submitted to the convention were adopted unanimously in the Party Commission. The struggle in the Convention therefore centred on the credentials and on the past actions of the Executive Committee.

The report of the minority of the credentials committee disclosed such utterly uncommunist manoeuvres that it seemed impossible to appease the outraged delegation of the left wing and prevent a split.

But the fever heat of resentment was overcome by the loyalty to, and the confidence of the comrades in the Comintern. The left wing delegation returned from its caucus to the convention and declared that under no conditions will it permit itself to be provoked into a split.

All throughout the debates of the convention, the fundamental differences between the groups manifested themselves. The lack of a political concept which could unify all the activities and all the analyses of the Party manifested itself on the one hand, — and an effort to give such a unifying concept was apparent on the other hand.

The debates were bitter but contributed to the clarity of the Party. The role of the Party in the class struggle was discussed, on the concrete basis of American conditions. A clear understanding of the resolution of the Second World Congress of the Comintern on that matter was thus created.

The real object of the Party's work in the trades unions, — not as industrial, but as political work — was made clear. This will contribute to a more conscientious application of the Party's forces to this task. It will help to eliminate the dangerous ideological division of the Party into trades unionists, and politicals. It will establish as the most important prerequisite and fundamentally necessary qualification for a Party member, that of being a Communist.

The Convention took up the problem of a serious reformist crystallization in the Party. This social democratic wing centred around Ludwig Lore, the editor of the *New York Volkszeitung*. Lore was an ally of the "trades unionists" in their revolt against the "politicals" in the Third Convention of the Party. As a true opportunist he supported the criticism of the "trades unionists", by the "politicals", but voted with the former to oust the latter from leadership. From the convention in January 1924 Lore wired to his paper that "the Trotskyites have won the Party". This was never repudiated by the majority. Lore and his adherents became an integral part of the majority caucus.

With the bolshevization of the Party, which manifested itself in an ever-accelerating tendency away from abstractions and toward concretization and action, the social-democratic remnants in the Party came into an ever sharper conflict with the Party's policies. Opposition to these policies became fundamental opposition to action. In the period when this reformist crystallization took definite form, it was imperatively necessary that the Party should join issue with it and thus preserve the unity and the purity of the Party. But the fact that the Lore group was an integral part of the leading group in the Central Committee favoured this opportunist crystallization.

The then minority took up the question of Loreism with the Comintern at the Fifth World Congress in April 1924. The C.I. supported the left wing and condemned Lore and Loreism. But the alliance of the "trades unionist" majority with Lore continued. Only a new decision of the Comintern made at the last Enlarged Session of the Executive Committee in April 1925 at the urgent request of the left wing severed the ties between Lore and the majority. But the division is by no means definite. The bulk of the rank and file which is under the ideological influence of Lore and Loreism, together with the least active sections of our Party, supported the anti Labour Party right wing in its struggle for further leadership before the convention. But the decision of the Comintern succeeded in driving home to the Party as a whole the seriousness of the Loreistic disease of our Party. As a result of this it was possible to unite the majority and minority fractions for a unanimously accepted proposal to expel Lore from the Party. On the initiative of the left wing the removal of Askeli, another Loreite, from the position of editor on the Finnish Daily, "Tyomies", was also decided unanimously.

The pro-Labour Party left wing did everything in its power to keep the discussion on the level of a political debate. This was very hard because of the right wing's persistent efforts to lead the discussion away from political fundamentals into the field of petty details. But in spite of all that, the Convention proceeded under the slogan of bolshevization. The very debates of the convention were a contribution to bolshevization. Whatever efforts might have been made to divert this

main aim were finally frustrated by the Comintern when it made and transmitted to the convention an eleventh hour decision in which among other things it stated categorically that:

"It has finally become clear that the Ruthenberg group (pro Labour Party left wing group) is more loyal to the decisions of the Comintern and stands closer to its view."

This C. I. decision had the effect of a bombshell in the convention. The majority, which, by its questionable methods characterized by the C. I. as "excessive mechanical and ultra fractional", had succeeded in having a majority of the delegates, after a long struggle in its caucus submitted to this decision. A Central Executive Committee was elected, with equal representation from both groups and a representative of our World Party as chairman.

Under the leadership of this Committee, the decisions of the Fourth Convention will be put into effect. The reorganization of the Party as a necessary pre-requisite to its bolshevization will be the immediate task. Out of a union of numerous language federations, each one in itself a political party, this Executive Committee will weld a unified centralised Communist Party, worthy of membership in the Comintern and adapted to the tremendous tasks awaiting it in the American class struggle.

The Party Conference of the C. P. of Austria.

By Johann Koplénig (Vienna).

From the 12th to the 14th of September there was held in Vienna the VIII. Party Conference of the C. P. of Austria. This Party Conference which was properly convened and held after more than two years of serious crisis, brought about the complete liquidation of the fraction struggles and the establishment of Party unity. This is of all the more importance as the situation created by the fraction struggles of the last few years could be regarded as one of the saddest spectacles within the Communist International, so that it became usual to speak of „Austrianising“ the Parties, as representing the exact opposite of Bolshevizing the Parties.

The C. P. of Austria, during the last two years, has not only lost the confidence of the working class, as a result of the fraction struggles, but it has gradually created even in its own ranks an atmosphere which rendered almost impossible any concrete discussion regarding the existing differences.

The National Conference of November 1924 had already brought an essential change for the better. The report of the Party Executive to the Party Conference recorded a number of faults and failings, both in regard to the political line followed in the past year as well as in regard to the practical carrying out of the same, but at the same time there could be discerned in the report the first steps on the road to **uniting and consolidating the Party**, including in this the Party's factory nuclei work. In a resolution adopted by the Conference it was pointed out that the political failures could be attributed in part to the influence exercised by the C. P. of Germany under the leadership of Ruth Fischer-Maslow, whereby the process of establishing political clarity in the C. P. of Austria was hindered.

The former fraction leaders Frey, Tomann and Koritschoner, immediately before the Party Conference, had united on a platform of common struggle against the existing party executive by making use of the failures and shortcomings which had been admitted by the Party Executive itself. This attempt to abuse the desire for unity existing among the members in order to launch a fresh attack upon the unity of the Party was emphatically repudiated by the Conference with an overwhelming majority. The discussion on the report of the Party Executive showed, in contrast to the previous party Conferences of the C. P. of Austria, the great political clarifying process which the Party had undergone since the last national Conference. The Party has developed in a relatively short time a sound core of capable functionaries, whose reliability has been tried and proved by the bitter experiences of the last few years.

In the centre point of the political discussion there stood the question of the **foreign political orientation of Austria**: incorporation with Germany or incorporation in a Danube-Balkan-Federation. This question, which had been raised by the social

democrats and the bourgeoisie in connection with the attempts to find a fresh way of escape in view of the growing acuteness of the sanitation crisis, had also for weeks past been a subject of lively discussion in the organisations and in the press of the C. P. of Austria. Both tendencies, the advocates of incorporation in Germany as well as the supporters of the Danube-Balkan-Federation, put forward the standpoint that this slogan, in connection with the revolutionary perspective, must be opposed to the social democratic-bourgeois incorporation slogans.

The delegation of the Comintern which was present at the Party Conference took part in the debate and represented the standpoint of the Executive, which rejects both the slogans of incorporation in Germany as well as the slogan of the Danube-Balkan-Federation at the present moment and calls upon the C. P. of Austria to carry out the revolutionary every-day work in the trade unions and the workshops and the struggle for the economic every-day questions of the proletariat, in order to win the broad masses. The representative of the C. P. of Germany informed the Party Conference that the Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany had rescinded the decision adopted by the Party Conference under the influence of the former leadership of Ruth Fischer-Maslow.

In the decision which was unanimously adopted by the Party Conference regarding the question of Austria's affiliation to another State, affiliation propaganda was stigmatised as a bourgeois-social democratic manoeuvre for the purpose of deceiving the Austrian proletariat regarding the causes of its misery and diverting the workers from the necessary struggle for securing their existence, as well as from the struggle for annulling the imperialist slave treaties. The plan for affiliation to Germany as well as to the Danube-Balkan Federation, is characterised as an attempt on the part of the imperialists to gratify their lust to extend their power on the continent and as the preparation for a war against Soviet Russia. The resolution declares that the bad economic situation of the Austrian proletariat in the present period can neither be removed nor improved by incorporation in Germany or by a Danube-Balkan Federation, because in all these countries the economic consequences of the world war have been just as disastrous for the workers and the petty bourgeois section of the population as in Austria. The Party Conference warned the Austrian proletariat and the petty bourgeois sections of the population against allowing themselves to be led astray by this propaganda. It showed that the only way to remove the mass misery arising from the effect of the war and the transference of the burdens of the Peace Treaties upon the proletariat, was the rallying of all workers to a united revolutionary fighting front, the determined struggle for the every-day economic demands, and the fight for the overthrow of the capitalist system, for the cancelling of the imperialist Peace Treaties and the setting up of a proletarian Soviet power.

To sum up, this Party Conference means the turning of the Party to the revolutionary every-day work in the workshops, concentration upon a systematic Trade Union work which shall render it possible for the Party, in the fight for every-day demands, to win over the masses of workers who have hitherto been under social democratic leadership, and to create a real communist mass movement. This new orientation found its expression in the composition of the **new Central Committee**, which consists almost exclusively of workers from the most important workshops and factories in Vienna and the provinces. The new Central Committee was elected unanimously. The former leaders who had only come to an agreement shortly before the Party Conference, were not elected. These declared that they would support the Central Committee in its work.

By the decisions of this Party Conference the C. P. of Austria has finally overcome a long drawn out period of crises. The excellent result is largely due to the **delegation of the Communist International** which, by its clear and purposeful participation in the proceedings, helped the Party to adopt a communist policy for winning the masses. By gathering together and attracting all the forces existing in the Party which hitherto were split up in fraction struggle, and their concentration upon a consistent every-day policy in the Trade Unions and in the workshops, we shall succeed in breaking through the isolation from the masses which has existed hitherto, and in creating in Austria, where the II. International at present has its strongest bulwark, a real communist mass party.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

A Festival in Honour of the Workers' Revolution and of the Genius of Science.

By A. Lunatscharsky.

On September 5th the Russian Academy of Sciences celebrated its 200 years' jubilee with great international festivities. Ed.

The jubilee of the Academy of Science was turned into a great festival of the whole Union and at the same time of the whole world. The Government arranged a great celebration of this jubilee which found a hearty echo both in the Press and among the public. The whole scientific world, and with it public opinion in all countries, devoted considerable attention to this event. The opinions expressed abroad varied greatly. Some scientific institutes and individual scientists were bewildered, some of them even indignant. They did not know what attitude to take towards this jubilee which at the same time as being a great festival in the world of science was also a festival of the hated Union of the Socialist Soviet Republic. But it was precisely the existence of this element of disapproval in the international opinion of scientists and of the public which gave the event peculiar vitality.

What was it that really took place? Would our academicians be right in saying that their personal merits, highly appreciated on all sides, made them, on the occasion of this festival, the centre-point of the attention of the whole world? Would they be right if they were to regard the Academy's achievements in the domain of science during the past 200 years, which indeed represent a huge number of discoveries and attainments to which everyone must pay respect, as the chief cause of this attention and of the dignified, extraordinary character of this festival?

No. In spite of our extreme respect for the now living academicians and for their predecessors, we must say that the festival of the academy was, of course, impressive and remarkable, but that it owes its immense significance to the fact that a great scientific institution with traditions of extraordinary value, has placed its services voluntarily at the disposal of the first socialist State.

It is just this which gives the event world-wide historical importance. As a matter of fact, it was proved on this day of celebration that the proletariat and, mark you, the proletariat of one of the most backward countries of Europe, having taken the power into its own hands, knows how to appreciate science.

Is it really conceivable that the shining lights of culture can peaceably work together with the masses of the people who have overthrown the dictatorship of the ruling classes? The festival proved that this is not only possible but natural. It proved to the whole world in the most telling way that Lassalle was right when he anticipated an alliance between "the fourth estate and science."

As the first step in a solemn fraternisation between the liberated workers and science, the jubilee of our Academy with its impressive celebration has become a magnificent event; at this festival, scientists from all over the world flocked to witness the official, formally celebrated espousals of the workers' revolution with science.

As a rule, official celebrations are dull, the speeches delivered are officially optimistic and at the same time officially uniformed. The festival of our Academy was quite different. Every word spoken was original and significant. No single historian of general culture will in the future be able to pass over this powerful manifestation of a regrouping of social and cultural forces, the final result of which will be the creation of an entirely new world which the old world is painfully labouring to bring forth.

The Academy is specially to be congratulated on its 200 years' existence because, at the end of this vast period of time, it has passed, in advance of all other great scientific organisations, through the triumphal arch of the greatest revolution the world has ever seen, into outer precincts of a new world.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostle.

IX.

The Soviet Union and the Capitalist Governments.

Karl Kautsky in the Service of Foreign Capitalists.

(Conclusion of chapter.)

Kautsky thinks himself to be extremely discerning when, with a gesture as though he were discovering America, he "un-masks" on the one hand our sympathies with the world revolution and on the other hand our aspirations towards "normal trade relations". He gossips in the manner of a police informer and denunciator about the fact that the Communists always find a way to "riggle over the borders" illegally and "to transmit instructions, slogans and above all money to the communists abroad", and writes:

"On the other hand the Bolsheviki must finally have noticed that the shares of the world revolution were selling badly and that their market price was constantly falling. They saw that the masses of workers in foreign countries were more and more unanimously turning away from their methods... that on the other hand the capitalists abroad were people with whom it was quite possible to deal if one held out to them a prospect of business and profits.

Thus a new object, diametrically opposed to that of world revolution arose: that of arriving at peaceful relations with the capitalist powers, being recognised by these and establishing free intercourse with them*).

This accusation was intended, according to Kautsky, to work like poison. If however we give the matter our close attention only for a moment, we immediately spot the charlatan.

We must really ask ourselves what Kautsky actually proposes. Are we not to desire friendly relations? Are we immediately to declare war on the whole capitalistic world?

In the first place every one would see that that would be mere stupidity.

Secondly, Kautsky would in this case scream still louder about universal plunder; as it is, Kautsky can have nothing to complain of.

Or are we expected to renounce our sympathies with world revolution? To those sympathies on which, in Kautsky's own words, our authority rests? Are we to cease to be "a young revolutionary body? Are we to be traitors even to the idea of world revolution? Is that what the old renegade suggests?

We will not agree to this. It would however be comic to hear such a proposal publicly made by Kautsky.

Now for the gist of the question! As the reader can easily see, Kautsky in these discussions is carrying out a direct commission of the international bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie negotiates with us and demands the maximum; it says: if you want to negotiate with us, throw your sympathies with the world revolution to the winds.

Our answer is: we do wish to negotiate with you; we will not meddle in your internal affairs but we mean to maintain our sympathy with the world revolution.

But how does Kautsky behave? In the dispute between the capitalists and us he takes wholeheartedly the side of the capitalists against us, he actually supports the demands of the capitalists.

Perhaps however it really is impossible for a proletarian State to exist and to negotiate with capitalist States without betraying the world revolution.

It is not difficult to answer this question in its essentials. The world revolution develops irregularly. The picture of its development is chequered and complicated. It is impossible to expect that the revolution will gain the victory suddenly and

*) Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia", p. 24.

simultaneously in all countries. A period of transition therefore, during which both proletarian and capitalist States exist, is inevitable. As however these conditions occupy a whole period, it is easy to understand that such a period is unavoidably affected with contradictions.

It is characteristic of Kautsky that he has completely "forgotten" his old reproaches against the Bolsheviks. The reader will probably remember how he accused us of having no understanding for times of transition. Now the innocent is "operating" with exactly the opposite arguments. Fine "dialectics!"

Kautsky's denunciations however go still further. Nowadays the whole bourgeoisie identifies the Comintern with the Soviet Government. It uses this to fight against both and to represent the Communist workers as agents of the "Moscow despots". And Kautsky? Kautsky entirely supports this "version":

"They (the Bolsheviks, N. B.) think they can carry on their ambiguous policy in that they have set up different institutions for their proletarian and their capitalist sides. The Communist International carries on the world revolution and preaches the overthrow of all governments. Soviet diplomacy on the other hand is trying to gain the confidence of these very governments..."

The fact however that both the 3rd International and Soviet diplomacy are under the command of these gentlemen is no longer a secret from anyone... The only effect of this contradiction to-day is that no one trusts the Russian Government!)"

Bravo Kautsky! Bravissimo! The "democrat" Kautsky identifies himself with the demands of the most reactionary imperialist politicians, the demand that the Comintern should be expelled from the Soviet Union, as that is what the worthy capitalists require. If we add to this the reference to the "government monies" (p. 10), it is as though actual police dossier labelled "Karl Kautsky's memorandum to the 2nd International" were revealed to us. It would be a distinct advantage to undertake a detailed analysis of the question: "Soviet Government and Comintern". Can Herr Kautsky not understand that the Ebert-Hindenburg republic can conclude a commercial treaty with Italy without this treaty signifying that the Republic declares its complete solidarity with the Fascist party? Is Herr Kautsky incapable of understanding that the English Government is a different thing from for instance the so-called "International League for Combatting Bolshevism?" Does he not see that there is a similar relationship between the proletarian government of the Soviet Union and the International Organisation of the Communist workers?

Anyone can understand this distinction. Kautsky however must dance when the whole bourgeoisie pipes. Keep it up, old fellow!

Do not however imagine, dear readers, that Herr Kautsky confines himself to an indirect speculation on war! He has a much more solid arsenal at his disposal. He is thinking of financial pressure also. It is really worth while going into this side of the question as well, for we have indeed to deal with the most classic instance of a renegade that was ever heard of.

We call the reader's attention to the following, really overwhelming remarks of Kautsky's:

"Even Soviet Russia cannot carry on nowadays without foreign loans..."

Granting Soviet Russia an unconditional loan means placing a strong means of power in its hand for the oppression of the masses of people over which it rules and which it can only hold down by force.

On the other hand an unconditional refusal of a loan to Russia means applying a powerful means of pressure which makes it possible to compel those momentarily in power in Moscow to grant concessions on democratic lines.

Loans should not be refused but granted only on conditions which would imply an alleviation of the terrible oppression...

Any such condition can be justified on the grounds of the lender's own interests, so that the Bolsheviks cannot reject it as an undue interference of foreign countries in Russia's internal affairs.

The granting of democratic concessions is, strange as it may sound, in the interest not only of the Russian proletariat but also of the foreign capitalists who want to bring money to Russia whether in the form of loans or in the purchase of concessions!)"

A considerable time has elapsed since the foreign capitalists renounced their impudent demand for a change in our political regime. They fought tooth and nail for these alterations. The workers and peasants however showed them how the people defends its regime against the attacks of foreign capital and the White Guardists. Thereupon the foreign capitalists tried to enforce the same demands by "peaceful methods", as preliminary conditions to commercial treaties. Even this "phase of development" however has passed.

Now, when there is again a smell of powder in the air, it is Herr Karl Kautsky who dares to raise these demands!

The sight of this Judas is really disgusting. The "loans", i. e. the money is not in Kautsky's hands but in those of the capitalists. The capitalists but not Kautsky can use the money for exerting pressure on us. Does this make Kautsky's demands any more modest? Not in the least. Kautsky makes use of the "interests of the creditors" as an argument.

A particularly cynical argument of Kautsky's is, that the pressure recommended by him, "is no interference with the internal affairs because it can be justified on the grounds of the lender's own interests". The best treatment for the writer of this "scientific argument" would be to seize him by his long ears and show the world what such a "thinker" (with your leave) looks like. Are we to understand then that an intervention can be "justified" by the interests of its originator? Or has Kautsky learnt a lesson from Vorländer and invented a new kind of platonic intervention? With what sort of idiots does he think he has to deal?

It is however to Kautsky's "credit" that he sees the weakness of his own standpoint. It gives him courage suddenly to find a loophole by declaring that the interests of the foreign capitalists are identical with the interests of our workers in the most important question, that of political power.

Workers! Express your gratitude to Herr Kautsky for his overwhelming discovery!

This is the way generals Ironside, Koltshak, Judenitsch etc. talked, who tortured our country. This is the way Karl Kautsky, the "leader" of the 2nd International, speaks to-day.

Revolting propaganda against the Soviet Union, financial pressure, war, insurrection — this is the programme of Kautsky who is exactly carrying out the instructions of the international bourgeoisie. As the international, especially the English spies, regard Georgia as the centre of their operations (the capitalists are nearer to their naphtha wells and it is especially convenient for the English to bring their navy along), Kerr Kautsky provides for this detail as well:

"In Georgia there was never a danger that an insurrection against the Bolshevik rule, if it succeeded, would help reaction. Any insurrection there would be with the object of gaining national independence of any Russian regime." (As though there were a "Russian regime" in Georgia! N. B.)"

This completes the circle of the "counsels" of the international bourgeoisie in the mouth of its herald. At the moment when a new counterrevolutionary wave is rising, when even the most moderate bourgeois writers are perturbed by the thought of the work of organising a new "holy" alliance against the "young revolutionary" country, Kautsky appears on the stage in the part of an "authoritative" expert of the bankers, the police, generals, conspirators, Fascists, White Guardist emigrants. He really behaves after the manner of an apostle of the international bourgeoisie.

¹⁰) Ibid., p. 34/35. Italics mine. N. B.

¹¹) Ibid. p. 42.

⁹) Ibid. p. 26.