

v. b. b.

M. N. Roy: The Indian Trade Union Congress.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 13

18th February 1926

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

CONTENTS

L. Trotsky: The Murder of the Soviet Couriers and the Home Secretary of Latvia.

Politics.

L. Katz: England, the Ally of Horthy Hungary.
J. B.: The Guerilla War in Syria.

China.

A. N. K.: The Part Played by the Kuomintang Party in the Chinese Revolution.

The Balkans.

Alexis Gheirou: The Working Masses under Pangalos' Dictatorship.
P. Z.: The International Campaign for the Child Victims of the White Terror in Bulgaria.

The Labour Movement.

M. N. Roy: The Indian Trade Union Congress.

Economics.

L. Orski: Land Law "Reform" in Poland.
Nino Barbieri: Emigration and Unemployment in Fascist Italy.

In the International

A. Bernard: The Fight against the Right in the Communist Party of France.
The Results of the Leningrad District Conference.

Union of Soviet Republics

N. Briuchanov: Two Years of Money Reform in the Soviet Union.
Z. Leder: Productivity of Labour, Socialist Accumulation and Rationalisation of Production.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

Bellugue: The Attitude of the Leaders of the Mexican Trade Union Movement.

International Women's Day.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. on the International Women's Day.

Obituary.

L. Sosnovsky: Larissa Reissner.

Book Reviews.

M. Beer: L. Trotsky: Whither England?

The Murder of the Soviet Couriers and the Home Secretary of Latvia.

By L. Trotsky.

A murderous attack was made in the train — in more than mysterious circumstances — on two of our diplomatic couriers, two soldiers of the proletarian revolution, with the obvious intention of taking possession of their diplomatic luggage. They had hoped to find in the sealed trunks documents which would expose the Soviet Government before the capitalist world and they calculated — with every justification — that, should it be necessary to pay for such a treasure by murdering the Soviet couriers, their deed would be appreciated and paid for in material values by capitalist public opinion and its organs. It is a question of secondary importance whether they expected to find, apart from valuable documents and, for instance, some quantities of explosives, gold for their own personal use. They must have known that there would be no lack of gold when they produced the "objective evidence". The mechanism of the crime leaves not the slightest room for doubt.

The couriers of the Soviet Republic showed that they had been trained in a good school. Although the situation had been prepared in every way for the crime, the soldiers of the revolution did not let themselves be taken by surprise. In spite of being exposed to an attack which was quite extraordinary in its perfidy, they felled both bandits to the ground (is it true that there were only two of them?). They paid heavily for their devotion to duty. Theodor Nette was killed, Johann Machmastal was seriously wounded. But they defended that which had been entrusted to them, and the heart of every Soviet citizen beat, not only with indignation but also with pride over the first reports about the crime. This is what they are like — the soldiers of the revolution!

The scene then opens on the second act. The Latvian Minister of the Interior appears on the scenes. He knows for certain that the only object of the attack was a common crime.

He communicates this to the Press. And the Latvian Press repeats the shrewd explanations of the Latvian Minister of the Interior which are copied by the Press of the whole capitalist world which is so disinterested and honest. Whence did the Minister get his firm conviction? And why was he in such a hurry to communicate it even before the results of the investigation were known? Not **why** but with **what object**? That is how the question should be put. The Minister evidently intends to turn the investigation into a channel which suits his purposes. The investigation is to be put on the track of a common crime. With what purpose? In order to avert it from the political aim. The Minister is in such a hurry that it looks as though his intention were to wipe out all traces. One would think that even the most hardened bourgeois would suppose or take for granted that politics were at the back of this crime. One would think that the Minister in his official position would feel himself bound to be cautious if not unprejudiced, to refrain from conclusions as to the aims and purposes of the attack until the investigation is completed. Not a bit of it; the Minister does not condescend to wait. The failure of this attack planned by some person unknown and paid for with blood, caused him completely to lose his self-control. Instead of sitting cautiously at the telephone, listening calmly and answering quietly, the Minister rushed into the street with the following words: "The attack has the pronounced character of a common crime. I, the Minister of the Interior for Latvia, say so!"

We believe that the Minister understands these affairs; but we do not believe his words. He is too excitable. His conduct is not only strange but monstrous. Behaviour of this kind should attract the attention of the officials who are conducting the affair. The examining judge ought to take evidence from the Minister himself, of course as a witness. For the present in the character of a witness... Or should it be in that of an expert?

POLITICS

England, the Ally of Horthy Hungary.

By L. Katz (Vienna).

Horthy's representative at the London Embassy, Count Zichy-Rubido, repudiated with indignation recently in the "Daily Herald" the accusations that the Hungarian Bethlen government was in any way involved in the Franc forgery affair.

Truly, one must question in what way the international bank note forgery gang who recently have been discovered in a fresh deed, pass themselves off as honorable men in the bourgeois sense of the word.

The exposed Hungarian counter-revolution produced, after the first discoveries violent convulsions. It appeared as if the whole compromised system would be overthrown. The cowardly Hungarian opposition itself began to protest in a more energetic manner, they demanded the immediate resignation of Bethlen and Horthy. Bethlen himself vacillated, adopted some tactical measures, but suddenly took up courage and went over to the counter-offensive. He declared that he was not inclined to yield to the oppositional demands, he would stay at his post, even that he would not dismiss any Cabinet Minister, even though any one of them be so compromised as he was himself.

How has this striking turn in Hungarian home politics come about? From where has Bethlen, who is so heavily compromised, received courage to be able to take on such an accusing tone?

English diplomacy has once more come to the assistance of the Hungarian counter-revolution. In 1919, at the time of the most fierce white terror, the English Ambassador in Budapest, Hohle and Admiral Troubridge justified the mass murderers; and now English diplomacy is whitewashing the Hungarian bank note forgers.

In the leading English Conservative press organs the most compromised participants in the dirty forgery affair, Count Teleky and Bethlen, challenge the public. The "Times" and "Morning Post" are opening an offensive against those who demand the full investigation of the forgery affair. They accuse the "red emigration" from Hungary of being responsible of making Bethlen's position difficult. The kept English agent, Sir William Good, who is now endeavouring to improve Hungarian finan-

ces, even accuses French diplomacy of intervening in the "inner affairs of Hungary". The above mentioned Hungarian Ambassador in London, Count Zichy-Rubido, can with justification assure in the Budapest newspapers that full confidence is to be observed in English circles towards the Hungarian government. The reactionary Hungarian press organs again adopt their usual tone. They throw poison against France, Czechoslovakia and the opposition in Hungary who wish to overthrow "national Hungary" by their attempts fully to investigate the bank note forgeries. Even the Conference of the Little Entente is commented upon scornfully, which under the pressure of England had to adopt a neutral attitude towards Hungary.

Never before had a great power backed up such a corrupt and murderous system as has been the case in Hungary on the part of England. One has to ask the question: what interests in English diplomacy in supporting in such an unashamed manner the shattered reactionary regime in Horthy Hungary and even to withhold French diplomacy from further pressure?

Doubtless English financial capital is interested in Hungary to the highest degree. From the League of Nations credit to Hungary the London stock-exchange placed about 60% (139 million gold crowns out of 250 million total credit). Even the heavily compromised Hungarian National Bank itself received considerable exchange credits from the Bank of England. The whole shipping fleet of the Hungarian Danube Shipping Companies are in the hands of the English "River Syndicate". The State metal factories are about to be delivered into the hands of English financial groups. The already mentioned Sir William Good occupies himself with obtaining a larger English credit to the amount of 25 million dollars for Hungarian towns. The large Hungarian landowners have already received mortgage credits from England to the value of 10 million Pounds. The greatest Hungarian banks, the General Credit Bank and the Pester Commercial Bank at the same time entered into close business relations with English financial groups. Gradually English financial capital has become the creditor of Hungary and is joined by a thousand threads to the present regime in Hungary, which ensures a high rate of interest and guarantees for further business.

But English imperialist foreign policy is also immediately interested in Horthy Hungary. At the moment when the competition between the two imperialist powers, France and England, had been concluded through the Locarno Pact to England's advantage, English diplomacy endeavours to overthrow the former predominance of France in the Balkans. Against the Little Entente, the means of French imperialism, England pursues the aim of bringing about a new grouping of powers in the Balkans. Horthy Hungary, Bulgaria and Greece of the dictator Pangalos serve as the basis for this English aim in the Balkans. It is no mere chance that for this Balkan policy Mussolini's support was also gained. English diplomacy is proceeding with full class consciousness and constructs its Balkan base out of the countries with military dictatorship against the Soviet Union.

At the present day not only Horthy Bethlen, but also the "Race protectors", the irredentists, Gömbös and consorts regard English and Italian diplomacies as their protectors. Chamberlain and Mussolini encourage the irredentist circles in Hungary. The "Times" recently wrote that the Franc forgery proves that the Trianon Peace Treaty is now ready for a revision. English imperialism also understands how to make use for their own ends of the tense nationalist feelings. The war armaments, recruiting, illegal armed organisations in Hungary are never objected to by the English Commandant of the Interallied Military Commission; indeed, the accusations of the representatives of the Little Entente are always disregarded.

That is the mutual understanding which is coming about between England and Hungary. And so the inwardly weak Hungarian counter-revolution succeeds in maintaining itself and to consolidate its position as they are always protected by the powerful English reaction.

At this moment it is the duty of the English class-conscious proletariat to expose the plans of English diplomacy and to hasten to the help of their Hungarian class comrades who are not able to fight alone against the united front of England and Horthy Hungary.

The Guerilla War in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The revolt in Syria is very inconvenient to the French public. Not only because it is an immediate burden on the Budget and makes constant calls for new cannon-fodder but also because in this case it is much more difficult to make "the part played by the French rule as the herald of civilisation" seem plausible than for instance in the Morocco war. The great mass of the French population takes a negative attitude towards the French mandate in Syria or, at any rate, will not hear of any sacrifice of money or human lives for the mandate. For this reason the new High Commissioner, Henri de Jovenel who took over the representation of France in Syria in December, had instruction to "pacify" the country as quickly as possible at all costs. This he actually succeeded in doing. At a hint from those in power, however the French Press at any rate ceased occupying itself with the Syrian revolt and — after an agreement between Chamberlain and de Jovenel — the chief English papers also. In this way the outside world gets the impression that everything is going on in Syria as well as could be expected, and Painlevé can give "reassuring" declarations in the Chamber.

In reality, the position of the French in Syria is still a very difficult one. During the last three months the revolt has extended in area. The insurgents have spread the area of the fight from the borders of Djebel Drus far into the interior of Syria. Damascus has been besieged for two and a half months, Homs for a whole month. The French garrison in Hasbaya (in the Lebanon district not far from the borders of Palestine) is shut up in the town by the insurgents. In the last few weeks the district of Aleppo has again become restless and the movement in that part is assuming a far more serious character than in the autumn of 1926. From the military point of view the French are still unable to cope with the insurrection, and in the last battles they have met with a number of serious reverses.

In the meantime, the insurgents are steadily improving their organisation. In spite of the insufficient means at its disposal, the national government in Djebel Drus is working splendidly. The training of the insurgent troops has been entrusted to experts who were previously in the service of the Turks, Germans and English, and a well organised revolutionary army is being formed in place of the undisciplined bands of robbers. The insurgents have formed connections with the nationalists of the neighbouring countries from whom they receive material and moral support. The enthusiasm in their ranks grows with every success of the insurgents, and has spread into the hinterland which is occupied by the French.

The great popularity of the national revolutionary slogans was most clearly expressed in the attitude taken by the overwhelming majority of the population towards de Jovenel's so-called peace proposals. De Jovenel wanted to create a sham Parliament in Syria. A few corrupted feudal lords were to declare themselves to be the representatives of the Syrian people and opponents of the revolt. The elections arranged for January 8th ended in a wretched fiasco. The natives did not go to the poll at all and — instead — manifested their solidarity with the insurgents. On the same day de Jovenel experienced a further disillusionment; he had promised an amnesty to all insurgents who laid down their arms on January 3rd... only one single village in Lebanon had surrendered. De Jovenel's efforts to bring about peace have shown more than anything else that the natives of Syria, as one man, are in favour of complete independence.

The French authorities in Syria are now doing their best to convince the French Central Government that a so rebellious people cannot be persuaded by peaceful measures and that it is advisable to despatch 100,000 troops to suppress the revolt by force. In an infuriated proclamation which he issued to the "Syrian population" after the failure of his parliamentary swindle, de Jovenel says that the real fight between France and Syria is only beginning and that he is sorry for those Syrians who think that they can resist the glorious "grande armée" which has never been defeated since 1870.

At the same time, the French exceptional court in Damascus has begun to work again after a short pause. The mere fact of anyone being accused of "instigation to revolt" is enough

for the French court martial to pronounce a sentence of death on him. This is in so far a novelty in that up to now "robbery" was the pretext for passing a death sentence.

Another new feature is the bitter persecution of the communists which has set in especially in Lebanon. In Beyrout, communists have been arrested, among them Fuad Shmalli, the leader of the Lebanon trade union, Joseph Jazbek, the editor of the (forbidden) communist paper "Insanie" ("Humanité") and Ali Nasar ed Din, a radical Nationalist of Drus descent. As, in Ottoman law, which is still in force in Syria, there is no special paragraph against communist propaganda, there is imminent danger of the communists being handed over to the exceptional tribunal for "instigation to revolt."

It is a matter of course that these acts of revenge on the part of the French Government against the national revolutionaries and the communists have by no means a "deterrent" effect, but on the contrary cause embitterment among the population. This Terror is intended to be the answer to the guerrilla warfare of the Syrian rebels which is undermining the French rule in the country and at the same time preventing the French generals from striking a decisive blow against the insurgents as they would like to.

It is now more than ever the task of the international proletariat and especially the French, to prevent the bloody suppression of the Syrian fight for freedom. If it is possible to hinder the despatch of 100,000 troops and to refuse the assignment of more millions for the Syrian war, the French imperialists will have no alternative but to evacuate Syria, and it is easy to imagine what would be the effect of such a defeat of imperialism on the further development of politics in the Near East and beyond it in the Orient altogether.

CHINA

The Part Played by the Kuomintang Party in the Chinese Revolution.

By A. N. K.

In January 1926, the 2nd National Congress of the Kuomintang party was held in Canton. The resolutions passed by the Congress of this party which was founded by Sun Yat Sen, the father of the Chinese revolution, are of great importance and form a turning point in the history of the Kuomintang and of the whole national revolutionary movement in China.

The forerunners of the Kuomintang were the revolutionary organisations "The National League" and the "Tunmenhu" party, which were founded by Sun Yat Sen. The chief forces of the "National League" which was founded in Tokio in 1901, were radical Chinese students who were forced by the police regime of the Manchu dynasty to study abroad. The League played an important part in the preparations for the Chinese revolution in 1911. During the revolution, the League reorganised itself into the Tunmenhu party which had the command of one third of all the votes in the National Assembly of 1912. The platform of the party was one for strengthening the republican State and making propaganda for the republican idea among the masses of the people. After a short time the Tunmenhu, with the object of creating a government majority, united with allied organisations under the name of Kuomintang, which means the party "to put an end to the government of the sons of heaven" ("Son of Heaven" was the title of the Emperors of China of the Manchu dynasty).

The chief tasks of the new party were: the fight for the republic; union of South China with North China where, after the Manchu dynasty had renounced the throne, the power was actually in the hands of General Yuan She Kei; establishment of equal rights of the Chinese with the Manchurians; support of provincial self-government etc. As is well known, the union of the North and South was accomplished at the cost of Sun Yat Sen renouncing the presidency and Yuan She Kei being elected. When Yuan She Kei had become President of the United Chinese Republic, he gathered all the reactionary forces round him and soon showed his anti-revolutionary character. On November 4th 1913 he declared the dissolution of the Kuomintang party which prevented him mounting the imperial throne, and threatened its leaders with arrest and banishment. The party

became illegal and remained illegal until 1919, when Sun Yat Sen once more raised the banner of revolution in the South and asserted himself in the Province of Kwantung.

The seizure of the province of Kwantung, in which Sun Yat Sen was helped by an understanding with Chen Tsu Min, one of the Chinese generals, determined the tactics of the Kuomintang party for the next three years. The party's standpoint was that of the so-called "militarist revolution". The Kuomintang opposed the mercenary troops of the reactionary generals with its own mercenary army, and hoped with its help to realise the Kuomintang programme. The party gave little attention to work among the masses and to attracting the workers and peasants to the active fight against reaction. The construction of the Kuomintang from the point of view of organisation was at that period very imperfect. Anyone who sympathised with the objects of the party, could be a member, while membership hardly implied any obligations. There were no party meetings, conferences or congresses.

The fact that the leaders of the Kuomintang yielded to the attraction of military combinations, resulted comparatively soon in the workers leaving the party and the party losing its influence among the peasants. The English, the foreign enemies of the Canton Government, made use of this circumstance. In the middle of 1922 they won over Chun Tsun Min, the General of the Canton Government by bribery, and his treachery led to the occupation of the whole of South China by the reactionaries. When, after some time, thanks to combinations and agreements with other generals, Sun Yat Sen once more succeeded in reconquering Canton, the tactics of the "militarist revolution" were abandoned. A beginning was made towards approaching the masses, which was especially intensified when the Communist Party of China joined the Kuomintang party in order to support the national revolutionary movement. All this led to the necessity of creating a programme for the Kuomintang.

The programme of the Kuomintang was given its final form at the first National Congress of the party in January 1924. It was based on three principles of Sun Yat Sen: the national principle, the principle of democracy and the principle of socialism.

The national principle is understood by the programme to mean the fight for liberation from political and economic dependence on foreigners and equal rights for all nationalities which inhabit China. The practical demands in this respect consist in the annulment of the treaties based on inequalities of rights which had been forced on China by the imperialist States. Furthermore the Kuomintang demands, as is expressed in the manifesto issued by the party at the beginning of 1925, the convening of a National Assembly for the whole of China with the object of uniting it and restoring its entity.

The realisation of the principle of democracy is to find expression in that all citizens are to be granted equal rights, with the exception of certain limitations of the rights of the reactionary generals and of persons who support the foreign capitalists.

The third principle, that of socialism, is understood as the institution of equal rights in the ownership of land and the limitation of the growth of private capital. In the land question, the party demands that peasants owning little or no land should have a share of the land at the expense of the State or should be granted the necessary means for renting land. As regards industry, the demands of the programme go considerably further. In this respect, the nationalisation of all Chinese and foreign industrial undertakings, railways, banks etc. is provided for. In the Labour question, the demands of the Kuomintang are for protection of work, of the mother and the child, help for unemployed etc.

The development of the Kuomintang towards the Left led to the secession from it of the possessing elements, the merchants, landowners and other elements which went over to the counter-revolutionary forces. In October 1924 an insurrection of Fascist groups took place in Canton, which had been organised by Canton and Hong Kong merchants. After the suppression of this insurrection, the leaders of the Kuomintang were faced by the question of organising a permanent revolutionary army. The divisions of the army were re-grouped on the European model, political divisions were organised and the institution of political commissaries was introduced. The school of instructors on the island of Wampu was reorganised for the training of revolutionary commanders. The school of Wampu -- the pride of the Chinese revolution -- played an important part in the

liquidation of the military opposition which, with Chen Tsu Min at its head, tried to destroy the Government of Canton.

The secession of the Right elements from the party led to the formation of an organised Right wing. In November 1925 the leaders of the Right wing, Cho Lu and Shiai Che summoned a congress of their followers in Peking which professed to be the 4th Plenary Conference of the Kuomintang.

The party was thus faced by the necessity of liquidating the threat of unity and of welding together the revolutionary forces of the Kuomintang. This task was fulfilled by the 2nd National Congress of the party which was held in Canton from the 2nd to 18th of January 1926. The Congress severely condemned the "Plenary Session" of Peking, the resolution passed by which "puts obstacles in the way of the development of the national revolution". At the same time the Congress resolved to exclude Cho Lu and Shiai Che for ever from the party and to inflict a number of disciplinary punishments on other leaders of the Right. In order to strengthen the unity and centralisation of the party, the Congress resolved to dissolve the executive bodies of the Kuomintang in Peking and Shanghai and to concentrate the whole of the party administration in the hands of the C. C. The Congress chose Canton, the revolutionary town, in which the power of State is in the hands of the party, as the seat of the C. C. and of all congresses and plenary sessions of the C. C. of the Kuomintang. Furthermore, a control commission was formed, consisting of the most experienced members of the party.

The Congress devoted great attention to raising the political and cultural level of the members of the party and to the work among the masses of workers and peasants. It was resolved to establish weekly meetings in all the institutions of the party and the Government and in the divisions of the army, which were to be devoted to expounding the ideas and the revolutionary activity of Sun Yat Sen. It was decided to centralise the propaganda carried out among the masses. A special resolution demands complete equality of women and men and new legislation with regard to marriage and divorce etc.

The reports from the provinces described the position of the party organisations not only in China but also in Korea, India and the Malay islands. The total number of members of the party, which until 1919 had been less than 100,000, had increased to 138,000 by the end of 1922. At present the Kuomintang numbers about 400,000 members, 87,000 of whom belong to the foreign party organisations. The rapid growth of the membership is illustrated by the following fact: -- before the notorious shootings in Shamin, there were 1000 members in Hong Kong, at present their number amounts to 18,000, of whom 10,000 are workers.

The resolutions of the 2nd National Congress of the Kuomintang complete the reorganisation of the party which was begun by Sun Yat Sen and indicate a new epoch in the history of the Kuomintang. The party has finally liberated itself from all the remains of the period of the "militarist revolution". The discipline and party duties of the members are being defined. The fratricidal fight in the political leadership of the party is being abolished and the connection of the party with the working class and the broad masses of the peasantry is being strengthened. The 2nd National Congress of the Kuomintang puts an end to the weakness of organisation and the political instability of the party and marks the transformation of the Kuomintang into a united fighting force, into a real party of the Chinese revolution.

THE BALKANS

The Working Masses under Pangalos' Dictatorship.

By Alexis Gheirou (Athens).

The situation of the working masses of Greece is an extremely tragic one. For ten years of war they sacrificed their blood for the realisation of the "national dreams", for the conquest of Constantinople etc. In Macedonia and Asia Minor, even in the Ukraine whither the adventurer Venizelos sent Greek troops, more than 100,000 Greek soldiers laid down their lives "for the fatherland."

The war came to an end. Greece had defeated Bulgaria and had been defeated by Turkey. But there was no difference in the results. The workers and peasants, not to mention the

refugees, all of whom had been ruined by the war, having made such terrible sacrifices of blood, were then called upon by the creditors to pay interest on the debts which had enormously increased during the war.

The "democratic" Government heaped new taxes on the exploited population in order to satisfy the creditors who are the true masters of Greece.

The drachma which before the war was equal in value to the franc, is now worth about 7 centimes. Food-stuffs have increased 15—20 fold in price. The tremendous number of refugees has caused an enormous increase in unemployment. Actual wages have been reduced; there are miners whose wages amount to 20—25 drachma with which they can hardly buy 3 kilos of bread. Some women workers are only earning 8—12 drachma (1 kilo of bread).

In spite of all this, the Greek bourgeoisie, in its endeavours to force the workers to pay both all the expenses of the war and the expenses of preparing for new wars, continues to intensify the exploitation of the working population.

The Communist Party — cleansed of the social patriotic elements and of the deputies who, commissioned by Venizelos, travelled about abroad — has not only fought for the improvement of the situation of the workers, peasants and refugees, but has also placed itself at the head of the energetic campaign against the new war for which the bourgeoisie are preparing. In order to prevent the growth of the influence of the Communist party and under the pretext that the Communist party had recognised the right of self-determination to the oppressed people of dismembered Macedonia, the Government ordered the arrest of dozens of communists, ex-service men and active members of the trade unions in all the towns and even in the villages.

For the same reasons and under the same pretext, the islands of the Aegean Sea are used as a place of banishment for a large number of workers.

On June 25th 1925, General Pangalos carried out a theatrical ploy by means of which he seized the power. A delegation of the Trade Union League waited on General Pangalos, demanding the liberation of the imprisoned persons (including Comrade Puliopulos, the secretary of the C. P., and Comrade Monastiriotis, the secretary of the Union of ex-Service Men); Pangalos gave them categorical promises with regard to their release, as "he personally" was convinced that our comrades were not guilty of the crime of "high treason" of which they were accused.

Pangalos declared equally categorically to the correspondent of the "Temps" that he had released the communists and further declared to the whole world that he had ordered the dissolution of the secret police corps. All these declarations of Pangalos were mere lies. He gave certain sham liberties to the people for a fortnight and then began an open offensive against the working class. He permitted meetings to be held for protesting against the rise in prices and for demanding the liberation of those in prison, only with the object of preventing them at the last moment and of imprisoning both the organisation committees and workers who attended the meetings. With a trap of this sort, Pangalos caught the new secretary of the Communist party, Comrade Maximos. The daily morning paper of the Communist party "Risospastis", which had protested against the brutal ill-treatment of the imprisoned persons, was prohibited for six months. The court martial which arbitrarily described the imprisoned party secretary Comrade Puliopulos as the chief editor of the paper, condemned him to a year and a half of imprisonment, and on the same day the daily evening paper of the party "The Proletarian Fight" was arbitrarily prohibited.

A few months ago, ten of the thirty persons accused of having stood up for the right of self-determination of Macedonia, were brought before the court martial (among the accused were the party secretaries Puliopulos and Maximos who were already in prison). Our comrades who were under trial for "high treason", accused the politicians of the bourgeoisie of having betrayed the interests of the working population and of being responsible for the wars of recent years and for the wars for which preparations are being made.

The Government which had declared its intention of applying the utmost rigour of the law (the penalty is death) realised that a death sentence would rouse the masses to revolt and felt compelled at the last moment to postpone the trial indefinitely.

In the last few days the cost of living and unemployment (especially among the tobacco workers) have increased and with them the discontent of the masses.

The dictator wanted to intimidate the masses. On the one hand he continued the arrests and banishments and on the other hand tried to found an "Independent Labour Party". But the people who founded the "Independent Labour Party" were too well known to the workers as secret police agents, swindlers etc., so that the attempt failed.

At the municipal elections, the "Bloc of workers and refugees" which had been formed in accordance with the programme of the Communist party, was successful in Saloniki, the capital of Macedonia, in Xanthi, the most important town of Thrace and in other places. Patriklos was elected burgomaster of Saloniki and Lukowikas burgomaster of Xanthi. Pangalos who was furious at this result, arbitrarily declared the elections to be invalid. In spite of the pressure and the persecutions, Patriklos was again elected with more than 8000 votes, whereas the Government candidate only received 4000. Even the soldiers of the "Democratic" battalions voted for the Bloc of the workers and refugees.

Beside himself with rage at this defeat, Pangalos ordered the arrest of the town councillors who were known as active Communists. At the same time, in order to obtain the support of the capitalist countries (especially of England) and to intimidate the workers, peasants and refugees who had begun to be conscious of their class interests, he ordered the resumption of the trial of those comrades who had been accused of standing up for the right of self-determination of Macedonia and the alteration of the laws so that he could hit the communists more severely (banishment from the country etc.); further the mobilisation of the secret police who would be able to prevent the oppressed and exploited workers from following the communists.

The judges and secret agents immediately set to work, but the persons who, a few months previously, had founded the "Independent Labour Party", had gone bankrupt. For a time, Pangalos was in a very unpleasant situation, but fortunately for him, people were soon found to take the place of the secret agents and the leaders of the "Independent Labour Party". Sideris, Dimitratos, Georgiadis, Passalidis, old social patriots, and a few other people, among them Royalists and Venizelists, who had nothing to do either with Marxism or with the proletarian revolution (some of them were known as official secret agents of the first army corps) undertook to "save" the working class according to the laws and wishes of Pangalos. Since that time, morning and evening, the bourgeois papers publish simultaneously Pangalos' threats and the promises of the social democratic band which consists of the old sinners and of the miserable new recruits.

On January 3rd, Pangalos' officers proclaimed a military dictatorship. The trial concerning the right of self-determination of Macedonia had to be postponed once more, but the lives of the accused are still in danger, and it is the task of the international revolutionary proletariat to help its brothers in Greece.

The International Campaign for the Child Victims of the White Terror in Bulgaria.

By P. Z. (Sofia).

In connection with the resumption of the international campaign against the White Terror in Bulgaria, the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International, in common with the International Children's Bureau, has started an international campaign for the Bulgarian children. The chief slogans under which this campaign is being conducted are:

1. Immediate amnesty for all fathers and mothers;
2. State support for all the orphans of workers, peasants and intellectuals who have been killed without sentence or have disappeared completely.
3. Free permission to help the thousands of orphans and other children who have become victims of the White Terror in Bulgaria.
4. Free permission for the children to leave the country so that they may be sent to children's homes abroad.
5. Inquiries into the cruelties and ill-treatment of children as victims of the White Terror.

The following figures help us to make a rough estimate of the number of victims of the White Terror in Bulgaria: more than 25,000 workers, peasants and members of the intelligentsia

among the people have been murdered; about 5000 arrested and condemned persons are in the Bulgarian prisons and the number of persecuted persons in the country and of those who have emigrated abroad amounts altogether to not less than 5000, so that the total number of persons murdered, condemned, arrested, persecuted and emigrated amounts to about 35,000 persons!

What do these figures mean for the children, mothers, brothers and sisters of these 35,000 revolutionaries? It means that we must multiply the number of revolutionaries by at least three if we want to obtain the number of children and mothers who are persecuted and in distress. In this way we arrive at an **army of 105,000 children who are exposed to the most fearful distress and the most dreadful fate, and some tens of thousands of wives and mothers of the revolutionaries.** It should be remarked that the total number of the inhabitants of Bulgaria is not even 5 million!

The blood-stained Bulgarian bourgeoisie recognises in this army of hundreds of thousands of women and children its sworn enemy in the future, and it is persecuting and punishing them already in the most merciless way by resorting to exceptional laws and to force. Thus for instance, according to the law for the defence of the realm, anyone who helps the victims of the **White Terror in Bulgaria or forms an association with this object, is punished with 10—15 years imprisonment and in special cases even with death.** There are cases in which mothers have been condemned to death because they gave a meal to a persecuted revolutionary who came into the house with their husband. It was in vain for these women to defend themselves on the grounds that they did not know the man in question and merely regarded him as a guest. There was a case where two children, a boy of 12 and a girl of 8, died of starvation because no one dared to help them or to give them food. The fathers of these children are at present in prison and the mothers are interned somewhere in the country.

These cases happened in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria. What then is the situation in the provinces and in the country where whole villages have been burnt to the ground and in some places all the men murdered! (For instance the village of Muchoff in the district of Tatar-Pazarchik). In this way the blood-stained Bulgarian bourgeoisie has succeeded in spreading fear throughout the country and in forbidding by law any help being given to the victims of the White Terror.

Needless to say the working population of Bulgaria finds ways to help its class brothers. This help however is very limited, insufficient, and involves great sacrifice. The Government of Zankoff the bloodhound, did not even give permission to enter the country to **foreign delegations** who wanted to come to Bulgaria in order to distribute relief among the victims of the White Terror. Thus for instance the Bulgarian Embassy in Basle refused to give Bulgarian visas to a relief delegation of **Swiss workers.** In the same way the Vienna Embassy even refused a bourgeois pacifist Austrian delegation permission to enter Bulgaria. Worse still, the **Czechoslovakian** delegation of workers who succeeded in getting into the country, was turned out again as soon as they attempted to distribute relief to the children and other victims of the White Terror. A further example: a small sum of 10,000 lewa was sent from England for the relief of the children. As soon as the Government learnt that this sum had arrived, it confiscated the money.

It is absolutely necessary that **all the orphans who are left without any relations should be freely permitted to leave the country so that they can be sent to children's homes in other countries.** The number of these orphans who are completely deserted runs into hundreds.

The new **Liaptcheff** Government which is trying to persuade foreign countries that it will restore "law, order and contentment" to the country, **does not think of repealing the exceptional laws.** So far there is no sign of its intention to give free permission for the relief of the victims of the White Terror. It must be **forced to give this permission!** Whether this and all the other demands are fulfilled depends on the extent and the intensity of the **international campaign against the White Terror in Bulgaria** and on the mass participation of the workers and peasants and their children in this campaign.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Indian Trade Union Congress.

By M. N. Roy.

The lock-out in the cotton mills of **Bombay** ended in the beginning of December. The workers resisted the attack on wages for ten weeks. About 160,000 workers, including 30,000 women and 12,000 children, were involved in the struggle. The lock-out was called off by the employers after the Excise Duty was abolished.

Cotton textile industry is the oldest Indian industry owned almost exclusively by native capital. The first cotton mill (power driven) was built in 1875. Since then the industry has grown steadily in spite of the competition of Lancashire backed by the entire political resources of British Imperialism. Over 30% of the British export trade with India being in cotton goods, imperialist policy naturally was to obstruct the development in India of cotton spinning and weaving with the application of mechanical power. Every time revenue purposes obliged the British Government of India to impose duty on the cotton goods imported, there rose an indignant protest from the textile magnates of Manchester. Finally, in the beginning of the present century a 5% import duty was agreed upon provided that a counter-vailing excise duty at the similar rate was levied upon the cotton textiles manufactured in the Indian mills. To demand the abolition of the excise duty on the cotton industry has since been an article of faith of Indian nationalism. After a few years it was reduced to 3.5%.

The situation suddenly changed in consequence of the imperialist war. Britain found herself in a position where it was impossible for her to supply the Indian market. **Japan** was not slow to take advantage of that opportunity and invade what had so far been an English monopoly. To encourage the production of the Indian mills was the only means of keeping Japan out. There was another consideration — to secure the loyalty of the Indian bourgeoisie, the British Government of India abandoned the policy of Free Trade and increased the duty on imported cotton goods to 8%. This economic concession was made to the Indian bourgeoisie in return for the latter's undertaking to help the raising of a war loan of £100 millions. The trade depression and the resulting budget deficit in the year following the post-war boom obliged the Government of India to increase the import duty to 11%. All this time the 3.5% Excise duty, however, remained in operation.

In the post-war boom period the Indian cotton industry became fabulously prosperous. Everything was favourable to it. Labour was as cheap as dirt, and totally unorganised; the mills were built in cities surrounded by rich cotton belts; the market was equally near; and there was an effective tariff against foreign competition. The total capital of the mills in and around the city of Bombay is in round numbers 200,000,000 rupees (a rupee is equivalent to 0.33 cents approximately). The net profit derived from these mills in the years 1918—22 was 360,000,000 rupees. In that period of prosperity the wages rose slightly over 100% in comparison with the pre-war rate, while the rise in prices and rent was an average of 154%.

Such an abnormal boom could not continue. Depression set in by the end of 1922. The year following showed a decline in the rate of profit. Wages were attacked and a 20% reduction was forced in the spring of 1924. The workers resisted the capitalist offensive by declaring a general strike which lasted nearly three months. In the period of prosperity, instead of an increase in the wages, the employers had granted a yearly bonus of a month's wage. The payment of the bonus was discontinued towards the end of 1924. This meant practically another 8% reduction of the wages. In June 1925 the owners declared their intention of closing down the mills unless the workers agreed to accept a further 20% wage-cut. The owners were divided on the issue. Finally the demanded cut was reduced to 11.5%. The enforcement of this last cut would reduce the wage almost to the pre-war level while the prices remained over 100% higher.

The capitalist cry was that the industry was ruined, because owing to the excise duty, it could not compete with Japanese

and English goods. Even in 1924 more than half the mills of Bombay paid 10 to 15% dividend, although all the mills taken together showed a total annual loss of 28,000,000 rupees. The saving on the wage bill in consequence of the projected 11.5% cut, would be equivalent to the amount paid in the excise duty. By their determination to lock out the 176,000 workers employed in the Bombay mills, the owners enlisted the support of the entire nationalist movement to the demand for immediate removal of the excise duty. The labour leaders (all humanitarian reformists and nationalist politicians) also supported the demand of Indian capital against British capital. They agreed with the employers that the industry was on the verge of ruin and that the inequitable impost should be abolished. They also endeavoured to induce the workers to understand the critical situation of the industry. But the capitalist attack was too bare-faced. The workers refused to work on the reduced wages and 80 out of 32 mills of Bombay were closed in the middle of September, throwing out in the streets 150,000 workers.

The Bombay lock-out proved to be a landmark in the history of the Indian labour movement. For ten weeks over 150,000 workers stood as a man in their resistance, without a union fund to back them and without a revolutionary class leadership to guide them. In this bitter struggle they developed proletarian leadership. From the very beginning a strike committee composed mostly of workers came into existence and led the struggle to the end. The bourgeois "labour leaders", who had exercised such a pernicious influence over previous strikes and lockouts, were obliged to remain in the background, requesting the imperialist government to intervene in favour of the workers, persuading the millowners to be kinder, and administering relief with the help of the financial aid received from abroad. For the first time Indian workers were practically supported in their struggle by the European labour organisation. This factor had a tremendous moral effect on the situation. Finally, the workers won. In the beginning of December the mills were reopened and the workers resumed work at the old rate of wages. The employers abandoned their attack on wages, because of the abolition of the excise duty.

The most important outcome of the Bombay lock-out, however, was the organisation of the Union of Textile Workers. The textile workers of Bombay had been practically unorganised. The Union existed only in name. A group of humanitarian intellectuals, headed by N. M. Joshi, functioned as the Union, doing some insignificant welfare work and carrying on negotiations with the Government and the millowners when occasion arose. The capital of the Bombay cotton industry, being predominantly Indian, the nationalistically inclined humanitarian "labour leaders" did not think it prudent to push the work of organisation. The new Union has grown out of the struggle with a purely proletarian character and with a class leadership. The 1924 strike was sabotaged by the bourgeois humanitarian leaders. Towards the end it was continued under the leadership of a number of workers. These proletarian leaders were dismissed soon after the strike was over. They organised into a club functioned as a nucleus of propaganda. It gradually gathered around it the most advanced elements among the Bombay proletariat, although the depression that followed the collapse of the 1924 strike made any effective organisation work almost impossible. It was under the initiative of this Workers' Club that the strike committee was set up in the beginning of the last lock-out. Soon after the lock-out had been declared the club converted itself into the Union of the cottonmill workers. In less than two months it enlisted 14,000 members. The restoration of wages has encouraged the workers, consequently the union is sure to grow rapidly. As against the really live proletarian organisation, the old nominal union maintains its existence and tries to enlist members, taking advantage of the general enthusiasm prevailing among the workers. The old union is affiliated to the Trade Union Congress and has for its secretary Jhabwalla (bourgeois humanitarian) who is a member of the Executive of the T. U. C.

It was on the morrow of these events in Bombay — the industrial heart of the country — that the Trade Union Congress met in Madras. It was naturally to be expected that the Trade Union Congress would draw valuable lessons from the struggle of the Bombay workers for the benefit and future guidance of the entire labour movement. They were disappointed, who expected it. As a matter of fact, such expectation was misplaced. All through the ten weeks of struggle, the Trade Union Congress

has remained passive, except for the relief activities of its Secretary Joshi. Absolutely no propaganda and agitation had been carried on either before or during the lock-out. To go on deputations to the millowners and the British Governor was the sole contribution. The concrete and most important outcome of the struggle — the Union — is practically opposed by the Trade Union Congress, since the old fake Union, which is its organ, does not liquidate itself in view of the rise of a live proletarian organisation. There are several very serious outstanding issues connected with the Bombay lock-out. These issues should be raised and agitation carried on on the basis thereof in order to consolidate the position gained and marshal the proletariat for further demands. After two years of depression, a rising tide is clearly to be noticed in the Indian labour movement. The Northwestern Railway strike (in the beginning of 1925) was the first indication. Although the strike was lost, it coincided with a series of demonstrations in which tens of thousands of workers participated, flying red flags with revolutionary slogans inscribed on them. As usual, the Trade Union Congress was nowhere in evidence. Three of its leading lights were luncheon with Oudegust in Geneva and making speeches in London (Imperial Labour Conference) when 40,000 striking railwaymen were demonstrating in India.

The deliberations of the Madras Trade Union Congress (Jan. 10) were not in the least affected by the two most important events of the labour movement during the preceding 12 months — the Northwestern Railway Strike (55,000 workers involved, lasting nearly two months), and the Bombay lock-out. I am not mentioning here other minor, but not unimportant events of the labour movement. The question of international affiliation, which was pigeon-holed in the previous Congress to satisfy the nationalist leader, C. R. Das, was not raised at all, although actions in connection with the Bombay lock-out had brought that question nearer home. The ex-Secretary, Chaman Lal, according to his own statement, had told Oudegust in Geneva (during the last conference of the International Labour Bureau) that the Indian Trade Union Congress would go neither to Amsterdam nor to Moscow, because it had received invitations from both sides. The present General Secretary, Joshi is, however, in favour of Amsterdam, and had been pressing for a decision to that effect for two years. A representative of the British Labour Party — Major Graham Pole — was present at the Madras Congress and warned the Indian labour movement against Bolshevism.

The question of wages for the period of lock-out still remains unsolved. The millowners have had their grievance (the excise duty) redressed. This victory of Indian capitalism has cost 150,000 workers ten weeks' wages. The first step toward the consolidation of the position gained by the Bombay workers and utilisation of the prevailing enthusiasm should be the agitation on the demand for the lock-out pay. Then, the depression in the Bombay cotton industry will continue even after the abolition of the excise duty. Therefore, it is to be expected that the attack on the wages may be renewed. The moment is propitious for preparing the workers organisationally to meet successfully any such eventual attack. These are two of the most outstanding issues which arise out of the Bombay lock-out. The Trade Union Congress was blissfully oblivious of them.

In 1924 the Trade Union Congress went practically into voluntary liquidation to secure the patronage of the nationalist Swaraj Party. The Swarajist leader, Das, broke up the annual session of the T. U. Congress and threatened to organise a new Trade Union Congress under the patronage of the Swaraj Party if his will would not prevail in the existing body. The official leaders of the Trade Union Congress (who were all seeking political careers as Swarajist members of the Legislative bodies) were cowed by the fury of the Swarajist leader. The left wing, which had put forward a demand to amend the constitution of the T. U. C. so as to make it a proletarian body, was shattered. It was as yet too weak organisationally and too immature politically to meet the situation. Nevertheless, when the Congress met at Bombay in the beginning of 1925, it was revealed that the revolutionary current could not have been altogether choked. For the first time in its none too eventful career, the kind-hearted gentlemen, nationalist politicians and unscrupulous careerists constituting the Trade Union Congress, found the presidential chair occupied by a railway employee who, to the great discomfiture of the respectable gathering, talked about class struggle. The presidential

address must have been positively stunning, because the Congress was otherwise sterile. The Congress dispersed evidently with the determination to hunt heresy. It was very smoothly done. Nothing more was heard of Thengdi, who had startled the country with his speech as the president of the Trade Union Congress in Bombay. According to the Constitution, the president of the Congress automatically becomes the Chairman of the Executive until the next Congress. But by some mysterious means the worker Thengdi was replaced by the English Christian Missionary, Andrews, who had broken and sabotaged not a few strikes in his highly Christian way. As if to wash away the black spot in its history, this year the Trade Union Congress met under the presidency of an apolitical lawyer.

The accomplishment of the Madras Trade Union Congress was three resolutions. The first supported the bourgeois nationalist demand for self-government within the British Empire; the second recommended the setting up of arbitration courts (by the government) to avert or to settle disputes between capital and labour; and the third demanded that there should be special workers' representatives on all the legislative bodies. Self-government within the Empire will mean the exploitation of the Indian working class jointly by native and imperialist capital. Even the revolutionary elements in the nationalist movement (intellectuals, petty bourgeoisie, etc.) are against this political programme of compromise between Indian capitalism and British Imperialism. But the Trade Union Congress supports this programme. This shows how much removed it is from the working class and how incapable it is of leading the Indian proletariat. To ask the brutally exploited Indian proletariat to pin its hope on an arbitration court is simply ridiculous and betrays an utter ignorance of the reality of the situation. Then, parliamentarism in a country without a parliament is an imbecile imitation of the British Labour Party, which is the source of inspiration to the Indian Trade Union Congress, although some of its luminaries indulge in occasional outbursts against Labour Imperialism.

ECONOMICS

Land Law "Reform" in Poland.

By L. Orski (Warsaw).

On December 28th 1925, the new law "for carrying into effect agrarian reform" was finally passed by the Polish Sejm.

Even before the war the agrarian problem was one of the most urgent social questions in Poland. Poland is terribly divided up into small parcels of land. Thus for instance small holdings (up to 5 hectares) comprise two thirds of all the farms in Galicia and hardly 40% of the whole area under cultivation. In the so-called Eastern districts (the voivodeships of Vilna, Novogrodek, Polesia and Volhynia), things are still worse; there the proportion of small holdings to the total number of farms is the same as in Galicia, whilst the area covered by the small holdings only amounts to 17.1%. The situation is further rendered worse by the fact that farming in the Eastern districts is on a considerably lower cultural level than in other parts of Poland.

At the same time there are enormous estates in the hands of the Polish aristocrats. In the Eastern districts where about 40% of the land belongs to large landowners, farming is altogether unmethodical; in the parts which previously belonged to Prussia, agriculture is on a high level.

In view of this structure, there was a great hunger for land on the part of the peasants in Poland even before the war, accompanied by a disastrous over-population of the villages. Before the war, this situation caused a large number of the rural population to emigrate (overseas as well as seasonal emigration to Prussia, Denmark etc.) and a considerable number to move into the towns where the developing industry offered occupation to many immigrants from the villages. Since the war, things are otherwise; on the one hand former possibilities of emigration are cut off, and on the other hand industry is in such a low state that it is rather necessary to reckon with a migration of some of the unemployed into the country. The over-population of the villages has assumed enormous proportions, the crisis

in the country has become extremely acute, the situation being rendered still worse by the ruthless pressure of taxation of the Grabski Government.

At the same time the hopes of the peasants that their thirst for land would be quenched, has been increased by the Russian revolution and by the revolutionary movement, in other countries in post-war times. The slogan: "The land for the Peasants!" is to-day the most popular slogan amongst the gigantic masses of the village poor. This slogan is an extremely revolutionising factor in the Polish village as, in consequences of the experiences with the governments of the bourgeoisie and of the agrarians, as well as in consequence of the treacherous demagogues which has so far been carried on by the opportunist peasant parties ("Piast" — the Large Peasant Party — and "Vizvolenie"), it is beginning to dawn on the peasants that those without land or possessing very little will never obtain land without a communist revolution.

Add to all this the nationalist policy of the Polish Government with regard to the so-called Slave minorities. In the Eastern districts the rural population consists of non-Poles, whereas the overwhelming majority of the large estates are in the hands of Poles. In order to strengthen "Polish ownership", the land in those districts is given to Polish settlers brought from Central Poland (mostly sons of rich peasants). On the basis of the existing law regarding settlement, land is further distributed to ex-service men, mainly generals and high dignitaries. In this way the local rural population is excluded from the parcelling out of land, for which reason its indignation and desire for revolution is constantly increasing. It should be added that Polish social democracy and the opportunist peasant parties are working most enthusiastically for these nationalist methods of settlement.

Finally, the increasing spirit of revolution amongst those possessing little or no land is roused by the high compensation paid to the agrarians for the land "ceded" by them. It is practically out of the question for a poor peasant who, as it is, needs financial support in order to farm his small holding, to undertake new burdens to pay for the land he is cultivating. Land to the peasants without compensation — this is the only solution of the agrarian problem! Theoretically even the leaders of the "Vizvolenie" party had to acknowledge this principle for in the Spring of 1925 the Congress of this party declared itself in favour of it under pressure from the masses. In practice however, the Sejm deputies of the "Vizvolenie" party were in favour of compensation.

In July 1920, when the Bolshevik army was nearing Warsaw, the terrified Sejm unanimously passed a fairly radical programme for agrarian reform. The parcelling out of the land was to take place pretty quickly, compensation was to amount to half the market price.

When however the revolutionary danger was over, the possessing classes treated the Sejm resolution as a scrap of paper. The parcelling out was done very slowly (chiefly in the form of the so-called "wild" parcelling out, through the medium of various private undertakings at very high speculative prices and with the participation of the Sejm deputies of the peasant parties who enriched themselves through these transactions.) A number of scandals resulted — whilst the poor rural population waited for the land with desperate impatience.

A year ago the Polish Government resolved to introduce a new bill for agrarian reform. In July 1925 the new proposal was passed by the Sejm. This new reactionary proposal, however, still seemed to the agrarians to be too "radical". The Senate worked out a number of "amendments" which gave the whole proposal a pronounced pro-agrarian stamp, the peasant masses of the annexed Ukrainian and White Russian territories moreover being entirely left out of the reform.

According to the law as finally passed, the agrarians get the full market price for the land which is parcelled out, the payment being half in cash and the other half in agricultural bonds.

In the most important question, that of compensation, the agrarians can record great success. The final wording of the law not only ensures them large profits but also makes it very doubtful whether the law can be carried out at all. Where is the State, which is permanently in a condition of financial and economic crisis, to find the means to compensate the agrarians? If

the State really carries out the reform, a new burden of taxation for the workers and peasants will be involved.

One of the most important alterations of the Senate deprives the Ukrainian and White Russian population of its land by providing that it should form a point of support for the efforts of Polish imperialism to "Polonize" the country. In this way a wedge of nationalist hatred is to be driven between the Ukrainian and White Russian peasantry on the one hand and the Polish peasantry on the other hand. On the basis of Article 50 thus amended, the Polish Government will be able to continue the colonization of the Eastern districts with sons of rich Polish peasants; in those districts these lackeys of Polish imperialism are, in consequence of their provocations and denunciations, the best hated element among the population.

According to the new law, the maximum of land owned by one person is to be 180 hectares. This alone makes the improvement of agrarian conditions in Poland impossible. In order to make a serious reform possible, the maximum would have to be reduced to 30-50 hectares (as was proposed by the communists in the Sejm). In the Eastern territories, an increase of the maximum up to 300 hectares is provided for in order to strengthen the Polish element. For estates on which there are factories for agricultural industry, the maximum amounts to 750 hectares!

In the debates on agrarian reform, the treacherous part played by the Polish Socialist Party (P. P. S.) became clearly evident. The deputies of the P. P. S. opposed all attempts to bring about a radical solution. (Zulavski, a member of the P. P. S. said in the Sejm — "there is no money for agrarian reform, therefore reform is impossible"). The "Vizvolenie" party has no definite line of policy. In order not to lose the remains of its influence, it took part in the obstruction — at the decisive moment however it was guilty of treachery and agreed to the reform which benefits the agrarians and large peasants.

The extreme Left wing alone, led by the Communist Party and joined by the "Independent Peasant Party" and the White Russian workers' and peasants' association fought against this so-called "agrarian reform".

The slogan: "The land to the peasants!" is one of the chief revolutionary slogans for the workers and for the poor rural population which at the same time is one of the chief slogans of the C. P. P. Just as the workers have grasped that the fraternal alliance with the peasants who are fighting for their freedom, is an indispensable preliminary to the victory of the Polish revolution, increasing numbers of the peasants owning little or no land, are also realising that they can obtain the power and land under the communist banner, and under that only. The temporary success of the passing of the agrarian reform is only helping the bourgeoisie and its opportunist followers to dig their own grave; for the ranks of the proletariat and the peasantry are thus linked more closely together to fight out the decisive battles for the complete liberation of the oppressed nationalities and for a worker and peasant government under the guidance of the C. P. of Poland.

Émigration and Unemployment in Fascist Italy.

By Nino Barbieri (Milan).

The Fascist newspapers very frequently publish statistics as to unemployment in other countries — England, the Soviet Union, America etc. — under the title "Unemployment in the countries where there is no Fascism", believing that they will convince people that Fascist Italy has become a country flowing with milk and honey. According to the last official figures, there were in Italy 85,769 unemployed at the end of October 1925. The official figures however represent less than 50% of the unemployed workers who are entered in the employment registers, for the benefit is only given for a limited number of days, after which the unemployed person, even though he still has no work, is no longer kept on the list, on the basis of which the famous official reports are made.

From the following official data with regard to emigration from Italy, especially in the last few years, it can be seen whether unemployment has or has not increased during the Fascist era. The fact that enormous numbers of workers and peasants

have left the country in the last few years in a far greater measure than usual, in the search for new fields of work, indicates that if the hundreds of thousands of emigrating workers had stayed at home, the number of unemployed would most certainly have been much larger.

Italy has always supplied other countries with very considerable numbers of emigrating workers, as a result of the constant increase of her population and the incapability of the ruling classes to provide work for the army of workers in a land which is chiefly agricultural and which has hundreds of thousands of acres of land which could be brought under cultivation.

Emigration from Italy to oversea countries developed between 1881 and 1923 as follows (annual average):

1881—1890	99,000 emigrants
1890—1900	157,359 "
1901—1910	361,517 "
1911—1913	408,550 "
1920—1923	176,203 "

The total number of Italian emigrants to the various oversea countries between 1881 and 1923 thus amounted to 8,115,222, as one sees, a respectable figure, which only refers to those officially supplied with passports.

In the "Economic Prospects 1925" published by Senator Mortara, the following total figures concerning emigration from Italy between 1909 and 1924 are found. (It should be remarked that emigration from Italy which, in 1876 amounted to 108,771 persons, had risen to 872,588 in 1913.)

The yearly average from 1909—1913 amounted to 670,000 emigrants. Since 1914 the annual emigration has been as follows:

1914	400,000
1915	180,000
1916	170,000
1917	60,000
1918	90,000
1919	200,000
1920	410,000
1921	280,000
1922	280,000
1923	396,000
1924	402,000

Before the war, the greater part of the emigrants went to oversea countries. Since the war, the stream of emigration has changed its direction, owing to the restriction of immigration by the United States, the Argentine, Canada and Australia and to the crisis in Brazil, further to the demand for workers in the countries on the European continent devastated by the war.

To-day the greater percentage of emigrants from Italy are absorbed by France. In a speech in the Chamber of Deputies, Mussolini maintained that there are in France 1300 agricultural workers, 300 part tenants and 400 tenant farmers from Italy. These figures are wrong. According to the report of the General Commissariat there were in 1923 12,804 agricultural workers from Italy and in 1924 20,204. These of course are only those who crossed the frontier with official passports. According to other statistics, the number of agricultural workers who crossed from Italy to France with official passports in 1921—1925 was as much as 50,000.

For some time the police have been discovering in the border towns and in the shipping centres actual organisations for secret emigration with offices of their own for the sale of forged passports and with their own commercial travellers who visit the homes of persons supposed to be anxious to emigrate either to the Continent or across the ocean. The trade is to America or nearer countries, according as opportunity offers. At the moment, secret emigration seems to be largely tending towards the North. The workers and peasants who risk the dangers, difficulties and expense of secret emigration are usually in a desperate economic position and are shamelessly exploited by those who make a profession of promoting secret emigration

and enrich themselves through it — frequently men who have been waiters, hotel-porters, luggage-porters, shoe cleaners, sailors etc. Numerous persons who wish to emigrate therefore try to cross the frontier secretly without the help of such agencies.

All secret emigrants escape of course the statistics of unemployment and emigration. The flocks of political refugees, the number of whom is not even approximately known, must be added to all those who secretly emigrate for economic reasons. The figures in the unemployment statistics are also reduced to no small extent by the numerous political opponents of Fascism from the ranks of the workers who are imprisoned for years.

The figures quoted by Fascism as to unemployment and emigration are thus, as we have shown, far removed from giving a correct picture of unemployment in Italy.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Fight against the Right in the Communist Party of France.

By A. Bernard (Paris).

In the last two months there has been a considerable intensification of the fight of the Communist Party of France against the Right opposition which is partly within and partly outside the party.

The greater acuteness of the fight is due to the fact that, at the moment when the party begins to carry out, on a large scale, an action for a united front, it is obliged to protect itself more than ever from opportunist deviations in its own bosom. This is all the more necessary because just at that time the "nucleus" of opportunism which, until a short time previously had been quite insignificant, actually gained more influence in the Party.

What accounts for this increased influence of the Right?

It is due to two causes:

1. The increasing development towards the Left of the French workers, which has already found political expression in the breach with the Left cartel and the formation of a Left wing in the social democratic party. This development towards the Left which prepared the soil for the united front supplies fresh food to the opportunists; they make use of the circumstance that this development towards the Left did not immediately lead to a rapid growth of the C. P. in order to accuse the party leaders of incapability etc., and in this way they attract a good many elements of the party which, though sound in themselves, have illusions as to the importance and the pace of the development towards the Left of the working masses.

2. The existence of germs of ultra-Left tendencies, or to put it more plainly, of remnants of a kind of "war communism" in the ranks of the party. The old "Left", as a fraction, has since 1923 carried on a severe fight against the opportunist majority of the party leaders and opened the way to Bolshevism to the party; during this time, forms and customs of internal party life developed which were indispensable for that fight, but in the long run had an unfavourable influence on the party. In the period of the fight against the Morocco war (in the summer of 1925), which was carried on by the party at the head of a revolutionary minority, signs of a policy suggestive of an ultra-Left tendency became evident and consolidated themselves, which were not confined to the internal party regime (over-tension of centralism) but also spread to the field of tactics (a narrow and mechanical conception of the tactics of a united front and neglect or schematized carrying out of trade union activities). The insistence of the party leaders in continuing these mistakes beyond the period of the activities against the Morocco war, roused a certain discontent in the circles of the members and functionaries. Fresh food was given to this discontent by the fact that the reorganisation on the basis of factory nuclei met with many difficulties in practice. The opportunists were very clever in making use of this natural and healthy discontent for their own purposes.

We can distinguish various groups which together comprise what we call the "Right opposition".

Their leading section, both as regards their ideology, their tactics and their organisation, is the Group of the Excluded with Souvarine at their head. The whole attitude of this group is

openly directed against the Communist Party and the Communist International as they are at present. Souvarine, Rosmer and Monatte are in every respect outside the Communist International. They fight against the party from without, their behaviour is dictated by hatred of the former "Left" which turned them out of the party. They have at their disposal two Press organs, the "Revolution Proletarienne" (which has appeared every month since December 1924) and the "Bulletin Communiste" (which is published by Souvarine and has appeared weekly since November 1925) and they work with numerous pamphlets, "open letters" etc. Their activities show that they have plenty of money at their disposal. The fact that this nucleus outside the party actually leads the opposition, makes the latter particularly dangerous.

Within the party, a group of functionaries who at one time were influential in the old party, are working in close touch with this nucleus. Their leaders are Lorient, Duvois and Poz. They are typical representatives of the previous upper strata of the old party, who, being adherents of the 3rd International never have, for sentimental reasons, understood nor ever will understand the true nature of Bolshevik activity, organisation and tactics. They started by fighting against the abolition of the territorial sections. Ridicule of Leninism and Bolshevism was and is the political background on which they develop their opportunist conception of the tactics of the united front, on which they reject the slogan of "fraternization" with regard to the Rif war on principle, and oppose the Central Committee of the party with all the means of invective etc.

As a third group we must mention a number of party functionaries who also belonged to the old party, some of whom still cherish marked remnants of the old ideology while some of them make the party responsible for certain deficiencies and failures in the party work.

A similar attitude is taken by the fourth group which is composed of old trade union functionaries. These are good old syndicalists who however have not quite understood the development of the party since the fifth World Congress.

Finally, as the fifth group we must mention a fairly large section of lower functionaries and members who are inclined to take an active part in the discussion of party tactics and allow themselves to be incited against the party leaders.

Only the first two groups can be described as an actual Right, as opponents of Bolshevik tactics in the strict sense. During the agitation against the Morocco war they alone continued the activity they had previously begun, against the party leaders. The other elements which must to-day be counted to the opposition, observed absolute discipline during the great action of the party.

A change occurred after the general strike. The leading groups of the Right without and within the party multiplied their exertions. They transferred their activities quite to the periphery of the party. They developed a special propaganda in the provinces and among the members of the trade unions.

The same opposition which declined the invitation to appear at the National Conference in Ivry which was held from the 18th—20th of October, is stirring up trouble everywhere with the argument that they are not given a chance to speak, that they are "shut up in nuclei and districts" etc. They succeed in winning over a number of correspondents and collaborators for the Press organs which are published outside the party and in opposition to it.

In the meantime the party continued its action without paying much attention to the Right. These months are of great importance in the development of the party tactics. In the course of November, by means of energetic self-criticism on the part of the party leaders, the party freed itself from the germs of ultra-Left mistakes. A meeting of the enlarged Central Committee on December 1st and 2nd 1925 put the finishing touch to this self-criticism. An "open letter" of the Central Committee of the party, addressed to all the members, points out the mistakes made and gives directions for the various branches of work of the party: the action for the united front, trade union work and internal party regime. This open letter serves as a basis for thorough discussions in the whole party.

This sound self-criticism of the party leaders was very inconvenient for the leaders of the Right opposition. They saw that this meant the beginning of their final isolation. For this reason they redoubled their attacks. At the very moment when

they had the opportunity of unburdening themselves within the party in open discussion, a number of chiefs of the Right who still belonged to the party, officially joined the editorial staff of Souvarine's "Bulletin" and wrote vile abusive articles against the party leaders in its columns. In nuclei and districts they tried to turn the discussion on to the opportunist platform formulated by them. In a pamphlet "Answer to the Open Letter" at the top of which they gave a quotation from a speech of Stalin at the 14th Congress of the C. P. of Russia "against the policy of exclusions", they formulated a new platform. They avoided all gross opportunist deviations and accepted in form and content — exactly the platform which the Conference of December 1st and 2nd had formulated: an improvement of the tactics of the united front, more intensive and careful trade union work, restoration of democratic centralism. At the same time they made allusions that the International agreed with them.

This "Answer to the Open Letter" which was not signed by the excluded members was clearly a manoeuvre of retreat. The party leaders entered on an open fight before the members in Paris where the majority of the leaders of the Right are found. The big settling of accounts with the programme and the tactics of the opposition took place at four **informative meetings**, to which all the nuclei sent some hundreds of delegates.

The first of these informative evenings offered a great sensation; **Loriot**, from the platform, read out a document which throws clear light on the whole opposition: the "Letter of the Two Hundred and Fifty".

This letter which was composed by the Right as long ago as in November and despatched to the Executive Committee of the Comintern, begins with the statement that the party is steadily declining, only has a superficial influence on the workers and is on the road to ruin. According to them the chief cause is the attempt to be "over-hasty with Bolshevisation", the result being the dissolution of the party to its foundations and the creation of an irresponsible all-powerful "apparatus". The remedy they propose is to abandon factory nuclei as the basis of the party and to return to territorial sections. The letter further, after referring to the "severe defeat in the Municipal elections", turns against the tactics of the party with regard to the Morocco war. The party ought to have realised the unity of the workers and should have led the Social Democratic party and the old C. G. T. into the battle. They maintained that the slogans "Evacuation of Morocco" and "Fraternization" were empty words without a definite aim. The Congresses of workers and peasants had been bluff, the strike a severe defeat. The campaign for trade union unity had been abandoned, the attitude of the party in the question of Alsace Lorraine had been determined in an irresponsible way. The letter concludes with the chief demand for complete democratic centralism, the right of free expression of opinion, room for initiative in every respect and free discussion.

The reading of this letter was the culminating point of the fight of the opposition. With it began the disintegration of the opposition which is now progressing irresistibly.

In the first place this letter gave the party leaders the opportunity of exposing in public the true character of the opposition; the result was overwhelming. Even at the first of the informative evenings of the Paris district, the handful of members of the Right were isolated in the hall and, by the end of the fourth meeting, the atmosphere was such that violence was to be feared on the part of the hundreds of representatives of the nuclei against the heroes of the opposition numbering about twenty. The annihilating blow struck the saboteurs of party unity when Comrade **Doriot** read two telegrams of the International in which collaboration with the Press organs appearing outside the party was condemned and the communication was made that an application of Souvarine to join the International had been rejected. This brought about a miserable collapse of the foul speculations of the opposition which had hoped that "the Comintern would tend towards the Right" in consequence of "Stalin's victory over Zinoviev". This unmistakable attitude of the members gave the party leaders the opportunity of taking energetic action against the leaders of the Right. They issued an ultimatum to all who signed themselves members of the editorial staff of or collaborated with the "Bulletin" calling on them to abandon their collaboration officially within 48 hours. At the same time it ratified the exclusion pronounced by two nuclei of some old agitators of the Right who had explicitly declined to give up this collaboration.

The reading of the letter by **Loriot** further resulted in the immediate collapse of the Right. It turned out that the leaders of the Right had obtained the majority of the signatures to the letter by fraud. They had represented the letter as a strictly internal document which in no circumstances would be made public. This had persuaded many a comrade who was critically disposed and who would never publicly have opposed his party, to sign it. The majority had never seen the whole of the letter, but had only been given certain points to read which, as the agitators of the Right had taken for granted, were in accordance with their point of view. Some of the "signatories" had not even known of the existence of the letter.

In consequence of this, soon after the publication of the document, the party leaders received numerous written and verbal protests or communications disclaiming solidarity from the "signatories". Indignant at the trick which had been played on them, they declared themselves in favour of the party leaders and against the opposition.

A wedge has thus been driven between the opportunists and the members with sound criticism. The latter have resumed their place in the party. Everywhere they are returning full of honest intentions to the practical work in the nuclei.

The party leaders have put into action the best weapon against the opposition; they have continued the process of cleansing party politics from the remnants of "war communism." The meeting of the enlarged Central Committee which was held from Jan. 31st — Feb. 2nd is an enormous advance in this direction. On the basis of these resolutions, the party will, without the "help" of the opportunists, prepare for the Party Congress which will bring us a united Bolshevist party and the final liquidation of the "Right".

The Results of the Leningrad District Conference.

(Telegram to the "Inprecorr".)

Moscow, 14th February 1926.

Today the 23rd extraordinary Party Conference of the Leningrad district came to an end. After the report of comrade **Bucharin** on the results of the XIV. Party Conference of the C. P. of the Soviet Union the district unanimously adopted a resolution by which they unconditionally agree to the Party decisions, declaring them as correct, and decidedly condemning the attempts of the opposition, by means of a fraction movement, to oppose the Leningrad Party organisation to the whole Party.

The district Conference unanimously forwarded a greeting of welcome to the Enlarged Executive of the E. C. C. I. in which, among other things, it was stated:

"The capitalist world is again faced with large upheavals. Increased exploitation, political reaction and Fascist dictatorship in the capitalist countries serve to strengthen inevitably the discontent of the working masses. The wave of the labour movement and of the great struggle for emancipation of the colonial peoples continues to strike with increased force against the strongholds of the bourgeois rule; it undermines the foundation and pillars of imperialism in the advanced imperialist countries, as well as in the backward enslaved peoples of China, India and Egypt, where the revolutionary forces are gathering together. But there are still large hindrances and difficulties to be overcome in order to lead all the exploited and workers in the fight against imperialism. All this requires the still stronger unity of the working class, the further development of the policy of the united front of the proletariat under the leadership of the Comintern.

The best weapon of the emancipation fight of the workers is the Bolshevism of the Communist Parties and their work on the basis of true Marxism-Leninism. The Leningrad proletarians and Communists greet the successes of the brother parties in the sphere of real bolshevisation.

In the construction of socialism in their own country, the Leningrad proletarians and communists regard themselves as one of the tools of the international fight for socialism and are thereby firmly convinced that every new success of the socialist construction in this single country of the victorious proletariat strengthens the position of socialism in the whole world.

Through the resolutions of the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R., with which the Leningrad organisation

unreservedly agrees, the correct policy in the further Party work is assured, the proletarian dictatorship on the basis of Leninist policy, of the firm alliance with the great mass of the peasantry is strengthened.

The difficult period which our organisation experienced during the recent discussion, has only served to strengthen our inner consolidation and steel-like unity. The Leningrad organisation has always been a basis of party unity and of the leading Party staff of the C. C. True to their bolshevist traditions the Leningrad organisation has completely overcome the attempts to oppose it to the whole Party, which is proved by the unanimous resolution of our district Conference. The Leningrad organisation again stands under the banner of the unshaken unity of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

We send the Enlarged Executive Committee of the E. C. C. I., and through it to the revolutionary proletariat in the whole world, our hearty proletarian greetings and declare that the Comintern can always fully rely upon our unshaken faithfulness to the cause of the workers, upon our firm resolution to fight to the end under the banner and the leadership of the Comintern for the proletarian world revolution."

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

Two Years of Money Reform in the Soviet Union.

By N. Briuchanov, People's Commissar for the Finances of the Soviet Union.

"A really important question is that of the stabilisation of the rouble. We attach decisive economic importance to this task. If we succeed in stabilising the rouble for a long period and subsequently for ever, it means that we have won."

These words of Lenin should be regarded as a legacy for the financial and economic functionaries of the Soviet Union, a legacy which we must indefatigably repeat and of which we must constantly remind those who, unfortunately, often forget the importance of a stable currency for our economic construction and our economic rise.

Two years have elapsed since the Treasury rouble came to the help of the Chervonetz which had preceded it by fourteen months as a substitute for the Soviet paper money which had tumbled headlong into the abyss.

The tempestuous growth of prices which was characteristic of the period of the falling currency was followed from that moment by one of stability of the general level of prices. The tremendous gap between the prices for industrial products and the prices for agricultural products disappeared. The exchange of goods between town and village which was threatening to cease altogether — we need only recall the "sale crisis" of the autumn of 1923 — quickly began to revive. The Chervonetz which at that time had fairly established itself as the means of exchange in the town, and the Soviet paper money which was still found in circulation in the slower exchange of goods in the country and which was steadily sinking in value, found, after the decree forbidding the further issue of Soviet paper money and after the price of its redemption had been established, a common language, the language of the new rouble Treasury notes and the silver 20 kopek pieces.

This gave a powerful impulse to the general rise of the economic, national, social and political life of the country.

We will not attempt to characterise the great variety of economic results which were achieved in the two years on the basis of the firm currency. We will confine ourselves to pointing out two facts concerning prices and the circulation of money.

The amount of money put into circulation during the two years increased fourfold, from 312 millions on February 1st 1924 to 1250 millions on February 1st 1926. During the same period the parity of our Chervonetz as compared with foreign gold currency remained stable at 100%, and on the whole the purchasing power of our stable currency remained steady in our home markets and there were only slight fluctuations which affected individual groups of goods in certain seasons, especially in the small retail trade.

It was only because the growth of the amount of money in circulation corresponded with the growth of the production of goods and the increase of the turnover of goods that we were

able to increase our wealth fourfold, to have four times as much money while maintaining the stability of its purchasing power. Any disturbance of this balanced relationship would inevitably have effected our stable currency. Any surplus of money, any excessive issue of new amounts of money inevitably results in a depreciation of the stable currency in the home markets, a stagnation due to a lack of profitability in the export of goods (while maintaining the gold parity), a stagnation which inevitably causes a stagnation of imports, the threat of a crisis in the general economic rise, in the development of large State industry and of a proper exchange of goods between town and country.

Our miscalculations in the autumn (when we erred — by way of overestimation — both as regards the objective conditions — harvest — and as regards the subjective possibilities of a systematic influence on the rural markets) led us, on the eve of the second anniversary of the reform of currency, to the verge of inflation, to the verge of depreciation of the stable currency in consequence of the growth of the exchange of goods which was out of proportion to the issue of money.

We shall meet this danger with the firm unshakeable resolve to avoid it by temporarily arresting the further increase of the total amount of money, even by a certain limitation of the money in circulation. The temptation further to force economic growth by issuing new money, without considering the stable currency, a temptation which attracts some of our comrades who are economic functionaries, simply must not exist for us. We know that this way would inevitably lead us to the inclined plane of the forced industrialisation of our economics, to the complete collapse of our stable currency, to the collapse of our plans in every direction.

We recall Lenin's legacy and are not satisfied that we have so far succeeded in stabilising our rouble "for a long period" (two years), we want to stabilise it "for ever".

This will mean that "we have won".

Productivity of Labour, Socialist Accumulation and Rationalisation of Production.

By Z. Leder (Moscow).

I.

The campaign for increasing the productivity of labour was begun on fairly broad lines a year and a half ago. The work of the party, the trade unions and the Soviets was carried on under the slogan of: "Increased productivity of Labour!"

The campaign gradually drifted into the current of daily work, and it seemed as though new and urgent tasks had supplanted the task which had been declared to be one of our most important ones by the plenum of the C. C. in August 1924.

Even at that time however it was emphasised that work for increasing the productivity of Labour was not a "storm campaign". Lenin himself taught us "that the productivity of work is at bottom the most important and chief factor for bringing about the victory of the new order of society". As early as 1919 he pointed out that "after having completed the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and of defeating all resistance on their part, the working class will be faced by the more important and difficult task of creating new social connections, a new discipline of Labour, new organisations of Labour which will combine the newest scientific and technical achievements with the union of a mass of conscious collaborators who will create socialist production on a large scale."

In our day we are faced by the second task described by Lenin as quoted above. This is a task which will take years, the task of construction which is socialist in its essentials.

It is therefore necessary to look back on the path we have so far travelled and clearly to outline our further work and the next stages of our development.

II.

Above all, what have we had in the past and what have we achieved up to the present moment?

In May 1925, the representatives of the economic organs, the reporters of the trade unions and the representatives of the Central Control Commission all stated that the former tendency for the increase of wages to exceed the growth of the produc-

tivity of Labour has been supplanted by the opposite tendency for wages to fall behind the productivity of Labour.

According to statistics produced by Comrade Dshersinski in his report at the 3rd Soviet Congress, the work accomplished by a worker in October 1924 exceeded that of October 1923 by 22.7%, whilst wages had increased by 26.2%; from October 1923 to February 1925 the increase of productivity amounted to 54.5% and that of wages to 27.4%.

According to a table presented by Comrade Korotkov at the Plenary Conference of the C. C., at which the quarterly reports were compared, the productivity of Labour had increased by 52.6% from the first quarter 1923/24 to the first quarter of 1924/25, and wages only by 46.5%. At the same time Comrade Vladimirov, a member of the Presidium of the Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union came to similar conclusions regarding the relative increase of the productivity of Labour and of wages.

Since then the situation has changed. From January to March 1925, the number of workers in large State industry had amounted to 1,430,000—1,460,000; in December of the same year, we had as many as 1,774,000 workers, i. e. by 300,000 more. We employed new groups of workers who were not sufficiently trained, prepared and disciplined and got new factories and works going and made full use of the equipment which up to that time had not been used to the full; these were however factories and works, engines, turner's lathes and means of production which were less useful, more worn out and less productive.

The final result is nevertheless that in the last few months we can once more observe a swing of the pendulum towards a favourable development of the productivity of Labour and of wages. Comrade Dshersinski in his report at the 14th Party Conference of the Moscow district in December 1925, compared the statistics of May 1925 with those of the latest report and showed that there was a growth of the productivity of Labour by 38.4%, and of wages by 49%. Another calculation, that of the Supreme Council for National Economy, also shows that since the 2nd quarter of 1923/24 (April—June 1924) until the 3rd quarter of 1924/25 (July—September 1925), the productivity of Labour increased by 40.5%, and that of wages by 37.4%. Thus, according to Comrade Dshersinski's report, there was, as early as in December last year, a deviation from the normal relation between the productivity of Labour and wages; according to another calculation, a similar change is imminent. According to calculations of the writer of this article, the productivity of Labour increased from October 1924 to October 1925 by 21.4% and wages by 21.6% (according to the Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union by 20.7%).

If, instead of comparing individual moments, we had applied the graphic method to both movements, we should easily have been convinced that the curve of the productivity of labour, instead of keeping fairly parallel to the curve of wages, as it did the whole time, is once more beginning to deviate from it.

III.

Let us pass from figures to the question of the economic significance of the "opening of the scissors" between the productivity of labour and wages which is once more to be observed.

We know, that in our order of society, wages are part of the product of labour after the deduction of that part which is required for the restoration and extension of original stock and for covering the necessary national and social expenses.

If wages increase as compared with effective work to such an extent that there is not enough surplus to cover the expenses mentioned, it results in the wearing out of means of production without their being restored, or in an additional value being taken from the work of the peasants.

If we dwell on the latter point, we cannot even to-day, in spite of the fact that the burden of taxation on the peasant has been relieved, maintain with full certainty that we give him even the pre-war equivalent when exchanging goods in the form of industrial wares. We have, at any rate, actually got so far that the distance between the curves of industrial and agricultural prices which, in October 1923 was threefold, fell in the second half year of 1924/25 (April to September 1925) to 1.00 and in the first quarter of 1925/26 to 1.22. Unfortunately however, the approach between these two lines is only partly due to a reduction of the prices of industrial products, and to a

very large extent due to an increase of the prices of agricultural goods, i. e. to the detriment of an increase of the actual wages of urban workers.

A second, not less important circumstance is that the approach of these two curves only concerns wholesale prices. The peasant must, as a rule, sell his agricultural products at wholesale prices and buy industrial products at retail prices, to which must be added that the costs of retail trade in villages are particularly high. It is therefore actually of interest for the peasant to compare the present retail prices with those of pre-war times, in doing which he can observe that even in the towns he pays almost three times as much for calico, more than twice as much for sugar, 1½ times as much for matches, 3½ times as much for salt etc. He on the other hand, only gets 1.6 times as much for his cereals as in pre-war times.

Let us leave aside for the moment the question of how the exchange of goods between town and village can be brought into a relationship which is as favourable for the peasant as in pre-war times. Even then we shall not escape the question of ensuring the supplementary product for socialist industry even to an extent which will guarantee its progressive development.

Such a development however means a transition to a higher stage of technique. This means that our industry which inherited extremely backward technics and organisation will be guaranteed the possibility of acquiring new machines and new equipment, of establishing more up to date organisation of production and also of organising itself on the lines of the latest achievements of capitalist science and technics.

We need not waste many words in proving that much money and much material are required for this. It is clear that we can only be sure of obtaining the necessary means on the condition that wages are raised at a pace which will make it possible to keep back a sufficient sum for the restoration and reconstruction of our original stock and for the purchase of new machines and equipment. This again would facilitate work, make it far more productive which, on its part, would make it possible to reduce the prices of industrial goods and further to raise wages.

Wages must increase on the basis of the growing productivity of labour in such a way that socialist accumulation is guaranteed in sufficient measure and at the necessary rate.

IV.

What paths can and must we take in the immediate future in order to reach the stages indicated? Our reply is: the path of the rationalisation of production, further the path of the improvement of the organisation of production and, in no less a measure, the path of the improvement of its technique.

We must transfer our industry to a higher technical level; this cannot be denied. All our efforts must be directed towards this aim. This is no less indisputable. For the time being however, we must import the greater part — or a considerable part — of our new equipment from abroad. For this purpose we require much ready money or long period credits. Unfortunately, as we now know, our ready money has been reduced by last year's negative balance, so that the influx of new means will be far less satisfactory in the current year than we had expected. The result is that we are compelled to limit the import of equipment to the minimum. As yet it is difficult to say how far we shall succeed in increasing these imports by long period credits. In any case it is undoubtedly necessary to be strictly systematic and economical in the use of these means.

Apart however from providing our factories and works with new and better equipment, much, very much can be done in the way of improving the organisation of our production, by doing away with slackness, awkwardness, superficiality of every kind, by introducing strict system into the work, by exact allocation of functions and division of labour, by making better use of machines and workers, by facilitating the work of the workers by comparatively cheap arrangements (of a sanitary and hygienic nature, and for transport within the works), by improving the technique of the methods of work, by improving the warehousing and book-keeping, the technical control of the whole management of production and the technique of the whole system of administration.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Attitude of the Leaders of the Mexican Trade Union Movement

By F. Bellugue (Moscow).

During the last few months of last year we have reported the attempts of Amsterdam International to persuade the **Crom** (Trade Union Federation of Mexico) to join the International Federation of Trade Unions. One of the secretaries to the **Crom** conducted negotiations with the Red International in Moscow in 1921. However, at the 1st Congress of the R. I. L. U. there was no official representative of the **Crom**.

The membership of the **Crom**, according to the estimates of its members and the additional statements from Amsterdam is about one million. This figure, however, should be taken with reservations, since it is bound to give us the impression of being exaggerated for a young trade union movement of Latin America with only 1 1/2 million industrial workers and an enormous majority of agricultural labourers. The R. I. L. U. assisted to a much greater extent in the trade union movement of Mexico than the I. F. T. U. and invited the **Crom** to Moscow to participate in the work of the 2nd Congress of the Red International in December, 1922. The **Crom** accepted the invitation of the R. I. L. U. and sent 3 delegates, who, however, failed to arrive at their destination.

The truth of the matter is that the **Crom** has not fulfilled the obligations given by the "worker delegate", whom Mexico sent to the Moscow Embassy to the members of the Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. The **Crom** explains this by a letter sent to Moscow stating that for the moment they had no intention of joining one of the existing Internationals and had not authorised one of their delegates to invite anyone to their next Congress.

The R. I. L. U. asked the **Crom** Executive to pass a unanimous resolution at their next Congress, due to take place in a few weeks, in favour of the only International which unites all workers of all Continents.

The attitude of the leaders of the **Crom** is antagonistic to the programme of the organisation. It is mentioned in the **Crom's** declaration of principles that considering the fact the employers are joining International Unions, the working class must join, through their national unions, one Union of all the workers, of the world.

From the above mentioned disavowal of the "worker's delegate" it follows that neither Moscow nor Amsterdam will be represented "for the time being", at the forthcoming Congress of the **Crom**. This is a grave sin against the duties of international solidarity. This resolution of the leader of the **Crom** has been influenced by the opinions of the late **Samuel Gompers**, who has found a worthy successor in the present chairman of the A. F. of L. (American Federation of Labor) and the Pan-American Federation of Labor, **William Green**, and in the secretary of the latter organisation **Santiago Iglesias**. Besides this also shows that the leaders of the **Crom** are afraid that a delegate of the R. I. L. U. might have an influence, which they consider undesirable.

The leaders of the **Crom** send worker delegates to Paris, Berlin, New York, Moscow, etc., to study the labour movements and their trade union organisations. On the other hand they are opposed to the same action by worker delegates of any other Trade Union International coming on behalf of millions of organised workers and demanding assistance in forming a united International including the workers of all countries and races.

Even the most conservative trade union organisation the A. F. of L. have admitted to their Congress **Purcell** of the Left, who most definitely advocated the idea of unity between the Trade Unions of Great Britain, and the Soviet Union and of International Trade Union Unity.

The attitude of the leaders of the **Crom** exceeds in intolerance even that of the A. F. of L.

Will the organised masses approve the action of their leaders who are opposed to the idea of International Trade Union Unity? Will the delegates at the forthcoming Conference of the **Crom** hear the proposals made by the R. G. I.? The results of the Congress which is to take place in a few days will show us.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. on the International Women's Day.

Moscow, February 8th 1926.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions has issued a circular to all the affiliated organisations in which it calls upon them actively to support the carrying out of this year's International Women's Day and attract broad sections of working women into this campaign.

In this year it is especially necessary to place the slogan of trade union unity in the foreground.

For the preparation of the campaign it is recommended that the actual questions concerning women's work, the organisation and propagandist carrying out of the campaign in the communist trade union fractions, the treatment of these questions in the press, especially the revival of the movement of the woman worker correspondents should be discussed. During the campaign as many meetings as possible are to be convened for working women of the different branches and above all of branches in which especially large numbers of women are occupied. Naturally workmen are also invited to these meetings.

OBITUARY

Larissa Reissner.

By L. Sosnovsky (Moscow).

On February 9th 1926, Comrade Larissa Reissner died of typhoid in Moscow after much suffering. Born in Leningrad on May 1st 1895 as daughter of Professor Michael Reissner, the famous communist lawyer, she occupied herself with literature from her youth, she especially carried on a campaign against the imperialist war and social patriotism, took an active part as a Communist in the civil war on the East and South fronts and later spent a long time in foreign countries, among them Germany. Her best known works are "The Front, 1918-1919" and "Hamburg on the Barricades", which have been translated into German. Editor.

In Larissa Reissner the Soviet Union has lost one of its first rate journalists, a vigorous character, in the prime of life and full of the joy of life.

She is perhaps the only one among our journalists who has the right to be called not only a fighter but an artist. There are altogether but few artists among us journalists. But in the Press of Soviet Union we cannot boast of such a combination of fine artistic, literary gifts with the true fighting spirit of the revolutionary communist.

Larissa Reissner was attracted by storms. Hardly had the tempest broken over Hamburg when she was there to lead us with her pen into the proletarian fight for communism. Her pen gave the distant, misty scene impressive and sharp outlines and a familiar form. She showed that the dock worker of Hamburg bears a striking resemblance to the turner of Lugansk. He hates the exploiter no less thoroughly, he is equally brave in fighting his strongest opponent, he has the same contempt for danger and he also can yield if necessary, in order to gain force for a new assault. The Hamburg proletarians, the heroes of the barricades were brought nearer to us, seemed more closely related to us, when Larissa Reissner told us about them.

Do we know anything of Krupp and other rulers of bourgeois Germany of our times except general facts and a few figures? We ought however to know, and Larissa Reissner sees that we do so. Hardly had she recovered from her impressions of Hamburg, than she penetrates into the offices of the Krupp directors, collects impressions there and tells us how the magnates of world capital live and rule.

I shall never forget one of her best feuilletons of recent times. It appeared under the title "Milk". Never has anyone introduced us in such a telling way to the daily life and the household of the German worker. Early in the morning, the milkman climbs the stairs of a large tenement house. Larissa Reissner invites us to follow him into each flat. We see at what cost the working class family procures the scanty jug of milk. We see the border-line of distress. We make the acquaintance of working class families from whose tables milk has entirely disappeared. In doing so we penetrate into the very souls and see the attitudes of mind of working Germany subjected to the Daves plan. We see before us the drama of two generations, the old and the young. In other words, the story of the passing milkman in the house inhabited by workers suffices, under the sharp, gifted pen of the artist and journalist to show us the genuine, suffering and fighting Germany of the workers not only in dry figures and diagrams but in living, unforgettable form.

Wherever Larissa Reissner might be, under fire in 1918 in the Red flotilla on the Volga, when fate tossed her to Afghanistan, where she succeeded in seeing European imperialism face to face at its work in the colonies, when she was in the coal fields of the Ural, in the huts of the home-workers in Central Russia, in the working-class suburb of Hamburg when the smoke of powder had not yet dispersed — she was always a keen observer in whom were combined in an incomparable original way, the fighter, the artist and the chronicler.

Full of the joy of life, mobile, undaunted, she might have turned up unexpectedly any day in a new spot far or near.

And now she has left us unexpectedly. One of the best has been taken from us.

BOOK REVIEWS

Leon Trotzky: „Whither England?“

By M. Beer.

Trotzky set himself the task of tearing up the wide-spread and close-meshed net of historical tradition, sociological confusion, ideological compromises, political hypocrisy and conventional lies in which the revolutionary outlines of present-day England are wrapped, in order to show the British working class its own strength, to open up to it the sources of power from its own history and to enable it to arm itself mentally and materially for the coming decisive fight. This task is chiefly a critical and polemical one. Nevertheless there is much that is positive in it; its chief objects are to combat false ideas, to render dishonest but influential advisers harmless by irony and satire, to throw light on and to complete the half truths of friends, to remove superannuated leaders from the saddle and to inspire timid leaders with courage and confidence.

The writer takes his material from the English history of recent and quite modern times. He reminds the British bourgeoisie of the fights which accompanied their rise, of the intrepidity and unscrupulousness with which they carried them through and the success which they achieved, and calls their attention to the grave-diggers who are waiting to pay the last honours to them.

The gist of the book is the idea that Great Britain is in the last stages of her capitalistic course in world history, i. e. on the eve of a proletarian revolution.

The first chapter which is called "the Decline of England", contains in concise form the main thoughts which are dealt with in the other chapters. The writer touches on the political revolution in the middle of the 17th century (the transition from personal monarchy to the parliamentary form of government) and the economic revolution in the last quarter of the 18th century (the transition from an agrarian and commercial State to an industrial State), which have made England the model capitalist country of

the world. This splendour lasted until the last quarter of the 19th century, when it was gradually undermined by the industrial rise of Germany and America. The economic revolution was closely followed by the Chartist movement, the first rising of the British working class (1825—1855), which was still immature but contained the nucleus of all the theoretical and tactical problems and considerations which have occupied the attention of the whole socialist movement in Europe in later decades. After the defeat of Chartism an epoch of social peace supervened, in which English industrialism and liberalism, its social expression, attained their zenith. Only after the industrial predominance of Great Britain had been shaken, did the working class slowly awaken to political independence, and the Labour Party was founded by the trades unions. The trade unions abandoned their anti-revolutionary attitude, took part in extensive strikes and political election campaigns, formulated revolutionary ideas, the essential feature of which was the "control of production"; — then came the great war. In the meantime the capitalist class was wrestling with the process of its economic decline and tried to find a remedy in the world war, but was greatly disillusioned, for it was just the world war which accelerated the decline of British capitalism.

"During the years of war" — says Trotzky, — "the gigantic economic preponderance of the United States developed and was revealed in its full magnitude. When the United States, so to speak, abandoned their position as a transatlantic provincial Power, Great Britain was, with one blow, forced into the second place."

For the time being, both Powers are working together but "Anglo-American co-operation" is preparing for war just as the period of reforms is preparing for the epoch of revolution. The very fact that England by way of "reforms", i. e. of agreements with America extorted by compulsion, will yield one position after another,

"will finally compel her to offer resistance".

There is a definite connection between the causes of the awakening of the British working class and the rise of the economic power of America and that of the economic decline of British capitalism. Great Britain was even incapable of re-establishing the equilibrium of her war finances and of her currency hovering on the brink of disaster, without financial help from America; but at the same time she became dependent on Wall Street (the seat of American high finance in New York). The London daily papers (the "Daily Mail" and the "Daily Chronicle") expressed it in a still more brutal way by saying that Great Britain had become an appendage of the United States.

In the grip of these pincers, the British bourgeoisie has lost its traditional capability of meeting the revolutionary movement by reforms.

"Fear of revolution", says Trotzky, "has up to now, made British capitalists inclined to agree to concessions and reforms, as long as the material possibilities of British capitalism were unlimited or appeared to be so. They could legalise the trade unions, abolish the corn duties, grant improved conditions of Labour, reform the franchise, pass social laws etc. In the present world situation of Great Britain which is changed to its core, the threat of revolution does not suffice to drive the bourgeoisie towards but rather paralyses the last remains of its economic initiative. Now, not the threat of revolution but revolution itself is necessary."

In the following chapters the author thoroughly analyses Stanley Baldwin, the cunning leader of the present British policy who is still at his post; then Ramsay MacDonald the incorrigible eclectic and compromiser, Sidney Webb, the head of the Fabians and the author of the expression "the inevitability of gradual evolution", and finally George Lansbury, the social reformist enthusiast and English Tolstojan.

On March 12th, Baldwin made a great speech in Leeds on the fate of Great Britain, in which he expressed his fear of socialism, and instructed the British worker that his way to well-being lay not along the path of revolution but along that of gradual evolution. As in doing so Baldwin referred to Trotzky, the latter gives him a private lecture on the course of history which everywhere and at all times, in home and foreign policy, fulfils itself by means of violent convulsions, wars and civil wars. Every great step in English progress, of a constitutional or social reformist nature, has either been the direct consequence of England's inter-

*) Leo Trotzky: „Wohin treibt England?“ Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, Berlin, W. 8.

An English translation of this work, under the title "Whither England", has been published and is obtainable from the "Daily Worker", Publishing Co., Chicago.

nal struggles or external wars, or the indirect consequence of similar forcible events abroad which have cast their reflection as far as the Thames. As regards the last stage of British capitalism, it is undoubtedly more difficult for the British working class to enter the phase of acute revolution than it was for the Russian proletariat. For

"the greater the wealth and the higher the level of culture of a country, the older and more developed its parliamentary democratic traditions, the more difficult it is for the Communist Party to seize the power, but the more quickly and successfully will Socialism be constructed when power has been conquered. . . The British proletariat will moreover, when it has seized power, be able to rely on the enormous material and human resources of the Soviet Union, for — and this we will not conceal from Mr Baldwin — the cause of the British proletariat is at least as much our cause as is and was the cause of the Russian bourgeoisie the affair of the British Conservatives".

It is not gradual evolution which will save Great Britain from the crisis, but a new economic revolution — the transformation of the whole economic system on a uniform socialist plan. But this transformation can only take place after a political revolution, after the seizure of power by the British working class. As however the bourgeoisie will certainly not renounce its rights of property and its rule voluntarily, it is necessary to proceed courageously and on revolutionary lines. Up to now history has found no other methods for its processes of transformation; and Great Britain will be no exception.

The polemics against Baldwin are at the same time polemics against the present leaders of the political Labour movement: MacDonal, Webb, Snowden, J. H. Thomas etc. For the method of these leaders is also that of gradual evolution. Trotzky reminds the leaders for instance that, had not the Russian revolution been fought out in 1917, there would have been no Labour Government in 1924. Not gradual evolution but the great war and the Russian Revolution gave Britain the general franchise in 1918 and, six years later, the Labour Government which, it is true, accomplished little, but was of great historical significance for the future.

In the whole of his polemics, Trotzky hits at Baldwin but means it for Webb; for it is Fabianism which, since its foundation, has tried to prevent the spread of Marxist doctrines, to blunt the class war and to side track the whole of political life on to Reformist lines. Trotzky considers it extremely important to combat the Fabians. The defeat of these corrupters of the mind would considerably facilitate and accelerate the victorious course of the British working class. Fabianism confirmed the political Labour leaders in their views that the social revolution is an unfortunate privilege of the continental workers; but events will sooner or later reveal the backwardness of these views.

"It will take much less time" says the writer, "to transform the Labour party into a revolutionary party, than it took to found it."

Against the will of the leaders, a process is going on among the masses which will finally put an end to the Liberal Parliamentary traditions and at the same time do away with the old leaders MacDonal, Henderson, Webb etc.

One of the finest passages in the book is the parallel drawn between Calvinism, the religion of the revolutionary bourgeoisie and Marxism, the doctrine of the revolutionary proletariat.

"Calvinism, with its doctrine of predestination, was the mystical form in which the attempt was made to grasp the laws of historical processes. The rising bourgeoisie felt that the laws of history were in its favour; it formulated this consciousness in the doctrine of predestination. The Calvinist denial of free will by no means paralysed the revolutionary energy of the interpreters who felt themselves called upon to complete an historical act. A parallel can, with some justification, be drawn between the part played by the doctrine

of predestination in the Puritan revolution and the part played by Marxism (economic determinism) in the proletarian revolution. In both cases, the increased activity is not based on private opinions and subjective sensations but on the recognition of law, which in the one case is felt mystically and in the other case realised scientifically."

The British working class should in any case — in contradistinction to its leaders — draw more correct conclusions from the history of England and make a special study of the English civil war (the revolution of 1640—1660), the part played by Cromwell, and of Chartism. Just as the civil war or the fight of the rising bourgeoisie against the personal monarchy and the feudal lords was only fully developed by the sword and Cromwell's dictatorship, the coming proletarian revolution in Great Britain can only fulfil its task if it is filled with the determination of the rising bourgeoisie of the 16th and 17th centuries and follows the decision and tactics of Cromwell. It is no less important to study the Chartist period.

The fulsome eclectics and the pacifism of MacDonal appear only to be valid when he preaches to the workers. When however MacDonal was at the head of the British Government, he forgot his fulsomeness and his pacifism and dealt with the Egyptians and Indians with a severity equal to that of Mr Baldwin and Lord Birkenhead. He did not disband the police neither did he have prisons destroyed. On the contrary, he built new prisons and also five new battle cruisers. In practice, MacDonal's pacifism amounts to the principle that the oppressed should not use force against the capitalist State and that the colonial peoples should not successfully revolt against British imperialism. He has learnt nothing either from the English revolution or from Chartism.

Trotzky anticipates the proletarian revolution in Great Britain in the near future. In his opinion, it will be one of the greatest dramas of history, for on the one side is the implacable, cold, cruel bourgeoisie, which will shrink from nothing in the fight to maintain its rule, and on the other side a proletariat whose passions have been fanned into flame and let loose in their whole depth and breadth in the fight for emancipation.

"The fate of the English proletariat in this fight is linked with the fate of the whole of humanity. The world situation and the part played by the English proletariat in production and in society, guarantee it the victory — provided that it is under a good and determined revolutionary leadership."

This leadership can only be given by a strong Communist Party which is closely allied with the masses of workers. This Party is only in the making. The question therefore is:

"Will it be possible to form a strong Communist Party, closely allied with the masses and which, at the given moment, will be able to draw all the necessary practical conclusions from the crisis which is constantly becoming more acute? England's fate is now involved in this question."

Trotzky concludes his first chapter with these sentences, and the closing words of his last chapter are of the same tenor:

"The Communist Party must develop into the party of the proletarian dictatorship and must assume power. We cannot escape from this. There is no bypath. Whoever believes that there is one, and proclaims it, is deceiving and betraying the British working class. This is the quintessence of our analysis."

There is much in this book which seems too hopeful. But in such matters, the outsider, who is gifted with a thoroughly trained talent for observation and with the necessary knowledge, has the advantage over the insider who only sees the difficulties and loses perspective.

Trotzky's book deserves to be ranked among the best productions of Marxist literature.