

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 9. No. 12

1st March 1929

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

CONTENTS

Maurice Thorez: Concerning the Expulsion of Trotzky.
Politics:

A. G. Richman: The Peace Pact Cruisers of the U.S.A.
W. M. Holmes: The Living Wage Proposals of the I.L.P.
in Great Britain.

William Wilson: The Hoover Administration and the Negroes.

China.

Tang Shin She: Chiang Kai-shek's Disarmament Conference.

In the Colonies.

M. N. Roy: Indian Communists in the Election Struggle.

Against Colonial Oppression.

Press against French Imperialist Slaughtering in Equatorial Africa.

Fascism.

The Fascist March in Vienna.

A. Zorski: The Workers of Western White Russia the Victims of Starvation.

The Labour Movement.

Fritz Heckert: Wage Struggles all along the Line in Germany.

The Political Bureau of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia Reviews the Position following on the End of the Textile Workers' Strike.

Eleven Years of the Red Army.

The Eleventh Anniversary of the Founding of the Red Army.
International Persecution of Communists.

The Life of Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea in Serious Danger.
In the International.

Open Letter of the E. C. C. I. to the Convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

Against Trotzkyism.

The "Isvestia" on the Fight against Trotzkyism.

International Women's Day.

G. G. Alexander: International Women's Day 1929.

Clara Zetkin: The Third International as Awakener and Leader of the Women of the East.

Phyllis Neal: Women Advancing in the C. P. of Great Britain.

A. K.: Women of the British Farms.

The Co-operative Movement.

E. Varjas: The Session of the Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance.

Ten Years of the Comintern.

M. Jablonski: The Tenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Comintern.

The C.P. of Germany and the International.

Speech by Comrade Gushev on the C.P. of Germany, the Rights and the Conciliators.

Concerning the Expulsion of Trotzky.

By Maurice Thorez (Paris).

The proletariat of the Soviet Union, at the decisive moment, when the capitalist world was profoundly shaken, succeeded in capturing power.

According to the view of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the Russian revolution was only the commencement of the proletarian world revolution. This view still remains perfectly correct. But the treachery of the social democratic parties has postponed the hour of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a number of countries. And thus there arose that state of affairs which Lenin had foreseen already in the year 1915, i. e. that a single socialist country must maintain itself in the midst of a capitalist environment. Thus it became the first task of the proletariat of the Soviet Union to prevent any weakening of the bulwark of the proletariat and, by strengthening the economic and political position of the Soviet Union and by consolidating the international class front, to pave the way for the extension of the world revolution.

One must proclaim with pride and admiration that our brothers, the proletarians of the Soviet Union, have advanced successfully along this road. Supported by their allies, the poor and middle peasants, the workers of the Soviet Union — under

the conditions existing in a country which, while it is backward, possesses vast natural resources — have achieved results which even their enemies are forced to admire.

As the enemies of the Soviet Union, particularly the Socialists, can no longer deny the growth of the productive forces in town and country, they are now attempting to make use precisely of this development for their own purposes. They maintain this development is a sign of a return to capitalism. This assertion is as absurd as it is mendacious. The economic development of the Soviet Union is above all accompanied by a rapid growth of the socialist elements of economy. The greatest advances are to be seen in industry, which is completely in the hands of the proletarian State, and in the co-operatives.

In the meantime there exist difficulties which our comrades in the Soviet Union do not seek to conceal. On the contrary, they endeavour to direct the attention of all proletarians to these difficulties, which are closely connected with the growth of the Soviet Union, in order the better to overcome them. Added to the difficulties of an economic nature is production which has indeed grown but still does not serve

to cover the ever increasing demand; backwardness of the apparatus of production taken over from the bourgeoisie; insufficient agricultural production, due to the ground being exceedingly split up into small portions — there are naturally difficulties of a political nature, as for instance the increased resistance which the big peasants offer to the class policy of the proletariat and its State. The dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean the end of the class struggle. It is rather a form of the class struggle, and in fact the last form, which puts an end to the class struggle by preparing the way for the disappearance of classes simultaneously with the setting up of Communist society.

In view of the fact that the proletarian State is surrounded and threatened by the capitalist world and that it has at the same time to conduct a fierce and systematic fight against the capitalist enemy in the interior of the country, the work of the proletariat and its Party is very difficult and complicated. It requires calm and clear insight, steady and persistent self-sacrifice rather than noisy phrases and heroic gestures.

This has been admirably understood by the Bolsheviks, who even before the October Revolution spent fifteen years in the school of Lenin. The millions of proletarians of the Soviet Union, who were educated in the spirit of Leninism, also understood this. But this could not be understood by the petty bourgeois elements who joined the revolution during the rising period of the international labour movement, but who, when the revolutionary wave in the whole world ebbed for the time being, became frightened by the greatness of the tasks. This has also not been understood by Trotsky who, in the year 1917, at the moment of the seizure of power, came over to the Bolsheviks and who turns away from Bolshevism when the history of the Russian proletariat imposes new tasks and thereby more complicated forms of struggle.

Trotsky fought the Bolshevik Party, the Party of Lenin from 1902 to 1917. In so doing he undoubtedly tried to make out that he was "more left". He was nevertheless the ally of those Mensheviks who have become the most bitter enemies of the proletarian revolution. Trotsky never realised what Marx emphasised in the year 1852 and what was again emphasised by Engels in the year 1874: the role of the peasantry. In this sphere of Marxist policy Lenin was the undoubted master. His systematic elaboration of the policy of relations with the peasantry has opened up new vistas. These relations to the peasantry, however, have always been a sealed book to Trotsky.

Meanwhile a time arrived in which Trotsky was able to play a role. Under the leadership of Lenin, Trotsky, the man of magnificent rhetoric, of splendid style, of powerful gestures, became one of the prominent workers in the revolution.

Nevertheless, at bottom, Trotsky had not corrected his Menshevik estimate of the conditions and of the forces of the proletarian revolution. At every important stage of the revolution he endeavoured to set up against the Bolshevik slogans (thanks to which it was possible to remove the hindrances) slogans which would have led the revolution into an abyss.

At decisive moments — as at the time of the Brest-Litovsk peace; when the role of the trade unions in the Soviet State was under discussion; when the kulaks were beginning to raise their head again — Trotsky always fell into his greatest error, in that he failed to understand the peasant question. As long as Trotsky submitted, even if reluctantly, to the Party decisions, the Party allowed him to occupy responsible positions.

When, however, the opposition of Trotsky assumed a systematic form, when Party members began to gather together on the basis of his incorrect views, when fractional disintegration work was commenced in the whole Party, then the Party resorted to its first measures. It removed Trotsky and his supporters from their posts, without however expelling them from the Party.

It was only the criminal attempt to hold a demonstration against the Party of the proletarian dictatorship on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the October revolution, which led to Trotsky and his friends being expelled from the Party. When they then still refused to cease their counter-revolutionary activity, they were deported.

Since then Trotsky and his friends have not abandoned their course. They have, on the contrary, intensified their fight against the Party, the main bulwark of the dictatorship. Their unheard-of attacks knew no limits. All dividing lines between them and the other counter-revolutionary groups became more

and more obliterated. They have become the champions of the anti-socialist forces to whom the socialists and the counter-revolutionaries of all countries accord the highest praise.

In these circumstances the proletarian State — which undoubtedly bore in mind the services which Trotsky at one time rendered the revolution, but which placed the vital interests of the proletarian revolution above all other considerations — expelled Trotsky from the Soviet Union. This severe measure is only the result of the acts which Trotsky himself committed against the proletarian State.

Trotsky is returning to the camp of his former allies. It is very significant that the Menshevik Dan, who was for many years an ally of Trotsky against Lenin, but who since 1917 fiercely combated Trotsky, wrote as follows in the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung" on 20th February:

"The social democratic labour movement has no reason to fear the political activity of Trotsky. On the contrary the present-day Trotsky, torn by inner contradictions, can rather deal a death-blow to the Communist movement outside of Russia and induce the Communist workers to return to the social democracy, than strengthen any Communist Party and cause any injury to the social democracy."

Thus Trotsky is gladly welcomed by the social democrats, while at the same time the bourgeois press moans over his fate.

But the international proletariat knows Trotsky from now on, in order to be immune from those errors which make one-time revolutionary leaders the hope of the counter-revolution. Now, in spite of everything, the proletariat has unshakable confidence in the Bolshevik Party, in the Party of Lenin, which is still pursuing its path without allowing itself to be led astray by vacillations and the fall of persons. At the moment when the danger of war against the first proletarian State is increasing, the international proletariat is making itself ready in order to defend the Soviet Union, the homeland of all workers, to the last breath against the capitalist "homelands".

POLITICS

The Peace Pact Cruisers of the U. S. A.

By A. G. Richman (New York).

The much-talked about "cruiser bill" has passed the United States Senate, by a vote of 68 to 12, carrying with it the largest naval appropriation since the world imperialist war ended. \$ 274 millions of dollars have been appropriated for the construction of fifteen cruisers and one airplane carrier.

The usual show of hypocrisy was played. Amidst assurances of peaceful intentions on all sides, the jingoes did Wall Street's bidding. An interesting travesty was that resulting from an amendment proposed to amuse the crowd by Senator McMaster. He proposed no less than that politicians and millionaires be the first to fight in the next imperialist slaughter, that all Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress and all rich men worth more than \$ 5 millions be the first to be drafted in the coming war. It was a good joke, and was defeated without even a recorded vote.

Senator Norris, a fake progressive, who supported Al Smith in the recent presidential elections, made a motion that the number of cruisers be cut down from 15 to 9. He would have voted for 9, so that he might be considered a somewhat lesser militarist than his colleagues. This was defeated by 69 to 12. In order to show that they were pacifistically inclined, the imperialists had Senator Bingham introduce a motion to increase the number of airplane carriers to three and then defeated it.

A day or two before the cruiser bill was passed, Coolidge let it be known that he was opposed to the three year time limit within which the 15 cruisers were to be laid down. One of the reported excuses for this was the alleged fear of a treasury deficit, which might lessen the millions of dollars in tax refunds Mellon was giving his companies and those of Morgan and other millionaire industrialists and bankers.

Coolidge's real attitude was shown, however, by assurances from his friends, after the bill passed the Senate, that he would sign it as soon as it should pass the House, which would be shortly and without material change. A few days before, he had

announced that he wanted the abolition of the three year time limit, and the impression he intended to create, which was stressed by the capitalist press, was that Coolidge had no militarist inclinations. The significance of his attitude on the time limit matter was quite different. What he was after was *carte blanche* to build the cruisers as he wished, depending upon relations with England and Japan. A statement from the White House said that if he had his way about the question of the time limit for building the cruisers, he would be able to have them built according to the results of the signing of the Kellogg peace and of the 1931 disarmament conference. That means he would have authorisation by Congressional action to use his discretion in holding the building of the cruisers as a club over any recalcitrant enemy. He could then have work begun on all the cruisers as soon as he would wish.

However, nothing much is really lost by the Senate's action, for the cruisers are to be built as quickly as is possible. The bill as passed gives the president power to alter the building programme to suit any agreements made at the next disarmament conference; Coolidge has let it be known that this means no let up in the building programme, for he states, Britain is so far ahead of the U. S. in respect to cruisers that all these 15 can be built no matter what limitation is decided upon. Besides, the U. S. has a couple of hundred wartime destroyers laid up in Navy Yards and docks which it can easily prepare for action for the next war.

The role of the fake liberal, Borah, is important. He moved to have a conference called on the rights of neutrals in wartime. He dropped this motion in favour of one by the arch-jingo of the Senate, Reed, to negotiate with the various countries on this matter. This motion passed by 81 votes to 1, Borah also voting for it.

One of those supporting Borah's plan was Walsh, of Montana, another alleged liberal. He was frank enough to admit the purpose of the cruiser bill: "It is perfectly evident that the construction of the cruisers contemplated by this bill looks to a war primarily with Great Britain and secondly with Japan". Senator Johnson, of California, the greatest Japanese-baiter in the country, also insisted upon the bill as a weapon against Japan.

Reed did a little plain talking also. He said: "I favour a navy so strong that no two countries could attack it... This is the age of rivalry. Great cities strive against weaker ones, great corporations gobble up little ones... The same rule applies to nations. If our commerce expands it hurts the others... Nations have been writing treaties for everlasting peace ever since they learned how to touch pen to parchment. The history of the world is a record of broken treaties."

That Hoover is 100 percent for the cruiser bill was admitted by Chairman Britten of the House Naval Committee who said that Hoover told him he wanted "a navy second to none in power and efficiency". Hoover tried to becloud the matter by stating that he had said nothing upon the question, but no one paid any attention to this.

The extent to which the passage of the bill was taken for granted is shown by the fact that such important papers as the "N. Y. Times", the Wall St. "Journal", and the "N. Y. Journal of Commerce" carried no editorials the day following. The papers which did editorialise about the bill either tried to create pacifist illusions or frankly admitted the warlike preparations of American imperialism.

One has only to recall some of the evidence of such preparation to realise at how rapid a pace we are heading for a new world war, with the U. S. as a leading participant. To mention only those connected with Latin America: Hoover's "good-will" trip; the virtual annexation of Nicaragua, and decisive steps in that direction with regard to Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, etc.; the Bolivian-Paraguayan affair, and Britain and the League in relation to it; Coolidge's Armistice Day speech asserting world hegemony for the U. S.; the fake Kellogg peace pact, and the like.

This concerns mainly Latin-American seeds of war between the U. S. and Britain. These exist in every part of the world, as is well known. The sharply growing danger of war against the U. S. S. R. — Britain in Afghanistan, France and Britain in the Balkans, etc., etc., — is also fully evident. To do its part to prepare for a leading role in the nearing world slaughter, the U. S. has decided to build these sixteen warships, the reality behind the smokescreen of the Kellogg peace pact and disarmament treaty talk.

The Living Wage Proposals of the I. L. P. in Great Britain.

By W. M. Holmes (London).

A new "Living Wage" report has been prepared by the I. L. P. (Independent Labour Party) for submission to its Easter Conference at Carlisle. The report allows for "socialism within two years", and is the result of the resolution of the last I. L. P. Conference which demanded "the establishment by law of a living wage to all workers, irrespective of occupation".

The scheme is ambitious. The amount of "the Living Wage" is to be determined immediately a Labour Government obtains office and applied at once to all public bodies and industries and services doing work for public authorities, or receiving loans from Government or public authorities. All contractors are to pay the wage to their employees as a condition of the contract and pensions, unemployment relief and Poor Law relief are to be raised to the standard of the Living Wage.

A time limit of two years is then to be given to private industry in which to raise wages to this level, under the control of an "Industrial Commission". This Commission would have authority to nationalise industries and would "reorganise industry". A special super-tax on firms which did not pay the living wage during the two years period of grace would be imposed. A shorter working day, retiring pensions and a guaranteed 14 days' holiday with pay, are put forward as solutions for unemployment.

The manner in which these grandiose proposals are presented is typical of the I. L. P. The workers are assured that their adoption means socialism within two years and a rapid and peaceful transformation of the decayed structure of British capitalism into a paradise for the workers. That the scheme has not been and never will be, adopted by the Labour Party is overlooked altogether, as is the fact that the I. L. P. itself is divided on the question, practically the whole of the Parliamentary fraction being resolutely opposed to it, as well as a strong minority on the Executive of the Party.

The complete split between the centrist rank and file whose ideas the programme represents and the heads of the Party in the Labour and Trade Union bureaucracy is evidenced by the resolutions sent out from branches for the Easter conference. There are nine other nominations for the Chairmanship besides Maxton, the present Chairman and father of the programme. Four or five of these are certain to withdraw, but there will nevertheless be an effort made to oust Maxton.

It is amusing to note that two resolutions urge that I. L. P. candidates for Parliament should accept the Party's policy and that there should be closer contact between the I. L. P. members of Parliament and the Administrative Council. There are also many resolutions declaring against a Liberal-Labour alliance and demanding a special emergency conference in such an eventuality.

The Lancashire district again demands an organised scheme of war resistance, though their resolution was rejected at the last conference. The Central London branch asks for endorsement of National Administrative Council's opposition to the participation by the Labour Party in the Simon Commission and another asks the Party to dissociate itself from the reactionary colonial policy of the II. International.

MacDonald is not likely to slacken his campaign against the Party, of which he is a member and there is certain to be a very strongly organised "right" fraction at the Conference led by Shinwell, which will demand absolute accord with the Labour Party on the plea of a united front for the eve of the General election. Some such plea is bound to be made and accepted to avert the long threatened internal crises in the Party and the conference will end in a series of compromises. The fate of the "Living Wage" and "Socialism in Two Years" proposals will be interesting. They are hardly likely to be seriously pressed, though they may be modified.

The Hoover Administration and the Negroes.

By William Wilson (New York).

The selection of his cabinet officers by president-elect Hoover is an event which is arousing considerable anxiety among the Negro Republican "leaders" who are expecting to be rewarded for services rendered the Party in the last campaign. The height of the ambition of these hirelings of the Republican Party is to secure a place in what is now known as the "Black Cabinet". It is composed of assistants to cabinet officers, the ministership of Haiti and the register of the treasury, though this last post had not been held by a Negro since the administration of William Howard Taft.

The most prominent Negroes mentioned for these positions are Robert R. Church of Tennessee who is one of the leading Republican Party henchmen in the South; Charles E. Mitchell of West Virginia, who has been at the beck and call of the Republican Party for many years and who has always managed to hold the rank and file Negroes of West Virginia true to the "Grand Old Party". The group lead by Robert R. Moton, principal of Tuskegee Institute, the school founded by the late Barker F. Washington. Many members of this group held prominent places in the "Coloured Division" of the Party during the campaign.

Anxious to appease the more radical (racially) of these job hungry black politicians and to make such a gesture as will fool the least conscious among the masses of Negroes, Hoover will undoubtedly appoint some of these flunkies to a "window show" job. It is quite likely that Moton who was an "assistant" to Hoover during the recent, Mississippi Flood disaster and who made no protest against the brutal treatment accorded Negroes (they were forced to work upon the "leases without pay and viciously discriminated against by "relief" committees of the Red Cross) will be well placed. All who receive recognition will have proved the milk and water quality of their tempers and the pappy nature of their demands. They will be expected to continue to sing the praises of the Party of Lincoln and follow instructions to the letter. There will be no protests against the continued rape of Haiti or the sale of Liberia to American Imperialism.

But the entry of the Communist Party into the South and its industrialisation are factors which must eventually ring down the curtain on the period of domination of the opportunistic leadership of the black masses. The play of class forces upon the Negro masses will operate to bring about a change in their ideology.

From the followers of the spineless and visionless "House of Du Bois" leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People; from amongst the followers of Moton, the apologetic tool of Hoover, will be created a genuinely militant Negro proletarian and peasant movement. The wornout and fatuous dogmas, the platitudes and formulations purged now of all revolutionary content, which never represented more than an attractive allurements for the masses, will be discarded. Divorced from all feeling of kinship with the vacillating phrase-mongering intellectuals who are now the court criers for the growing Negro bourgeoisie, and from all adherence to the yellow trade union organisers of the type of the leaders of the "Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters"; painstakingly working out a revolutionary cause, a Negro revolutionary proletariat allied with and supported by the Negro peasantry will repudiate the old opportunist leadership and the members of the "Black Cabinet" and will link itself with indissoluble ties to the American proletarian revolutionary movement. Under the red banner under the slogan "Workers of the World Unite" they will go forward.

CHINA

Chiang Kai-shek's Disarmament Conference.

Fight between Bourgeoisie and Militarists.

By Tang Shin She.

The disarmament Conference desired by the bourgeoisie which took place from the 1st to 25th of January in Nanking has not by any means achieved the longed-for result, but the exact contrary. The feudal militarists succeeded, by the creation of disarmament districts, in once again nominally dividing China among themselves. The unification of China is and remains a dream of the bourgeoisie.

General Chiang Kai-shek, as the spokesman of the bourgeoisie, declared disarmament to be the only means to save the country. He wanted to persuade his faithful armed comrades to follow the example of the Samurai (the Japanese feudal generals who, in the Japanese revolution of 1868, voluntarily surrendered their power and placed their troops at the disposal of the government). Chiang Kai-shek's brother-in-law, Sung Tze Wen drew up a detailed memorandum relating to the financial difficulties, according to which the Generals must hand over their provincial financial apparatus to the central government and disarm their troops. The bourgeoisie, under the name of the "Pan-Chekiang Union" and the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce etc., handed in numerous petitions stating that they are completely satisfied with the intentions of Chiang Kai-shek and Sung Tze Wen and that the "armed comrades" shall unconditionally accept these proposals. The feeble bourgeoisie have, as a matter of fact, taken up a pitiable fight against the feudal militarists.

The so-called militarist great men as Feng Yu Hsiang, Yen Shi San, Li Dji Chin and Li Tsung Lin, naturally took part in the Conference for the purpose, of manoeuvring and gaining information; but the actual organisers of the Kwangsi group, General Peh Tsung Chi and the Manchurian ruler Chang Hsi Liang flatly refused to participate in the Conference.

Ever since the capture of Peking the bourgeoisie has been constantly crying for disarmament. The Generals hastened to express their approval of this demand (of course in their sense), and a preliminary Conference had already taken place in Peking. Under the cloak of disarmament there was carried out even a reorganisation of the army: In place of the word "army corps" there was substituted the word "division". The troops, however, remained at the same strength; in fact in many cases they were increased. As General Ho Yin Chen declared at the disarmament Conference, there still exist after the partial reorganisation, the following troops:

"1st Army (Chiang Kai-shek): 13 divisions of infantry, 2 independent brigades, 4 divisions of various categories of troops, totalling 240,000 men.

2nd Army (Feng Yu Hsiang): 12 divisions totalling 220,000 men.

3rd Army (Yen Shi San): 12 divisions totalling 200,000 men.

4th Army (Kwangsi Group): 13 divisions, totalling 230,000 men.

So much for the reorganised army. The troops which are not yet reorganised are as follows: Directly under the command of the Nanking government: 11 army corps totalling 220,000 soldiers. The Fengtien (Mukden) troops: 120,000 soldiers. The Kirin and Hailung-Kiang troops: 40,000 men. Yunnan: 30,000 men. Szechwan: 180,000 men. Kwantung and Kwangsi: 120,000 men. Kweichow: 200,000 men. The reorganised and non-reorganised therefore amount all together to 1,800,000 men."

Thus the Kuomintang possesses as cannon-fodder nearly 2 million men who are employed against the Chinese workers and peasants in the interests of the imperialists. There is no sign of disarmament. On the contrary, armaments are increased.

The 220,000 troops of the Nanking government are in reality soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek, whom he recruited after having solemnly promised to disarm. Feng Yu Hsiang, after the reorganisation, created a number of provincial troops, which are not included in the 2nd army. The Kwangsi group, which of course would not allow itself to be taken at a disadvantage, has not only reorganised its troops in Kwangtung and Kwansi but has also acquired a great number of troops who have come from Feng Yu Hsiang and Shantung and Chili. This competition in armaments is the result of the disarmament proclamation of the Kuomintang generals. The Nanking disarmament conference will naturally lead to the same result.

The bourgeoisie substantiated their demand for disarmament by declaring that they can no longer bear the burden entailed by the upkeep of the army. The clever generals on their part make use of this demand for further extortions. The memorandum of the Minister for railways, Sun Fo, to the disarmament Conference states:

"From August to November 1928 the leaders of the troops have laid claim to 3,692,000 dollars from the income of the railways; in addition to this they themselves levied a contribution for military expenses amounting to 2,416,000 dollars and finally raised a considerable sum for the purpose of disarmament..."

The era of disarmament has provided a further source of income for the generals. The Conference further decided to raise a popular disarmament loan amounting to 25 million dollars.

The spokesman of the bourgeoisie, Chiang Kai-shek, specially emphasised that "the chief task of disarmament is national unity in place of the country being split up under different rulers". But what is the result of the disarmament Conference up to this point? Paragraph 6 of the programme of action on disarmament states:

"The whole country is divided into six disarmament districts. The first district belongs to the I. army, the second district to the II. army, the third and fourth districts to the III. and IV. armies, the fifth district to Manchuria, sixth district to Szechwan, Yunnan and Kweichow."

Thus China is openly divided into six parts. The programme further states that the troops of the whole of China are to be limited to 800,000 men, but that the different provinces can maintain provincial troops. That is a really elastic provision!

Chiang Kai-shek wanted, by means of the disarmament action, to establish the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. But he was compelled to abandon his illusions and even to capitulate. General Peh Tsung Chi extorted further money for war purposes. Chang Hsiu Liang even caused the ally of Chiang Kai-shek, Yeng Yu Ting, to be executed. In Yunnan and Kweichow a new war of generals broke out just at the time of the Conference. The disarmament Conference has not brought any sign of peace, but only war and again war in the interest of the reactionary feudalists.

IN THE COLONIES

Indian Communists in the Election Struggle.

By M. N. Roy.

Four Communist candidates were put up at the last Municipal Election of Bombay, held on January 31. This is the first time that Communists participated in any election in India. Indeed, hitherto no working class candidate of any complexion has participated in any election struggle. Considering the extremely limitedness of the franchise in India there was, of course, very little chance for a working class representative to be elected. A larger section of the people has the right to vote in municipal elections than in the election of the National or Provincial legislatures. Nevertheless, even the municipal electorate falls far short of universal suffrage, excluding practically the entire work-

ing class. Fighting under these entirely unfavourable conditions, the pioneers of Bombay were, of course, defeated. They did not expect to gain seats in the municipal council elected by an almost purely bourgeois franchise, and packed with capitalist agents. They participated in the elections with the purpose of mobilising the working class and the oppressed urban petty bourgeoisie in the struggle against foreign imperialism and native capitalism. In this they won remarkable success.

Since the introduction of Reforms in 1919, a few "labour representatives" sat not only in the Municipal Councils of big cities like Bombay and Calcutta, but even in the Provincial and National parliaments. They are not elected by the working class, but nominated by the British government and, as such, are rather defenders of imperialism than of the Indian working class. By contesting the municipal election of Bombay the Communists challenged this fraudulent representation of labour.

One hundred and forty five candidates contested the election to 74 seats. The total electorate is about 600,000. That is, if all the voters participated in the elections, which is hardly the case, approximately 4,000 votes would be cast for each candidate, on the average. The four Communist candidates polled 12,453 votes. Thus they did not poll much lower than the average calculated on the assumption that all the voters participated in the election. Indeed, two of them were beaten by the narrow margin of 227 and 146, being at the top of the unsuccessful candidates in their respective districts.

In view of the fact that very few of the workers have the right to vote, this result indicates the spread of Communist influence even over the poor petty bourgeoisie. Had the working class been enfranchised, there would have been a crushing Communist victory. For, during a whole year the proletariat of Bombay have been carrying on a determined fight under Communist leadership against the capitalist offensive; the "Red Flag" Trade Union, organised by the Communists in the course of this struggle, alone has a membership of over 80,000. This being the case, no less than a quarter of a million votes would have been cast for the Communists, giving them all the mandates from the proletarian districts, were the working class enfranchised.

Owing to the doubtful position of the Communist Party, and the general antagonism to Communism that characterises the present bourgeois political atmosphere of the country, the election was contested in the name of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. But the candidates are all popular leaders of the Bombay proletariat, and are well-known as Communists not only to the British government and bourgeois nationalists, but also to the working class. If they are persecuted and hated by the former as Communists, precisely as such they are loved and trusted by the proletariat.

The demands with which they contested the election made the class character of the candidates evident. In addition to the basic political demand for complete national independence, as against the compromise policy of bourgeois nationalists, the following immediate demands were put forward: 1. Free education, recreation and medical relief for the working class; 2. Municipal relief for unemployed; 3. Increase of the wages of the manual and clerical workers employed by the Municipality at the expense of the highly paid officials; 4. Cheap house-rent for the workers; 5. Heavy taxation of industries; 6. Adult suffrage; 7. Abolition of nominated seats on the Municipal Council; and 8. Municipal ownership of Suburban railways, tramways, gas and electricity works.

The election campaign was combined with the general revolutionary working class agitation and propaganda. For example, the Lenin Memorial Day was just a week before the election. A mass meeting was held on that occasion. The election campaign was closely connected with the Bombay Uprising, which took place three days after the election. Obviously, the mobilisation of the masses during the election campaign gave a great impetus to the determination of the working class to push their resistance to capitalist offensive to the extent of street-fighting.

By contesting the election the Communists gave another sign of their political independence. Most resolute fighters for national freedom, they will defend the interests of the working class not only against foreign imperialism, but also native capitalism. By these tactics of revolutionary class struggle the Communists will

mobilise and lead the proletariat as the driving force of the national revolution.

The election result indicates another thing — the general radicalisation of the entire political situation. While, under conditions entirely unfavourable, the Communists, contesting the elections for the first-time, polled nearly the average vote, a number of right wing nationalists, who for years had sat on the Municipal Council, were routed. This shows that, although the petty bourgeois masses do not as yet follow the Communists, they are being influenced by the rising tide of proletarian revolt. The fearless exposure of the character of bourgeois nationalism by the Communists helped the petty bourgeoisie to refuse their support to the out-spoken right wingers, and to cast their votes for more radical nationalist candidates.

In short, this new move of the Communists has had much greater effect upon the situation than its immediate result. It cannot be judged by the number of votes polled by the Communists, which nevertheless, is not negligible having regard to Indian conditions.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

Protest against French Imperialist Slaughterings in Equatorial Africa.

The barbarous system of colonial exploitation, slavery and oppression is still flourishing in its most brutal form. Forced labour and other forms of oppression by French imperialists in Equatorial Africa has killed off native railroad workers at the rate of tens of thousands and swept away whole sections of the native population. While the International Labour Office at Geneva, in the name of civilisation, is supposed to investigate the conditions of forced labour among the natives, this barbarous oppression and bitter forced labour is butchering millions in the colonies. During the last decade the population of French Equatorial Africa has been reduced by six millions. For the last several months native workers have been in open revolt against this French imperialist oppression. At this moment French imperialism is crushing these workers and carrying "civilisation" into Africa at the point of the bayonet. This raping of Africa, the bathing of the struggles of the workers in their own blood and the extermination of the population in order that imperialism may flourish is shrouded in silence and secrecy. Only fragmentary bits of news leak out, through the strictest censorship, about this uprising and the consequent slaughterings by the French imperialists. This censorship and secrecy hides all the barbarism of the French imperialists.

Brothers and workers of the world: Protest in world wide unison against this slaughtering of our African brothers and fellow workers! Unmask the Impostors!

The International Trade Union Committee of Negro Workers of the R.I.L.U. calls upon the working class movement to protest and rally to the support of the African Workers.

We appeal to the French Workers to send a Workers' Delegation including Negro Workers to investigate this blood curdling oppression of French Imperialism.

World Revolutionary Movement: Mobilise the Masses! Unmask the French imperialist Cut-Throats!

With our African Brothers and Fellow Workers we struggle against French Imperialism and against World Imperialism.

The International Trade Union Committee
of Negro Workers
(Heller.)

FASCISM

The Fascist March in Vienna.

Counter-Demonstrations of the Revolutionary Working Class.

Vienna, February 24th 1929.

The fascist march in Vienna took place today under the defence of the Seipel government and under cover of the Austrian social democracy.

The march, so far as numbers participating in it are concerned, was a direct fiasco. There were in all not more than 4000 fascists on the streets, 3200 of them being in uniform. Only a small minority of those participating in the march are members of the Heimwehr organisations. The rest consisted of members of other fascist organisations, (Front fighters, "Oberland", Christian Socialist Freedom League etc.), while the national socialists held aloof. The fact, however, that the fascists were able to march through the streets of "Red Vienna" at all is regarded by them as a triumph.

The demonstration of the social democratic Republican Defence Corps was attended by 10,000 members of this organisation. The participation of the workers was very weak.

At the head of the Heimwehr demonstration there marched Federal Councillors Steidle and Pfriemer, as well as the notorious Major Pabst from Germany.

The counter-demonstrations commenced as the Heimwehr marched from the centre of the town into the working class district of Meidling. On the return march the Heimwehr encountered powerful counter-demonstrations in front of the Meidling Workers Club in the vicinity of which the participants in the counter-demonstrations broke through the defence cordon which could only be restored with great difficulty by the police.

Along the whole route there were heard the cries from the ranks of the workers: "Murderers of workers!", "Down with the fascists!" "Clear the fascists out of Vienna!" etc. The slogans of the Communist Party of Austria were taken up everywhere.

The police everywhere proceeded with the greatest brutality repeatedly cleared the square in front of the Meidling Workers Club and arrested many workers. Of the 70 arrested workers among them being numerous Communists, some were very seriously mishandled by the police.

The members of the Republican Defence Corps for the greater part maintained a passive attitude. Numerous workers however, expressed their dissatisfaction with their social democratic leaders. As the Heimwehr marched past the Mautehof and the Reuman Hof, tenement buildings which are for the greater part occupied by social democratic workers, it came to great counter-demonstrations of the inhabitants who have decorated the whole block of buildings with red flags. The counter-demonstrations were repeated when the Heimwehr procession dispersed. A group of workers, under Communist leadership, endeavoured to break up a section of the Heimwehr with the result that fresh arrests were made.

Today's "Rote Fahne" was again confiscated — for the third time. An action is being brought against the responsible editor for high treason.

The Communist Party has called a counter-demonstration to be held on 27th of February in the same building in which the Heimwehr today held their demonstration. In addition the Party is arranging for the 10th of March a march of the workers through those streets through which the Heimwehr marched today.

The Workers of Western White Russia the Victims of Starvation.

By A. Zorski (Vilna).

A great part of Western White-Russia is ravaged by starvation. Great masses of peasant workers of the Vilna and Novogrudok districts are this year devoid of bread and potatoes and of seed-corn for their fields. Now already, thousands of them are consuming the last remnants of their old stocks, selling their last cows to buy potatoes. But these potatoes which they get for their last sous, will last them at most for a month and a half, after the lapse of which time hundreds of thousands will be altogether without means or sustenance.

Even the Fascist press of Vilna publishes reports of mass-starvation and typhus in these regions. The Fascist "Kurjer Wilenski" writes that the situation of the peasants is "extremely bad", and even Prince Sapieha made a remark in the Seym to the effect that in the starvation areas the population would hardly be able to hold out till the spring.

Suffice it to quote a few figures to show the social foundations leading to this state of affairs. In Western White-Russia one per cent. of the population, the feudal magnates, possess 54 per cent. of the entire land, while 80 per cent. of the millions of peasants own such extremely small lots that they are quite unable to carry on farming operations, for which reason they are exposed to want and misery. The Government makes a show of its agrarian measures, which are intended to still the land-hunger of the poor rural population; the measures envisaged are a system of freehold lots, commassation, and the liquidation of the service-tenure. But reality has shown that these measures are nothing but means of enriching a handful of kulaks, while new burdens are imposed on the broad peasant masses. Western White-Russia and Western Ukraine are colonies of the Polish landowners and capitalists. Therefore the Fascist Government endeavours to get more and more out of these regions, to press out of the peasants, by means of the tax-screw, two and three times as much as it was wont to receive before the war, and to exploit the soil at a feverish rate. The various occupations destroyed the industry of Western White-Russia; the sons of the poor peasants have no possibility of finding occupation in the factories; there is a far-reaching splitting up of the small and middle-sized farms, while in the villages there are thousands who have neither work nor other means of sustenance. The broad masses of poor peasants, who seek a way out of the difficult situation, become more and more indebted to the landowners, merchants, and kulaks and thus fall into a state of bondage. The economy of the broad masses of peasants is deficient, so that every failure of the crops entails misery and hunger. If even in the opinion of a Fascist economist, writing in the Vilna "Slovo", the peasants of the Vilna and Novogrudok districts have after normal harvests "hardly enough bread and potatoes for their own needs", it is obvious that a failure of the crops represents the last straw to them, exposing them to absolute starvation. Harvest failures can occur anywhere, but it is only in the circumstances of barbaric exploitation by feudal landlords and capitalists that such a failure spells starvation for broad masses of the population.

The harvest failure in Western White-Russia has entailed starvation on a very large scale. For the peasants of this region, exploited by the landowners, squeezed by the tax-authorities, and at the mercy of the Polish police, are unaided in their fight against the elementary catastrophes. The only means liable really to overcome starvation is the surrender of the soil to the peasantry, the alteration of the social order in Poland, and the overthrow of the Fascist dictatorship. Broad masses of peasants are coming to recognise this fact and the illusions that a better destiny is possible for them under Fascist rule are fast disappearing. Starvation is showing the broad masses whither the Fascist policy in regard to agriculture really leads. Starvation is making them react against the Fascist dictatorship. The Fascist Government knows this full well and seeks by means of a mendacious demagoguery to check the dissatisfaction of the peasant masses and the revolutionary fermentation among them.

As soon as the terrible extent of the starvation in the Vilna district became known, Fascist organisations and "compromisers" of all sorts started speaking about it at conferences and congresses, declaring their intention of obtaining relief for

the victims from Government and of saving the masses in their dire need. Many blatant resolutions were passed and much propaganda was made for the Government, which was said to be preparing "adequate relief" for the starving population. Now it is known in what this "adequate relief" consists. The Government has granted about two million zloty of credit under the blatant name of "Credits for the Preservation of the Milk Industry in the Vilna District". This fine name, however, serves to cloak something very ordinary indeed. The credits are intended for the landowners, settlers, and kulaks, to enable these "sufferers" to buy up the cattle of the starving small peasants. The latter must be glad if he is enabled to sell his cow to a landowner or kulak whom he knows instead of parting with it to some unknown dealer. Besides this help, the Government has promised seed-corn for the spring, but it is already known that the seed in question will be distributed by the organisations of landowners and kulaks, which is tantamount to saying that it will disappear in the maw of the landowners, settlers, and kulaks and not benefit the soil of the poor peasants. Finally, the Fascist Government intends to help the starving population by voting funds for the construction of the Druia-Voropaievo railway required for the military offensive against the Soviet Union. Cynical and callous as it may sound, even this preparation of an imperialist war is designated by the Fascist agents as a relief in the interest of the starving masses.

When the representatives of the workers of Western White-Russia, i. e. the delegates of the White-Russian Club of Workers and Peasants, attempted to call a conference on the question of relief for the starving regions, the Fascist Government prohibited this on the grounds that the relief measures were in the hands of the Polish Minister Skladokowski, while the political police possesses the monopoly of assisting the workers of Poland.

A real assistance on behalf of the starving peasants of the Vilna district is altogether lacking, and their struggle against the Fascist Government assumes ever greater dimensions. This fight extends to broad masses of the working peasantry of Western White-Russia and has assumed the character of a fight of the peasantry for the undiminished expropriation of the soil and for the overthrow of the Fascist dictatorship.

The increasing strike movement among the Polish proletariat — illustrated most drastically by the struggle of the Lodz textile workers — and the aggravation in the resistance of the peasant masses to the Fascist dictatorship are leading under the present circumstances to the creation of a real united revolutionary front of the struggling masses of the toilers under the leadership of the Communist Party and are seriously threatening the Fascist rule.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Wage Struggles all along the Line in Germany.

By Fritz Heckert (Berlin).

The Social Democratic press and the organs of the reformist trade unions are seconding the insidious assertion of the employers that the business position does not permit of any increase in wages, as an alternative to which the workers are told that there is no prospect of a successful fight now in view of the decline in business and the present economic predominance of the capitalists. Thus it is that the latter can reckon in the realisation of their policy on the full support of the arbitration authorities, i. e. the Social Democratic Labour Minister Wissel and his arbiters. Although there are 3,200,000 unemployed in Germany, as is even officially admitted, the arbiters prevent the reduction of working hours to eight hours daily, affording the employers the possibility, indeed, of lengthening the working hours in certain cases to 60 weekly, as was recently decreed in the finding for the Saxon-Thuringian weaving district.

This method of strike-prevention by the arbitration authorities and of a sabotage of the class struggle by the reformist bureaucrats naturally entails a constantly renewed menace to the working class and to new offensive action on the part of

the employers. This is proved to the hilt not only by the aggressive measures of the textile manufacturers against their workers in Saxony, Thuringia, Lausace, and on the Lower Rhine, but also by the numerous tariff cancellations on the part of the employers. The reformist bureaucracy consciously and intentionally prevents the mobilisation of the working masses for the fight against the employers, so as not to endanger the coalition with the bourgeoisie in the German Parliament.

Almost six million workers are involved in the wage alterations of the coming spring. Their contracts have either lapsed or else they have been cancelled or will be cancelled by March 31st.

From one and a half to two million agricultural workers are in a tariffless condition. Their contracts lapsed on December 31st and it is only the quite preposterous demands of the small Junker class that prevented the reformist bourgeoisie from concluding new contracts to the disadvantage of the workers. The favourable position resulting for a strike in view of the approaching seed-time, must be exploited by the workers without scruples in the interest of their just demands.

The next strongest group engaged in wage negotiations is that of 1,600,000 constructional workers. For them, too, the long duration of the frost period should entail advantageous conditions upon the resumption of building in the interest of movement for higher wages.

The tariff contracts of some 800,000 metal workers have now partly lapsed, while in part they have been cancelled by the employers or may still be cancelled by the workers.

Similar conditions obtain in the case of 300,000 transport workers, 150,000 State and municipal workers, 150,000 timber workers, 150,000 workers in the graphic trades, and 180,000 shoemakers, saddlers and leather workers. Smaller movements are noticeable among the workers of the foodstuffs and allied industries. Several hundred thousand clerks are to a considerable extent involved in wage contests.

The struggle of the textile workers in Saxony and Thuringia, which has now lasted for some weeks, has been augmented by the employers by a lockout of 30,000 textile workers in Lausace and the threat of wage curtailments for the silk-weavers of the Crefeld region and the textile workers of the Wuppertal (in the case of the Barmen hand-weavers by 8.5 per cent.). The Textile Workers Union has agreed with the employers that the lockout and the workers' struggles shall be terminated on the basis of similar measures to those adopted by Severing against the foundry workers. So that the employers may rely on the zeal of the reformist leaders, the leaders of the Textile Workers' Union have sanctioned regularly organised strike-breaking in Lower Lausace, which permits the employers to put through their urgent orders in such factories as are not affected by the lockout.

In three important and decisive branches of industry the reformist bureaucracy is with all its might preventing the outbreak of the fight on the part of the workers. Scheffel, chairman of the Railwaymen's Union it is true, solemnly swore to the workers last autumn that he would on all accounts cancel the working contract concluded with the Dawes Railway. Now he is doing all he can to prevent the cancellation. Similarly, the reformist leader Husemann promised the miners the cancellation of the preposterous working conditions in the different German mining districts. Though since the beginning of the year the possibility of a cancellation has obtained, Husemann, together with his confederates of the Christian Miners' Union now stands in the way of a mobilisation of 450,000 miners. The same tactics, again, are being adopted by Brey, chairman of the Factory Workers' Union, with the 300,000 workers of the chemical industry.

The reformist leaders, who know full well that an independent action against the employers on the part of the working masses under the lead of the revolutionary trade-union opposition would spell the defeat and ruin of reformism and the impossibility of continuing their egoistic coalition policy, are replying to the rebellious workers by a renewed offensive of expulsion and disruption. They have called upon the revolutionary trade-union functionaries to sign a reservation, obliging them not only to separate from the Communist International but also to take up the fight against all such elements among

the workers as propagate revolutionary tactics in the unions. In a declaration submitted by the chief committee of the Metal Workers' Union, the following passage occurs:

"The undersigned declares that he does not recognise the resolutions of the Communist International and the Central of the Communist Party of Germany in trade-union matters and is ready to oppose them if outsiders or members of the Metal Workers' Union should attempt to propagate them within the organisation."

It is just such measures on the part of the bureaucrats that prove how important it is for the working class to accept and carry out the fight against the employers on the basis of the resolution of the Red International of Labour Unions and the Communist International.

The Political Bureau of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia Reviews the Position following on the End of the Textile Workers' Strike.

Prague, February 18th.

The Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has published a declaration in the press, as follows: The "Pravo Lidu" and the "Sozialdemokrat" of February 14th started a great campaign of agitation against the Communist Party and against the Red Trade Unions. With a malice worthy of the most despicable agents of the bourgeoisie and the most infamous enemies of the working class, this band of traitors is now triumphantly proclaiming that "the Communists have interrupted the strike" and that "the putch of the C. P. Cz. has collapsed".

The historical significance of the North-Bohemian strike lies in the fact that the Social Democrats have not only driven a wedge into the united front of the proletarian struggle but have also openly and barefacedly organised strike-breaking and that with a greater effrontery than has been noticeable in any country of late years. This band of blacklegs has opened the eyes of the Czechoslovakian proletariat to its true rôle of traitors and enemies to the working class. Every Social Democratic worker must realise that to-day; every worker must needs understand that.

It was, however, a serious opportunistic mistake on the part of the strike-centre at Reichenberg that under the influence of this Social Democratic outcry the strike should really have been broken off. At the moment when the struggle was interrupted, from 4000 to 5000 workers were striking. Our comrades did very little to induce the striking workers to demonstrate in the streets, to lead them to such factories as continued to work, and to make the position clear to the workers of these mills on their way home from work.

This serious opportunistic mistake appears all the graver if we consider that part of the striking workers went so far as to refuse to resume work. The best proof of this is furnished after the termination of the strike by certain concerns in regard to which the strike was not abandoned and to which the workers did not return out of fear that the leading strikers might be victimised by the employers. It is a fact, moreover, that our comrades interrupted the strike at a moment when the central strike committee was on its way from Prague to Reichenberg. A further serious mistake lay in the fact that the workers who remained on strike were not consulted before the strike was broken off.

We therefore openly declare that the retreat beaten by our Reichenberg comrades was a mistake, that the struggle has by no means been terminated, that the Communist Party and the Red Trade Unions persist in declining the single emergency bonus conceded by the employers, and that the fight will continue to be organised and will be renewed actively in the near future. It is now for our Reichenberg comrades to place themselves at the head of the partial strike still being carried on in certain concerns, to comprise all striking workers under

common strike leadership, and to take all organisational steps towards extending the strike, while at the same time subjecting the mistakes made during and at the termination of the strike to a radical criticism.

In this connection we gave a most decisive answer to the reformist blacklegs, declaring that, in spite of the mistakes committed we do not desire to regard the North-Bohemian strike as a second Red Day. The North-Bohemian strike is of immense historical importance. For the first time in the history of the C. P. Cz., a fight has been waged against the will of the Social Democratic traitors on the basis of the new political line; for the first time the broadest masses of workers have in this strike been combined in a united front from below in the democratically elected strike-committees; for the first time these masses of workers have waged a fight against the triple alliance of workers' enemies, viz. the capitalist State, the employers, and the Social Democratic leaders, and that quite independently of the extent of the strike-funds.

In this strike we Communists have proved that we are willing to fight and shall fight for the historical and present interests of the working masses. The reformists of all-degrees, on the other hand, have proved in this struggle to what an extent they are at one with the capitalist State apparatus and with the employers' organisations. They have proved that they are not only unwilling to fight but that they are also determined to do their utmost to undermine and disorganise the fight.

That is the difference between the Red Day and the present North-Bohemian textile-workers' strike. The Red Day made manifest the mistaken opportunistic directives of the Party centre and its opportunistic lethargy. The Red Day was a serious defeat of the C. P. Cz., which for a short time suffered a setback in consequence thereof. The North-Bohemian strike, on the other hand, is, notwithstanding its mistakes, an incentive for further struggles on the basis of the new political line of the Party, which has been satisfactorily tested in this fight. The defeat in the North-Bohemian strike, we emphatically repeat, by no means terminates the struggle. It furnishes us with the most valuable experience for its continuation. That is the great historical fact which remains in spite of the vociferous jubilation of the reformist blacklegs and the entire bourgeois press.

ELEVEN YEARS OF THE RED ARMY

The Eleventh Anniversary of the Founding of the Red Army.

Theses of the Political Administration of the Red Army.

1. The Red Army of the workers and peasants celebrates the eleventh anniversary of its founding at a time when the hostility of the imperialist states towards the Soviet Union, and the antagonisms among the imperialist states, are growing; at a time when the class antagonisms between capitalists and workers within the imperialist states are becoming more acute, and when even in the Soviet Union the class struggle is developing, for the capitalist elements are resisting the ever increasing advance of the socialist offensive.

The growth and aggravation of the antagonisms of capitalism and the danger of a new imperialist war for fresh markets and fresh spheres of influence for the investment of capital; the rejection by the capitalist governments of the disarmament proposal made by the Soviet delegation at Geneva; the feverish armaments and swelling military budgets of all capitalist countries, disguised in pacifist phrases; the series of anti-Soviet military blocs and alliances formed amongst our nearest neighbours on the commands of the greatest imperialist powers — all these facts render the war danger the "chief axis of the present international situation" (theses of the VI. Congress of the Comintern). Therefore the question of the unceasing reinforcement and strengthening of the Red Army and the defensive capacity of the Soviet state, must be the central point around which the whole of our work is concentrated.

2. During the past year the development of the armed forces of the Soviet Union took the form of unceasing effort for the

strengthening of all elements required for the fighting efficiency and military defence of the proletarian State.

The Red Army has been strengthened by the following means:

- a) by the complete political soundness of the Red Army;
- b) by the growth of the Party organisations in the Army, and by the development of the cadre of workers in the Party organisations;
- c) by the further increased authority of the Party and the Soviet power in the army and fleet;
- d) by the improvement of the military and political level of the commanding staff;
- e) by the more firmly established military discipline and general political and military training of the troops, clearly demonstrated at the manoeuvres in 1928;
- f) by the considerable improvement in the material position of the Red Army soldiers and the commanding staff;
- g) by the steadily increasing equipment of the troops with technical fighting material;
- h) by the tactical disposition and correct tactical orientation of the troops, corresponding to the present status of the science of war;
- i) by the considerable increase of the cadre of workers in the new contingent in the military schools.

The Red Army enters the twelfth year of its existence as an unshakable and armed support of the proletarian dictatorship.

3. The firmer establishment of the Red Army of the workers and peasants has been made possible by the great success achieved by the Party and the Soviet power in the sphere of socialist development. Besides this, the industrialisation of the country carried out by the Party and the Soviet power, the extensive investments, the victorious offensive carried on by the socialist elements against the capitalist elements in town and country, and the firmer establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and of the alliance between workers and peasantry thereby ensured, have furnished the firm material and political basis for the continued uninterrupted perfecting of the Red Army, and form a firm foundation for the development of the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union.

The objective prerequisites here enumerated, combined with the ideological oneness of the Party organisations and the commanding staff, the firm guidance of the Red Army by the Party, the existence of perfectly trained and politically schooled commanding staff cadres, provide all that is required for the uninterrupted and systematic consolidation of the Red Army in its capacity of armed protector of the proletarian State.

Besides the tactical perfecting of the troops, the main task of the Party organisations, the political organisations, and the commanding staff, consists of tenacious effort for the decisive overcoming of every shortcoming in the work of the various components of the military apparatus and of the leading cadres (for instance, the obliteration of the class line in educational work, bureaucratic degeneration in various parts of the military apparatus, delayed response to the trends influencing the Red Army soldiers, lack of cultural work in the commanding staff, deficient application of the methods of self-criticism necessary for the enhancement of the fighting capacity of the Red Army, etc.).

4. Among the most important tasks to be fulfilled by the leading cadres of the Red Army we must count in particular the task of extending the whole of the work being done for the furtherance of the class-conscious unity of the Red Army masses under the slogans of the Party, the training of the Red Army soldiers to become active fighters for the building up of Socialism in town and country, the schooling of efficient fighters and agitators for the socialist reformation of agriculture, the formation of aids to the Soviet power against the kulak elements in the village. This task is of especial importance in connection with the aggravation of the class struggle in the Soviet Union and especially in the village, where the capitalist elements resist the developing offensive of socialism at every point of progress.

5. This task cannot, however, be fulfilled solely by enlightenment work among the Red Army soldiers in the Red Army itself. The system of political influence exercised over the masses of the Red Army by the Party organisations, the Young Communists, and the commanding staff, must be supplemented by firm ties between the Red barracks and the working masses of our works and factories, and by the systematic influencing of the masses of the Red Army by the proletarian organisations.

6. One of the most important forms of these connecting ties is the "adoption" by the workers of the undertakings and organisations of certain divisions of troops. Experience has taught that the interest felt by the workers in the life of the Red soldiers of their adoption, the cultural and, to a certain extent, material support thereby accruing to the troops, the participation of the workers' organisations in the manoeuvres, the joint active work in the sections of the municipal Soviets and other forms of daily contact between the workers and the troops adopted — all this promotes the class-conscious fighting unity of the Red Army soldiers, and enables them to realise the leading rôle played by the proletariat in the alliance of the workers and peasants.

The workers' adoption system has not yet assumed a mass character. It is applied from time to time, and is often confined to reciprocal representation by leading and commanding persons. It need not be said that adoption of this kind is not adapted to securing the needful prerequisites for the firm establishment of the influence of the proletariat over the Red Army, and must be revised from the standpoint of ensuring a real alliance between the workers and the Red Army. The examination of the activities being carried on under the adoption system among the troops, now being made on the occasion of the eleventh anniversary, will contribute greatly to the solution of this problem.

7. The eleventh anniversary of the Red Army will be celebrated under the slogan of an intenser systematic influence to be exercised over the Red Army by the proletariat, by means of the firmer establishment of the alliance between the workers' organisations and the Red Army. This must be the principle upon which the systematic contact between the workers and the troops is based: mutual visits, organisation of excursions to the works and factories, familiarisation of the Red Army soldiers with the character of some definite undertaking, with the working conditions obtaining in this undertaking, with the achievements and importance of the branch of industry concerned for the reconstruction of agriculture and for the consolidation of the economic alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

8. If we celebrate this eleventh anniversary by drawing the balance of the results and achievements of the workers of the Soviet Union, of the building up of the Red Army, and of the reinforcement of the defensive powers of the Soviet Union, we ensure to a greater extent than ever before the participation of the working masses of the towns and of the middle peasant masses from the country, and further than this, of the trade union, co-operative, and public organisations in the cause of securing the defensive powers of the country.

9. Those organisations serving the public welfare which have for their object the reinforcement of the defensive powers of the Soviet Union, and the spread of knowledge of the science of war among the population (aviachim, Red Cross, Young Communists, organs of political enlightenment, reading rooms, etc.), must take part in an energetic and active manner in the celebration of the eleventh anniversary of the Red Army. It must be ascertained to what extent the directions have been carried out, the slogans realised, the programme and instructions issued by the public organisations, the Young Communists, and the organs of political enlightenment, put into actual practice. It is imperatively necessary that every organisation and every Young Communist should realise that at the present juncture the most important task is not the drawing up of general directions and resolutions, but in living and practical work based on the directives already resolved upon, and in drawing the broad masses of the workers into this work.

The whole of this work must be carried out with the closest collaboration and under the immediate guidance of the local Party organs.

INTERNATIONAL PERSECUTION OF COMMUNISTS

The Life of Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea in Serious Danger.

Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea has been on hunger-strike for more than three weeks. In addition to this he has now entered on a thirst strike. His life is in immediate danger.

Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea, a courageous self-sacrificing leader of the Communist Party of Roumania, was arbitrarily arrested by the Roumanian Siguranza. No charge was brought against him. He was arrested solely because he is a Communist. This arrest is only a link in the bloody chain of terror of the "Democratic" Maniu Government against the revolutionary labour movement, a terror which even surpasses that of the reactionary Bratianu government.

Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea commenced a hunger-strike as a protest against his arrest. In a letter to the Roumanian workers he declared that his hunger-strike constitutes not an individual action, but is the expression of the collective indignation of the working class against the brutal regime of the National Zaranist government.

The Maniu Government, fearing that the struggle of Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea would stir up the proletariat, at once hastened to bring him to trial on the charge of "endangering the order of the State". The trial was rushed through, the witnesses for the Defence were not allowed to give evidence. Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea declared that he will continue the hunger-strike until he is released or until he dies. His attitude at former trials and now proves that he is determined to convert his words into deeds.

To the previous sentences which have been passed during the three months of the existence of the Maniu government and which have brought more than one hundred years' hard labour for revolutionary workers, there is now added the sentence on Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea: eight years' hard labour. By this he is to be made "harmless" once and for all.

Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea has continued his hunger-strike during and after the trial. He is terribly weakened. His life is seriously endangered.

The workers of the whole world must at the last minute stay the arm of the Roumanian hangmen. The Maniu Government must be compelled by mass protests to release Comrade Dobrogeanu-Gherea. At the same time the Maniu Government, which, with the support of the social democratic leaders, is suppressing the revolutionary labour movement by fascist means and which systematically does to death our Comrades Boris Stefanov, Bujor, Kahana, Mania Ehrlich and many hundreds of other courageous leaders of the Roumanian workers and peasants in the torture chambers of Roumania, must be compelled to issue a general amnesty.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Open Letter of the E. C. C. I. to the Convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

Dear Comrades,

The VI. Convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America marks an important stage in the great change through which the Party is now going.

From a propagandist organisation, uniting chiefly immigrant workers and having an insignificant influence among the native workers, the Workers (Communist) Party is now beginning to turn into a mass Party of political action guiding the political and economic actions of the most advanced and

most militant ranks of the American proletariat. The VI. Congress of the Comintern emphasised in its resolutions this important new feature in the development of the Party, declaring that "a number of stubborn and fierce class battles (particularly the miners' strike) found in the Communist Party a stalwart leader."

Precisely in the period following the convention of 1927 the Party has been acting with increasing frequency as the stalwart leader of mass actions of the American proletariat and has increased its influence among the native workers. The turriers' and garment workers' strikes, the miners' strike, the textile workers' strike in New Bedford and Fall River and the silk strike in Patterson — such is the series of battles in which the Workers Party of America has for the first time appeared in the role of a Party of political action capable of linking up the economic struggles of the proletariat with its political aims.

The struggle for the organisation of new unions which the Party had to carry on under circumstances of fierce terrorism on the part of the State apparatus, the murderous bands of powerful trusts, the yellow American Federation of Labour and the most stubborn resistance of the Socialist Party, is one of the best pages in the history of the work of the Party during the last year.

However, the Party is now just making its first steps on the new path. It is now just on the threshold between the old and the new, it has not yet passed the turning point. It has as yet done little to shift its base from the immigrants to the native Americans employed in the basic industries. It has done still less in relation to the millions of the Negro proletariat.

Meanwhile, the conditions which will impose enormous tasks on the Workers Party of America, and will compel it to take the lead in gigantic class conflicts, are developing ever more rapidly.

The aggressiveness of the United States in the struggle for markets and the most important sources of raw material throughout the world is growing swiftly. The election of Hoover as president means that American imperialism is resolutely embarking on a course which leads to colonial wars of occupation and to an extremely rapid accentuation of the struggle between the United States and its chief imperialist rival — Great Britain. American imperialism is striving for a monopolist position in world economy and politics and is becoming more and more involved in the universal crisis of capitalism and comes more and more into the orbit of the growing instability of world capitalism.

The striving towards domination in world politics drives American imperialism, on the one hand, towards brutal capitalist rationalisation which throws considerable sections of the proletariat out of production, leads to an extreme overstrain of labour without corresponding compensation, to a colossal growth of unemployment (3-4 million) and to a general worsening of the conditions of the working class. On the other hand it leads towards tremendous growth of armament which puts ever-heavier burdens onto the shoulders of the toiling masses. All this and the menace of the terrific calamities of war creates a state of uncertainty and insecurity in the entire working class. It is on this basis that the tendency towards radicalisation of the American working class is increasing; that its activities, its will to defend itself, which in some places transforms itself into a will to assume the offensive, is developing. This drift towards the Left does not develop evenly in all parts of the working class. It now embraces the unorganised workers, especially in those industries which have not reached their previous level after the depression of the first half of 1928.

The Workers (Communist) Party is obviously still unprepared for the great class conflicts which will inevitably arise on the basis of the sharpening class relations in the United States.

Its past still weighs upon its present. The relics of the previous period of its existence form the greatest obstacle in the path it has to travel before it successfully passes the turning point and develops in the shortest possible time from a numerically small propagandist organisation into a mass political party of the American working class.

This, however, is the task which the whole objective situation in the United States, the entire post-war development of American imperialism places before the Party. This is the chief, fundamental and decisive task to which all other tasks must be entirely subordinated.

The Workers (Communist) Party of America has been for many years an organisation of foreign workers not much connected with the political life of the country. Owing to this immigrant exclusiveness two leading groups arose, took shape and became consolidated within the Party. For six years an almost uninterrupted struggle for supremacy in the Party has been going on between them. The struggle was, in the main, not based on principle, and at times, it assumed an unprincipled character. At times it assumed the appearance of a struggle based on principle, but in reality it was not entirely a struggle of principle; principles served chiefly to camouflage the struggle for supremacy in the Party. Whenever the struggle between the groups was centred more on principles (the attitude towards the Labour Party, the question of trade union tactics), the differences could have been settled without a factional struggle.

The absence of substantial differences on points of principle between the combatant factions has been recorded many times by the E. C. C. I. as well as by the Party itself.

Thus, in 1925, all resolutions at the IV. Convention of the Party were adopted by both factions **unanimously**, notwithstanding the acute factional struggle prior to the convention. But when the convention was over the factional struggle became even sharper than before.

Further the resolution of the presidium of the E. C. C. I. on the American question adopted on July 1st, 1927, states:

"The objective difficulties, the weaknesses of the Workers (Communist) Party, and its inadequate contact with the masses of the native workers, are factors complicating the inner situation of the Workers (Communist) Party. An insufficiently strong Party life, as the result of an insufficient mass basis, the inadequate contact of many members of the former language groups with the specific problems of the class struggle in the United States favour the development of groups and factional struggles, the existence and intensity of which we seek in vain to explain through serious differences of principle."

No less indicative is also the fact that both groups adopted unanimously in February 1928 extensive theses concerning all vital political problems of the United States, as well as the fact that both groups prior to the VI. Congress committed in common Right Wing errors.

Finally, the VI. Congress of the C. I. declared that the factional struggle of the Workers (Communist) Party of America "is not based on any serious differences of principle".

Nor can the E. C. C. I. find such serious fundamental differences between the convention theses of the majority and the minority of the C. E. C. as to justify a struggle within the Party. The differences between the majority and minority of the C. E. C. do not go beyond those limits which would make it impossible to settle them without a factional struggle.

The majority has shown a tendency to under-estimate the process of radicalisation as well as the process of differentiation in the ranks of the working class, which finds its expression in the attempts to point out the conservatism of the American working class in a static form without giving a class analysis of the causes which underlie its backwardness and without a sufficient consideration of the further prospects of development of its political consciousness.

The minority, on the other hand, over-estimates the degree of radicalisation of the American working class at the present time, interpreting the vote for Smith of a part of the workers during the presidential elections as a sign of the radicalisation of the proletariat. This is wrong, just as is the reference to Lenin's letter of 1921 which refers to the Roosevelt vote, because Roosevelt was a candidate of a third party, something which did not exist in the last elections. Both the majority and the minority entirely under-estimate the Leftward trend of the working class in the other capitalist countries. In the theses of both groups there is no attempt to evaluate such important

facts as the Lodz strike and the Ruhr lockout; they are not even mentioned.

In estimating the character of American Trotskyism, the majority does not draw in its theses a clear line of division between the out and out Right wing opportunist deviation and Trotskyism, which is opportunism disguised with Left phrases. The failure to understand this difference objectively leads to a weakening of the struggle against the main danger — the Right danger, as in reality it limits the struggle to the task of the struggle against Trotskyism.

The minority however not only under-estimates the Trotskyist danger, but, on the one hand says nothing in the theses about the fact that such extreme Right wingers as Sulkanen and Askeli, who do not even hide themselves behind Left phraseology, belong to the Cannon group, or that the latter has concluded a bloc with Lore and Eastman; and, on the other hand it states that Cannon has taken with him a number of workers from the Party, which objectively adds prestige to the Cannon group and weakens the struggle against American Trotskyism.

All the enumerated differences between the minority and majority could, if the factional struggle would cease, easily be overcome by means of self-criticism within the Party.

At the same time the majority and minority commit the same mistake in their view of the relations between the American and world economic systems, although expressed in different forms and both groups make different conclusions. This mistake lies in their wrong conception of the nature of the relationship between American and world economics and the underestimation of the increasing involving of American imperialism in the rapidly sharpening general crisis of capitalism. Both sides are inclined to regard American imperialism as isolated from world capitalism, as independent from it and developing according to its own laws. Both sides do not take sufficiently into account that the approaching crisis of American imperialism is part and parcel of the general crisis of capitalism. Both sides believe that world economy plays in relation to American imperialism only or chiefly a subordinate and passive role of a market for the export of commodities and capital.

The failure to understand the close relations between American economy and the general crisis of capitalism leads the majority to a wrong estimation of the role of American capital in the stabilisation of Europe, and to a misconception of the inevitable sharpening of the conflicts between the ever-more aggressive American imperialism and trustified Europe, which strives to free itself from the economic domination of the United States. It leads the minority to the conception that the coming crisis of American capitalism is called forth exclusively by its internal contradictions.

These mistakes reflect the failure to understand the fact that the roots of the contemporary general crisis of capitalism, side by side with the sharpening contradictions between the development of the productive forces and the contraction of markets, side by side with the existence and development of the U. S. S. R. as a factor which revolutionises the working class of all countries and the toiling masses of the colonies, and stands opposed to the world capitalist system, there is also the unequal growth in the economic development of the various countries which has its expression in the transference of the economic centre of capitalism from Europe to America and the rapid development of American imperialism which surpasses the development of the other capitalist countries.

The rapid development of American capitalism does not exempt the United States, or any other capitalist country, from the crisis; on the contrary it accentuates the general crisis of capitalism as a result of the extreme sharpening of all contradictions which it leads to. On the other hand a sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism is to be expected not because American imperialism ceases to develop, but on the contrary, it is to be expected because American imperialism is developing and surpasses the other capitalist countries in its development, which leads to an extreme accentuation of all antagonisms.

The failure to understand the nature of the general crisis of American capitalism inevitably leads to a distortion of the

entire revolutionary perspective outlined in the decisions of the VI. Congress in connection with the third period. To consider American capitalism isolated from the sharply accentuated general crisis of capitalism means to overlook the general revolutionary crisis of capitalism which includes the economic crises in all capitalist countries, the imperialist struggle against the U. S. S. R. and the rebelling colonies, the struggle among the imperialist countries themselves, as well as the class struggle of the proletariat in the various capitalist countries.

With regard to the fundamental question as to the nature of the contemporary general crisis of capitalism, the perspective of its accentuation, the further shattering of stabilisation throughout the entire world economic system, the question of struggle against the Right danger, which has of late become the chief and decisive issue in the Comintern, both the majority and the minority commit big errors which inevitably lead to a profound under-rating of the revolutionary perspectives in Europe and especially in America.

The majority entirely ignores in its theses the resolution of the VI. Congress (the point referring to the third period of post-war development), and the minority, while quoting that point, was unable to link it up with its own conclusions concerning the American crisis. The VI. Convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America must decidedly rectify this mistake and pass resolutions on this most vital issue such as would be in full accord with the decisions of the VI. Congress of the C. I. This mistake of the majority is closely related to its great over-estimation of the economic might and the powerful technical development of the United States. It is wrong of speak of a second industrial revolution as is done in the majority theses.

"A powerful technical revolution is taking place in the United States, a tremendous rationalisation, an increase in the forces of production, which in its effects can be compared to a second industrial revolution."

This is a serious error. On the one hand, the emphasis on the fact that the remnants of feudalism are being wiped out in the South of the United States (which is wrongly considered in the theses as its colony) and that a new bourgeoisie with a new proletariat are being formed, may give the term "second industrial revolution" the implication of a second bourgeois revolution. On the other hand, if we were not to interpret the term "second industrial revolution" in this sense, it could not be explained in any other way but as an uncritical over-estimation of the significance and results of the development of technique. Such over-estimation would play into the hands of all advertisers of the successes of bourgeois science and technique who seek to deafen the proletariat by raising a lot of noise about technical progress and showing that there is no general crisis of capitalism, that capitalism is still vigorous in the United States, and that thanks to its extremely rapid development, it is capable of pulling Europe out of its crisis.

However, the development of the productive forces on the basis of the technical transformation and the new forms of organisation of labour, leads to increasing antagonisms between them and the limited home markets and, consequently, to a further deepening and sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism and not a diminution or a liquidation of that crisis, as the apologists of American imperialism pretend.

The slightest concession to the noisy advertisers of the growth of technique, the slightest vacillation, is an intolerable opportunist mistake.

A no less important shortcoming both in the majority and minority is the under-estimation of the effect of the technical development and rationalisation, on the working class. Not only the majority theses which over-estimate the significance of the tremendous technical development, but also the minority theses leave this aspect of rationalisation in the shade and pay little attention to it.

The fact is that the great intensification of labour arising from technical development and capitalist rationalisation expressed in the speeding up of the conveyor and the movement of machinery, in an extreme crowding of the working day, in a terrific speeding up of the workers by means of the bonus system which leads to the wearing out of the workers and their being thrown out of the factory sooner than was the case hitherto and, finally, the absolute diminution of the number

of workers in some industries, which gives rise to a tremendous growth of unemployment, are truly becoming the central problems of the entire American working class and thus acquiring the greatest political significance.

This new form of exploitation of the workers is based upon the increase of wages of a very small upper strata and upon the lowering of the standard of living, which was low enough hitherto, for the vast majority of the working class (notwithstanding the statement of the majority theses to the contrary).

The American proletariat does not feel so much the worsening of its position in any other respect as in the growing overstrain of labour, in the reduction of the period of the worker's stay in the factory, and in the growing unemployment.

Huge masses of American workers can be rallied to a struggle against the overstrain of labour and the monstrous growth of exploitation. The chief demands capable of uniting them in a common struggle are -- 1) the 7-hour day and 6 hours for workers engaged in industries injurious to health and in underground work; 2) social insurance (in case of sickness, injury, invalidity, and unemployment) at the cost of the employers and the State.

Extensive and persevering agitation for these demands throughout the entire period should be the main task of the Party which must simultaneously proceed also with the organisation of the unemployed. By fighting for this programme, the Party can unite broad sections of the proletariat, educate them politically, strike deep roots in the midst of the American workers, and become a mass working class Party. The revolutionary unions, provided their organisations will be seriously prepared and their leaders carefully chosen, can be an extremely important lever in that work.

The struggle against the consequences of capitalist rationalisation should be closely linked up with the struggle against the war danger. In this connection, the Party absolutely fails to see the enormous importance of this task and its decisive political significance. This entails an under-estimation of the revolutionary perspectives. There is no doubt that the objective situation as well as the first successes of the Party in leading mass conflicts provide a basis for a healthy discussion on points of principle within the Party. But the existence of two crystallised leading groups is a decisive obstacle to embarking on this course.

So long as these two groups exist in the Party, the possibility of an exchange of opinion on questions of principle within the Party, and hence the further healthy ideological development of the Party is entirely excluded.

To advance artificial differences of principle on questions concerning which no such differences exist would at the present time serve only and exclusively as a means of furthering the non-principled factional struggle.

The deep-rooted unprincipled methods of factional struggle are becoming a great obstacle in the struggle against all deviations from the correct political line and hindering the development of self-criticism or leading to its factional distortion.

However, the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern on the struggle against deviation from the correct political position is of special importance to the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

The ever-growing economic power and ever-increasing importance of American imperialism on the world arena, the specific method of economic and political oppression of the working class on the part of the bourgeoisie, who use the powerful apparatus of the A. F. of L. as an agency in the working class -- all these conditions give rise to the most serious danger of the development of a strong Right wing tendency in the American Party. The fact that both factions were guilty of Right wing errors is most significant and amply confirms the existence of the danger of the development of a Right wing tendency in the American Party. The VI. Congress has already pointed out in its resolutions a series of Right wing errors (the attitude towards the Socialist Party, inadequate work by the Party in organising the unorganised and the struggle of the Negroes, the insufficiently clear struggles against

the murderous policy of the United States in Latin America), and recorded that "these mistakes cannot, however, be ascribed exclusively to the majority leadership". The mistakes committed since the VI. Congress of the C. I. were also of a Right character.

The appearance of Trotskyism in the United States can be explained by the fact that the Trotskyist opportunist deviations on the question of the Party and its structure, at the basis of which lies the "principle" of unprincipled alliance with all and sundry Right and "Left" groups and organisations fighting against the Comintern, seems to fit perfectly into the scheme of political struggle in the United States where lack of principle was always the underlying principle in the activities of all bourgeois parties. Nowhere, in no other country in the world, have we witnessed so easy and rapid formation of a bloc of the Trotskyist and the out and out Right wingers as in the United States, thus revealing at the very outset its Social Democratic and anti-Comintern nature. The Right mistakes of the Party helped the growth of Trotskyism in the United States.

Notwithstanding the presence of certain temporary premises for Trotskyism in the United States, the Trotskyist bloc there also is doomed to collapse. The main condition for this is a correct political line of the Communist Party based on clear principles aiming at the elimination and correction of Right mistakes and a decisive fight against the Right danger in the ranks of the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

A successful struggle against both the out and out Right as well as against the "Left" Trotskyist deviations, has been hindered until now mainly by the intolerant and unprincipled faction struggle between the two leading groups. Each faction speculates on the mistakes of the other concealing or under-estimating meanwhile its own mistakes. Each faction hurls against the other accusations of alleged Right and "Left" mistakes. Actual and imaginary errors are exaggerated for factional purposes and deviations are manufactured out of them.

For factional considerations, the minority of the C. E. C. attacks the majority on some points more sharply than the Trotskyists who have been expelled from the Party. In its turn the majority, also for factional reasons, resorts to absolutely intolerable manoeuvres (the invitation of the renegade Cannon to a meeting of the C. E. C., for example). Speculation on deviations (instead of combating them), and factional manufacturing of deviations, does not give the Party a chance to discover the real mistakes and to establish the actual dimensions and the actual sources of the Right (and also the "Left") danger.

The struggle against the Right and "Left" dangers has to contend with factionalism in the Workers (Communist) Party of America and cannot be developed in a truly Bolshevik manner until this main hindrance is eliminated.

The C. I. several times requested the Party in the most decisive manner to put an end to the factional struggle. The VI. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. demanded from the Party a "complete and unconditional cessation of the factional struggle". The American Commission during the VIII. Plenum confirmed that decision. The Polit. Secretariat of the E. C. C. I. declared in April 1928 that: "it is the opinion of the E. C. C. I. that the main problem of the Party in the field of organisation is to kill all remnants of factionalism." Finally the VI. Congress decided that: "the most important task confronting the Party is to put an end to the Factional strife, which is not based on any serious differences, and at the same time, to increase the recruiting of workers into the Party and to give a definite stimulus to the promotion of workers to leading Party posts."

The existing factions must be resolutely and definitely liquidated. The factional struggle must be unconditionally stopped. Without this no mass Communist Party of the American proletariat can be organised.

This is the most urgent task of the Party. The VI. Convention of the Workers Party must categorically prohibit any further factional struggle, under threat of expulsion from the Party, and lay the foundation of a normal Party life, especially internal democracy, self-criticism and iron Party discipline, based on the unconditional subordination of the minority to the majority and an unconditional recognition of the decisions of the Comintern.

All Party members must unite their efforts for the speediest carrying out of this most urgent task.

The **Young Workers League** must not be led by any of the factional groups in the Party, its members must fight on the basis of the decisions of the Comintern and the Communist Youth International for the liquidation of factionalism and factional groupings both in the League and in the Party.

The fact that the Party has increased last year the number of its members employed in big factories by 14%, the fact that it has already come out as a staunch leader in stubborn class wars, the fact that its influence among the native workers has increased and improved, all this shows that the Party has already matured for transformation into a mass organisation. But the fact that the Party could not get more than 50,000 votes in the elections shows that its ties with the American proletariat is still weak.

The Party can become a mass proletarian Party only on condition that it **widens its base by creating its main strongholds in the ranks of the American workers, especially in the most important branches of industry, and also among the Negro workers, while at the same time retaining its positions among the revolutionary immigrant workers.**

This course on the American workers and the decisive branches of industry must run through all activities of the Party and must be laid down as the foundation of the organisation of the unorganised, the creation of new unions, the organisation of the Left Wing in the old unions, "laying thereby the basis for the actual realisation of the slogan of creation of a wide Workers' Party from below." (Resolution of the VI. Congress of the C. I.)

Four principal conditions are now essential in order that the Party may definitely enter the path leading to its transformation into a mass Communist Party, four conditions, the **decisive significance** of which neither the majority, which is responsible for the leadership, nor the minority have understood. These conditions are:

1. A correct perspective in the analysis of the general crisis of capitalism and American imperialism which is a part of it.

2. To place in the centre of the work of the Party the daily needs of the American working class and especially a) the demand for a 7-hour day and 6 hours for underground workers and those engaged in injurious trades, while exposing and waging a systematic struggle against the capitalist methods of rationalisation directed towards intensifying the exploitation of the workers; b) the demand for all forms of social insurance at the cost of the employers and the State.

3. Freeing the Party from its immigrant narrowness and seclusion and making the American workers its wide basis, paying due attention to work among the Negroes.

4. Liquidation of factionalism and drawing workers into the leadership.

The E. C. C. I. calls upon the VI. Convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America to carry out these decisive tasks.

With Communist Greetings.

Executive Committee of the Communist International.

AGAINST TROTZKYISM

The "Isvestia" on the Fight against Trotskyism.

Moscow, 19th February 1929.

The "Isvestia" declares that Trotskyism has degenerated into a real anti-soviet organisation whose attitude towards the Soviet Union is not in any way different from the attitude of any other anti-soviet organisation. In their correspondence the Trotskyists refer to the C.P. of the Soviet Union by no other name than that of "enemy". As can be seen from their most recent documents, the Trotskyists have no other enemy. Blind fury has removed the imperialists and the social democrats from their purview. The struggle against the C.P. of the Soviet Union, against the Soviet Union itself and against the Communist International, these are the basic ideas of Trotskyism.

The "Isvestia" reminds its readers of the letter of instructions of Trotsky of 21st October 1928, which was published in the organ of Maslow and other white guardist journals, and declares that the main ideas of Trotsky's new programme are the slogans of the secret ballot, strikes and the preparation of the followers of the opposition for a new civil war. This programme is extremely important for it proves that in his programme Trotsky is bearing the banner of the counter-revolution, for the white-guardists, social revolutionaries and mensheviks marched in 1921 in the Kronstadt revolt with the slogan of the secret ballot. The hope of strikes and civil war is characteristic of all the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship.

During the space of one year Trotsky and his supporters have gone through a remarkable development. In 1927 they fought against the Party under the banner of bourgeois democracy and in 1929 they are fighting against the Party and against the proletarian dictatorship under the banner of the counter-revolution — really a brilliant end!

Some of the supporters of Trotsky even speak of the necessity of arming the proletariat for the struggle against the Soviet power. However, the Trotskyists overestimate their strength. The underground Trotskyist group is with few exceptions nothing but a miserable little group of bankrupt adventurers torn by internal dissensions.

At the time of the XV Party Congress it was possible to speak of the opposition as the tool of the "Third Power" in the struggle against the dictatorship; today however, the Trotskyist organisation has become an active and subjective counter-revolutionary force whose most important task is the all-round struggle against the proletarian dictatorship. It is quite clear that the struggle against the Trotskyists must be carried out ruthlessly.

In the past year the Trotskyists have adopted the position of enemies of the Soviet Union, and therefore we can only deal with them as enemies. Proletarian public opinion must be mobilised against the Trotskyist underground organisation which must be exposed as an anti-soviet organisation striving to undermine the building up of socialism.

The Trotskyists are not in agreement amongst themselves. Some of them have raised the question, "Back to the Party!" and suggest co-operation with the Party. These people imagine that they can save the Party from the right-wing danger and imagine their return to the Party in the form of a bloc. Our Party with its millions of members does not need such assistants. Now as before, it will be able to deal with all its enemies and with all deviations from the path of Leninism. Those half-way Trotskyists must think of saving themselves before it is too late. Either they must go with the Party and with the proletariat against all its enemies, and in this case a decisive breach with the Trotskyists is necessary, or they must go against the dictatorship of the proletariat and against the Party, in which case no more need be said.

In years of struggle against Trotskyism the Party has grown and strengthened. The development and the fate of Trotskyism should serve as a warning to all anti-Leninist deviations, for all vacillations and for all comrades who deviate from the line of the Party, the only line which guarantees the victory of the proletariat.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

International Women's Day 1929

By G. G. L. Alexander.

That the banners under which the Communist International leads the working women of all countries into the great world front of the fighting proletariat bear, in the world historical hour of March 1929, almost the same slogans, as they did a year ago — the fight against imperialist war, for the Soviet Union, against the robbery of capital — does not mean that the historical hour of today does not differ, or differs but little, from that of the last Women's Day. The wheel of history turns and drives the contradictions of capitalism to their culmination. The growing internationality, the ever more rapid succession of gigantic and obstinate economic struggles, taking place under ever harder conditions, under the increasingly brutal measures enforced by the capitalist bandits on an ever higher level of exploitation and enslavement of the broad masses, develop along a zigzag line showing the crisis of capitalism, now entering its final stage.

Unbounded rationalisation: this means unbounded exploitation, unbounded expansion at the expense of health, wages, and working hours at the expense of the blood and lives of all the exploited, and especially at the expense of the cheap labour of women, and by methods and measures forcing these exploited more and more to resistance and struggle. "Capitalism gives birth to its own grave-digger, the proletariat". The character of the latest struggle on the economic front brings ample proof that the proletariat — increasingly conscious of its rôle and task as grave-digger of the capitalist state of society — is offering resistance to the capitalist offensive.

It is characteristic of these intensified class struggles, born of the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system, that in all countries the economic forces rule the State apparatus, that laws fettering the workers' organisations and paralysing the fighting powers and fighting energies of the working masses have been introduced in almost every country, and that everywhere social democrats and reformists help to make these laws and to enforce them in every individual case, in many cases not even taking the trouble to conceal their treachery (for instance during the latest struggles in Germany) beneath some swindling manoeuvre.

It is characteristic too, and new, that the social democrats and reformists are resorting more and more to that policy already adopted by the American trade union reformists, that of openly declaring the necessity of liquidating the policy of class war, and of advocating in its place the policy of industrial peace, of "economic democracy".

These tactics have been widely adopted of late by the social democrats in Germany. With their aid, carried forward from stage to stage, capitalist rationalisation has been able to emerge triumphant from every economic struggle, at the expense of the workers; with their aid proletarian activity has been paralysed by arbitration swindles and fraudulent manoeuvres of every description; with their aid even the terrorist measures of the employers have been approved and supported. But this cynical candour has unveiled the true character of all "industrial peace" between capital and labour in the eyes of the broad masses, has impressed it effectually upon their consciousness — and this again is a fresh factor of the present situation.

The methods of state Fascism on the Mussolini pattern, the methods of brutal suppression and even complete extermination of all workers' organisations, of open and intensified provocation and murder of the workers, of bloody police measures against arrested class fighters, are becoming increasingly custo-

mary in all the other capitalist countries, and are camouflaged and aided by the social democrats everywhere. This is proved by the brutalities towards Red Front Fighters, state of siege as a reply to protest movements against the murdering of workers in Germany, terrorist measures against striking workers in America, Poland and Austria.

In all the great capitalist countries the workers reply to the increasingly shameless attacks of the capitalists by more energetic and determined strike movements; to the lockout tactics of the employers by revolutionary struggles and class demonstrations, and to the political, social, and politically cultural advances of the bourgeoisie, for the exploitation and impoverishment of the workers, by united class action under the leadership of the Communist Parties.

Of all the strikes conducted of late in revolutionary forms and with revolutionary slogans, the self-sacrificing and tenacious strike of the Lodz textile workers was indubitably the most striking example. Here hundreds and thousands of strikers, led by the communists, resisted the united front of the employers, Fascists, and reformists, under the slogan of the general strike. Here, too the women workers showed their readiness to take their share, heroically and unitedly, in the undaunted defence of the revolutionary class front.

In Germany one struggle has followed another in the leading branches of industry. In the textile workers' struggle in the Ruhr district it was again the women workers, as often before, who first took up the fight, and first rose in protest against the employers' offensive, against the robbery of their wages and their leisure time.

The wives of the locked out metal workers too took an active part in the resistance, organised by the communists, against the anti-labour policy of the trade union leaders and of Severing the social democratic "arbitrator" and member of the government. Not only did they help in the organisation of the W. I. R. work in the soup kitchens, but they showed their readiness to sympathise and fight by their participation in the meetings, demonstrations, and committees of action organised by their locked out brother workers.

The gigantic strikes and lockouts in the coal industries of Pennsylvania and Colorado were again characterised by the active participation of the working women and workers' wives, a participation finding organisational expression in the founding of proletarian women's organisations in the strike districts during the strikes themselves.

The decisively important rôle played by the women workers in the textile and garment-making industries has again found proof in England, where the women took the initiative in many of the recent struggles.

In the textile workers' struggles in France, the women workers have again shown themselves, as so often in this country, to be active and determined fighters. They have marched at the heads of demonstrations, worked in the strike committees, taken part in the delegations sent to the employers, and helped to organise the relief work.

In almost every struggle, all over the world, we can observe a growing proletarian counter-offensive, an energetic self-defence along the whole line of intensified capitalist aggression, a conscious protest or at least a fermentation within the working class against the inhuman methods of capitalist rationalisation, and, since it is the women workers who suffer most severely under these methods, it is natural that we also observe their growing initiative in the economic struggles. The working women of all countries feel the full force of capitalist hunger for cheap labour, that is, for the labour of women and children, for colonial slaves, for markets for their goods and for the purchase of raw materials, and finally, for war armaments. Hunger and exploitation convert the women into fighters in the class war, make them ready to follow the leadership of the Communist Party, prepare proletarian men and women to fight together for even the so-called "women's slogans" — equal pay for equal work — "the married woman's right to earn" — and to recognise that in reality these are slogans of the common struggle of working men and women against the employers.

For in the struggle they learn that it is now more important than ever to bridge the chasms of sex and nation which have

been made to divide the workers of the world from one another, in face of the united offensive of the imperialist employers of the whole world, whose political and international expression and instrument is the League of Nations, that organisational centre, that scarcely masked general staff of the next war, the class war between the world proletariat and the world bourgeoisie.

For while the international concentration of all economic forces into concerns and cartels, into combines with common interests after the manner of the League of Nations, is one aspect of world imperialism in its striving towards its culminating point as an international power, the other aspect is the frightful tension already straining these forces, the tension between the various groups of powers, expressed in the constant and ever more openly pursued war armaments, and in the ever acuter danger of war.

But double-facedness is characteristic of imperialism; the tension among its own forces does not prevent it from combining in one front of the exploiters against the proletariat as the front of the exploited. That the attack on the proletariat involves the whole antagonism between the world front and world rule of imperialism on the one hand, and the world front of the proletariat on the other, may be seen very clearly from the constant and increasingly more frequently repeated hostile and provocative moves against the Soviet Union, as the most powerful proletarian stronghold in the world. When the imperialists, and their allies, the social democrats, speak today of securing peace, they mean war against the Soviet Union, synonymous with class war against the world proletariat as bearer and accomplice of the world revolution. Therefore the Communist International calls upon the working women of all countries, on this International Women's Day, to join the great revolutionary world front for the fight against economic exploitation and political oppression, against the threatening danger of war, and for the defence of the Soviet Union and with this the fight for the proletarian dictatorship.

The fear and hatred felt for revolution by the exploiting and owning class, their efforts to prolong their rule, find their intensest historical utterance in the deadly enmity towards the Soviet Union, this mighty creation of the proletarian world revolution which has already begun, this first State of the proletarian dictatorship and of socialist construction, this first State in which women's emancipation and women's equal rights are actually being realised. In the Soviet Union the working women defend their own present and future, their bread of today, their liberty of tomorrow.

Our Women's Day and anti-war campaign will enable the working women to understand international solidarity, the link joining their fate with the struggles for national liberation and against imperialism in China, India, Latin America, and in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The bourgeoisie mobilises the women by military laws. But this mobilisation for imperialist war can become a mobilisation for revolution — in accordance with Lenin's slogan of "turning the weapons". Precisely the working women will be forced more than ever before, in the coming imperialist war, into the war front in defence of the interests of the imperialists. It is not only that the fact of their already greatly increased participation as cheapest labour, in the rationalised process of production, will be extended to an unlimited degree in war. The next war will bring the working women increased dangers as compared with the last: The fact that warfare by means of gas and aeroplane will greatly extend the area of attack in the next war, bringing the danger zone from the frontiers into the interiors of the countries, into the great cities, and most of all into the great industrial centres, signifies that the lives of even the civil population will be endangered, especially the lives of the children. And this threat hangs above all over the heads of the women working in the war and armament industries. We must drive all these facts home to the working women, that they may be prepared to fight for their own class against the mobilisation forced upon them by the industrial lords and their agents: the bourgeois governments and their faithful henchmen, the social democrats.

The women's movement of the II. International plays its special part in the treacherous policy and tactics of social democracy towards the broad masses. The tactics of the social demo-

cratic women's movement aim at diverting the attention of the women from political questions and from questions of the class struggle. They divert the women's attention from the war danger by spreading pacifist illusions.

The International Communist Women's Day, by its mass demonstrations and actions in every country, will show that in the question of imperialist war a fundamental ideological line of demarcation divides the masses of revolutionary women from the shallow illusions and phrases about understandings between the peoples and peace among the nations, disseminated by the Locarno pacifism of social democracy and reformism. Our anti-war campaign must transform this communist realisation into conscious will to action among the broad masses of the women, convincing them that only the relentless proletarian class struggle, pursued by every means available, can avert the danger of war and defend the Soviet Union and its splendid achievements for the building up of the socialist state of society.

The bourgeois women's organisations of today signify no more and no less than the provision of an army of millions of women ready to render war service, and of these millions many are proletarian women. Leagues and associations of every description are working in their various spheres, in welfare service, vocational training, cultural and educational work, religious education, physical training up to the point of military drill. Of late these organisations have even penetrated the works and factories in order to reach the working women there.

In the face of all these facts — the fact that on the one hand the social democrats, reformists, and pacifists, are seeking to deceive the women as to the nearness of the impending war, whilst on the other hand the jingo patriots and Fascists are trying to mobilise them for war, and of the fact that alarming news comes with ever greater frequency from all parts of the world, news of aggravated conflicts between the various groups of powers, or reports of new "securities" and alliances between other groups of powers, directed obviously against the Soviet Union, whether in the form of reorganisations of industrial groups for the production of war equipment, or in the form of the discovery of fresh stores of munitions or poisonous gases, — we must devote the utmost energy to making our Women's Day campaign at the same time a comprehensive and widely visible fighting action against imperialist war, an effectual action against war danger and the war preparations of the imperialists, and for the protection of the Soviet Union.

The Third International as Awakener and Leader of the Women of the East.

By Clara Zetkin.

(Extract from a long treatise.)

The victory of the Red October, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, and the beginnings of the building up of Socialism in the Soviet Union have created for the Communist International an immense sphere of work for the emancipation and attainment of equal rights for the women of the Orient, a wide field of possibilities of activity. The fact that the proletarian revolution broke the galling chains fettering the female sex, has illuminated the darkness surrounding the women of the Near and Far East like a flaming pillar of fire in the night. They have begun to awaken from the twilight of uncounted ages. They are awakening to the realisation that they are human beings, and feel within them the urge for human rights. Capitalism, penetrating even into the East, has paved the way for the revolutionising of women, and not only by establishing close and permanent relations with the West. Capitalist commerce destroys the old productive household economy, and therewith the family as the economic unit. The capitalist industrialisation of the East brings with it the intensest exploitation of female labour. Great masses of women are removed from economic dependence on the family, and from the family itself. But the capitalist employer — alike whether

native or foreign — substituting his sovereign power for this dependence, does not help to put an end to the social and legal enslavement of the female sex by the patriarchal family and the privileges of the man. On the contrary, he utilises the woman's position to squeeze out more surplus value, combining the latest methods of modern production with the powers of enslavement bequeathed him by an ancient state of society.

We see that a woman's rights movement of a bourgeois character has gained partial success in Persia, India, Japan, China, and especially in Turkey. This has not, however, overthrown the main pillar supporting the general enslavement of women, and above all it has failed to penetrate into those sunless social depths where the actual power and tradition of ancestral economic and social conditions, of religious rules and delusions, increase beyond endurance the misery of the exploited and subjugated masses of women. The Communist International, fully realising the far-reaching importance of the revolutionising of the women of the East for the national struggles against imperialism and for the world revolution of the proletariat, has not shrunk from the extremely difficult task of including in its aims the struggle for the complete emancipation and equal rights of the women of the Near and Far East. In these countries its national Sections courageously and devotedly take the lead, in the advance towards this goal. It is bringing to the working and peasant women the realisation that woman is not to be the servant of the desires and the beast of burden of the man, nor a profit-making machine for the rich and powerful. It is showing them the path to the conquest of free human rights. It is transforming passive patience and secret longing into fighting determination and fighting power.

The work done by the young Communist Party of China is exemplary in this respect. It has awakened the idea of the liberation of the female sex to active fighting vitality among great masses of working women — factory workers, peasants, proletarian and petty bourgeois housewives, intellectuals. It has at the same time succeeded in imparting to the struggle for woman's rights an extent and impetus which the bourgeois women's movement has failed to do. A few facts out of the plenitude of proofs of this:

In 1927 a women's conference was held at Hupeh, opened on 8th March as an International Women's Congress. Delegates sent by organised women of all classes took part in the conference, including 22 representatives of working women. The conference opened its sessions by sending greetings to the Women's Secretariat of the Communist International in Moscow. The first sentence of the programme of action drawn up by the conference read: "Revolution is the only way to the emancipation of woman". The women were further called upon to take part conjointly with the men in the revolutionary struggles.

The magnificence of this conference pales, however, before the dry figures which state that, in April 1927, 325,000 working women were organised in trade unions in five provinces in South China; that in the provinces of Hunan and Kwantung 140,000 peasant women were members of the peasants' unions, and that in Hunan the women's associations had approximately 200,000 members of different social strata. These figures are not merely statistics on paper. The history of the revolutionary struggles proves this. In the glorious strike and insurrection-movement at Shanghai on 8th March, 1926, working women fought and fell in the front ranks, and they did not fail to take part in the gigantic demonstration celebrating the anniversary of these events in 1927.

In China, as in all countries of the East, the Communist International finds a powerful ally in its struggle for the complete emancipation of the female sex. This is the great work of women's emancipation accomplished by the proletarian revolution in the Republics and autonomous regions of the East and the Soviet Union and in Central Asia. That the proletarian revolution has here raised the vendible chattel woman to the position of a human being with full rights, emerging unveiled from the closeness and confinement of the women's apartments into public life — this actuality, undreamt of by the women of the East, is recruiting armies of hopeful fighters and death-defying combatants among the masses of women.

The idea of international solidarity, of alliance with the sisters and brothers of all nations, races, and confessions, fighting for the same aim, acts with the power of a religious faith upon those who share it. Hundreds and thousands of women are pressing forward to the new Easter conference which will help them to their place in humanity. In these women there lie latent immeasurable resources and stores of energy, hitherto unable to find an outlet. Once released, this energy will expand with irresistible force, like a stream long ice-bound, but breaking forth at last from its icy thrall and sweeping away the dams in its path. It is the task of the Communist International to guide this force into the channels of the World Revolution, where it may shatter the old and create the new. The task is enormous, as is also the responsibility for its fulfilment.

Women Advancing in the C. P. of Great Britain.

Their Part in the X. Party Congress.

By Phyllis Neal.

The development of the work of the Communist Party of Great Britain among women during the past year was reflected to a considerable extent at the X. Congress of the Party, held January 19—22; not so much in the number of women delegates attending, as in the participation of those delegates in the deliberation of the Congress and the attention given by the Congress as a whole to the women's aspect of every question.

The number of women attending with deliberative votes was 9, out of a total of 131 delegates with deliberative votes. The number with consultative votes was 15, out of a total of 100 consultative votes. The total of women delegates was thus 24 out of 231. Of these, 5 were from women from industry, 6 in commercial and professional work, 8 housewives and 4 functionaries. The strongest representation was from London and near districts (10), by reason of the poverty and unemployment prevailing in the industrial centres of the North and the coal-fields of South Wales, Scotland and the Midlands, which forbade the payment of heavy travelling expenses. Nevertheless there were present women from Lancashire (cotton textile district) 3; from Nottingham and Derby (region of mining, lace, hosiery and artificial silk manufacture), 2; and one each from the Scottish coal-field, the South Wales coal-field, Glasgow (textile, metal works, and shipbuilding), Sheffield (steel), and Birmingham (area of iron, pottery, railway works and home industries such as making of cheap jewelry and toys).

A woman comrade, Lily Webb, of Wigan (textile area), was elected to the Presidium, and one (Kath Duncan of London) to the Political Commission of the Congress. The elections to the C. E. C. resulted in the return of three women, where formerly was only one: Helen Crawford (re-elected), Beth Turner (national woman's organiser) and Marjorie Pollitt.

In almost every important discussion before the Congress women delegates took part: upon the international and national situation and the general tasks of the Party; upon the tactical questions arising from the new policy of the Party in relation to the Labour Party; upon trade union work; upon organisational questions; as well as upon the special item of work among women.

To the last question the Plenum of the Congress devoted about an hour and a quarter, appointing at the same time a commission of men and women delegates, to examine in detail the thesis on work among women, and to receive also all other questions and proposals connected with this part of the Party's work.

The thesis in its final form examined the economic and political character of the present period, from the point of view of its effects upon the life of working class women. It placed before the whole Party, men and women members, alike, the tasks: Mobilise the working class women against the capitalist offensive and against the imperialist war preparations; recruit the working women to the Party and the trade unions. In the

series of concrete measures enumerated for the carrying out of these tasks, the first importance was given to women in industry, especially in the potential war industries; and prominence was given to the development of delegate meetings and to winning the support of working women for the Party's policy and programme in the approaching Parliamentary Election.

The reporter upon this item in the Plenum, Comrade Beth Turner, was followed by seven speakers (five women and two men), only lack of time preventing many more who were desirous of speaking. It was very noticeable that the comrades who participated in the discussion spoke out of considerable practical experience in this work. Chief attention was given to the very big and urgent work (of which the Party is as yet only at the beginning) which must be carried out in the chemical and artificial silk industries; the already great, and still increasing, introduction of women into the metal industries; the struggles in the cotton industry; the importance of unemployed women; the necessity to avoid the mistake of neglecting the worker's wife while giving the greatest measure of attention to women in industry. An intensified fight against the women reformist leaders was called for; and a repeated demand was made for thorough training of women members and their advancement to responsible posts.

The reports upon the Party's work among women gave evidence that the principal success of the past year was the extension of Communist influence over wide circles of non-Party women, in the mass organisations, by means of united front activities under the proclaimed leadership of the Party; as for example in the campaign for International Women's Day, and the campaign against imperialist war, out of which arose the delegation of 50 working women to the U. S. S. R. On the other hand, they revealed wherein lies its greatest shortcoming at present: in the slight extent to which this movement has drawn in the women in the factories.

To sum up: the Party will go forward from the 10th Congress with a yet wider appreciation of the revolutionary importance of winning the masses of working class women; with a knowledge of its present strength and weakness in this field, and of the forces within its ranks which can be developed and made more efficient; with a clear picture of the next tasks, and concrete plans for fulfilling them.

Women of the British Farms.

By A. K.

The peasant woman, working upon a plot of land which belongs to her family, so familiar a figure in most countries, is practically unknown in England. In Ireland there are some 57,000 of them, and a few in remote parts of Scotland. But in England the land is almost entirely cultivated by farmers who rent it from the great landlords and work it by means of wage-labour. It is capitalistic farming.

The agricultural labourer, toiling early and late, earns a wage of between 20/- and 30/- a week — seldom more than the latter. In some cases he may receive in addition grass for a cow, milk or potatoes, but never sufficient to afford his family more than a miserable level of subsistence.

Usually the cottage in which they live belongs to the farm. They may therefore only occupy it so long as the man works for that particular farmer: should he for any reason be dismissed, they will be not only foodless, but homeless. And not only are these village workers economically at the mercy of the farmers, so that it is dangerous to show an independent spirit, but the landlord has already taken care, through the medium of the village school and church, that their ideas shall be moulded as far as he can ensure it to submission and reverence for his power.

The life of the labourer's wife may then be easily imagined. Wretchedly poor, living in a cottage that is small, usually dilapidated, with no sanitary arrangements, in many cases without water, it is impossible to give her children a healthy upbringing. Passing through a country village, the traveller,

expecting to see bonny, rosy-cheeked women and children meets instead pale, sickly children and young women already lined and haggard. To supplement the husband's pittance women and children work in the fields as "extra hands" certain seasons, for example, at harvest, potato-lifting, turnip thinning, and so on, at very low wages. The education authorities allow the children to be absent from school for this purpose, or even in some districts close the schools when the children work. The wife in the intervals of her other work will probably rear fowls and sell the eggs, cultivate her own little garden, and if the farmer allows it, keep a cow or a calf.

Her daughter will probably not remain at school even until the age of 14, as the children of town workers usually do. Her parents will be obliged by their poverty to apply for her release as soon as she is 12 years old. If she remains in the countryside she will become a servant on one of the farms, rising at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning to get men off to their work in the fields, slaving all day at cleaning, milking, baking, etc., and going to sleep late in the evening in an attic or out-building. Her wages will be between 4/- or 5/- a week, paid at intervals of three months, with food in addition. Out of this she must buy her own clothes, and possibly send a little help for her parents and young brothers and sisters.

Or else in some little town near by may be set up one of the great factories connected with the newer industries (such as, for example, artificial silk) in which the employers prefer to avoid the industrial centres where there is some tradition of trade union organisation. Here she will be set to work on machines that are run at ever-increasing speed for a wage which represents shameless exploitation, but which she struggles every nerve to retain, because it appears to her a good wage in comparison with wages on the farms.

Among the agricultural labourers of Scotland and Ireland conditions are very similar, except that there the girls are hired by the farmers at periodical fairs — usually every six months. Wages are much the same, or even slightly lower in Ireland. The questions usually asked by Irish women offered themselves for hire are: "Will I get the same food as the farmer's family?" "Will I sleep in the house or in the barn?" "Will I get time free on Sunday to go to church?"

Although they have shown great heroism in the national struggle, the country women of Ireland have as yet hardly begun to take an active part in the class struggle. And in the agricultural workers in general, by reason of their "isolation" and surroundings, are the most backward section of the working class of Great Britain and Ireland. They have few opportunities for association and interchange of ideas; they come to the workers in the great centres; it is not easy for revolutionary propaganda to reach them; and the influence of the church is powerfully exercised.

Only through revolutionary action together with the industrial workers can these women look for release from the slavery of the countryside. Only a revolutionary workers' government, by taking the land from the big owners, making it accessible to the country worker, encouraging co-operative working, assisting by instruction in scientific methods, credits, etc., organising state farms, with good conditions of work controlled by an agricultural workers' trade union, can open the way to their emancipation.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The Session of the Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance.

By E. Varyas (Moscow).

The 7th and 8th of February saw the session, at Prague, of the International Co-operative Alliance. Besides the report by the General Secretary and the financial report for 1928, the agenda included the report of the Commission for Reorganising the Agenda of the Congress, and reports by the Economic Commission, the Statistical Commission, and the like.

General interest centred on the session of the special commission entrusted with the working out of a programme for the economic activity of the Alliance.

Even prior to the session these questions were discussed by the co-operative press. Thus, in an article in the central organ of the Alliance, Professor Gide attempted to prove that the principle of class struggle was out of date and must be replaced by co-operation between workers and employers. He denied the class character of the task of the consumers co-operatives, supporting his arguments by a reference to the change allegedly brought about in the composition of the membership by a greater accretion from better situated circles. In an article published in the same columns, May, Secretary of the Alliance, openly took the part of the cartels and trusts, which, he declared, had undoubtedly rendered the consumer valuable services in the direction of price-stabilisation, while in certain instances contributing to an improvement of working conditions. He opposed those members of the co-operatives who found it necessary to fight against the monopolist trusts and cartels, seeing that, in his opinion, this did not come within the scope of the task the Alliance was intended to fulfil. Tanner, Chairman of the Alliance, laid stress on the advisability of a co-ordination of the activity of the Alliance with that of the respective organ of the League of Nations.

In summing up these three points of view, we obtain the following factors: a) Renunciation by the co-operative movement of the principle of class struggle. b) Denial of the class character of the tasks facing the co-operatives. c) Necessity of co-operation by the Alliance with the economic organs of the League of Nations, by the national co-operative organisations with their bourgeois Governments, and by the workers with their employers. d) Recognition of the "useful" rôle played by the monopolist cartels and trusts in the improvement of working conditions.

The motions put forward in the Commission by the representatives of the various national organisations, practically coincide in the matter of their contents with the points of view outlined above. Owing to the war, the revolution, and post-war occurrences, the Western European co-operative ideology has abandoned the former Utopian theory of a peaceful transformation of the existing capitalist order of society into a Socialist order by means of the co-operatives and has passed over to a conception of the co-operatives as integral parts of the capitalist system. This appears quite clearly from the above theoretic reflections and their practical application.

Reformism now regards the co-operatives merely as organs for the distribution of goods in a manner advantageous to the consumer, but as nothing more.

While at former Congresses of the Alliance the reformist standpoint was repudiated by the Italians (Vergnani), Belgians (Anseele), and French (the Guesdistes), who insisted on the class character of the co-operatives, we now see a complete uniformity of opinions among West-European co-operative leaders on the fundamental questions of the rôle and object of the co-operative system. At the Prague Congress, it was only Comrade Kissin, representing the Soviet co-operatives, who opposed the suggestions which aimed at turning the co-operatives into a purely commercial organisations.

The declaration made at the Alliance meeting by Comrade Kissin in the name of the Soviet co-operatives,* sets forth the standpoint of the members of Soviet co-operatives as to the true tasks of the consumers co-operatives under capitalist conditions. The declaration furnishes an exact idea of the real tasks of co-operatives and repudiates the reformist standpoint. Starting from the fact that the co-operatives are organisations of the working class, it argues that not only must the requirements of the workers in the character of consumers be taken into consideration but that relief must also be extended to the workers in the case of strikes, unemployment, lockouts, political persecution, and the like. The declaration goes on to point out that under capitalist conditions, with the means of production concentrated in the hands of the capitalist class, the rôle of the co-operatives and their significance for the workers must necessarily be greatly limited and that the co-operatives could hope to fulfill their real mission — that of one of the main factors in the development of Socialism — only after the transference of power into the hands of the workers and peasants. The declaration concludes by analysing the position of the consumers co-operatives and the forces and tendencies influencing their development, and seeks means for the improvement of their activity and for the better protection of their interests, starting from an analysis of the position of the working class which is the actual presumption for the existence of consumptive co-operatives.

The Soviet co-operatives once formulated the tasks of the Alliance, starting from the principle of class struggle, from the necessity of a co-operation of the Alliance with the proletarian organisations which really protect the standard of living of the workers, for peace and against the danger of war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, for the liberation of the colonial peoples, for the destruction of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism.

The Prague session led on the one hand to a clearer understanding of the new orientation of the West-European leaders as to what are the rôle and the actual object of the co-operatives under capitalist conditions; on the other hand, this session served to set forth the standpoint of the greatest co-operative movement, isolated within the Alliance in its insistence on class-warfare, the standpoint of that co-operative system which is the greatest in the world, which has developed under circumstances of a proletarian dictatorship and which now represents an important factor in Socialist construction.

TEN YEARS OF THE COMINTERN

The Tenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Comintern.

By M. Jablonski (Moscow).

Ten years have passed since the best representatives of the international revolutionary proletariat, rallying to the call of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, gathered together in the Red Capital of the first workers' State to lay the foundations of the "new revolutionary International". They were not numerous, these foreign delegates to the first world conference of the Communists, who stood for the platform of Bolshevism; but the ideological force with which they were supported made the whole capitalist world quake. For this was the power which arose out of the imperialist war and of the October Revolution, which in consistently triumphant advance won over the vanguard of the working class, who defended it with great sacrifice and suffering, with the blood of such fighters of the proletarian struggle for emancipation as Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and thousands of unknown heroes.

The days from the 2nd to the 7th of March, 1919, on which the first Congress of the Comintern sat under the chairmanship

* The full text of this declaration will be published in the next regular number of the "Inprecorr".

of Lenin and proclaimed the battle-cries of the world revolution, are an important date in the history of humanity.

The class fight of the proletariats in the whole world took on new forms, forms of the real revolutionary insurrections against international capital. It assumed fresh fundamental content, represented by the conviction that the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and destroying the bourgeois State is no longer a more or less distant future dream but an actuality on the order of the day. In a word: the changing of the fundamental forms of the proletarian fight and the changing of its main content was summed up and expressed in those two leading principles laid down by the first congress in its resolutions: the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the Soviets as its form, as the form in which democracy for the working class, democracy for all workers, is most practically and concretely realised.

In these two principles or, rather, in this one single principle — for the Soviet Power is the realisation of proletarian dictatorship — lies the fundamental historical significance of the Communist International, "its place and its role" in the fight for the emancipation of the working class and of the whole of humanity from economic exploitation and political bondage. In his famous article "The III. International and its Place in History" Lenin points out the insoluble relationship between the founding of the Comintern and the creation of the Soviet Union, the common path of the fight which must be followed by them to achieve the overthrow of world capitalism. In this connection Lenin says:

"Formally the III. International was founded at its first congress in March, 1919, in Moscow. And the characteristic feature of the III. International, — its vocation to fulfil Marx's testament and convert it into life, and to realise the eternal ideals of Socialism and of the Labour movement — this characteristic feature of the III. International found expression from the start, for the new, the third, "International Labour Association" immediately began to coincide in a certain measure with the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics."

Lenin supplements this thought in the following explanation:

"The international federation of the parties, which command the most revolutionary movement in the world, i. e. the movement of the proletariat for the overthrow of capitalist dominion, now has a special and, as far as its completeness is concerned, an unparalleled basis: several Soviet Republics, which embody on an international scale the dictatorship of the proletariat and its victory over capitalism."

When Lenin wrote these lines the Hungarian Soviet Republic existed side by side with the triumphant Soviet State of the Russian proletariat, and in this strengthening of the foundations of the international revolution, in this extension of its basis, the clearest expression was given to the fact that the Communist International is not only a child of the October of 1917 but organiser and creator of the world October, the pledge of the final victory of the proletariat in the whole world.

The words of Lenin, that the revolutionary world party possesses a firm foundation in the existence of the Soviet Republics, confirm and further develop Marx' thought that the proletariat attains the greatest degree and the highest form of the intensified class struggle only when the workers of individual countries succeed in seizing the power. It is only then that the victorious proletariat, holding its position as the ruling class, can ruthlessly suppress all resistance on the part of the exploiting class in its country and at the same time develop its leadership among all workers and among the oppressed masses. This victory of the proletariat in one country

(or in individual countries) forms the centre about which all national and class conflicts of the new epoch of world history will have to gather.

For this reason the creation and the existence of the first proletarian State in the world arise from the same causes as the existence and the whole course of development of the Communist International. The two are, therefore, inseparably associated not only by reason of the fact that they both, by their very existence, deny the whole capitalist world in opposing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat and the bourgeois system of exploitation by the system of Social construction; they are also the representatives of a uniform process of world revolution, for every class struggle, irrespective of the particular country or part of the world in which it breaks out, is governed not only by the domestic conditions of the particular country but chiefly by the state of the fight waged by world capitalism against the Soviet Union, as the stronghold of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world and as the outpost of all oppressed and exploited peoples.

This also means that whoever fights for the basic principles of the Communist International must also fight for the Soviet Union, and, conversely, the whole history of the international Labour movement shows that all who oppose the October Revolution must be regarded as the worst enemies of the Comintern. An illustration of this indisputable fact is that every renegade from Communism, every deserter from the Comintern, is a manifest adversary of the Soviet Union and the worst of calumniators of the Proletarian Power. It is quite unnecessary to give examples. The whole course of the development of all renegade groups and tendencies, which have been expelled from the Comintern, shows that in the end every fight against the Comintern leads to a fight against the Soviet Union and to a counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet attitude. All rightward and "leftward" deviations from the Comintern proved this indisputably.

For, as Lenin pointed out, the splits which to-day take place within the Labour movement are no longer the same as they were in the past, for instance, like the splits which took place before the war in Social Democracy and among the Anarchists, but are of a nature which bears upon the very meaning of our historic epoch: "for or against the proletarian dictatorship".

The interpretation of this simple formula is: "for or against the Comintern, for or against the Soviet Union". There is no third.

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Comintern all honest revolutionary proletarians, all oppressed and toiling masses, in celebrating the founding of the Communist World Party, which is destined to put an end to the whole capitalist order, to exploitation and subjugation will remember that the Soviet Union is a child of the Comintern and that it was only under the slogans of Leninism that the Russian proletariat was able to complete its emancipation. They will remember that the Communist International is also a child of October. Only then will they fully realise that it is only under the banner of the Comintern that the revolutionary proletariat can defend its "homeland", "the homeland of all toilers", and that the world dictatorship of the proletariat, the world union of Socialist Soviet republics, can only be realised under the banner of the Comintern. For the world-historic significance of the III. International lies in the fact that it began to translate into reality the great slogan of Marx, the slogan which epitomises the century-old development of Socialism, the slogan which is expressed in the idea of the "dictatorship of the Proletariat".

— — — "A new epoch of world revolution began."

The C. P. of Germany and the International.

The C. P. G., the Rights and the Conciliators.

Full Text of Speech Delivered by Comrade Gushev at the Meeting of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. on December 19th 1928.

Comrades, the Political Secretariat of the E. C. C. I., as Comrade Kuusinen has already announced, has appointed a commission to look into the question of the alternate members of the C. C. C. P. G. — Hausen and Galm. That commission examined a number of factional Right documents and the detailed explanations given by Comrades Hausen and Galm and on this basis drew up a draft resolution. In that resolution we had to dwell upon the whole political platform of the Rights and also the activities of Brandler and Thalheimer. We condemned minor leaders of the Right faction only because they happened to be alternate members of the Central Committee of the German Party and kept silent in our resolutions over the activities of Brandler and Thalheimer who are the true leaders of the Right faction. That is the first fact. Secondly, we could not take up the question of the Right danger in the German Party in its full scope as decided on by the Politsecretariat, and ignored the question of the conciliatory attitude toward the Right tendency.

That is why the limits of the work of the Commission were extended, the two Commissions of the Politsecretariat on the German question were amalgamated and the result of their joint work was two draft letters — an Open and a Closed Letter to the Communist Party of Germany, which have been sent out to the members of the Presidium.

Why have we added to the Open Letter a section appertaining to the conciliators?

We did that not only because the conciliators in general, at all times and in all climates, constitute a certain element belonging to the Right tendency, but also because the German conciliators at the present time stand between the Party and the Right Faction as a buffer which restrains and moderates the blows delivered to the Rights by the Party. The conciliators impede the struggle against the Right danger, hamper the Party in that struggle, in some cases they openly defend the Rights and paralyse the struggle of the Party against them.

To overcome the conciliators is therefore one of the elements of the struggle against the Right danger and in this sense a systematic struggle against them constitutes one of the indispensable elements of the struggle against the Right danger. That is why we had to insert a section on the conciliators in the Open Letter on the Right danger in the Communist Party of Germany.

What has happened in the Communist Party of Germany during the period of October 6 and the middle of December? In my mind this could be briefly formulated as follows:

1. The Rights organised with extraordinary rapidity their faction, extensively developed their factional activity and openly adopted a hostile attitude towards the Party and the Comintern.

2. During the same period, the conciliators have also assumed an offensive against the majority of the Party and took the position of a loyal opposition in the Party, in which connection their recent activities begin to assume an openly hostile factional character.

The political platform of the Rights consists of a negative and a positive part. The negative part includes a repudiation of the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. and the VI. Congress of the Comintern, including the Programme. The positive side consists of the theory of transitional slogans in the transition period as opposed to the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. and the VI. Congress of the Comintern (concretely, their slogan is: control over production at the present time), plus some Trotskyist ideas on the organisational question with some corrections concerning German Social Democratic practice.

The Open Letter stigmatises the platform of the Rights as a Left Social Democratic platform. It also enumerates the chief points of the political platform of the Rights. But I think it would be beneficial to us to take up this political platform as laid down by Brandler himself. In his outline, there are certain original shadings which cannot be left out of consideration. Brandler delivered a speech at a Party meeting at Offenbach which was attended also by students. A report on that speech

was published in the "Volksrecht", No. 6, Nov. 1923. Here is the outline of the platform as published in that paper on the basis of Brandler's speech.

Thesis 1: August 1923, marked the culminating point of the mass labour movement against hunger and against the high cost of living. The mistake in the evaluation of the political situation of the time consisted in the fact that the position of the bourgeoisie was considered to be hopeless and it was believed that the bourgeoisie will be unable to stop the inflation and to stabilise the mark. The masses were then really backing the Communist Party. Brandler, who then went to Moscow, disagreed with the members of the E. C. C. I. and believed that to go over from the defensive against the Fascist attacks to an independent offensive, would considerably undermine the sympathy of the masses towards the Party.

Thesis 2: The Party was so "enthused and militarised" in October, that it did not observe the coming "depressing moods of the masses".

Thesis 3: Brandler kept silent until now on the October events because he did not want to provide the prosecutor with material prior to the amnesty. Now, after the amnesty, he speaks openly of his conferences in Moscow with the Russian comrades, headed by Trotsky, concerning the setting up of, and preparation for, fixed dates on which to deliver an "armed blow" (bewaffnetes losschlagen) and concerning "illegal imports of Russian grain" to Saxony.

Thesis 4: Brandler kept silent before the amnesty because he did not want to provide the prosecutor with information, but after the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I., the secret agreement between the Russian and German delegations and the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern he can no longer keep silent.

Thesis 5: To abide by these decisions in the sphere of trade union activity would be disastrous for all Communist Parties in the capitalist countries.

Thesis 6: The present Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany has returned, as a result of the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., to the old Ruth Fischer position, but has done so inconsistently and drawn no logical conclusion concerning the need for the organisation of new unions.

Thesis 7: The Party has become a barrack.

Thesis 8: It is a grave error to leave out the transitional demands from the Programme. Precisely, the question of industrial democracy, brought forward by the Social Democrats, who want to direct the instinctive desire of the workers for mutual aid along the lines of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, the slogan of control of production.

This is exactly what we have many a time asserted, namely, that Brandler applies this transitional slogan to the present non-transitional period.

Thesis 9: The differences existing in the C. P. S. U. are being artificially transferred to the other Parties.

Thesis 10: It is clear that the Party which has already accomplished the revolution, leads the revolutionary international. However, it is fatal that there is no other Party in the Comintern of equal descent with the Russian Party.

If we were to combine all the ten theses into one, we could formulate it thus: The C. P. S. U. is to blame for the defeat of the German revolution in 1923. Now in 1928, the C. P. S. U. leads all Parties through the Comintern along Ruth Fischer's lines and towards catastrophe. Brandler & Co., however, have a miraculous means of saving them, and that is, control of production right now.

Such is the meaning of the philosophy of the political platform of the Rights as enunciated by Brandler. The beginning and the end of the platform, namely, the emphasis on the question of the C. P. S. U. sounds very suspicious. I am afraid, on the basis of ample experience, that anyone who starts with enunciations against the C. P. S. U. ends with attacks against the U. S. S. R. I am afraid that Brandler will end in the same

way. I make no assertion; I do not predict, I simply express a fear.

Now that we have settled with the political platform, we shall take up the question of the factional activities of the Rights. I will be as brief as possible, although the activities were extensive. The factional activities of Hausen and Galm have been dealt with in the Open Letter, so that the comrades can get information through it. They lead the factional work in the Breslau and Offenbach organisations, publish factional papers and carry on various other factional activity. They have close relations with Thalheimer and Brandler, as has been established by the Commission. They wrote, together with Thalheimer & Co., the famous Open Letter to the Comintern. Further, the factional work of Brandler and Thalheimer has been characterised in a resolution in the last Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, passages of which I will quote here. I have not got the decision with me, but I have the draft. Judging by the telegram published in "Pravda" and judging by the despatch received from the Central Committee of the German Party, no important alterations have been made in the draft. Let me read the first half of that draft:

"The Central Committee calls the attention of the Party and the E. C. C. I. to the hostile work of the ex-members of the C. P. G. now members of the C. P. S. U. — Heinrich Brandler and August Thalheimer. Under their leadership, the Right liquidatory group has lately resorted to most profound provocative acts, in the process of which the Rights openly declare that they consider the aim and object of their activity to be to damage greatly the Communist movement. In doing this, they resort to such methods as slander of the Communist International and the C. P. G.; they carry on propaganda against the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Comintern and the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. in violation of Party discipline and try, by means of factional meetings and conferences and publication of papers, bulletins, proclamations and abusive pamphlets directed against the Party, by means of supplying the Social Democratic and bourgeois press with material directed against the C. P. G., and by means of a complete rupture with the most elementary principles of Party discipline, to cause confusion and decomposition in the Party.

"The hostility of their activities is particularly to be found in the following most decisive acts which have lately been undertaken by them to the detriment of the Party and to the interests of the bourgeoisie.

"1. The Right liquidators have circulated in Offenbach-on-Main, among other things, a proclamation 'to the working population of Offenbach', entitled 'Differences in the Communist Party'. This has been widely circulated in the streets, at factory gates and even through the bourgeois and Social Democratic press. The main slogan in that proclamation is 'Remove Thälmann from his Post', for which purpose the 'working people of Offenbach and the vicinity' are called for a joint struggle against the "decadent C. P. G."

"2. In November, Brandler spoke at a meeting in Offenbach, devoted to the anniversary of the revolution. That meeting was organised by the then local committee of the organisation, which consisted of Rights, in spite of the categorical and published decision of the district committee.

"3. The Right liquidators in Offenbach have resorted to disruptive measures, in the direct meaning of that term, by sequestering membership dues and issuing their own dues' stamps.

"4. During the municipal elections in Stuttgart, the Right group ordered to have its list of candidates printed in 12,000 copies in the printing office of the Social Democratic "Tagwacht". That list contained Right candidates and was designated as a Communist list with the inscription, Communist Party, as a means of deceiving the working class electors. These candidate lists were sent out to members of the metal workers' union and partly to members of other organisations where they still hold some positions and distribute them in front of the buildings where elections were being held. Thus, in this case the Right faction has come out quite openly against the C. P. G. in the elections as a second party, and in order to confuse the electors it misused the name of the Communist Party."

Finally, to finish with the factional work of the Rights I should mention Enderle's trip to the Ruhr district. He went there

during the strike with the special object of securing information which would discredit the Party's activities in the Ruhr. He apparently had no other object in view. This is seen from the correspondence which Hausen presented as anonymous material at the session of the commission, which was later published in the "Volksrecht", also anonymously. Comrade Remmele declared at a meeting of the district committee of Berlin that Enderle was the author of that correspondence. Enderle's correspondence in the "Volksrecht" is of a typical Menshevik type and thoroughly hostile to the Party. It contains not a sign of success of the Party. It does nothing but slanderously criticise the Party's work in the Ruhr. Here, for instance is, what he says: "The information given in the Party press on the events in the Ruhr gives an absolutely false picture and, what is still worse it does so deliberately."

Here is another point. He says: "The meetings at which the 'committees of struggle' were elected (he puts the words committees of struggle ironically in quotation marks) were almost in every case attended by a dwindling minority" ("Von einer verschwindenden Minderheit"). I could not find a better translation.

On the manner in which the committees of struggle were elected, Enderle wrote just the opposite of what was written by the representatives of the C. C., especially by Comrade Merker, who stayed in the Ruhr as long as the struggle lasted.

Enderle's correspondence is not the correspondence of a Communist, but of an enemy of the Communist Party, a Menshevik, a Social Democrat. There is no other way of describing him. Such correspondence during the struggle in the Ruhr and the enunciation of similar Menshevik views against the Party in the factional "Gegen den Strom" and the vicious agitation against the new strike strategy — these constitute criminal sabotage of the Ruhr activities of the Party, bordering on downright strike breaking.

All enumerated facts of the factional work of the Rights show that their faction is rapidly and unavoidably leading to the formation of a party within the Communist Party, that the faction is becoming ever more hostile in its attitude toward the Communist Party of the Comintern, that it already stands with one foot outside the Party, that it is about to destroy the last bridges which still unite it with the Party.

The question as to how to treat such a faction and what to do with its leaders, would not be so very difficult to settle if there had been no conciliators standing between the Party and that faction, who exert their efforts to prevent the enforcement of the necessary decisive measures in relation to the Rights by the Party. We must therefore investigate the position occupied by the conciliators on the question of the struggle against the Rights, the question of their attitude to the Rights and to the majority of the Party. I have already indicated at the beginning of my speech that since October 6, the conciliators have assumed the offensive against the majority of the Party and that their recent attacks assume a factional character.

There are two documents of the conciliators which are most indicative in this respect: 1. the so-called political platform of the conciliators, entitled "On the Differences in the Execution of the Decisions of the VI. Congress", signed by Ewert, Dietrich and others. It was submitted to the Politbureau on the 5th or 6th of December. 2. The document entitled "A Statement on the Question of the Situation within the Party". That statement is signed by Ewert and Meyer and was submitted to the C. C. Session of the December 14. We received it yesterday and could not distribute it.

Let us analyse these two documents. First on the platform of the conciliators. The platform launches an attack against the present Party leadership and its political line. The task of the platform is expressed in its very last line, where it says that "the present Party policy is disastrous". The task of the platform is to prove that the present Party course is disastrous. Parallel with this I could show also that Hausen and Galm start their statement by saying "the Communist Party of Germany is on the verge of a precipice". They also refer to the inner-Party course. The manifesto of the Rights in the first issue of "Gegen den Strom", published by Hausen, says on the subject that the present course of the Communist Party Germany is disastrous and that the Party is on the verge of ruin. In criticising the present political line of the Party, the Rights and the conciliators, as is seen from their platform, have the same point of departure — the incorrect evaluation of the nature of the present stabilisation of capitalism.

I am not going to analyse this question. I have no time for that. But I will simply point out what is said on this question in the Open Letter sent out to the members of the residuum. The Open Letter says:

"This view (i. e., the incorrect idea of the stability of stabilisation), is typical of the Rights, and the conciliators, in giving an estimate of the perspectives, are absolutely closer to the Rights than to the estimates given in the resolution of the VI. Congress of the C. I."

This uniformity in the starting point of the Rights and the conciliators, finds the clearest expression in the main formula of the conciliators' platform which speaks of "struggle on two fronts — both against the Rights and against the internal policy of the C. C."

You know that the VI. Congress adopted a formula of struggle against the Right and Left deviations from Leninism. In the draft open letter it is pointed out that the conciliators' formula does not correspond to the formula of the VI. Congress. We recall that point from the draft letter. It speaks here of the conciliators' platform. It says that

"the slogans of the VI. Congress of the Comintern on the struggle on two frontiers — the Rights as well as the 'Lefts', are displaced by a new slogan of 'struggle on two frontiers — both against the Rights and against the internal policy of the C. C.'. Thus the concentration against the Right and Left deviations from Leninism, proclaimed by the VI. Congress of the Comintern, is substituted by the conciliators by a concentration against the Rights (in words) and against the Leninist line of the C. P. G. (in deeds)."

I am not going to deal with this side of the question. I should like to point out another feature characteristic of this attitude, namely, if the conciliators who claim to represent the VI. Congress better than the Thälmann group, if they want to bring into full harmony their formula with the formula of the VI. Congress, they should have said that the "struggle against the inner-course of the C. C." is a struggle against the "Left" or "ultra-Left" deviation of the Party majority. But this they dare not say. In the platform there is actually not even a hint to this effect. It is otherwise with Comrade Humbert-Droz, who said here from the platform at the Communist Party of Germany is now pursuing an ultra-Left course. This is exactly what the Rights say. I can give a number of passages from various documents of the Rights. Bassumer's statement, Hausen's statement and Brandler's statement speaking of the Ruth Fischer policy of the C. P. G. show you that the conciliators and the Rights agree on this point. The uniformity in the starting point of the Rights and the conciliators is expressed precisely in the fact that they hurl the same political accusation against the Party, an accusation of the Party's Left and ultra-Left deviation. Until lately, the conciliators have not carried their criticism to its logical conclusion, they did not speak of the ultra-Left deviation, but in the latest documents, as we shall see in a few moments, they have made considerable progress along these lines and have come fairly close to the position taken here by Comrade Humbert-Droz.

The German conciliators do not carry their criticism to the end also on other questions, but they criticise the Party on the same points as the Rights, and their criticism tends towards the same direction.

I will take one question as an example, namely, the criticism of the Party's tactics in the Ruhr. That criticism is precisely of the same tendency as Brandler's criticism. Here is what the conciliators' platform describes those tactics:

"Strike committees are created simply along the lines of least resistance; some strike committees are elected by the unorganised masses at open meetings. This discredits the idea of strike committees, weakens the role of the trade union opposition", etc.

This we find on page 16 of the Russian translation, and page 17 it says that strike committees "must not, as was the case in the Ruhr, consist partly of unorganised workers and partly almost exclusively of Communist workers". In charging that strike committees were elected exclusively by the unorganised, that they were elected at open meetings — a circumstance which makes Enderle wild — the terminology used is taken word for word from Enderle's Menshevik correspondence in "Volksrecht". The conciliators do not accuse the Party of creating a split between the organised and unorganised workers,

of splitting the trade unions, i. e., they do not agree with the accusations of the Rights against the Party. Where therefore do they differ from the Rights? They stand for strike committees, whereas the Rights are resolutely opposed to strike committees. On this question, therefore, the conciliators stand between the Party and the Rights. But their criticism corresponds, to a certain extent, to the criticism of the Rights and is directed along the same lines. But in criticising the regime within the Party, the conciliators' platform is very close to that of the Rights.

I have already mentioned that the conciliators' platform assails the Party leadership and the majority of the Party. But it is an assault not only because it attacks the majority of the Party, but also because it does not fight against the Rights. The conciliators do not deny the Right danger, they even express their readiness to fight against the Rights. What would their formula, "struggle on two fronts — both against the Rights and against the internal policy of the C. C.", mean otherwise? But in criticising the Rights, they are very moderate. On this question they speak in their platform of "wrong and party liquidatory views on the role, tasks and tactics of the Party". Their criticism literally reduces itself to the following sentence: "The rejection of such tactics (i. e., the tactics of the election of strike committees) in the present mass conflicts as demanded by the Rights, practically signifies a refusal to reveal the role of the Party in the economic struggle." That is all the conciliators have in their platform in the line of criticising the Rights. And even this insignificant critical remark is exceedingly moderate, exceedingly cautious. The heading, however, speaks of a "struggle against the Right danger and the inner-Party course", but the criticism is directed against the methods of struggle used by the Party against the Rights.

Two pages of the platform are devoted to this point. The factional work of the Rights is characterised by the conciliators in the platform as anti-Party attacks. Not a word is said concerning the attempts to organise a Right opportunist party within the Communist Party, concerning the disruptive activities, etc. Equally so there is not a word in the conciliators' platform concerning the harmful sabotage of the Rights in the Ruhr, in their effort to disrupt the Ruhr activities.

The conciliators' platform was submitted to the Politbureau of the C. P. G. at the beginning of December, e. g. when the nature, scope and direction of the factional disruptive work of the Rights were absolutely clear. The fact that the platform does not criticise the Rights, emphasises the one-sided anti-Party character of that platform which could be designated as an "irreconcilable platform of the conciliators" (irreconcilable in their attitude toward the Party, conciliation in relation to the Rights).

I am now going to take up the second conciliators' document, the "statement on the situation within the Party", signed by Ewert and Meyer.

The first peculiarity is that the attacks on the Party leaders are much sharper and stronger than in the platform and it hurls additional charges against the Party leaders. Chief of these new charges is the accusation of the Majority of the C. C. of "Left" sectarian deviations or of toleration of "Left" deviations or of "dangerous 'Left' vacillations". Here is a literal quotation.

"It is becoming clear that the policy of the majority of the C. C. fully confirms the anticipations of the VI. Congress — here follows a quotation from the resolution of the VI. Congress. "Parallel with this (i. e., the Right danger) there are 'Left' deviations which find expression in a tendency to deny the united front tactics, in the lack of understanding of the enormous significance of trade union work, in the policy of revolutionary phraseology."

Here follows another quotation from Ewert's and Meyer's statement.

"An ever clearer 'pseudo-Left' grouping is being formed in the Party leadership which deliberately and systematically goes against the decisions of the VI. Congress (Remmele, Neumann, Lenz, Grube, Opiz, etc.). The Politbureau does not resist that group any more than it opposes the 'Left' deviations. It is becoming ever clearer that not only is there the danger of toleration of opportunism, but also of toleration of 'Left' tendencies. Politbureau is absolutely guilty of such toleration."

If we are to take literally the meaning of this passage, we find that the majority in the C. C. is guilty of toleration

not only of the Left deviation, but also of opportunism, because the Remmele-Neumann group is regarded not as a Left, but as an opportunist pseudo-Left group. This accusation of toleration of opportunism is not repeated in the statement. It is true that elsewhere it speaks of an unprincipled mechanical struggle of the majority of the C.C. against the Rights, but the statement about toleration of opportunism is not repeated.

This perhaps is simply an accidental omission in the text. The accusation concerning toleration of the "Left" tendency is repeated several times. The concluding formulation of this charge reads as follows: "The majority of the C.C. generally does not combat the Left tendencies and is itself the bearer of them." You can thus see that the formula of the conciliators' platform "Struggle on two fronts — both against the Rights and against the internal policy of the C.C." is being transformed into the formula "struggle both against the Rights and against the Lefts who are in the leadership of the C.C." After Meyer's arrival in Moscow, the conciliators have adopted the formula which was given here by Comrade Humbert-Droz, although they have not yet made up their mind to give it in full. This is the first peculiarity of that new document.

The second peculiarity of the Ewert-Meyer statement consists in the fact that the conciliators have commenced to criticise the views and actions of the Right faction. That is new. Of the six pages of the statement, about two are dedicated to a criticism of the Rights and four to a criticism of the Central Committee.

The general summarising formula of the conciliators against the Rights is — "Liquidatory views (no longer partially liquidatory, as was the case in the platform) and anti-Party methods of struggle against the Right faction which is objectively (and partly subjectively) seeking to leave the Party." Such is the general summarising formula given by the conciliators.

As to the criticism of the Rights by the conciliators, the following remark should be made. If the conciliators, in attacking the majority of the Party, use the weapons of the Rights, in criticising the ideas and actions of the Rights they, on the contrary, choose the weapons, not always successfully, used by the Party, the majority of the Party.

However, it is not the criticism of the conciliators, which, in itself, is far from satisfactory, that is important. Nor is it a fact that the conciliators have (rather very late) commenced really to criticise the Rights. Nor is it the fact that the conciliators are in a hurry, so to say, to "make good" or "balance" their criticism of the Rights by a sharp criticism of the majority of the C.C. and by advancing new charges against it. What is important is that this criticism is **purely verbal** and that the conciliators not only fail to draw the inevitable organisational conclusions from it, but are energetically opposed to these conclusions, opposed to the application of those conclusions.

With this in view, they are trying to pull the Party back to a stage which it has already gone through. They energetically speak of an ideological struggle against the Rights which, in their opinion (of course they do not say so openly), should substitute organisational conclusions. Here is how they do it: "The majority of the C.C.", they say, "acts on Comrade Ulbricht's wrong prescription, who said at the session of the Politsecretariat that 'the first phase of the struggle against the Rights is organisational measures, the second phase is an ideological struggle against them.'" Comrade Ulbricht did not say that. This is a distortion of what Comrade Ulbricht said. But I am going to leave to Comrade Ulbricht himself to correct this. "We," continue the conciliators, "are on the contrary, of the opinion that Comrade Stalin expressed" — here they quote Comrade Stalin's speech at the November Plenum thus; "Of course it is easier to remove comrades from their posts than to conduct a wide and elaborate campaign of enlightenment on the Right tendency, the Right danger, and the struggle against it. But the easiest thing is not the best thing."

Needless to say, the conciliators quote Stalin in vain. In vain have they attached his name here. Comrade Stalin spoke of the Right danger in the C.P.S.U., and the question we are concerned about is the Right danger in the C.P.G. These are two entirely different things, notwithstanding the fact that the Right danger of the C.P.S.U. and the Right danger in the C.P.G. have a common basis in the form of uniform ideas on collaboration with the bourgeoisie. To apply Comrade Stalin's formula to the C.P.G. means to act openly in violation of dialectics. To approach the question from a correct dialectical

angle it must be formulated thus: What "stage" or what phase of development is the Right faction of the German Party now going through? The answer to this question must be absolutely exact, definite and unequivocal because upon it depends the choice of modes of struggle against the Right danger. In essence, this is the main question which we must to-day consider and settle. We must decide whether the present "stage" of development of the Right faction in Germany is the same as Trotskyism was, say in 1925, or Trotskyism in 1927. In answer to this question, in my opinion, is clear.

The activities of the Rights in the Ruhr (sabotaging and deriding on blacklegging), in Offenbach (a circular "To the Workers of Offenbach") and in Stuttgart (independent candidate list — this is under German conditions, of course only by historical analogy, the same as the Trotskyist actions in October 1914). What measures does the Open Letter propose in relation to the Right faction? These measures have been laid down in the letter and I am not going to repeat them. I shall merely point out that these measures in their entirety comprise a last ultimatum to the Rights who, as the conciliators have admitted, seek to leave the Party.

What do the conciliators propose? Here is what they say on this topic in their last statement signed by Ewert and Meyer.

"At the moment of a possible and probable divorce of the Party from a number of our comrades such as Brandler, Thalheimer, Walcher, Frölich, Enderle, Schneiders and others" — this is no mistake, comrades, that is what it says. It does not say "divorcement of Brandler, Thalheimer, Walcher, Frölich, and others from the Party" but as I have read it here, I continue — "who were among the founders of the Spartakus Bund and who on August 4, 1914, stood by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg" — we consider it our duty to declare before the Party that such comrades cannot be put in the same category as such traitors as Levi, Friesland, or such petty-bourgeois as Maslow and Ruth Fischer. We are of the opinion that at the present time a relentless struggle is necessary against these comrades in the interests of the Party and the revolution appealing to these comrades to admit their mistakes and not to leave the Party."

In other words, — wage an ideological struggle against the Rights, but do not expel them! You are Rights and liquidators, but on our knees we pray, don't leave our Party, you Party, do not divorce the liquidators Brandler, Thalheimer and Walcher. Such is the real meaning of that statement.

We also stand for an ideological campaign against the Rights, for a wide systematic campaign. This we state frankly in the Open Letter. But it would be ridiculous to speak now of an ideological preparation for the expulsion of Brandler and Thalheimer, and particularly to speak of a discussion with the Rights as Comrade Serra proposes. It would be ridiculous to urge an ideological struggle as a substitute for organisational conclusions and the ultimatum given in the Open Letter. The time for such methods of struggle is already far back in the past. The conciliators do not even take the trouble to themselves — what if Brandler and Thalheimer will not agree to admit their big mistakes, what then? There is no answer. In vain will you look for it in the last conciliators' statement. This shows that the conciliators' criticism of the Rights which they have at last resolved to exercise is, to say the least, impotent. This circumstance is stressed also by the fact that in the last Plenum of the C.C. the conciliators voted against a request to the C.C. C.P.S.U. to expel Brandler and Thalheimer from the C.P.S.U. I read part of that statement at the beginning of my speech.

The question of Brandler's and Thalheimer's expulsion is more correctly, of sending them an ultimatum (apparently Thalheimer and Brandler will not submit to the ultimatum and the question of their expulsion will arise), has now become the main question in all divergencies between the Rights and the conciliators and is thereby becoming also the main political question. The Party can make no progress, it cannot further unfold its forces in the coming big economic grapples which will be of tremendous political significance, unless it rids itself of the Right faction, of this alien body which hampers freedom of action.

One of the two — either Brandler and Thalheimer accept the conditions put before them by the Open Letter, or they will be immediately expelled. Only thus can we put the question.