

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 10 No. 3

16th January 1930

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berlin G 25, Bartelstrasse 1/5, III. Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered post: International Press Correspondence, Berlin G 25, Bartelstrasse 1/5, III. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Berlin. Telephone: Berolina 1169 and 2886

CONTENTS

Politics.

J. T. Murphy: The MacDonald Government and the Political Parties in Great Britain 38

M. Garlandi: The Intensification of the Class Struggle in Italy 39

Economics.

A. Hahn: Agricultural Crisis and Capitalist Offensive in Czechoslovakia 40

League of Nations.

Gustav Sobottka: The Geneva Coal Conference 41

The Balkans.

The Series of New Political Trials in Bulgaria 41

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union.

J. Stalin: The Socialist Transformation of the Village in the Light of Marxist-Leninist Theory II. 42

D. Saslavsky: The Creation of Cadres. 45

Against Colonial Oppression.

A. N.: The Terror in Indo-China and the Development of the Revolutionary Movement 46

In the International.

R. Page Arnot: Eleventh Congress of the C. P. of Great Britain. 46

Trade Union Movement.

A. Glyn Evans: The 10th All-India Trade Union Congress 47

The Labour Movement.

The Extraordinary Party Congress of the Labour Party of Iceland 48

The Peasant Movement.

M.: Demonstration of Small Peasants in South Germany 49

In the R. I. L. U.

A. Losovsky: Lessons and Prospects of the Economic Struggles II. 49

The Five-Year Plan.

The Five-Year Plan of Cultural Construction 51

Lenin-Liebknecht-Luxemburg Week.

Six Years Without Lenin. 52

J. Stalin: On Lenin 53

V. I. Lenin: The First Lessons of the Russian Revolution of 1905. 54

Werner Hirsch: From Spartacus League to the Bolshevik Party. 55

V. I. Lenin: How the Competition should be Organised 56

Karl Liebknecht's Letter to the Zimmerwald Conference 59

Rosa Luxemburg: The Development of the Russian Revolution of 1905 59

Paul Merker: Lenin and the Political Mass Strike 60

The Hague Reparations Conference.

By Paul Braun (Berlin).

** The proceedings at the Hague Conference correspond to the general sharpening of all the contradictions and antagonisms of world capitalism.

While agreement has been reached on a few minor questions (the new railway law, the German investment, without interest, for the Reparations Bank, the liquidation treaties with the British Dominions, with Italy, Poland and other states, the "adaptation" of the special agreement between Germany and the United States to the Young-Plan), none of the points in dispute in connection with the reparations question, in the narrow sense, has yet been decided. Meanwhile an agreement appears to have been arrived at regarding the date of the German monthly payments. The German delegation has given way to the demands of Great Britain and France, and conceded that the greater part of the monthly instalments falling due shall be paid on the 15th of each month. Up to the present, however, no progress has been made with regard to the most important questions: the mobilisation of the unprotected Ger-

man reparations debts, the moratorium, and above all the question of the sanctions.

These difficulties, to which the protracted course and the creeping crisis of the Hague negotiations are to be attributed, arise from the situation in which the Conference is taking place and which differs fundamentally from the situation prevailing at the time of the Paris Conference and of the first Hague Conference. Since the signing of the Young-Plan a considerable change has taken place in the international situation. The Stock Exchange crash in New York, which caused repercussions on all the most important Stock Exchanges in the world, was the first warning signal of the inevitably approaching crisis of USA. capitalism. The collapse of the trade boom in the United States, which put an end to the exceptional position which the economic development of the USA. has enjoyed since the end of the war and draws American capitalism into the general decline of the capitalist system, is tremendously accelerating the approach of the acute world economic crisis.

The approaching crisis in the United States is already beginning to affect the rest of the capitalist world. Its effects are being very severely felt in Germany, which, as a result of the millions invested in it by the United States and of the Young-Plan, is inseparably bound up with the fate of USA. capitalism. The glutting of the home market and the enforced increased exports of the capitalist countries, especially of Great Britain and France, compels American finance capital to undertake an exports-offensive on a colossal scale. Thus the problem of markets comes to the forefront of world politics. The competitive struggle on the world market is entering an acute stage. The antagonistic imperialist interests are colliding with each other quite openly and with full force.

This new world situation gives the second Hague Conference its special stamp. The first Hague Conference witnessed the attempt of the MacDonald Government, by means of temporary concessions to the United States, to gain a respite in order to prepare for the historically inevitable armed encounter of the British Empire with its American rival. The second Hague Conference is overshadowed by the storm clouds of the approaching world crisis of capitalism.

The events of the last few weeks already permit one to recognise the new regrouping tendencies. The time is past in which MacDonald, by following the policy of continual yielding, could flirt with the United States with a certain outward success. A temporary co-operation of the United States and Great Britain, which was the precondition for the bringing about of the Young Plan, has become impossible under the conditions of sharpened competitive struggle on the world market. The United States is on the offensive on all fronts. The special agreement with Germany, the most important point of which provides that America's share of the reparations payments shall be paid to her not through the medium of the Reparations Bank but direct to the Government of the United States, has destroyed the united front of Great Britain and the United States on the reparations question. With this agreement the United States emphatically declares that she intends ruthlessly to pursue her own course and is determined to create the political presumptions for her export offensive, regardless of the aggravation of the antagonisms which will result therefrom.

The change in the international situation found its sharpest and clearest expression in the negotiations over the Statutes of the Reparations Bank (**Bank for International Settlements**). At the Conference in **Baden-Baden**, at which the statutes of this bank were laid down, the antagonistic interests of the chief imperialist Powers were revealed quite openly. The result of the Baden-Baden conference is a compromise which contains in it the germs of still acuter conflicts and has not the remotest resemblance to the phantastic dreams which the project of the reparations bank gave rise to in many heads when it was first brought forward at the Paris Conference.

At Baden-Baden the representatives of French and British finance capital conducted a stubborn fight against the attempt of the representative of the United States to make of the Reparations Bank a world bank of the United States which should possess world-embracing importance. The provision contained in the statutes that the business of the bank must "be in harmony with the policy of the central bank of each of the participating countries", and that the Board of Directors must in all financial business "give the central bank or the central banks immediately participating opportunity to raise objection", prevents the Bank for International Settlements from serving only the desires of American finance capital.

The growing economic contradictions of capitalism serve to intensify the imperialist antagonisms between Great Britain and France, France and Italy, France and Germany etc. -- a development which found expression in the fight over the Eastern Reparations.

In these circumstances the Hague Conference can only end in a compromise which in turn will only contribute to reproduce all the capitalist contradictions on a higher level, to intensify the economic crisis of world capitalism and the imperialist antagonisms.

POLITICS

The MacDonald Government and the Political Parties in Great Britain.

By J. T. Murphy (London).

** The Parliamentary debate on the **Coal Bill** brought sharply to the front the question of the relationship of the parties. The Liberal Party adopted a very critical attitude to the Bill and demanded that it must proceed further in the direction of applying the scheme outlined in the **Coal Commission Report** of 1925 advanced by the chairman of the Commission Sir Herbert Samuel. Four demands were formulated as conditioning the support of the Liberal Party. But when to the Bill and demanded that it must proceed further in the declaration that whatever the answer of the Labour Party and the Government to the demands of the Liberal Party the remainder of the Bill was so vicious that the Liberal Party could not support it. Lloyd George gave the Government a thorough castigation, denouncing the Bill as a coalowners Bill in every respect. This change of front on the part of the Liberals raised the question of the possible downfall of the Government and the imminence of a general election. The Government succeeded in winning through the second reading, only by 8 votes. That there was any intention of bringing down the government at this stage is out of the question. Nevertheless it was a well staged demonstration and intimidation of the Labour Government.

At the same time the possibilities of a general election this year are not ruled out by any means. It may come on the initiative of the Labour Government according to its fortunes in the forthcoming international conferences with the other powers if these conferences produce any kudos for the Labour Government. On the other hand if the conferences produce no results in the form of capital for the Labour Government and open the way for sharp criticism from Lloyd George, the Liberals and Conservatives together may force a dissolution. These are possibilities which are in no way contradictory to the principal tendency towards coalition and the growth of social fascism. The role of the Liberals is to maintain social democratic illusions in the minds of the working class as long as possible, and it will not be the fault of Lloyd George and the other Liberal leaders if they do not attempt to strengthen their position as a more decisive force within the general framework of coalition politics. This is the meaning of the tactic of Lloyd George when he leads the Liberal Party into more radical policies than those of the Labour Party. The Liberal Party stood for prompt and unconditional recognition of Soviet Russia when the Labour Party were seeking to impose the terms of the Tory Party. Their demands on the coal bill are more radical than the proposals of the Labour Party. The same applies to the demand for proportional representation. This attitude is obviously intended to catch the leftward drift of the workers and force the Labour Party deeper into coalition politics, with the Liberal Party leaders playing a more decisive part within the coalition. The question of the length of life for the Labour Government on the one hand is a matter of what the Liberals and the Tories consider the best tactical moment in which they can get a still firmer grip of the Labour Party and on the other hand of the initiative of the Labour Party in its efforts to secure majority government.

The latter, the Liberals and the Tories are determined to frustrate, not because they have profound differences with MacDonald and his government but because they fear the rapidity of mass disillusionment which would follow from the advent of a majority Labour Government. Lloyd George explained what he conceived to be the role of the Liberal Party as far back as 1919, he warned the bourgeoisie that Britain was topheavy so far as its class forces are concerned, that a small class at the top rests upon a mighty industrial proletariat. He warned them that there was and is no peasantry in Britain that can stand between these two classes as in continental countries. Therefore it is the task of Liberals to play the role in Britain which the peasantry plays on the continent and prevent the landslide from 'right' to 'left'. It

was for this purpose he appealed in 1919 and 1920 for the coalition of Tories and Liberals against the Labour Party which had not then travelled so far along the road of social fascism. It is for the same reason that he manoeuvres to-day with the Labour Party to stem the movement of masses from 'right' to 'left', to consolidate social fascism, "national" politics and coalition government — the corporate state. This policy does not by any manner of means preclude an early general election. On the contrary it may be that precisely for this reason the election may be early and we must guard against the formal argument that because the MacDonald Government is functioning as a social fascist imperialist government that an election is out of the question. This question will be determined by the relation of social forces and the measures which are deemed necessary by the bourgeoisie to stem the tide of radicalisation of the masses more than by any programmatic differences of the parties for these have well nigh vanished.

Especially will this be seen as the crisis within the Empire deepens. The rapid march of events in India sowing the Indian revolution advancing with giant strides accompanied with great waves of revolt in the Near East and in Africa is shattering all prospects of stability within the Empire, indeed tearing at its foundations and thrusting the Government along the path of Fascist Imperialism. It is in the policy of Imperialist suppression of the colonial peoples that the Labour Government is rendering the bourgeoisie the greatest service and which will hold back the party attacks of the Liberals and Tories more than anything else. The "home" situation is undermining the Government. The colonial and foreign policy of the Government gives it strength in the ranks of the bourgeoisie.

But the question as to whether there will be a general election this year is not the outstanding question. The most important is the fact that social fascism is growing rapidly, that the bourgeoisie are growing more and more desperate. Not a strike occurs but what the Labour Government rushes big battalions of police to overawe and intimidate the strikers. Not an issue is raised but arbitration enters the field to throttle the workers' actions at their birth. The trades union apparatus becomes more and more an integral part of the state machinery for the suppression of the mass activities of the workers.

In this process the pseudo-lefts Maxton, Wheatly, Brockway, Cook and Co., are playing the role of division of labour with the Government to save the government. On the question of the Meerat Trial they came on to the Meerat Defence Committee in order to sabotage its work and divert the agitation against the Labour Government into means of support for the Labour Government. On the question of unemployment they have posed as the critics of the government in order to divert the workers from the national Unemployed Workers Movement. They whitewashed the Arbitrators who cut the wages of the cotton textile workers.

It is these facts that thrust the Communist Party into the foreground of all struggles of the workers. At no time has the Party had such opportunities to advance as the leader of the proletariat. Its launching of the "Daily Worker" on the first of January this year sets it on the high road to becoming a mass party. Following, as it did, quickly on the heels of the Party Congress which made most decisive changes in the leadership in its determination to advance along the new line of the Comintern as an independent Party of struggle, there can be no doubt the sharpening of its relations with all other parties and the intensification of its class fight. Already the Party is feeling the great difference which a daily paper makes to all its work. It passes from a propagandist role to that of political leadership of the day to day struggles. It has set its face towards the factories with the determination to transform itself into a party based upon the factories, the mills and mines. It has demanded the cessation of vacillations within its ranks, issued the call to build itself on the basis of the policy of the "united front from below". The fact that the year 1930 opens as a year of deeper crisis for British capitalism means that it also opens as the year of greater and ever greater opportunities for the Party of proletarian revolution. That our party will seize these opportunities we are confident. Already the very appearance of the "Daily Worker" has made the capitalist press howl with anger. But that is

only the beginning. 1930 promises to be the year of great progress for the Communist Party and the mass organisations of struggle which it is building and leading. It is shedding its parochialism, listening more intently to the Comintern, learning rapidly and uniting the fight of the workers of Britain with the fight of the colonial workers and peasants against the common enemy. Along this path our Party will grow in strength and confidence.

The Intensification of the Class Struggle in Italy.

By M. Garlandi.

Recent events in Italy are deserving of the greatest attention. The fascist policy goes from one failure to another. The period of the "extension of industry" and of the stabilisation of the Italian currency was followed by the period of "agrarianisation". Fascism has turned its "face to the village", or more correctly said to the big landowners.

What is the reason of this turn in fascist policy? The industrial crisis of 1926/27 was followed by a still more serious crisis of agriculture which drove ten thousands of peasants into misery and privation. Fascism adopted a determined policy aiming at the annihilation of the middle sections of the peasantry and strengthening of the position of the big landowners.

The relative success of the mechanisation of agriculture brought with it a tremendous increase of unemployment in the rural districts and promoted the proletarianisation of many thousands of small peasants and small lease-holders. In connection with this there is to be observed a general decline of agriculture.

The deficit of the Italian trade balance, which amounts to 30 to 35 per cent., is the result of the decline in the production of corn which compels Italy to import many millions of centals of corn from abroad.

The poverty of the rural population is indescribable. The towns of Southern Italy are swarming with beggars who have come from the rural districts. In Apulia and Sicilia, where the agricultural workers constitute a large proportion of the population, unemployment is a mass phenomenon.

Industrial production has been greatly restricted. The greatest Italian automobile factor Fiat with an output capacity of 500 automobiles daily, produced only 200 automobiles daily in 1926/27, in the year 1929 only 130, and even this number is constantly declining. The number of workers in this factory fell from 20,000 to 9 to 10,000, and these only work three to four days a week. The crisis is extending to all factories of Turin and Milan. Only the war industry, which receives the all-round support of the government, is extending. The number of unemployed in Italy has reached a million (together with their dependents five million).

A powerful upsurge of the labour movement in the North has set in simultaneously with the peasant movement in the South. Hundreds of toilers stormed the buildings of the municipalities and of the fascist party. The authorities have suppressed the rebellion by means of gendarmerie and militia. The village militia did not succeed in suppressing the movement and therefore is regarded as "unreliable". At the same time the partisan movement is growing. It happens more and more frequently that tax collectors and local representatives of the fascist government are attacked. In Faenza (province of Emilia) a peasant killed two fascists. The authorities answered with reprisals but met with the active resistance of the peasants. Eight fascists were wounded and if the gendarmerie had not intervened the losses of the fascists would have been considerably greater.

At the beginning of November numerous workers of the Fiat works were informed by the management that they were dismissed owing to lack of work. Thereupon the desperate workers attacked prominent fascists, foremen and strike-breakers and wounded more than ten persons.

In the Lombard Iron Manufacturing Works in Milan the workers elected a committee to fight against wage reductions, which entered into immediate negotiations with the management of the firm. This action is a violation of the fascist laws, which "regulate" the relations between the workers and the employers. In spite of this fact the management was compelled to

receive the workers' delegation and the workers succeeded in preventing the proposed wage reduction.

In Genoa at the end of October there took place a demonstration of unemployed who proceeded to the centre of the town, and only there did the police succeed in dispersing them. Numerous arrests were made.

Miani & Silvestri a firm of locomotive builders in Milan employing 3000 workers, dismissed a great number of workers. When the intended dismissal of a further 800 workers was made known, the workers wrecked the factory offices. After the building had been occupied by troops, the workers gathered in the streets and held a protest demonstration against the employers and against fascism. In the ensuing collisions several workers and police were wounded. The workers in other factories in Milan arranged solidarity demonstrations.

The Communist Party of Italy is at present undergoing a process of reorganisation. In the movement which has been developing during the last months the Party was not always up to the mark, but it is now beginning to recover and to reestablish its organisations, to play again an active role in the sphere of mass struggles. There is no doubt that the accentuation of the fascist crisis is proceeding more rapidly than the reorganisation and the political development of the Communist Party.

The C. P. of Italy is working on the lines of the instructions given by the last September Plenum of the C. C., which predicted an „intensification of the struggles on the basis of the accentuation of the fascist crisis“. We are confronted by severe struggles, and in these struggles the Party will be called upon to lead the revolutionary masses of Italy.

ECONOMICS

Agricultural Crisis and Capitalist Offensive in Czechoslovakia.

By Alois Halin (Prague).

— The international agricultural crisis also finds expression in Czechoslovakia. For weeks and months a broad discussion has been taking place on the possibility of its solution. The social-fascist government has now submitted an agricultural programme. As this crisis cannot be solved independently of the serious industrial crisis which is approaching in Czechoslovakia, the programme of the government aims at solving the crisis not only to the advantage the big landowners but also the big industrialists. As agrarian capital is merging with finance capital it is clear that the solution of the agricultural crisis is dictated by finance capital.

In the year 1926 the agrarian customs duties were introduced, which formed the starting point of the hunger plan. But even these agrarian customs duties could not prevent the agrarian crisis, although imports have greatly declined and thus home grown corn was „protected“. The following are the figures of the

Imports of some Agricultural Products (in tons):

	1927	1928	1929 (first ten months)
Wheat	332,976	298,227	136,059
Wheat Flour	175,027	175,075	131,368
Rye	167,608	113,801	20,088
Rye Flour	4,325	4,801	892

But also the Prices of wheat have declined. This is shown by the following table of the

Wheat Prices (Quotations of the Prague Corn Exchange) Czech Crowns

	End of May 1926	13th December 1929
Wheat	210	160
Rye	140	119
Barley	150	98—125
Oats	145	108
Wheat Flour	400	252
Rye Flour	265	145
imperialist		

In spite of the fact that the area under cultivation increased from 3,322,000 hectares in the year 1928 to 3,521,000 hectares in 1929 the harvest yield has declined:

Harvest Yield (in tons):

	Wheat	Rye	Barley	Oats
Harvest 1928	13,282,779	17,450,764	70,354	14,232,814
Harvest 1929	12,463,701	15,846,367	63,022	13,664,324

These figures relate to the winter yield, but we perceive the same decline of the harvest yield with the summer corn.

Between the industrial and agricultural products there is to be seen an increasing disparity. At the end of December the trade index for industrial products was 141, whilst at the same time the trade index for agricultural products amounted to 115 (1913 = 100).

The Czechoslovakian land reform was not carried out to the advantage of the landless and poor peasants. The high prices of land enabled only the rich peasants to acquire new land, whilst the small and middle peasants who had acquired land at great financial sacrifices, incurred such big debts that the land had to be sold again. The following table refers to 8,650,000 hectares land.

Distribution of Land

Extent of the undertaking	Before the land reform	After the land reform
0 to 2 hectares	7.3 per cent	7.0 per cent
2 to 5 hectares	14.3 per cent	16.4 per cent
5 to 20 hectares	44.1 per cent	49.7 per cent
20 to 100 hectares	17.89 per cent	19.3 per cent
over 100 hectares	16.0 per cent ¹⁾	7.6 per cent ¹⁾

What are the proposals for the solution of the agricultural crisis?

1. Increase of customs duties. After the introduction of the agrarian customs the following duties were laid down:

Wheat	60 Czech Crowns
Rye	56 Czech Crowns
Barley	44 Czech Crowns
Oats	48 Czech Crowns
Wheat Flour	120 Czech Crowns
Rye Flour	120 Czech Crowns
Potatoes	10 Czech Crowns
Oxes (per head)	210 Czech Crowns
Pigs (per head)	40—100 Czech Crowns

The corn duties are to be increased by 100 per cent, whilst the duties on cattle are to be trebled.

2. Organisation of selling monopolies, especially the setting up of a grain monopoly.

In the organisation of the selling monopolies chief attention is to be given to the agricultural co-operatives, which are exclusively in the hands of the agrarian bourgeoisie, i. e. finance capital, which means that the small and middle peasants will have to bear the costs of this solution of the agrarian crisis.

3. Standardisation of production.

4. Rationalisation and mechanisation of the agricultural undertakings.

The fact that rationalisation and mechanisation of the agricultural undertakings are out of the question for the small and middle peasant, renders it also impossible for him to introduce standardisation.

5. Creation of a grain credit fund, to which the government is to grant 10 million whilst the remaining sum is to be obtained by the increase of the price of fertilisers. This credit fund is to serve for financing the exchange manoeuvres.

6. Extension of the import license system, which means that with the export of Czech agricultural products the exporters will be able to import agricultural products free of duty.

7. New distribution of the land and grouping together of split-up parcels, which means that the rich peasants and big

¹⁾ Of which 60 per cent are big landed estates.

landowners will get the best land while the poor peasant will get the worst.

8. The milling law.

9. **Reduction of wages and of social burdens.** The wages of the agricultural workers have already been reduced by 15 per cent. In addition to this, the expenses arising from social insurance are to be reduced by means of all agricultural workers being compelled to bear the greater part of the expenses for the social insurance.

This plan is being supported by the whole bourgeoisie, although the social fascists decided to conduct a sham fight against the increase of customs duties, just as in the year 1926. They will certainly agree to the increased customs for as they who speak most of solving the agricultural crisis in the interest of the whole State.

The workers and the peasants will conduct the sharpest struggle against this plan, for it means an unheard of impoverishment and exploitation of the poor peasantry and of the working class. They will conduct the fight for the expropriation of the big land owners, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for only on this basis can the poor peasantry be saved.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The Geneva Coal Conference.

By Gustav Sobottka (Berlin).

On the 6th of January there met in Geneva the so-called Coal Conference, convened by the International Labour Office. As is known, the Mine Workers' International, at its congress at Nîmes in May 1928, put forward the demand for international regulation of the coal industry. A resolution was adopted in which the International Labour Office was requested to convene a world conference of the coal producing countries, at which conference the representatives of the mineowners, the governments and of labour (i. e. trade union representatives) should participate.

Albert Thomas, the director of the International Labour Office, has endeavoured to bring about this fraternising action. As the mineowners refused to participate in international conferences together with the representatives of the mine workers' international. At the first meeting of the Economic Commission of the League of Nations on this question, which took place in October 1928 in Geneva, the representatives of the Mine Workers' International were not admitted. Only after the Executive Committee of the Mine Workers' International had again adopted a very energetic resolution and after intermediation on the part of Albert Thomas, were the representatives of the Mineworkers' International invited as so-called experts to a Conference in February 1929.

At the end of September 1929 the first Conference, which was to bring peace in the coal industry, took place, participated in by the governments, the mineowners and mine workers' leaders of all countries concerned. The present January Conference is a continuation of the September Conference.

Dr. Berger, the expert of the mine workers' Union of Germany, wrote in an article, which was published by the whole of the capitalist press, that the January Conference constitutes a milestone and shows the power exercised by the Mineworkers' International. This power has compelled the governments and the employers to settle the most important questions regarding the mineworkers by peaceful means and to make concessions to them with regard to working hours.

In reality this is a downright swindle. The fact that the mineowners of England, Germany, France, usw., participated in a common conference is not due to the pressure of the reformists but to the extraordinary difficulties of the imperialist-capitalist coal industry of England, which compelled the English "Labour Government" to demand an agreement on coal markets at the negotiations on the Young Plan and later in the Hague and in Geneva at the League of Nations meetings. The proposals, which were submitted to the Economic Council of the League of Nations, and which were discussed at the Conference of 30th September behind closed doors, were as follows:

a) conclusion of international agreements between the coal producers regarding production, markets and prices;

b) creation of an international organ on which all interested bodies are represented (governments, producers, miners, dealers and consumers);

c) to adopt measures in order to level up or unify wages, working hours and working conditions;

d) abolition of the artificial restrictions of the coal trade, as well as the artificial promotion of production (customs barriers and subventions).

These proposals prove that at bottom it was not a question of regulating the working hours or working conditions, but of attempts to overcome the difficulties arising from the competition of the capitalist economy by means of establishing syndicates, trusts and agreements on an international scale.

Agreement upon even a single one of the above items was frustrated at the September session in Geneva owing to the attitude of the German mineowners. The latter have again consolidated their position on the international coal market by means of an increased coal export in 1929 exceeding the quantity exported in 1913. Therefore the quota granted to them by the English mineowners in a Germany-Anglo syndicate is probably too small for them and therefore they rejected the agreement altogether.

In order to deceive the public, it was decided to meet again on the 6th of January for the discussion of a uniform regulation of working hours. The first reports of the proceedings however, show that the German, French and Polish governments and mineowners openly and brutally opposed a reduction of working hours. The German representative of the mineowners and of the social democratic Minister for Labour, Wissell, proposed that the international working hours be fixed on the basis of the mining law elaborated by himself. That means the general introduction of the 8½, and if need be even 9½-hour day for underground workers according to the provisions of the German mine working hour's law.

It is characteristic that whilst the reformist miners leaders and the mineowners and government representatives are delivering big speeches in Geneva in order to deceive the public, the chief directors of the English and Polish mining concerns are meeting, on the proposal of the English mining industrialists, on the 10th of January in Berlin in order to bring about an understanding with regard to the North European coal markets. The purpose of this understanding is to exert pressure upon the German mineowners and to compel them to give way. The working class of all countries must closely watch all these proceedings. International fight for a reduction of working hours in all countries is the immediate task of the mineworkers.

THE BALKANS

The Series of New Political Trials in Bulgaria.

Letter to the "Inprecorr."

Sofia, 11th January, 1930.

The trial of the "52" was only the first of the series of new political trials in Bulgaria. Several new trials have been initiated, solely on account of the protest movement against the trial of the "52". In addition to the trial of some editors of anti-fascist papers proceedings are taking place against 12 members of a protest delegation. In Plovdiv 20 workers are a waiting trial etc. All the accused have been thrown into prison at once.

In addition 15 new trials, involving 34 accused, are pending under the law for the protection of the State; of the accused 32 are already in prison awaiting trial. A further trial is to take place of three members of the C. C. of the C. P. of Bulgaria, another one of eight members of the Anti-Fascist Committee, whilst another 12 trials are pending of editors of the Labour press. The number of the accused editors is

growing from day to day. In the last three months thirty worker editors have been thrown into prison.

The revolutionary propaganda against these trials will be of greatest importance for the class struggle in the country and will again arouse the struggle for complete and unconditional amnesty.

The trial of the Anti-War Committee of the 1st August 1929 is a monstrous trial. By this trial, in which ten persons are accused and in connection with which many arrests have been carried out, the government wants to render impossible in the future any legal fight against the preparation for imperialist wars. This struggle has been conducted in Bulgaria as part of the struggle conducted by the international proletariat. In this trial there are at the same time involved nearly all editors of the legal working class press: "Edinstvo", "Rabotnitchesko Delo", "Rabotnitchka", "Mladesha Duma" and "Amnesty". In the same trial there are also involved various persons as authors of appeals, which have been issued in the name of legal organisations, as well as the secretary of the Labour Party, a member of the C. C. and the secretary of the Independent trade unions of Bulgaria, so that by this trial all the legal mass organisations of the working class are brought into the dock.

Never before has the labour press been so suppressed by fascism as at present. The newly introduced practice of the courts is worse than war censorship. The printing works of the proletarian press are under police supervision. Everything printed is at once confiscated by special police organs: six copies of the paper are at once submitted to the police presidium and to the Public Prosecutor, who either permits the paper to appear or objects to it in the name of the police. In the latter case a trial is initiated; the confiscated paper constitutes the evidence and the responsible editor is arrested. Subsequently the court pronounces its verdict on the basis of the juridical fiction that the paper has been already distributed, as a copy is appended to the evidence. In spite of the irrefutable proof that the paper was immediately confiscated as it came off press and that not a single copy has been distributed, sentences of several years' imprisonment are pronounced on the basis of such juridical fictions.

This is a monstrous violation of law. Fascism is not even content with the barbaric provisions of the law for the defence of the State against the labour press, but is violating even these provisions.

At the same time the editors are thrown into prison in the hope that one day they will all be under lock and key and there will be nobody left who can write for the labour press. As a result of the confiscations the labour press is financially greatly handicapped, and this is also used in order to render the publication of workers' papers impossible.

The trial of the young Communists is also a mass trial. After the trial of the year 1927 that is the second great trial of the Young Communist League of Bulgaria.

This new series of trials must be answered by the protest action of the whole international proletariat, by the struggle for the defence of the accused, of the legal workers' organisations, the Labour Party, the independent trade unions, the anti-war and anti-fascist committee, the working youth of Bulgaria, for the defence of the press of the toilers, for the legality of the Communist Party, of the Young Communist League, of the Red Aid, for complete unconditional amnesty, against the preparation of imperialist wars.

SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Socialist Transformation of the Soviet Village in the Light of Marxist-Leninist Theory.*

By J. Stalin.

(Conclusion).

4. The Town and the Village.

There exists a prejudice, which is cultivated by the bourgeois economists, relating to the so-called "scissors". Ruthless war must be declared against this prejudice, as well as against all other bourgeois theories which, unfortunately, are spread in the Soviet press. I have in mind the theory that the October Revolution allegedly gave less to the peasantry than the February revolution, that in fact the October revolution gave nothing to the peasantry.

This prejudice was for a time circulated in our press by a "Soviet" economist. It is true this "Soviet" economist later on abandoned his theory (Interjection: Who was it?). It was Gromann. This theory was, however, seized upon and made use of by the Trotzky-Zinoviev opposition against the Party. Nor can one maintain that it is not current at the present time in circles of the "Soviet public". That is a very important question. It touches the problem of the relations between town and country. It touches the problem of annihilating the state of contradiction between town and country. I think, therefore, that it is worth while for us to deal with this strange theory.

Is it true that the peasants received nothing from the October Revolution?

Let us have a look at the facts.

I have before me a certain table worked out by the well-known statistician Comrade Nemtchinov. According to this table the land owners "produced" in the pre-revolutionary time no less than 600 millions poods of grain. The Kulaks at that time "produced" 1,900 millions poods of grain. That represents a very great power which the Kulaks at that time had at their disposal. The village poor and the middle peasants produced 2,500 millions poods of grain. That was the situation in the old village, in the pre-revolutionary village. What alteration has taken place in the village since the revolution?

I take the figures relating thereto from the same table. Let us take, for instance, the year 1927. How much did the land owners produce in this year? It is clear that they produced nothing, and in fact could not produce anything, because they were annihilated by the October Revolution.

It is plain that this must have meant a great relief for the peasantry, as the peasants have been freed from the yoke of the land owner. That is naturally a great advantage which the peasantry have derived from the October Revolution. How much did the kulaks produce in the year 1927? 600 millions poods of grain as compared with 1,900 before the revolution. Thus in the period following the revolution the kulaks have lost more than two-thirds of their economic power. It is obvious that this was bound to ease the situation of the village poor and the middle peasants.

And how much did the poor and middle peasants produce in the year 1927? 4,000 millions poods as compared with 2,500 before the revolution, that is to say, that after the October Revolution the poor and middle peasants produced one and a half milliard poods more grain than in the pre-revolutionary time.

These are facts which show that the poor and middle peasants have received a great benefit from the revolution. How can one assert in the face of these facts that the October Revolution has not given the peasants anything?

But that is not all. The October Revolution abolished private property in land, did away with the sale and purchase of land, and introduced the nationalisation of the land. What

* Speech delivered at the Conference of Marxist Agrarian Research, on 27th December 1929. The first part of the speech was published as the leading article in our last week's number. Ed.

Change of Address!

The address of the "Inprecorr"
is now:

BERLIN C 25

Bartelstraße 1—5 III, Germany.

does that mean? That means that the peasant has no need first to buy land in order to produce grain. Formerly he was compelled to save up for years in order to be able to get hold of a little piece of land; he got into debt, submitted to extortion, solely in order to get possession of a piece of land. The sums expended on the purchase of land naturally went into the value of the grain produced. The peasant no longer has need to do that now. He can now produce grain without buying land. Now does that ameliorate the position of the peasant or not. It is clear that it ameliorates the position of the peasant.

Moreover, up to recently the peasantry was compelled to cultivate the soil with the old stock and implements and by individual labour. Everyone knows that individual labour, equipped with old means of production which are already unsuitable, does not yield that profit which is necessary in order to lead a tolerable existence, to improve systematically one's own material position, to develop one's own level of culture and to get onto the path of socialist construction. To-day, after the increased development of the collectivisation movement, the peasants have the possibility of combining their labour with the labour of their neighbours and uniting in the collective farms, to cultivate waste land and woodlands, to obtain machines and tractors and thereby double or even treble the productivity of their labour. That means that to-day the peasant, by joining the collective farms has the possibility of producing much more than formerly with the same expenditure of labour. That means that grain can be produced much more cheaply than was the case until only recently. That means, finally, that while the price of bread remains the same, the peasant can obtain much more than he did hitherto.

How can one maintain after all this that the peasant has not gained anything by the October Revolution?

Is it not clear that people who talk such nonsense slander the Party and the Soviet power?

But what follows from all this?

There follows that the question of the „scissors“ (the disproportion between the prices of industrial and of agricultural products. Ed.), the question of liquidating the „scissors“, must to-day be approached in quite another manner. That means that the „scissors“ will be done away with in the near future if the collectivisation movement grows at the present rapid rate. It follows, therefore, that the question of the relations between town and country will be placed on a new basis, that the contradiction between town and country will disappear at an accelerated pace.

This fact is of the very greatest importance for our whole work of construction. It changes the psychology of the peasant and turns him towards the town. It creates the conditions for the abolition of the contradiction between town and country. It creates the basis on which the slogan of the Party, „face to the village“, will be supplemented by the slogan of the peasants united in the collective farms: „face to the town“.

There is nothing very wonderful in this, as the peasant is now getting from the town machines, tractors, agronomists, organisers and, finally, also direct aid in the fight to overcome the kulaks. The old type of peasant, with his mistrust of the town, which he regarded as a plunderer, is passing away. His place is being taken by the new peasant, by the new peasant of the collective farms, who regards the town with confidence. The old type of peasant who is afraid of sinking down to the status of the village poor, and stealthily seeks to raise himself up to the position of a kulak is giving place to one with a new perspective: to join the collective farms and thereby escape from his poverty stricken condition.

That is the change that is taking place. It is all the more regrettable therefore that our agrarian theoreticians have not resorted to every measure in order to exterminate root and branch all bourgeois theories which seek to call in question the achievements of the October Revolution.

5. The Nature of the Collective Farms.

The collective farm as an economic type is one of the forms of socialist economy. There can be no doubt about that.

One of the speakers at the conference here sought to belittle the collective farms. He maintained that the collective farms, as economic organisations, had nothing in common with the socialist form of economy. I must declare, comrades, that such a characterisation of the collective farms is quite

incorrect. There can be no doubt that this characterisation has nothing in common with Leninism.

What is it that determines an economic type? Obviously the mutual relations of human beings in the process of production. How otherwise can one determine the type of an economy? Do there exist in the collective undertaking a special class of men, the owners of the means of production, and another class of men, who are deprived of these means of production? Does there exist in the collective farm an exploiting and an exploited class? Does not the collective farm constitute the socialisation of the most important means of production upon land which likewise belongs to the State? What reason is there for maintaining that the collective farms as economic types do not represent a socialist form of economy?

Of course there are contradictions to be found in the collective farms. Of course there exist individualistic, even big peasant survivals which have not yet been overcome but which must in any circumstances disappear in the course of time the more the collective farms are developed and the more they are equipped with machinery. Can one, however, question that the collective farms, taken as a whole, with all their contradictions and shortcomings, the collective farms as an economic fact, represent at bottom a new path of socialist development of the village as opposed to the kulakist, to the capitalist path of development? Can one perchance question that the collective farms (I am speaking of the real and not the sham collective farms), under the conditions obtaining with us, represent a basis and a centre of socialist construction in the village which have grown up in bitter fight against the capitalist elements?

Is it not clear that the attempts made by some comrades to depreciate the collective farms and represent them as a bourgeois form of economy are devoid of all foundation?

In January 1923 there was with us no collective economic mass movement. In his article „On the Co-operatives“ Lenin had in mind all kinds of co-operatives, both their lower forms (buying and selling co-operatives) and the higher forms (collective economic forms). What did he say at that time regarding the co-operative, the co-operative undertakings?

„Under the order of society prevailing in our country — says Lenin — the co-operative undertakings differ from the private capitalist undertakings, as they are collective undertakings; they do not, however, differ from the socialist undertakings if they operate on land and with means of production which belong to the State, i. e. to the working class.“

Lenin therefore regarded the co-operative undertakings not as something apart, but in connection with the order prevailing with us, in connection with the fact that they carry on operations on land which belongs to the State, and in a country where the means of production belong to the State. And having considered them in this manner, Lenin declares that the co-operative undertakings do not differ from the socialist undertakings.

That is what Lenin says regarding the co-operative undertakings in general. Is it not clear, then, that we have all the more right to say the same of the collective farms in the present period?

This also, by the way, explains why Lenin regarded the „simple growth of the co-operatives“ under the Soviet power as „identical with the growth of socialism“.

Thus you see that the speaker before mentioned committed a great error against Leninism when he belittled the collective farms.

From this error there follows a second — regarding the class struggle on the collective farms. The speaker portrayed the class struggle on the collective farms in such glaring colours, that one might think that the class struggle on the collective farms does not differ from the class struggle outside of the collective farms, and in fact is raging even more fiercely.

It should be mentioned, however, that not only the speaker mentioned before has erred in this question. The idle talk about the class struggle, the whining about the class struggle on the collective farms is to-day one of the characteristic features of our „left“ shouters. The most cynical thing about this whining is that these people „see“ the class struggle where it does not exist, or scarcely at all, but on the other hand do not notice it where it exists and exceeds all bounds.

Are there elements of the class struggle on the collective farms? Yes. There are bound to be elements of the class struggle on the collective farms when there still exist there remnants of individualistic, in fact big peasant psychology, as well as a certain inequality. Can one say that the class struggle on the collective farms is the same thing as the class struggle outside of them? By no means. It is one of the mistakes of our "left" phrasemongers that they do not perceive this difference . . . What does the class struggle **outside** of the collective farms mean, **before** the latter have been set up? It means a fight against the kulak, who owns tools and means of production with the aid of which he subordinates the village poor. This struggle is a life and death struggle. What, however, is the meaning of the class struggle on the basis of the collective farms? It means, in the first place, that the kulak is crushed, that he no longer possesses tools and the instruments of production.

That means, in the second place, that the poor and middle peasants are united in collective undertakings on the basis of the socialisation of the most important tools and means of production. It means, finally, that it is now a question of a fight between members of collective farms, many of whom have not yet discarded the individualistic and big peasant traditions and are endeavouring to use to their own advantage the inequality which still exists to a certain extent on the collective farms, while the rest desire to eliminate this inequality from the collective farms. Is it not clear then that only the blind fail to see the difference between the class struggle on the basis of the collective farms and the class struggle outside of the collective farms?

It would be a mistake to believe that once a collective farm exists there exists all that is necessary for the building up of socialism. It would be an even greater error to believe that the members of the collective farms have already become socialists. No, it will still require considerable work in order to convert them into collectivist peasants, to liberate them from their individualistic psychology and to reshape them into real producers in a socialist society. This will be done the more quickly, the more rapidly the collective farms are equipped with machinery and the more rapidly they are supplied with tractors.

That does not, however, in any way reduce the tremendous importance of the collective farms as an instrument for the socialist transformation of the village. The great importance of the collective farms lies precisely in the fact that they represent the chief basis for the employment of machinery and tractors in agriculture, the chief basis for the transformation of the peasant, for the reshaping of his psychology in the spirit of proletarian socialism. Lenin was quite right when he said:

"The reshaping of the small farmer, the reshaping of his whole psychology requires generations. Only the material basis, technic, the employment of tractors and machines in agriculture on a large scale, electrification on a large scale can solve this question with the small farmer, heal his whole psychology, so to speak."

Who can question that the collective farms constitute that form of socialist economy by which alone the millions of the small peasantry can connect themselves with machines and tractors as with the lever of economic progress and of socialist development of agriculture.

Our "left" phrasemongers, and also our speaker, have forgotten all this.

6. The Class Changes and the Turn in the Policy of the Party.

We come finally to the question of the class changes and the attack of Socialism on the capitalist elements in the village.

The characteristic feature of our work during the past year is a) that we, as a Party, as the Soviet power, have developed the attack on the whole front against the capitalist elements in the village and b) that this attack, as is known, has led and is leading to very palpable and positive results.

What does that mean. It means that we have gone over from the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks to the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class. This means that we have carried out, or are carrying out one of the most decided changes in our whole policy.

Up till quite lately the Party pursued the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulak. As is known, this policy was proclaimed already at the 8th Party Congress.

The same policy was again announced at the time of the introduction of the New Economic Policy and at the 11th Party Congress. We all remember Lenin's celebrated letter to Preobrazhensky (1922), in which he again raised the question of the necessity of such a policy. This policy was of course confirmed by the 15th congress of our Party. And it is this policy that we carried out right up to recently.

Was this policy correct. Yes it was indubitably correct. Could we, perchance, five or three years ago have undertaken such an attack on the kulak as we are carrying out to-day? Could we at that time have reckoned on such an attack being successful? No, we could not. That would have been the most dangerous adventurism! That would have been an exceedingly dangerous playing at attack. We would certainly have come to grief and thereby strengthened the positions of the kulaks. Why? Because we had not yet at our disposal those points of support in the village in the shape of a broad network of Soviet estate and collective farms upon which we could rely in the decisive attack on the kulaks. Because at that time it was not possible for us to **substitute** the capitalist production of the kulak by socialist production in the shape of the collective farms and Soviet estates.

In the year 1927 the Zinoviev-Trotsky opposition wanted at all costs to force upon the party the policy of an immediate attack on the kulaks. The Party did not enter on this adventure, as it knew that serious people do not play at attack. The attack on the kulaks is a very serious matter. One must not confuse it with declamation against the kulaks. One cannot confuse it with a policy of skirmishing with the kulaks, which the Zinoviev-Trotsky energetically endeavoured to enforce upon the Party. To attack the kulaks means to smash the kulaks, to liquidate them as a class. Without these aims attack is a declamation, a skirmish, anything but a real bolshevist attack. To attack the kulaks means to make proper preparations and then deliver the blow, such a blow that they are not able to recover. That is what we Bolsheviks call a real attack. Could we have undertaken such an attack five or three years ago with any prospect of success? No we could not.

In the year 1927 the kulak produced over 600 million poods of grain, 150 million poods of which he got rid of by exchange outside of the village. That is a fairly serious force with which one must reckon. And how much did our Soviet estates and collective farms produce at that time? About 80 million poods, of which they threw 35 million poods (commodity grain) onto the market. Judge for yourselves whether at that time we were in a position to replace the production and the commodity grain of the kulaks by the production and the commodity grain of our Soviet estates and collective farms. It is clear that we could not have done so. What would it have meant to undertake a decisive attack on the kulak under such conditions? It would have meant running our heads against a brick wall, strengthening the positions of the kulaks and at the same time remaining without grain. Therefore we could not at that time undertake any attack on the kulak, in spite of the adventurist declamations of the Zinoviev-Trotsky opposition.

And how does matter stand at present? We now have an adequate material basis in order to deliver a blow against the kulak, to break his resistance, to annihilate him as a class and to replace his production by the production of the Soviet estates and collective farms. You are aware that the grain produced on the collective farms and Soviet estates amounted in 1929 to no less than 400 million poods (200 million poods less the total production of the kulak farms in the year 1927). You also know that in 1927 the collective farms and Soviet estates delivered more than 130 million poods of commodity grain (that is more than the kulaks in the year 1927). In the year 1930 the total production of the collective farms and Soviet estates will amount to no less than 900 million poods (i. e. considerably more than the total production of the kulaks in the year 1927), and they will supply not less than 400 million poods of commodity grain (i. e. incomparably more than the kulak in the year 1927).

As is to be seen, to-day there exists the material basis enabling the big peasant production to be replaced by that of the collective farms and Soviet estates. That is why our attack

on the kulak has now met with undeniable success. That is how one must attack the kulak, when it is a question of a real attack and not empty declamation. It is for this reason that we have recently gone over from the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulak to the policy of liquidating the kulak.

Now how shall we approach the policy of "dekulakisation" (purging the village of the kulaks. Ed.)? Can we permit dekulakisation in the fully collectivised districts — this question is put from various sides. A ridiculous question! We could not permit dekulakisation so long as we were pursuing the policy of restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks, so long as we had no possibility of replacing big peasant production by the production of the collective farms and Soviet estates. At that time a policy which did not permit dekulakisation was correct and necessary.

To-day the matter is different. To-day we have the possibility of making a decided attack on the kulak, breaking his resistance, liquidating him as a class and replacing his production by the production of the collective farms and Soviet estates. To-day, dekulakisation is being carried out by the masses of poor and middle peasants themselves, who are realising complete collectivisation. In the completely collectivised districts dekulakisation it today no longer a simple administrative measure, it forms an integral part of the formation and development of collective farms. Therefore it is ridiculous and nonsensical to talk a lot about dekulakisation. As a Russian proverb says, "A beheaded man does not bemoan the loss of his hair".

No less ridiculous is the other question, whether we can accept the kulaks in the collective farms. Of course not, as he is a sworn enemy of the collectivisation movement. The matter is perfectly plain.

7. Conclusions.

There are therefore six knotty questions which the theoretical work of our Marxist agrarian researchers cannot pass over.

The importance of these questions consists before all in the fact that their Marxist elaboration furnishes the possibility of exterminating root and branch all and every kind of bourgeois theory which at times — to our shame — are spread by our communist comrades and which confuse the heads of our practical workers. And it is really high time that these theories were rooted out and discarded. It is only in a ruthless fight against these theories that the theoretical ideas of the Marxist agrarian researchers can grow and become strong.

The importance of these questions consists, finally, in the fact that they place the old problems of the economy of the transition period in a new light.

To-day the question of the N.E.P., the question of the classes, of the collective farms, of the economy of the transition period are approached in a new manner. The mistakes of those who regard the N.E.P. as a retreat and only as a retreat, must be dragged to the light of day. As a matter of fact Lenin said already at the time of the introduction of the N.E.P., that the N.E.P. represents not only a retreat, but it is at the same time the preparation for a new and decisive attack on the capitalist elements in town and country.

It is necessary to expose the mistakes of those who believe that the N.E.P. was necessary only for the purpose of connecting the town and the country. We cannot make use of every connection between town and country. We require such a connection as will guarantee the victory of socialism. And if we cling to the N.E.P., it is because it serves the cause of socialism. As soon as it ceases to be serviceable to the cause of socialism we will fling it aside. Lenin said that the N.E.P. was introduced seriously and for a long time. But he never said that it had been introduced for all time.

We must also put the question of popularising the Marxist theory of reproduction. We must work out the question of the construction scheme of the balance of our national economy. That which the Central Statistical Office put forward in the year 1926 as the balance of the national economy is not a balance but a game with figures. Also the manner in which Basallov and Gromann treat the problem of the balance of national economy does not bring us any nearer to the matter. The revolutionary Marxists must work out the scheme of the national economic balance if they wish to engage at all in the working out of the economic questions

of the transition period. It would be good if our Marxist economists appointed a special group from their circle who would have the task of working out the economic problems of the transition period as they confront us to-day.

The Creation of Cadres.

By D. Saslavsky (Moscow).

The task is laid down: In order to carry out the Five-Year Plan (now already the four-year plan) not only new factories are necessary but also new men, namely 800,000 new skilled and semi-skilled workers, 80,000 engineers, 150,000 technicians.

The new leading cadres of industry must arise from the working class, if not completely but in their majority. Socialist industry can be built up by only the hands of men really devoted to socialism.

The working youth is gradually filling the higher technical schools of the Soviet Union. Three years ago about 40,000 students attended these schools; already 40 per cent. of them were workers, and together with the peasants they comprised over the half. But it was laid down that in the near future three quarters of the students of the technical high schools must be workers and peasants.

How is the training of these cadres carried on at present? The so-called factory schools are being attached to the factories. But there are also workers faculties at the technical high schools, in which the young workers are being prepared for the technical high schools. Every year the trade unions send a certain number of young workers to fill the proletarian cadres. But all this is not sufficient.

We need new institutes which are now being established in all parts of the Soviet Union near the big factories. Near Dneprostroy, for instance, there is being organised a big high school for building construction accommodating 3000 students. Theory and practice at the same place. The construction of new factories will take place before the eyes of the workers students. Near the new engine factory in Bjeshtze an institute for machine construction is being established.

Instruction in these schools has completely changed: the books are being adapted to work at the benches. In all institutes uninterrupted working practice is being introduced. The student learns for three days and the other three days he works in the factory. The State factories are obliged to accept workers' students for practical training. Such a practice on a large scale is quite impossible in the capitalist countries. It is only being practised in individual factories in America. Up to now the system of uninterrupted working practice was carried through only in an electro-technical institute, at the head of which stands the famous Professor Kagan-Shabachay. This system has now been introduced in all technical schools.

But this is not sufficient. It is necessary that technical knowledge is not only acquired by individual workers but becomes the common property of the whole of the working masses. Recently there arose the idea of the "Factory technical school". This idea was approved and recommended by the Party. It means that for workers who desire it, the three-days week is introduced: they work for two days and on the third they learn in the factory itself, in the laboratories, at the bench. The factory is at the same time factory and university, this is to become the new type of factory of socialist society.

This idea has been enthusiastically welcomed. The workers of the great Moscow automobile factory "Amo" have discussed this proposal and warmly supported it. Its carrying out demands certain sacrifices from the workers, they earn less in the three day week. But this questions has not even been discussed. The workers willingly put up with this loss in wages in order to become qualified. This fact shows the burning desire for knowledge permeating the working class. Another Moscow factory, the small "Samototchka" employing 400 workers, made the offer to convert the factory into such a "factory technical school".

Of course this is no easy task. In the discussions a whole number of difficulties were pointed out. But the path of the Russian working class is full of difficulties which are overcome by an energetic struggle. The specialists have examined the question of the "factory technical school" and consider it feasible.

The youth must fight step by step for the universities and the laboratories. Compared with the wealth of school equipment which the capitalist bourgeoisie, especially in America, has at its disposal, we are very poor. But in this respect also a great work of construction is proceeding; big houses are being built to accommodate students, the life of the students is being organised in these homes and one can reckon that in the near future the privations of the workers' students will be a matter of the past. The chief thing is: the courageous and firm will of the working youth, its great desire to overcome the last remnants of the bourgeois monopoly of science and to train its own engineers and leading industrial workers for the socialist country.

The universities and technical schools were for a long time the strongholds of the monopolists of science who had established themselves there before the new life. The working youth has captured these strongholds, is driving these old monopolists out, tearing down the walls and uniting life with science, factory practice with scientific theory. It is that of which the teachers of Communism have long spoken.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

The Terror in Indo-China and the Development of the Revolutionary Movement.

By A. N.

Indo-China, a colony of French imperialism in the Far East, is at present undergoing a regime of unheard terror.

In February 1929 mass arrests took place following the execution of **Bazin**, the director of the office for the recruitment of labour in Tongking for the plantations in Southern Indo-China and in the **New Hebrides** and **New Caledonia**. At the same time a secret organisation of the nationalists in **Annam** was discovered; the matter was brought before the court and 6 revolutionaries from Annam were sentenced to more than 300 years' imprisonment. **Lo Sap Qiat**, a former sergeant, who has been sentenced to capital punishment in his absence, and who has been the leader of the revolutionary movement of **Binh Lieu**, was arrested on the Chinese frontier; the court commission, which was hurriedly called together, confirmed the death sentence.

These monstrous reprisals, which first began in Tongking, were also later carried out in **Annam** and the other parts of Indo-China.

The organisation of the revolutionary youth of **Annam** was discovered in the carrying out of a widespread distribution of leaflets against the Chinese hangmen who had arrested the Annamite revolutionaries who had fled to China; hundreds of these young revolutionaries were thrown into prison. Two members of this organisation were sentenced to death without any evidence being produced against them, and several others were sentenced to hard labour for life.

In **Cochin-China** hundreds of Annamite Communists are awaiting trial in prison on the charge of having conspired against the security of the State.

The mass arrests and house-searches, which are carried out quite arbitrarily, are continuing. Whilst hundreds of revolutionaries are thrown into prison without any evidence of their guilt, others are horribly tortured to death in the offices of the police. **Nguyen Van Vien** of **Hanoi**, who had been sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, **Nguyen Van Vien** of **Bac Ninh** who has been sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment, **Le Huan**, a former political deportee, and others have been murdered in prison.

Nevertheless these cruel reprisals cannot stop the growing action of the masses. Already after the execution of **Bazin** the Indo-Chinese had proved that they will not allow themselves to be exploited, to be legally murdered, to be dragged about over the whole world in order to be used as slaves by the imperialist sharks, without raising energetic protest. Revolts of the coolies on the plantations against their inhuman treatment are breaking out again and again. In many districts the workers are on strike against their imperialist and native exploiters.

The Communist Party of **Annam** and the illegal revo-

lutionary trade unions have been reorganised. On the anniversary of the October Revolution leaflets against French imperialism and for the Soviet Union were distributed in the whole of Indo-China. In **Hue**, the capital of **Annam**, a big red flag with the sickle and hammer and fighting slogans was hoisted on the 7th of November. On the same day, two red streamers with inscriptions referring to the anniversary of the October Revolution, were displayed in the chief streets of **Camau** in Western **Cochin-China**. On armistice day leaflets were distributed in **Hanoi**, **Salgon** and surroundings, calling upon the toiling population not to participate in the military parades. Numerous placards on the walls stigmatised the terror of French imperialism and called upon the toiling masses to organise for the final struggle.

In spite of the terrorist regime of **Pasquier**, Governor General of Indo-China, the revolutionary movement is extending and will put an end to the cruel rule of French imperialism.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Eleventh Congress of the C. P. of Great Britain.

By R. Page Arnot (London).

The Eleventh Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain held on November 30th to December 2nd, marks a decisive turning point in the development of the party into a mass Bolshevik party. By its cleansing of the party leadership of opportunist and conciliatory tendencies, by its fiercely self-critical mood reanimating the party cadres, the Congress furnished prerequisites for a mobilisation of the revolutionary working class together with the toiling masses of the colonies against Imperialism and Social-Fascism.

The Congress met at a moment when British Imperialism, falling behind in the race with its imperialist rivals on the world market, faced by the growing colonial revolution, confronted with the growth of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, is launching a savage attack on the working class, an attack rendered more savage by the beginning of a world economic crisis, and is endeavouring to rivet the chains more firmly upon the colonial peoples. The specific task of the MacDonald Government is to carry forward war preparedness, especially against the U.S.S.R., under a screen of pacifist phrases, to try to win over the landlords and the bourgeoisie of the colonies in order more effectively to defend imperialism against the rising colonial revolution, and to endeavour to break the resistance of the British working class to rationalisation. These endeavours are doomed to failure: and are meeting with a higher wave of the colonial revolution and of the radicalised working class.

In this objectively favourable situation, the Congress had first of all to ensure the liquidation of the Right Danger inside the party which had prevented the carrying through of the line of the Comintern, had diminished the numbers and influence of the party, and had hampered the development of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. The opportunist tendency in the British Party, which already could be discerned after the General Strike, had, in the last two years, developed and after the 9th Plenum it exhibited the characteristic standpoint of the International Right Wing. The line of the 9th Plenum was sabotaged in deeds. The decisions of the 9th Plenum were not carried through but instead, many erroneous tactics were carried through, based on an overestimation of capitalist stabilisation, on an underestimation of the radicalisation of the proletariat, (especially of the effects of the General Strike) on a wrong attitude to the Social democrats (especially shewn in the attitude to the Cook-Maxton manoeuvre) and in a lack of confidence in the independent leadership of the working class struggle by the Communist Party.

In the Central Committee the opportunist influence developed so strongly that at the end of March, 1929, two months before the General Election, five leading comrades voted for the support of MacDonald in constituencies where the C. P. had no candidate, a proposal which would have not only meant that in 95 % of the constituencies the C. P. would have sup-

ported the Labour Party but also would have taken the heart out of the Communist Party struggle in the remaining 5%.

After the General Election, the opportunist elements enforced their organisational control by changing the politburo so as to strengthen the opportunist influences thereon, a step which (along with the failure to apply the line of the March closed letter of the E.C.C.I.) caused wide dissatisfaction in the membership, such districts as London, Manchester and Newcastle as well as the C.C. of the Young Communist League passing resolutions against the line of the Central Committee.

Though this condition was remedied after the 10th Plenum by the choice of a political bureau nearer to the correct line, and though a self-critical resolution was adopted by the August Plenum of the Central Committee, the errors committed by the leadership did not cease, the struggle inside the leadership was not sufficiently carried into the life of the party and the pre-congress discussion was not adequately led so as to bring out the line of the party clearly or to emphasise the main tasks before it.

Under these circumstances the Congress delegates assembled in a mood of militant self-criticism and, as a result of the revolt throughout large portions of the party membership against opportunist views and waverings (mainly directed against the leadership), with a determination to concentrate on the inner party situation.

The Congress concentrated most on the task of cleansing the Central Committee. For the first time in the history of the Party, instead of the so-called "democratic" open vote of Congress (really Social Democratic method, because its only effect was to ensure the yearly re-election without an ounce of political discussion, of those whose names had been most prominently before the Party) a Bolshevik method was adopted. For the purpose of drawing up the C. C. list a nominations commission was elected by the Congress.

The political qualifications of each candidate were discussed exhaustively in the nominations commission and in the District delegations. Thereafter a list containing 12 of the old C.C. and 23 new members was adopted by the Congress, with one addition. Amongst those who were not re-elected, were Comrades Inkpin, Rothstein, Horner, Bell.

The new Central Committee, meeting within a few days, rounded off the work of the Congress, by laying down clearly the principal immediate tasks before the Party and by elaborating the necessary tactics.

The fight against the Government and against the Pseudo-Lefts has to be organised in a programme of struggle which has to combine the daily demands with the general political slogans, and so develop every partial struggle into a fight against the Labour Government. The necessary weapon for this fight was the creation of the Daily paper, and the Congress resolved to set the zero hour for the production of the **Daily Worker**, at 1st January, 1930 — a resolve which has since been carried through. Further, the fight could not be carried on without the application of the United Front from below, which the Party had not as yet learned to apply.

Amongst the concrete tasks which lay before the party were: — to change colonial work into a living part of the daily activity of the party bound up with the struggle in the factories, so as to realise the united front of the British workers and the colonial masses: In the very centre of this work is agitation against the trial of the 33 leaders of the Indian workers at Meerut, the fight for their release. The fight against the rationalisation drive of the Labour Government, its imposition of wage cuts by arbitration, the fight of the unemployed, the fight in industry after industry, especially mining, transport and textiles, all these were taken up under definite organisational slogans of struggle such as the election of Factory committees of action to lead the struggle, of both organised and unorganised.

The Congress laid it down very clearly that the double pre-requisite for the party becoming a mass Bolshevik party and fulfilling its immediate tasks was on the one hand the conduct of an ideological campaign against the opportunism in the party, and on the other the rooting of the party on the basis of the factory cell.

The 11th Congress marks the fact that for the first time in the history of the British Party an opportunist tendency was discussed openly and openly fought. This conflict revived the party's proletarian self-criticism and party democracy began for the first time to exist. The atmosphere of the 10th Plenum swept through the party, cleansing it of the cobwebs.

That fight against the Right Danger, now well begun, has to be carried right through ideologically and organisationally. Thereby the British Party will grow, gain strength and become hardened into Bolshevism.

Trade Union Movement

The 10th All-India Trade Union Congress.

By Glyn Evans.

The action of the Reformists, in sabotaging strikes in India (Jute strike in Calcutta, and more especially the Bombay Textile strike) alienated workers from the trade unions controlled by the reformists. A large number of workers left the reformist unions and with masses of previously unorganised rallied to the militant **Red Flag Unions** which, led by the Workers and Peasants party conducted heroic battles against their class enemies.

The intense difference of opinion and different action taken in cases of Trade Union policy (reformist and revolutionary), came to a head at the **10th All-India Trade Union Congress, held at Nagpur Nov. 29th — Dec. 4th 1929.**

The Congress split, the reformists seceding from the Congress even before the open session began.

An indication of the feeling against the reformists was expressed when, on the arrival of **Joshi** and **Chamanlal** at Nagpur, they were greeted by a large number of delegates with hostile shouts. It is to be remembered that the Congress had sent an invitation to the Communist Party of Great Britain to send a fraternal delegate. **W. Gallacher** was elected by the Party but the British "Labour" Government refused his passport.

At the Executive meeting prior to the open congress, the Vice-Chairman of the Reception Committee took objection to the "objectionable" nature of the placards placed outside, and handed in his resignation. The placards bore the inscriptions "Down with Chamanlal", "Down with Joshi". **Deshpande** stated that he had placed them there.

The reports of the actual discussion and voting at the congress and the E. C. meeting prior to it have not yet appeared, but a further indication of the struggle between Reformists and revolutionary policy is given in the several statement made by various parties issued to the press after the Congress.

Ginwalla, a member of the Legislative council, in a statement, shows up the attempt of the reformists to restrict the voting power of the newly affiliated Red Flag Unions.

"The Girni Kamgar Union" states Ginwalla "claimed a membership of 54,000 on the strength of the report in the credentials committee, consisting of Kulkarni, Shiva Rao, and Jawaharlal Nehru with Bakhale as Secretary. The Committee after a full discussion could not come to a unanimous conclusion. It, therefore, informed the E. C. about the three views of the members. Some recommended a membership of 25,000, others 40,000 and the third was for 50,000. . . . My motion for 40,000 membership was carried by the casting vote of Jawaharlal Nehru. The right wing trade unionists wanted to give a normal membership of 6,000 to the Girni Kamgar Unions, which is hardly fair, in view of the fact that even in the credentials committee the lowest membership recommended was 25,000. This would make no difference in the voting power of the G. K. U. on the E. C. council whether a nominal membership of 6,000 or a larger membership of 40,000 was given. In any event they were entitled to a membership of 4 members on the E. C."

The **Whitley Commission** boycott was discussed. Ginwalla moved a resolution for the complete boycott of the Commission. He was supported by Kulkarni, Raikar (Girni Kamgar Union and G. I. P. Railwaymen's union) and S. Chandra Bose.

M. Kanti Bose moved for conditional boycott, the conditions being, withdrawal of the Meerut case, the Public Safety Ordinance and the repeal of the Trades Dispute Act.

A resolution for complete wholehearted cooperation with the Commission was supported by Shiva Rao, K. R. Choudhury, Joshi, Chamanlal and L. Hussam. After a heated discussion lasting five hours the vote was taken and complete

boycott resolution was carried by 53 to 41. Of the Bengal Unions, the newly affiliated Jute workers Unions and Lilloah Railway Union and the B. N. Railway Union voted for complete boycott. Following this vote a two hours discussion centred round a resolution moved by Deshpande, Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Union for affiliation to the Pan-Pacific Secretariat. This resolution was carried.

Other resolutions agreed upon to be placed before the open Congress were, affiliation to the League Against Imperialism, the rejection of the proposal to hold an Asiatic Labour Conference; the refusal to send delegations to the future sessions of the International Labour Conferences of the League of Nations at Geneva; the re-appointment of the Worker's Welfare League of India as the agent of the All India T. U. C. in Britain (broken off at the instigation of Purcell and Hallsworth, the British T. U. C. delegates to the Congress in 1928) rejection of the proposal for a Round Table Conference and the condemnation of the Nehru Report. One of the most important resolutions passed at the E. C. — affiliation to the Pan-Pacific Secretariat — was withdrawn by Deshpande at the open session, in order states Liberty to avoid a split. The split had already occurred, before the open session of the Congress.

The open session was held in a huge Pandit; outside were hung huge placards with inscriptions, "Long live Revolution", "Remember your comrades at Meerut"; "Forget not the sacrifices of Jatin Das"; "Down with Imperialism"; "Youth of India stand for complete independence"; "Don't be deluded by Round Table Conferences" etc.

These slogans denote the politics which dominated the life of the Congress.

R. S. Rulkar, in his Chairman's speech, dealt with the repressive action of the Imperialist Government and the capitalist class in India, the Meerut Trial and the attempt to stifle the Girni Kamgar Union by prohibiting meetings, etc. He attacked the Whitley Commission whose real object he states was to "undermine the solidarity of the Indian working class and to whitewash the repressive policy of the Government".

"He advocated a militant policy and put the question of 'Geneva or Moscow'. He plumped for Moscow. The Russian Revolution has been an event of great magnitude, the real character of which is not still understood by many of us".

He advocated the use of the General Strike as the only means of gaining complete independence.

Jawaharlal Nehru, made a Presidential speech of a Brockway-Maxton type. He condemned the capitalist system, roundly denounced the Whitley Commission. He said in relation to the Commission and the part the Labour Government plays in it: —

"Their (the Labour Government spokesmen) chief aim appears to prove to the world that they are as sober and respectable as those who are the inheritors of wealth. When Prime Minister MacDonald speaks in America or in Geneva is it the Socialist and the Pacifist that is speaking? He speaks as the representative of Imperialist England and Austin Chamberlain could be no fitter representative. Mr. Snowden at the Hague forgets his Socialism and stands for the prestige of 'John Bull' and the glory of the Union Jack. The very triumphs of the Labour Government's policy, such as they are, are the triumphs of Imperialist policy."

He then dealt with British Labour Imperialist policy in China, Egypt and Palestine. The Labour Party in England under Mr. MacDonald's guidance, was the complacent partner of the Tory Party in their imperialist policy.

It was when dealing with international affiliations that Nehru tried to be the real statesman. Moscow at any cost must be tabooed. "If I may venture to suggest it would be best for us not to affiliate to either international." (2nd or 3rd.)

Of the 2nd. International, he said that the "occupancy of office in various countries, has made its leaders betray their principles and become the exponents of a new type of imperialism, Labour imperialism, which may not speak in the accents of the Tories, but which is none the less thorough. To affiliate to Amsterdam would be disastrous to our cause". He followed by stating that he was an admirer of Soviet Russia and asked the Congress to ignore the threats held out to those who have had any connection with the Third International.

Still, he finds certain objections against the 3rd International and asked the Congress to "keep off the rocks", implying a centre way out, which is obviously impossible. "The Labour

movement is above all International. It seeks to build society on a cooperative basis".

The purport of his speech was to keep the Indian T. U. C. away from Moscow. In fact the R. I. L. U. was not mentioned by him though that would be the appropriate body to affiliate to, as the organisation built up upon an industrial basis, with the Third or Communist International giving the political leadership rather than the C. I. itself.

The prisoners at Meerut, all of them having close connection with the T. U. C. sent a telegram to the Congress. It was sent by Joglekar and 26 of the accused signed it headed by the veteran of the Trade Union movement in India, D. R. Thengde. The telegram is as follows: —

"Congratulations for the bold lead given by the Congress. Hope the E. C. will follow it up and force the powerful working class to the front. We emphatically condemn the definitely pro-capitalist move of Joshi, Chamanlal and Co. splitting the workers ranks by starting separate Federation as the price for membership of the Royal Commission."

Subhas Chandre Bose was elected President, Deshpande Secretary and Ginwalla Treasurer for the next year.

The Congress report suggests that Bose and Nehru are becoming revolutionary. The same might have been said after the British T. U. C. Congress at Scarborough in 1925, of Purcell, Hicks and Cook. We have seen what happened to Purcell and Co.

Driven by the mass struggle, Bose and Nehru are forced to take up a "left" pose: but as the crisis develops, Bose, Nehru and others will fail as utterly as have Purcell, Hicks and Cook. In India as in Britain the only leadership of the working class is the revolutionary leadership of the Communist Party.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Extraordinary Party Congress of the Labour Party of Iceland.

By B. J. (Reykjavik).

At the last Party Congress of the Icelandic Labour Party in 1928 it was decided to convene an extraordinary Party Congress for the end of 1929 which should deal with the trade union questions. The Communists had proposed to re-elect the delegates and to invite the numerous trade unions which were not affiliated to the Labour Party to participate in this Congress. This proposal was rejected by the social democratic party leadership.

In spite of this the number of Communist representatives was this time 10 as against 5 at the previous Congress. This larger representation was due to the fact that some trade unions have withdrawn their former social democratic representatives and replaced them by Communists. The social democratic leaders at first threatened to annul this election, but did not carry out their threat, as they wished to avoid a split in view of the approaching elections to the Althing (Parliament).

Since it assumed office in 1926 the reactionary peasant government has been supported by the social democrats, although the anti-labour policy of this government has become more and more obvious. It has considerably reduced wages, which in the State undertakings only amount to 40 to 60 per cent of the lowest wages paid in private industry. In spite of this the social democracy will not undertake anything against this government. It has, in collusion with the Conservative party, fixed the day of the elections to the Althing at a time when the majority of the workers are scattered over the whole country as a result of seasonal work, and therefore have no opportunity to go to the poll. The government also attempted to introduce a compulsory arbitration law, but had to abandon this attempt owing to the determined opposition it aroused.

When the question of coalition was discussed at the extraordinary Party Congress, the Communists exercised sharp criticism of the Party leadership, which was not without effect. They submitted a motion in which they demanded that support of the government by the social democrats be dependent on a number of conditions. The social democratic

leaders did not venture to put this motion to the vote, and therefore referred it to a commission. Instead they submitted a pious, hypocritical resolution declaring for unconditional support of the government. This resolution was then adopted by a big majority. Nevertheless it is clear that there exists great dissatisfaction among the working masses with the social democratic tactic, which dissatisfaction can be considerably enhanced by a correct and energetic policy of the Communists.

With regard to the trade unions the social democratic leaders submitted to the previous Party Congress draft statutes, according to which inner democracy is to be completely abolished. This draft has been rejected by an overwhelming majority of the members wherever it has been discussed in the trade unions.

The Communists proposed to convene a Congress in Autumn 1930, to which all the trade unions which are not affiliated to the Labour Party, are to be invited. This Congress would have to decide on the formation of a Trade Union Federation for the whole of Iceland, push back the influence of the social democrats and create the preconditions for the founding of a Communist Party. The motion was strongly opposed by the social democratic bureaucrats but was supported by individual social democratic delegates. The motion was rejected by the majority, which however adopted a similar resolution. It will now be the task of the Communists to win the majority of the delegates to this Labour Congress.

The Communists further proposed, as at the previous Congress, to take a ballot of the membership on the question of the Labour Party's affiliation to the II. International. The social democratic leaders sabotaged the discussion of this question and prevented the vote being taken, which is a sign that they are being driven to the defensive.

On the occasion of the thousandth anniversary of the Althing next Summer, a great nationalist festival is to take place. All parties, including the social democratic, are represented on the festival committee. The government of Iceland has officially invited the governments of most of the European States to participate in this festival. Therefore the Communists proposed that the Labour Party withdraw its representatives from this committee and protest by great mass meetings and leaflets against the participation of the imperialist and fascist States in this festival; but the social democratic leaders refused to put this motion to the vote.

After the conclusion of the Party Congress a Conference of the Communist National Committee took place in order to discuss the tasks of the Communists for the next future. These include: 1. Preparation of the general trade union Congress; 2. to advocate in all trade unions that after a discussion on the international affiliation of the Labour Party a vote should be taken on this question; 3. the national festival shall be made use of for a far-reaching anti-imperialist propaganda and to rally the workers to the fight for the defence of the Soviet Union

THE PEASANT MOVEMENT

Demonstration of Small Peasants in South Germany.

A Prelude to the European Peasant Congress.

By M. (Berlin).

The profound crisis of world capitalism and especially the agrarian crisis is rendering the position of the small peasants of Germany so difficult that they are in a state of great excitement and unrest. This fact was strikingly shown at the peasants' demonstration, held on Sunday the 5th January at Würzburg in preparation for the European Peasant Congress. Small peasants from East Prussia, Thuringia, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg, Schleswig-Holstein, Oldenburg, Hessen, Württemberg, Baden and Bavaria were sent by the District Committees as delegates to Würzburg to prepare for the European Peasant Congress.

Vitus Heller, a radical peasant leader, spoke on the desperate situation of the South German peasants; Miglioli (Italy) spoke against Fascism and the danger of war; and the secretary of the Preparatory Committee, Harry Richter, spoke on the international situation. The slogan "away from the

big landowners en masse" was received with tremendous applause.

The European Peasant Congress, which is to take place at the end of March, was welcomed with great enthusiasm. A resolution against giving support to the kulaks who have emigrated from the Soviet Union was adopted unanimously. A national Committee for the preparation of the European Peasant Congress was elected.

Some landowners and fascists whom they had brought with them wanted to break up this gigantic demonstration. Police marched into the hall and tried to disperse the gathering. The peasants, however, stood their ground and shouted the reactionary big landowners down. The latter thereupon left the hall followed by a handful of supporters. When a few landowners and a secretary of the Christian Peasant Union called to the peasants to stand by their old and "tried" leaders, it came to tumultuous scenes. The agrarians were shouted down and peasants' fists were shaken at them. It was here that the police tried to intervene. The chairman of the meeting, however, succeeded in preventing this, and the demonstration was carried out to an end. A resolution was adopted protesting against the arrests which are taking place in Poland of the peasants delegated to the European Peasant Congress. The bourgeois press has maintained complete silence regarding this peasant demonstration.

The peasant demonstration in Würzburg is of great importance to the working peasants in all capitalist countries. It shows that even in Catholic Bavaria the peasants are awakening while it is also a good augury for the success of the European Peasant Congress.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

Lessons and Prospects of the Economic Struggles.

Report delivered by Comrade Losovsky at the Plenary Session of the Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U.

(Continued).

In the question of the political strike we naturally take our stand at the opposite pole to the social democrats and reformists. They are opposed to economic strikes, and even more to political ones. They believe that this "expensive" means of struggle can be replaced by others, whilst we on the contrary are of the opinion that this means is effectual precisely for the reason that it comes expensive for the capitalist state. Every strike must be carefully prepared, care must be taken when it begins to go beyond the limits, when it spreads to fresh categories of workers, when a step forward may be made, when fresh reserves are to be brought into the field, when the demands can be extended and a number of political demands added, and when this strike is in a position to pass forward into a political mass strike raising the whole of the political problems already facing us.

It need not be said that we cannot isolate the political strike from the other methods of fighting. It is true that the fighting methods of the working class, the methods of direct action, can be reduced to their component parts like the links of a chain: the economic strike, the political strike, the armed rebellion, the civil war. But it must not be assumed that any sharp dividing line can be drawn here: there is no Chinese wall between the economic and the political strike, or between the political strike and the insurrection, or between the political strike and the insurrection, or between the insurrection and the civil war. Each form of struggle can and must merge into the next.

** In order to be able to pursue a correct policy in the sphere of the leadership of the mass movement of the proletariat, it is therefore necessary to carry on a relentless struggle against reformist and strike-breaking trade union bureaucracy on the one hand, and against the remnants of reformism in our own ranks on the other. Are there still such remnants to be found among us? I believe that they still exist in every section of the R.I.L.U. (this became especially conspicuous after the IV. Congress). They are perhaps small in number, but there certainly are groups

opposing their standpoint to that of the R.I.L.U. This became observable as early as the IV. Congress, but the tendency did not take a definite form until after this Congress. It formed a special political group in Germany, it possesses an organised group in France, in the United States, in Czechoslovakia. All these groups have one common base, they all suffer from organisation fetishism, or, if you like, from cretinism in their attitude towards the reformist trade unions. They are of the opinion the idea of leading economic struggles without and against the reformist trade unions is in itself heretical. Hence they are ready to subject the movement of the proletariat to historically evolved forms, and are prepared to abandon an independent leadership of the economic struggles on the pretext that these struggles must be led by the historically evolved reformist trade unions. It must further be remembered that they one and all deny the radicalisation of the masses, and disavow the term, possessing a profound political content, which we apply to the social democratic parties and reformist trade union leaders when we call these social fascists. They all form a special judgment on the situation, have their special policy, and their own special tactics. It is just this which places them beyond the pale of the revolutionary trade union movement. Some of them have already broken organisationally with the Red International of Labour Unions, others, for instance the Rights in France in their own federations, have broken with us ideologically; but that which they all possess in common leads them further and further away from the revolutionary wing of the labour movement. This must be clearly recognised, and due consideration given to the extent to which these tendencies, these groups, under different titles and under different flags, have deviated from our line, and how greatly they have already become alien and hostile ideologically, some of them organisationally, towards our tactics.

Under these conditions the question arises: what is to be done, what methods are to be employed against these elements. We must differentiate between the leading elements with social-democratic traditions, and the certain even if small number of workers following these elements. What line is to be adopted towards them? In the past some of these Rights have shown themselves to be outside of the ranks of the R.I.L.U., as for instance when they rejected our motion with respect to Czechoslovakia, in which we proposed that the internal disagreements should be settled democratically, that is, the majority of the members should decide what leaders they want. But Hais and Sikora hold the standpoint always held by the Amsterdamites, that they are bound to remain the heads of the trade unions till the end of their lives, and, if the majority of the union members do not desire this, then they are going to remain in their positions against the will of the majority.

It is obvious that we could not agree with such a policy, and the consequence was that this group of Czechoslovakian Rights placed itself outside of the ranks of the Red International of Labour Unions. As I have already stated, there is another type of Right, who are still in our ranks.

I may give an example. We appealed for participation in the 1st August demonstrations. We were of the opinion that a demonstration against war must be carried out on an international scale. But several trade union leaders in France spoke openly against these demonstrations, against demonstration strikes, against demonstrative proclamations. And now I say: a violation of discipline by action is no longer a shade of opinion. If we call for a strike or other action, then agitation against this is strike-breaking in our ranks. It brings our revolutionary ranks into confusion, and must be fought against with the utmost decision.

Recently the Polish social democrats called upon the miners to make a one day's demonstration strike. We know that they wanted to arrange this one day's strike for the purpose of throttling the struggle. It was not a one day's strike which should have been called for, but a strike advancing definite demands; this was what the logic of the struggle required. And what do our comrades do? They issue an appeal in which it is not said whether there is to be a strike or not, and if there is to be, what demands are to be advanced; it is simply stated that they are against everybody, against Pilsudski and the social fascists. I do not know what this really is: in any case it is very feeble

strategy, and shows that as soon as the problem of the direct guidance of the masses has to be concretely faced, a process of shuffling begins, instead of a definite and correct attitude being adopted. Or let us take Germany. In a large number of towns there are many comrades—in Central Germany for instance—who have voted for the resolution of the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U., for the independent leadership of economic struggles, for the election of strike committees, for the setting up of their own lists for the works councils elections; but as soon as the elections to the works councils take place, then they forget that all this must be realised, and seek every possible way of avoiding the fulfilment of these elementary tasks. What is this: opportunism in actual practice, or something worse?

I believe that we shall have to devote very serious attention to this misunderstanding, or we shall not emerge from the reformist bog, and the independent leadership of economic struggles will remain empty sound. Our ranks are still strong in legalist tendencies, in trade union legalism, in worship of the trade union whatever it may be like, be it the most reactionary of all, of the stamp of the trade unions of the American Federation of Labor. In spite of all this, we cling to these trade unions with what may be termed a certain piety. I believe that this tendency is still present to a high degree in our ranks. The capability of putting up a decisive fight against this legalism, and of doing what is necessary for the working class against and without trade union bureaucracy: this capability we do not yet possess. We have still to attain it, and we have still much to do to free ourselves from these ideological influences, which fetter our activity and initiative.

We are unsound at still another spot. There are comrades who maintain that at the present time, in the third period of post-war capitalism, strikes are inevitably certain of defeat. Can a partial strike bring any results for us? We have social democracy against us, the trade unions, the State, the police, the courts of law; we have everyone against us. We shall wait for the final decisive struggle, and then we shall show our courage; at present, however, we should lose everything, and should scarcely be able to gain anything. This sounds extremely radical, but it is Philistine opportunism, for it employs revolutionary phraseology for the purpose of postponing the daily struggles, the struggles during the course of which the consciousness of the masses is developed, the struggles during the course of which we train our army for the more decisive and greater struggles to follow. In my opinion we should combat these phrases determinedly. This is a variety of opportunism, and a very harmful one.

Finally, in our ranks there are still some elements who regard the strike movement as an object in itself. This reminds me of the old anarchist theory that every strike is a good thing. I believe that these ideological remnants too will have to be banished from our midst. The anarchist conception of the strike has nothing to do with our revolutionary line. Wherever this false idea of the strike obtains, whether from the economic or the political standpoint, it is a residue of anarcho-syndicalism which must be combated.

I am not in a position to enumerate here all the Right tendencies, theories, etc. observable at the present time in the movement, beginning with Sweden, where our comrades wanted to dissolve the unity committee because the reformists demanded this, and ending with Rumania, where members of revolutionary unions expressed themselves in favour of legalism at any price, under a Fascist government. It is important for us to realise that the Right deviation in our ranks is not accidental, that it is not incorporated in individual persons, to vanish with these persons when they die politically or physically. Unless we realise this we fail to recognise that the increasing acuteness of the struggle will cause even our ranks to waver, will bring deviations even into the communist ranks.

In Soviet Russia, too, a Right deviation has been observable among the leaders of the Soviet Union. How has this found expression? In the fact that the increased difficulties were accompanied by a wavering attitude on the part of some leaders. They believed that this wavering would contribute to the removal of the difficulties. Politically this wavering attitude has been distinguished by opposition to self-criticism.

to the rapid tempo of industrialisation, to the rapid tempo of the collectivisation of the rural districts, to the new tempo of activity in the trade unions—showing the ideological relationship with the international Right, with the international conciliatory tendency. In this deviation there are expressed outspokenly trade-unionistic tendencies and usages, a certain bureaucratic petrification, and some trends directed against the R.I.L.U. All this has indubitably been the result of an influence alien to the working class being exercised in our trade union movement.

The U.S.S.R. is of course not Czechoslovakia; here the formation of special unions and the seizure of the trade union buildings is of course impossible, for here the Party is very strong, here the working class has passed through a certain school. Here there are no waverings and vacillations, for every one of our workers knows that such vacillations endanger not only the speed of socialist reconstruction, but the existence of the Workers' State itself. Hence the decision, firmness, and promptness with which the trade union movement of the Soviet Union has liquidated these vacillations; the II. Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, followed by the III. Plenum, drew the political balance, and not only replaced their leaders, but spoke openly of the waverings and falterings, of the Right tendencies, of the trade-unionistic survivals, and of all the other glories of reformism. It can be said that the II. and III. Plenums brought about a revolution in the sphere of the inner policy of the Soviet trade unions, and at the same time in their outer policy, so far as the attitude of the Soviet labour unions towards the R.I.L.U. is concerned. The new leaders of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union pursue the line corresponding to the interests of the Soviet proletariat and of the international proletariat.

The importance of all strikes which have already taken place, and of those taking place in the future, goes far beyond the frontiers of any single country. This is the peculiarity of the present moment. The latest events in India—the textile workers' strike, the formation of the Girni Kamgar Union—exercise an influence extending far beyond the borders of India. The smaller strikes taking place in Czechoslovakia, in France, the Balkans, the United States; the recent strikes in Belgium; the smaller strikes in Germany, etc., have all acquired international importance owing to the peculiarities of the situation, and therefore we, the Red International of Labour Unions and its organisations, are set the extremely important task of internationalising the leadership, of internationalising the movements and extending them to many countries, of drawing the worker troops into the struggle and leading them from their various countries to the scene of the struggle, and of solving the problem of the international leadership and the practical internationalisation of our tactics. Why are these struggles becoming more and more international in character? This is the consequence, in the first place, of the growth of the international trusts, and in the second place of the indubitable solidarity of the revolutionary wing of the labour movement in the struggle against the bourgeoisie in the different countries. Therefore there stands on the order of the day the international strike, the organisation of, let us say, an international boycott or of some strike, international action on both sides of a frontier; action with relation to great political events on important points of frontiers. All this now forms part of our agenda, and the practical solution of this question is the most important task, the most important stage of our struggle. We must postpone these matters, we must not regard these questions merely theoretically. These are problems set us practically by the struggle; and we must learn to go somewhat further than the frontiers of our own country, to remember that in a struggle involving this or that group of workers, in this or that district, it is not only the workers of the country concerned who must mobilise, but these must at the same time seek contact with the workers of other countries. Therefore, it is incumbent on us as the Red International of Labour Unions, as an international class trade union organisation, to concentrate the attention of all our sections on this problem.

Let us take for instance the bloc, the pact of solidarity, concluded a few months ago, during the congress of the Unitary Unions of Mexico, between our American comrades and these Unions. This pact is however only on paper at present.

But we are not writers; we are practical men, we must convert such documents into something concrete. I could adduce dozens of instances in which comrades have contented themselves with the sending of resolutions in times of strikes.

The problem of international aid in times of struggle, the question of the organisational form to be taken by this aid, of stimulating the whole of our work internationally, of the organisation of joint action, is a practical question which must be solved at any price. Should we fail to solve it, should we continue internationally as before, then we shall fall behind the tempo of development of events. Life will stride forward and pass our organisations by, for at the present moment there is a widespread need for the organisation of international action, for the co-ordination of undertakings, for joint parallel advance on different sides of the frontier.

(To be concluded).

The Five-Year Plan

The Five-Year Plan of Cultural Construction.

The Struggle against Church and Religion.

In the year 1913 out of 100 persons in Russia 76.5 were illiterate. Up to the year 1928/29 we have made a great stride forward. Out of 100 persons 46 are illiterate. At the end of the Five-Year Plan there will only be 18 illiterates out of 100 persons. Illiteracy will be completely liquidated in the most important districts of the country. The illiteracy of the youth (12 to 15 years) will be liquidated to 100 per cent. (At present 3 million youths are being taught to read and write.) In the towns 93 per cent. of the population will be able to read and write.

The elementary education will be arranged in such a way that by the end of the five years all children of the Soviet Union from 8 to 11 will attend the elementary schools. Only in the most backward districts where there are particularly great difficulties will this plan not be completely fulfilled. As a result at the end of the five years the elementary schools will be attended by 17 million children as against 9.5 million in 1927/28 and 7 million in 1914.

The Soviet Union needs 85,000 engineers as against the existing 30,000; 110,000 technicians as against the existing 40,000. In order to realise this huge programme, ten to twelve new technical high schools and 175 technical schools are being established. The number of the scholars will be increased to 64,000, and 90 per cent. of the students will receive scholarships.

During the last decade 1.5 million workers have been trained, 400,000 in the factory schools, trade unions schools etc. 5 million peasants will attend short courses in order to raise the level of the cultivation of the soil.

The Five-Year Plan provides for an increase in the number of reading huts from 22,000 to 38,000, i. e. by 75 per cent. This means 5.5 reading huts per district. The number of libraries is to be increased from 23,000 to 34,000. In addition, 40,000 new travelling libraries are being organised. The number of the clubs, people's houses etc. is being augmented by 25 per cent.

With regard to the press it is intended to increase it threefold in the course of the five years. That is eight times the pre-war level. The circulation of the newspapers will be increased from 1,700,000 in the year 1927/28 to 5 million in the year 1932/33. The publication of books is to be increased from 1,850 million leaves to 4,000 million in the year 1932/33. The publication of mass literature will be increased five to sixfold.

The number of cinemas will be increased from 8520 to 50,000 (of which 14,000 will be school cinemas); that is a sixfold growth. The Five Year Plan provides for the installation of cinemas in at least 80 per cent. of all clubs and the establishment of at least 3 cinemas in every district.

The wireless is to be increased twentyfold, from 350,000 sets in 1927/28 to 7 million in the year 1932/33.

It is intended to supply with wireless sets at least half of all workers' dwellings and 3 million peasant houses, all the workers' clubs, peoples' houses, reading huts, schools, barracks, collective and Soviet farms and Red corners.

Lenin-Liebkecht-Luxemburg-Week

Six Years Without Lenin.

** The death of Lenin, the mighty leader of the October Revolution, the organiser of the first government of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the world the inspirer and founder of the Communist International, this death which dealt the heaviest blow to the world Communist movement, gave wings to the hopes of the bourgeoisie of all countries. Having, by the hand of social-democracy, suppressed all post-war upheavals of the proletariat, and by the same treacherous hand brutally murdered Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, and other outstanding leaders of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie hoped that after Lenin's death its affairs would be easier to manage.

The last year of Lenin's life coincided with an event of great world importance — the defeat of the German proletariat (Autumn 1923), an event which was, according to the words of the VI. Congress of the ECCI, the "final link in the chain" of the first period of post-war development, "the period of extremely acute crisis of the capitalist system, and of direct revolutionary action on the part of the proletariat".

The death of Lenin coincided with the beginning of the Second period, "the period of gradual and partial stabilisation of the capitalist system".

This "stabilisation", signifying the consolidation of capitalism and a slower tempo of proletarian revolution, fertilised every anti-Bolshevik theory — beginning with the mystical theories of the "eternity" of the foundations of capitalism to the new and newest "theories" of the Right and "Left" social-democracy.

"Stabilisation" made possible the invention of arguments against the teachings of Lenin that imperialism is the last stage of capitalism, the stage of capitalist downfall, the epoch of wars and the proletarian Revolution.

To deny the teachings of Lenin concerning imperialism not only deprives the proletariat of the Western countries of their faith in the early victory of the proletarian Revolution. It means the overthrow of the October Revolution, a denial of its Socialist character. It means the isolation of the October Revolution and assists the intervening powers to bring about its downfall.

The characteristic given by Lenin to imperialism is the starting point of the struggle of Bolshevism for the creation of the Communist International. To deny the teachings of Lenin concerning imperialism, as the period of the downfall of capitalism is to deny the need for the Communist International. No small wonder that the first steps towards "stabilisation" should be accompanied by an outburst of the newest theories about the long duration of capitalism.

Hard upon the heels of the "theory" of Kautsky concerning the advantages of bourgeois democracy over the Proletarian Dictatorship came the theory of Otto Bauer of the impossibility of the victory of Socialism in the USSR. (with which the Trotskyist conception fully coincides) and the theory of Hilferding and other heroes of "left" social-democracy about the new era of the rise of capitalism, of the evolution of capitalism towards a mitigation of its inner and outer contradictions.

Linking up these theories with the slogan of "economic democracy" and "peace in industry", the ideologists of "left" social-democracy supported "in practice" the Right traitors, sowing among the working masses illusions concerning the possibility of overcoming capitalist contradictions and wars without the Proletarian Revolution. While lulling the class-consciousness of the masses with poisonous lies and slanders against the USSR, by seeking to prove that the victory of socialism is impossible, the heroes of the II. International at the same time embellished capitalism on every hand. The last word in their treachery is the theory of "organised capitalism".

The second period of post-war development was not only a period of "partial stabilisation of the capitalist system, but also a period of "rapid restoration in the USSR, and of extremely important successes in the work of building up Socialism".

The contradictions of the imperialist stage of capitalism are most palpably seen in the very fact that the bourgeoisie has failed to liquidate the first decisive victory of the proletariat in the history of the world.

Together with the sharpening antagonism between various imperialist camps, the second period was marked by a most violent class struggle; the struggle of capitalism for its stabilisation, its fight against the USSR, and Chinese revolution, the struggle of the working class against the new attacks of capital, and the hitherto unknown exploitation in the form of capitalist rationalisation.

In spite of stabilisation and on its basis, contradictions arise daily. However, this did not alter the fact that illusions about stabilisation, sowed ardently by the "left" social democrats, began to have an influence upon the less stable Communist elements.

The exaggeration of the might of capitalism, complete lack of faith in the forces of the proletariat, in its capacity to lead the basic peasant masses, were the distinguishing features of Trotskyism.

The Trotskyist opposition disguised the fact that it was hypnotised by the technical development of capitalism, under the cloak of revolutionary impatience and left phraseology. But the right deviators in their estimation of the general position of capitalism (and consequently the perspectives of revolutionary struggle) as a result of the influence of stabilisation and exaggerated estimate of the successes of capitalism, gradually approached theories, the difference between which and Hilferdingism could only be found with the help of a microscope.

The growth of technical development in the United States and Germany was hailed by the Rights as a great turning point, even as a "revolution", which would mean considering afresh all previous conceptions, and which would give capitalism the possibility of opening up new perspectives.

It was impossible to see trees for the wood. Because of the growing technical development, the Rights no longer differentiated between the new class movements, they failed to see the radicalisation of the working class, they lost their capacity to understand the deepest contradictions which day by day were undermining stabilisation. Hence comrade Bukharin's step down to the theory of "organised capitalism". Hence the Rights underestimated the class struggle in the Soviet Union and in the capitalist countries.

This extraordinary exaggeration of the forces of capitalism is closely linked up with the underestimation of the forces of the proletariat. Hence the lack of faith of the Rights in the construction of Socialism, the concessions to capitalist elements, the capitulation before the Kulaks, their terror in the face the high "tempo" of socialist construction. Hence the fight of the Brandlerites against the Leninist line of the CI and the RILU, the fight against the tactic of "class against class". Hence the Brandlerites' pathetic defence of "left" social-democracy, and their final rapprochement.

The whole position of the Rights in the CPSU and other sections of the CI shows clearly that the Rights orientate not around the perspectives of world revolution, but around the prospects of a prolonged, firm stabilisation of capitalism. And this is proof of their absolute deviation from Lenin. The Right danger becomes the chief danger in the period of the leftward swing of the working class movement and the approach of a new revolutionary wave.

The world proletariat will observe the Sixth Anniversary of the death of Lenin and the Eleventh Anniversary of the death of Karl and Rosa, in the conditions of the "third" period.

Already one year after the VI. Congress, which pointed out that the "third" period "is inevitably giving rise to a fresh series of imperial wars among the imperialist States themselves; war of the imperialist States against the USSR", the X. Plenum of the ECCI was in possession of new facts, which permitted it to state that "at no time since the end of the war of 1914—1918 has the menace of another imperialist world war been so great as at the present time". Events on the Chinese Eastern Railway, the feverish growth of military,

naval and air armaments in the largest countries of imperialism, the open war preparations on the western frontiers of the USSR (in Rumania, Poland, Finland), indicate that since the X. Plenum the menace of a military attack on the USSR has approached even nearer.

The VI. Congress of the ECCI pointed out that the third period would lead to a growth of the revolutionary forces in the ranks of the working class movement, to the strengthening of the position of Communism in the international labour movement. The process of the disintegration of capitalist stabilisation has advanced so rapidly, since the VI. Congress, that already, after one year, the X. Plenum ECCI is able to state that: "A new feature in the situation since the VI. World Congress is the sharply marked radicalisation of the international working class and the rising of the new tide of the revolutionary labour movement". The few months which have passed since the X. Plenum have even further confirmed this estimation.

Yes! The position of the Communists is strengthened daily! First and foremost, Socialist Construction in the USSR advances with seven-league boots. Despite the pessimism of the "lefts" and rights, the tempo of industrialisation of the USSR has exceeded all expectations. It has exceeded the programme of the Five-Years Plan. Thanks to this, the second year of the Five-Year Plan has become the "mighty turning point" (Stalin). The successful advance against capitalist elements and the tremendous growth of industry has pushed forward with enormous force socialist reconstruction in the village, which is the **Decisive** step in the direction of the victory of Socialism in the USSR. Lenin's policy towards the peasantry, his plan of cooperation, electrification and collectivisation, have won the day. The movement for mass collective farming, is of huge historical significance, is the finest monument to Lenin.

The position of Communism is consolidated also in the capitalist countries, where the proletariat everywhere is moving forward from a position of defence to one of counter-attack. How very unlike capitalist stabilisation is the picture of ever-growing **strike actions** throughout the world, the development everywhere of economic strikes into political action, the struggles of the masses on the streets in the chief centres of capitalism, the mass demonstrations on May 1, the May 1 barricades in Berlin, the international demonstration of the proletariat on August 1, the November 7 demonstrations (not only in advanced countries of the West, but also in the East, particularly in Shanghai!)! How unlike capitalist stabilisation is the growth of the mass **peasant movement** in all countries, the development of the partisan movement in the Balkans and the colonies (China, South America), the crisis of Fascism in Italy and Poland.

Such facts as the growth of Fascism, fascisation of social-democracy and the putting into power of the reformists (in England and Germany, etc.) speak only too clearly of the sharpening crisis of capitalism. However, of greatest significance is the capitalist crisis the growing fear of the bourgeoisie of the red spectre of the World October. But the most striking characteristic is the approaching crisis in the **United States of America**. It is already becoming clear that this crisis, which began in Wall Street, is now **spreading to American industry and beginning to reflect on the position of affairs in several other capitalist countries.** *g. Britain Germany.*

This glorified country of "Prosperity", the chief argument in the agitation of the II. International and its chorus of Right Communists, has now joined the ranks of "mere mortals". Like all the other capitalist countries, it is standing on the brink of a crisis. What can now be said of the "organised nature" of American capitalism, of its great capacity for planning, which the renegades of all shades dared to hold up against the Socialist planning of the USSR?

Imperialism stands before us just as Lenin saw it, and not as the Right and "left" followers of social-democracy imagine it.

Only on the basis of Lenin's analysis of imperialism (which analysis is not refuted by the "stabilisation", in spite of the efforts of the theoreticians of Social Democracy) can the Comintern work out the exact tactical line which will lead the proletariat to new victories. Only by deviating from Lenin's estimation of imperialism can the opportunists deny the correctness of the CI. line. Only by means of an irreconcilable struggle against all revisions of Lenin's teachings, only by keeping in mind Lenin's revolutionary perspectives,

has the Comintern been able to keep to its course, and in full Leninist armour is marching forward to the **New stage of development**.

The features of this new stage are the victorious advance of Socialism in the USSR, the increased war danger, the early collapse of capitalist stabilisation, the maturing of a new, mighty revolutionary wave.

The proletariat of the whole world are meeting this new stage without Lenin, but they are now better armed with Leninism, they are steeled in the struggle, they are the wiser for their experiences. In the arsenal of their armament they have, on the one hand, 12 years' experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the USSR, and on the other hand an equally long period of experience of the bourgeois rule of all kinds of coalition governments, and the attempts at government of the reformists. The sum total of the experiences of the two systems can no longer be hidden from the broad masses of the proletariat of the capitalist countries, despite the efforts of the lackeys of the bourgeoisie — the social traitors of every colour.

The conclusion, which day by day becomes more clear in the minds of the advanced workers, is that the only road to freedom of the proletariat and all toilers of the world is the way of the October Revolution, the way shown by Lenin.

The growth of decisive class conflicts puts before the proletariat and its Communist vanguard the task of being better equipped with Leninist class strategy and tactics, of gaining experience and applying it most successfully.

In the transition from defence to attack, when mass political strikes are the order of the day, it is in the interest of the international proletariat, which is preparing for the immediate struggle for power, that its Communist Vanguard purges its ranks of all vacillating elements and, combining Leninist revolutionary theory with revolutionary practice, learns to the highest degree the art of leading revolutionary class struggles.

Confronted by decisive conflicts, the Communist vanguard will take with it the broad masses of the proletariat and win the leadership of the labour movement, bearing high the banner of Leninism, the banner of the victorious struggle for World Communism.

On Lenin.

By J. Stalin*).

The Eagle.

I first made the acquaintance of Lenin in the year 1903. This acquaintance, it is true, was not a personal one, but was based on an exchange of letters. But this acquaintanceship made an unforgettable impression upon me, which has not left me during the whole of my Party activity. At that time I was living in banishment in Siberia. Acquaintance with the revolutionary activity of Lenin at the end of the nineties and particularly after the year 1901, after the appearance of the "Iskra" (Spark) convinced me that here we had to do with a quite exceptional person. I saw in him at that time not the simple leader of our Party, but its actual founder, for he alone understood the inner nature and requirements of our Party. When I compared him with the other leaders of our Party, it always appeared to me as if Lenin's collaborators — Pleckhanov, Martov, Axelrod and others — stood quite a head below him, as if, in comparison with them, he was not simply one of the leaders, but a leader of a higher type, an eagle, who is a stranger to all fear and would courageously lead the Party

* From a Speech delivered at a meeting of the military students in the Kremlin on the 18th January, 1924. Comrade Stalin prefaced his speech with the following remarks:

I have been told that a memorial evening in honour of Lenin has been arranged here and that I have been invited to attend the same to deliver a report. I consider it unnecessary to give a detailed speech on Lenin's activity, and prefer to confine myself to relating a number of facts which illustrate Lenin's peculiarities, which reveal him to us as man and statesman. These facts are perhaps not connected together by any inner bond, but this is no reason, why we should not derive from them a general picture of Lenin. However that may be, I am not in a position at the present moment to give you more than I have just promised.

along the unknown paths of the Russian revolutionary movement.

This impression penetrated so deeply into my soul that I felt the necessity to write to a near friend of mine who was at that time in exile, in order to obtain his opinion. After some time, — at that time I was already in banishment in Siberia, it was towards the end of 1903 — I received the enthusiastic reply of my friend and a simple, moving letter from Lenin, to whom my friend had given my letter to read.

Lenin's letter was comparatively short, but it gave a bold, fearless criticism of the practice of our Party and a surprisingly clear and compact presentation of the whole plan of work for the next period. Only Lenin was capable of writing so simply and clearly, so compactly and boldly over the most complicated things that every sentence not only speaks to the reader, but also hits the bull's eye. This simple letter increased my conviction that we had before us in the person of Lenin the eagle of our Party. Unfortunately I have, according to the custom of old conspirators, burned this like so many other letters.

It is from that time that I date my acquaintance with Lenin.

The First Lessons of the Russian Revolution of 1905.

Lenin wrote the following article at the beginning of February 1905. It was published for the first time in 1926, under the title of "The first Lessons".

** The first wave of the storm of revolution is ebbing. We are on the eve of the inevitable and undeviable second wave. The proletarian movement is spreading widely, and has already reached the remotest frontier regions. The fermentation and discontent have seized upon the most various and most backward strata of society. Trade and industry are paralysed, the educational institutions closed; the Semstvo follows the example of the workers in striking. In the intervening period between the mass movements we witness, as ever, repeated acts of individual terror: an attack upon the president of police at Odessa, a murder in Caucasasia, the Senate representative at Helsingfors murdered. The government turns abruptly from the policy of the bloody knout to the policy of promises. It tries to deceive at least a few workers by the comedy of the reception of a workers' delegation by the Tsar. It tries to divert public attention by news from the scene of war and commands Kuropatkin to begin an offensive against Hun-ho. On 9th January the blood-bath took place in St. Petersburg, and on the 12th this offensive began, senseless from the military standpoint, and ending with the severe defeat of the Tsarist general. The Russians were beaten back, and even the correspondent of the "Novoye Vremya" admitted that their losses were approximately 13,000, or double those of the Japanese. In the sphere of military administration the same disintegration and demoralisation rules in Manchuria as in St. Petersburg. In the foreign press the telegrams alternately confirming and denying the quarrel between Kuropatkin and Gripenberg are succeeded by telegrams alternately confirming and denying that the grand-dukes' party has recognised the danger to absolutism incurred by the war, and is striving for the conclusion of peace as rapidly as possible.

It is no wonder that under such conditions even the soberest bourgeois newspapers of Europe do not cease to speak of a revolution in Russia. The revolution is growing and maturing with a rapidity unknown before the 9th January. Many circumstances impossible to foresee will decide whether the second wave rises to-morrow, the day after, or in a few months. This makes it the more urgently our task, to draw a certain balance from the days of revolution, and to attempt to ascertain the lessons to be learnt from them, lessons which we may need sooner than many are inclined to believe.

In order to form a correct estimate of these days of revolution, a general survey must be made of the latest events in the history of our Labour movement. Almost twenty years ago, in 1885, the first great labour strikes took place in the central industrial district, at Monorov and other places. At that time Katov wrote of the Labour question arising in Russia. And with what amazing rapidity the proletariat developed, passing forward from economic struggle to political demonstration, from demonstration to revolutionary advance. Let us look back over the chief milestones on the road already

trodden. 1885: great strikes, participated in only very slightly by a few completely isolated socialists, bound together by no organisations. The ferment among the people caused by the strikes caused Katov, the faithful hound of absolutism, to speak in the law court of the "salute of 101 shots in honour of the Labour question which has made its appearance in Russia". The government made economic concessions. 1891: participation of the workers of St. Petersburg in the demonstration at Shelgunov's funeral; political speeches at a St. Petersburg May Day celebration. This was a social-democratic demonstration of the advanced workers, but no mass movement. 1896: strike of tens of thousands of workers in St. Petersburg. Mass movement and commencement of street agitation, this time with the co-operation of a whole social democratic organisation. However small this organisation (composed chiefly of students) was, compared with our present Party, still its determined and systematic social democratic intervention and its leadership were such that the movement, in comparison with the Morosov strike, acquired a gigantic impetus and importance. Again the government made economic concessions. The strike movement gained a firm foothold all over Russia. The revolutionary intelligentsia became generally social democratic. The Social Democratic Party was founded. 1901: the worker hastens to the aid of the student. A demonstration movement begins. The proletariat carries its appeal into the street. — Down with absolutism! Radical intelligentsia divides finally into liberal, revolutionary bourgeois, and social democratic. The participation of the organisations of the revolutionary social democrats in the demonstrations becomes broader, more active, more direct. 1902: the mighty strike at Rostov develops into a magnificent demonstration. The political movement of the proletariat no longer clings to the intellectuals, to the students, but grows directly out of the strike. The participation of the organisations of revolutionary social democracy becomes more active than ever. The proletariat fights and gains for itself and for the revolutionary social democrats of its committee the liberty of mass meetings in the streets. The proletariat opposes itself for the first time to all other classes, and to absolutism, as a class. 1903: again the strikes go hand in hand with political demonstrations, but on a still broader foundation. The strikes extend over whole districts, more than one hundred thousand workers take part in them, political mass meetings are held repeatedly in a number of towns during the strike. There is a feeling that barricade fighting is imminent (an utterance of the Kiev social democrats on the movement in Kiev in 1903). But this period of expectancy proves comparatively long, as if it wished to accustom us to mighty classes gathering together their forces for months and years, as if it wished to put to the test those intellectuals of little faith who have joined the social democrats. And truly, the intellectualist wing of our Party, the rapprochement of the new "Iskra" or (what is the same thing), the new "Rabotscheyelzes", began after demonstrations of a "higher type" to seek to induce a form of agreement between the workers and the Semstvo without arousing a panic. With the lack of principle peculiar to all opportunists the adherents of the new "Iskra" permitted themselves the incredible, completely incredible, thesis, that in the political arena only two forces exist (!): bureaucracy and bourgeoisie (see the second commentary of the "Iskra" editors regarding the Semstvo campaign). The opportunists of the new "Iskra" forgot, in their anxiety for momentary success, the independent force of the proletariat. Then came the year 1905, and the 9th of January once more exposed all the forgetful intelligentsia. The proletarian movement swung up to a higher step at one stroke. The general strike mobilised certainly no fewer than one million workers all over Russia. The political demands of the social democrats percolated downwards even to the strata of the working class still believing in Tsarism. The proletariat broke through the confines of the police Subatoviade, and the whole of the members of the legal workers' associations, founded for the purpose of combating the revolution, joined Gapon to pursue the path of revolution. The strike and the demonstration became transformed before our eyes into the insurrection. The participation of the organised revolutionary social democrats was incomparably greater than in the previous stages of the movement, but still weak, and especially weak in comparison with the stupendous demand made by the active proletarian masses for social democratic leadership.

Taken on the whole, the strike and demonstration movements combined with one another in various forms and for various reasons, they grew broader and deeper, became more

and more revolutionary, and approached in actual practice ever nearer to the general armed insurrection of the people, so long spoken of by the revolutionary social democrats. We drew this conclusion from the events of 9th January as early as in Nos. 4 and 5 of the "Vperyod". The same conclusion was drawn, immediately and directly, by the workers of St. Petersburg themselves. On 10th January they stormed a legal printing office, set the type of the following leaflet, sent us by the St. Petersburg comrades, printed more than 10 000 copies, and distributed these in St. Petersburg. This remarkable leaflet read as follows:

"Workers of the world, unite!

Citizens! Yesterday you witnessed the brutalities of the absolutist government! You saw blood flowing in the streets. You saw hundreds of murdered champions of the cause of the workers, you saw death, you heard the groans of wounded women and defenceless children! Workers' blood and workers' marrow have splashed the pavement laid by workers' hands. And who has directed the troops, the guns, and the bullets, against the breasts of the workers? The Tsar, the grand-dukes, the ministers, the generals, and the courtiers.

These are the murderers! Death to them! To arms, comrades, seize the arsenals, the weapon reserves and the weapon shops! Demolish the prisons, comrades, free the fighters for liberty! Shatter the police and gendarmerie offices and all official institutions. We want to overthrow the Tsarist government and establish our own government. Long live the revolution, long live the constitutional assembly of the representatives of the people!"

This appeal requires no explanation. The independent activity of the revolutionary proletariat is fully expressed in it. The demands of the St. Petersburg workers were not fulfilled as quickly as they hoped. The appeal was made more than once, the attempts to realise it ended in failure more than once, but the enormous importance of the fact that the workers themselves set themselves the task is incontestable. This achievement of the revolutionary movement, leading to the recognition of the practical urgency of this task and of the necessity of according it the first place in every people's movement, this achievement can now no longer be taken away from the proletariat again.

It is well worth while to devote some attention to the history of the idea of insurrection. The new "Iskra", beginning with the eternally memorable leading article in No. 62, spread abroad so many nebulous platitudes on this question, so much opportunist confusion thoroughly worth of our old acquaintance, Martinov, that the exact reconstruction of the old viewpoint is especially important. It is impossible in any case to follow up the whole of the platitudes and confusion of the new "Iskra". It would be much more to the purpose to think oftener of the old "Iskra" and its old positive slogans.

At the end of the pamphlet "What is to be done?", by Lenin, page 136*), the slogan of the general armed insurrection of the people is laid down. The following was said on this subject quite at the beginning of 1902, that is, three years ago: "Let us imagine an insurrection of the people. At the present time we shall all be agreed to think of the insurrection and must prepare ourselves for it. . .")

From Spartacus League to the Bolshevik Party.

By Werner Hirsch (Berlin).

The eleventh anniversary of the day on which the social democratic **Ebert-Scheidemann-Noske Government** caused the leaders of the revolutionary proletariat of Germany, **Karl Liebknecht** and **Rosa Luxemburg**, to be murdered by their hired assassins, occurs in a period of a resurgence of the revolutionary wave, of a new revolutionary advance.

This situation, which must rapidly bring about in Germany a new 1923 and thereby confront the proletariat again with the immediate task of the revolutionary seizure of power, renders it very appropriate that we glance back at the days of the first revolutionary fights in which Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg fell.

When on the 9th of November 1918 the Hohenzollern monarchy collapsed, when everywhere in Germany workers' and soldiers' councils were set up, the resentment and fighting will of the broad masses was directed not only against the overthrown monarchy, not only against militarism, which had been flung from its pedestal, but equally against the capitalist system. Socialism as the aim of the fight inspired the minds of millions. But with regard to the way to this goal, with regard to the methods by which it was to be reached, there existed not the least clarity. The social democracy, which fought with utmost determination for the maintenance of the capitalist system of economy, had at that moment to camouflage its real policy with the deceitful cry of "Socialism is marching". The Independent Socialist Party, in whose ranks were to be found the masses of the best revolutionary workers, was almost entirely under the leadership of the Right opportunist elements. Only the Spartacus League, the little group of revolutionary socialists round Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Leo Jogisches and Franz Mehring, came out with the clear slogans of continuing the revolution to the proletarian dictatorship as the prerequisite of Socialism. The Spartacus League arose from that loosely knit group of Left radicals in pre-war social democracy, who for more than two decades fought against the revisionist degeneration of the proletarian party and since 1906 also against their former allies, Bebel and Kautsky, the so-called centre. It was only during the war that the group of revolutionary socialists became more firmly welded together under the compulsion of illegality and of the pressing revolutionary tasks in the fight against imperialism. The war accelerated, also ideologically, that process which rendered the former Left Radicals of the German social democracy capable of founding the independent revolutionary party according to the model of the Bolsheviks.

It was naturally not by chance that the Left Radicals, in spite of their sharp struggle against revisionism, had never demanded in a determined manner the separation from the revisionists, although it is now evident that Marx and Engels had spoken with all clearness of this necessity for the socialist movement of Germany. The failure of the Left Radicals in this question was of course closely connected with one of the errors of the Luxemburgian theory, the under-estimation of the role of the Party and the necessity of organising the revolution. Thus it was only during the war, after the 4th of August 1914 and only after a long development, that the Spartacus League raised the question of a final break with the social democracy, and it was only after the outbreak of the revolution that there took place the formation of an independent Communist Party.

The founding of the Party took place at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919. Thus it is clear that when, scarcely a week later, the social democracy together with the military counter-revolution took up the open fight to annihilate the revolutionary proletariat of Berlin, there were still lacking the first requisites for a really revolutionary party organisation. It is only thus that we can explain the defeat of the Berlin workers in the January fights of 1919. The military means at the disposal of the Government were very feeble at first. The masses of the Berlin proletariat were faithful, even if only instinctively, to the banner of revolution. But the party, which could have organised the masses, conducted the fight and gone over from the defence to the attack, to the overthrow of the government, was lacking. The Spartacus League was neither objectively nor subjectively capable of solving this gigantic task. In addition to the lack of cadres there were also ideological differences within the Spartacus League itself and among its leaders regarding the tactic to be followed. Here also it was shown that the process of ideological clarification in the ranks of the best revolutionary elements of the German Labour movement was far from being complete. The contemptible deserter from the ranks of the Communist Party Paul Levi, who is to-day an enthusiastic social fascist, attempted a year ago to "reinterpret" these

*) The page number here given refers to the first Russian edition of the pamphlet "What is to be done?".

**) Here the manuscript breaks off.

differences of opinion within the Central Committee of the Spartacus League in the January days. He tried to make out that in the January days Karl Liebknecht, together with Wilhelm Pieck, had conducted an adventurist, putschist policy which Rosa Luxemburg indignantly opposed, and of which she was the innocent victim. We must state emphatically that here the renegade Paul Levi is deliberately falsifying history.

As a matter of fact the differences of opinion of those days related to two questions. The one was the attitude of the young Communist Party to the so-called revolutionary shop stewards in the big enterprises in Berlin, in whose hands was the actual leadership of the January struggles. Rosa Luxemburg rightly demanded that the Party should come forward quite independently of these elements, who for the most part belonged to the Independent Socialist Party and were more or less confused politically. In the other question Karl Liebknecht was right as against Rosa. It concerned the setting of the aims during the January fights. Rosa Luxemburg did not agree to the immediate issue of the slogan of the overthrow of the Ebert-Scheidemann Government. She was of course right when she stood for the same policy which was advocated at the foundation Congress by the whole Central Committee of the Spartacus League, namely, that a certain development, a certain ripening of the working class was necessary before there could exist the presumptions for the seizure of power. But history did not grant the German proletariat such a peaceful development. The provocation of the social-democratic government and of the officers' camarilla, which with the removal from office of the revolutionary police president Eichhorn initiated the fight for the destruction of the positions which the workers had gained in the November days 1918, compelled the proletariat to take up the fight at once. In this fight the revolutionary advance-guard had to go over from mere defence to the attack. It was precisely because the Communist Party did this hesitatingly and weakened its own forces by the connection with the confused elements of the Independent Socialists and the revolutionary shop stewards that it was unable to create immediately during the fight the mass basis and to organise the victory over the counter-revolution.

Such a critical examination of the January fights in 1919 in no way detracts from the revolutionary merits of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. They themselves during the fight and immediately before their tragic end indicated the weaknesses of the movement and drew the lessons therefrom. In particular that article written by Rosa Luxemburg in the "Rote Fahne" in which she drew the balance of the January fights is still to-day the leading thread for every critical analysis of that section of revolutionary history.

The essential historical content of the January struggles is that it represents with incomparable clearness the problem of organising the revolution and the necessity of a firm revolutionary mass party. It is just the defeat in this fight which forms the starting point for the development of the revolutionary party. This development could have taken place more quickly if the German proletariat had not lost its best leaders in the first stage of its revolutionary schooling. Under the leadership of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg the development of the German Communists from the Spartacus League to the Bolshevik mass party would have been quicker and less painful. How clearly these two leaders had grasped the most important lessons of the Russian Revolution is shown by all their speeches and writings delivered or penned during the last fighting weeks immediately preceding their death. All those counter-revolutionary scoundrels who try to play off Rosa Luxemburg or Liebknecht, i. e. the Spartacus past of the Communist Party of Germany against its Bolshevik present, will only earn the contempt of the revolutionary proletariat. That the fates of the German and Russian revolutions are bound together can be denied only by those who have sold themselves completely to the bourgeoisie. It was Rosa Luxemburg who, at the foundation Congress of the C.P.G., uttered the historic truth that the German proletariat has taken over even the A.B.C. of its own revolution from the Russian Bolsheviks. Thus the path of the German Communists to Bolshevism is at the same time the testament of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

How the Competition should be Organised

By V. I. Lenin.

Preliminary Note of the Lenin Institute.

This article of Lenin would appear to have been written at the end of March or the beginning of April 1918. The contents of the article itself are the basis for this supposition. The article deals with that complex of questions which is also dealt with in the existing draft "Daily Questions of the Soviet Power" which was dictated by Lenin to the stenographer on the 28th. March 1918 and which is in the possession of the Lenin Institute.

The Lenin Institute.

The bourgeois writers have written and are still writing paucis of praise in favour of competition, private initiative and all other daring characteristics to be found in the capitalist order. They accuse the socialists of failing to appreciate this daring initiative and of refusing to reckon with "human nature". In reality, however, capitalism has long ago replaced small independent commodity production, where competition could create, in a certain larger sphere, a spirit of enterprise and daring initiative, by large and larger factory production by joint stock companies, syndicates and other monopolist undertakings. Under this capitalism competition means an unparalleled and brutal suppression of the spirit of enterprise, the energy and the daring initiative of the mass of the population, indeed, its overwhelming majority, 99% of the toilers — it further means the substitution of business competition by financial swindling, despotism, crawling on the rungs of the social ladder.

Socialism does not abolish competition, on the contrary, it offers for the time the possibility of applying it on a really mass scale, of really organising labour in such a way that the majority of the toilers can develop their capacities, can show their talents of which there is an inexhaustible supply in the people and which capitalism crushes, suppresses and throttles by the thousand, by the million.

Now that a socialist government is in power it is our task to organise a competition.

The lackeys and lickspittlers of capitalism represent socialism as a uniform, routinised, monotonous, grey barrack drill. The servants of the money bag, the menials of the exploiters — the bourgeois intellectual gentry — "shocked" the people with socialism, the people who under capitalism are condemned to compulsion and to barrack square drill, excessive boring work, semistarvation and oppressive poverty. The first step towards the emancipation of the toilers from this forced labour is represented by the confiscation of the lands of the landowners, the introduction of workers control, the nationalisation of the banks. The next steps will be, the nationalisation of the factories, the compulsory organisation of the whole population in co-operatives, which at the same time represent societies for the distribution of production, a State monopoly of the bread trade (grain) and other vital products.

The greatest possibility, on a mass scale, of developing the spirit of initiative, of competition, of daring initiative, has now been provided. Every factory where the capitalist has been thrown out or at least held in check by a real workers control, every village where the rich landowner and exploiters have been smoked out and deprived of their land, now and only now represent a basis on which the man of labour can develop, straighten his back, develop his capacities and feel himself a human being. For the first time after centuries of labour for others, extorted labour for the exploiters, he has the possibility of working for himself, and working with all the achievements of the latest technical and cultural progress.

Naturally, this historically unparalleled substitution of forced labour by free labour, of labour for others by labour for themselves, cannot be carried out without friction, difficulties and conflicts, without the application of force against the reactionary idlers and their supporters. In this connection none of the workers have any illusions, hardened in years of forced labour for the exploiters, by endless ridicule and abuse from the exploiters, hardened by oppressive poverty, the workers and the poor peasants know that time is

necessary to break the resistance of the exploiters. The workers and peasants are not in the least affected by the sentimental illusions of the intellectuals and the whole wobbling gentry around the "Novaya Zhizn"*) and others who shout themselves hoarse against capitalism, who "denounce" it, "gesticulate" against it, "thunder" against it, but who, when it comes to deeds, to the carrying out of the threat to overthrow capitalism, commence to whine and conduct themselves like beaten dogs.

This magnificent substitution of forced labour by free labour, by a systematic, gigantic, national scale, in a certain sense international, world scale organised labour requires, apart from "military" measures to break the resistance of the exploiters, tremendous organisational efforts on the part of the proletariat and of the poor peasantry. The organisational task becomes an indissoluble whole with the task of a ruthless military suppression of the slaveowners of yesterday, (the capitalists) and their lackeys, the bourgeois intellectual gentry. We have always been the organisers and superiors, we have given orders, thus speak and think the slaveowners of yesterday and their supporters in the ranks of the intelligentsia — and we want to remain so. We will not obey the "common" people, the workers and peasants. We will not subordinate ourselves to them, we will turn knowledge into an instrument for the defence of the privileges of the money bag and of the dominance of capital over the people.

The bourgeois and the bourgeois intellectuals speak and think and act like this. From an egoistic point of view their attitude is understandable: the lickspittles and lackeys of the rich landowners, the priests who lived on the charity of the landowners, the slavedrivers (the Estate inspectors), the bureaucrats described by Gogol, and the "intellectuals" who hated Byelinsky**), found it very difficult to separate from seridom. But the cause of the exploiters and their intellectual rabble is a lost cause. The workers and peasants are breaking the resistance of their class enemies — unfortunately not yet determinedly and ruthlessly enough, but they will break it.

"They" believe that the "common" people, the "common" workers and peasants, will not be able to perform the heroic task, really heroic in the world historical sense of the word, of an organisational nature which the social revolution has placed on the shoulders of the toilers. "They can't get on without us", the intellectuals console themselves because they are used to serving the capitalists and the capitalist State. Their insolent speculation has failed, however, the educated people are abandoning them and going over to the side of the people, to the side of the toilers, and helping them to break the resistance of the servants of capital. There are many organisational talents amongst the peasantry and the workers, and these talents are beginning only now to be conscious of themselves, to awaken and to strive towards doing creative work, to take up independently the building of the socialist society.

One of the most important, if not the most important, task consists in developing this independent initiative of the workers and of the toilers and exploited masses in general in the field of creative organisational work. The old, worn out, clumsy, repulsive and reprehensible prejudice that only the so-called upper classes, only the rich or those who have attended the schools of the rich, can administer the State and direct the organisational construction of the socialist society, must be abolished at all costs.

That is a prejudice. It is supported by lazy routine, by ossified and slavish custom, and still more by the dirty greed of the capitalists who are interested in robbing whilst they are governing and governing whilst they are robbing. The workers, however, will never forget for one moment that they need the power of knowledge. The extraordinary zeal which the workers show for education, and particularly the zeal which they are showing now, proves that in this connection there is no illusion amongst the proletariat and cannot

be. However, the simple worker or peasant who can read and write, who has a knowledge of human nature and practical experience, is capable of organisational work. There are a great number of such men amongst the "common people" about whom the bourgeois intellectuals speak so arrogantly and disdainfully. The working class and the peasantry represent an untouched source of such talents, and a rich source.

The workers and peasants are still "shy", they have not yet got used to the idea that they are now the ruling class. They are not yet determined enough. The revolution could not produce these capacities suddenly amongst millions and millions of people who had been forced by hunger and privation to work their whole lives under the whip. But the strength, the vitality and invincibility of the November revolution lies just in the fact that it is awakening these capacities, abolishing former inhibitions, breaking the old rotten chains and leading the toilers on the path of independent, creative work for the construction of a new life.

Keeping accounts and keeping control — these are the most important economic tasks of each soviet of workers, peasants and soldiers deputies, of each distributive co-operative, of each supply association or committee, of each factory committee and all the organs of workers control in general.

The struggle against the old custom of regarding the quantity of work, the means of production from the standpoint of the chained man: to think over how superfluous ballast can be abandoned, how at least a fragment can be torn from the bourgeoisie — this struggle is necessary. The progressive class-conscious workers have already begun this struggle and they are already putting a bar up against these interlopers in the factories. These interlopers appeared in great numbers particularly during the war, and they would like to take up the same attitude towards the factory now that it has become the property of the people. They are guided by the one principle: "Get as much as possible and then disappear". All that is conscious, honest and reasonable in the peasantry and the toiling masses in general, will support the progressive workers in this struggle.

Accountancy and control when they are carried out by the councils of workers, peasants and soldiers deputies as the highest State power, or at the instance and instructions of this power, general, all-round, all-inclusive accountancy and control, control of the labour quantity and the distribution of the product, in this lies the essence of the socialist transformation and of the maintenance and consolidation of the political dominance of the proletariat.

The accountancy and control necessary for the transformation to socialism can only be of a mass character. Only voluntary and conscientious, revolutionary and enthusiastic co-operation of the masses of the workers and peasants in controlling the rich, the swindlers, the idlers, the rowdies, will be able to abolish these remnants of the cursed capitalist society, this scum of humanity, these hopeless and rotten, decayed branches, this pestilence, this plague, this abcess which capitalism has left as a heritage to socialism.

Workers and peasants, toilers and exploited! The land, the banks and the factories have gone over into the hands of the whole people! Take over the control of production and the distribution of the produce into your own hands — that and that only is the path to the victory of socialism, the guarantee for victory, the guarantee for the abolition of all forms of exploitation, over all forms of poverty and privation. In Russia there is sufficient bread, iron, wood, wool, cotton and flax for all. All that is necessary is that production and labour are correctly divided, that the expert and practical control of the people is established over this division. All that is necessary is that the enemies of the people, the rich, the lickspittles, the swindlers, the idlers and the hooligans should be removed not only in politics, but also in economic every day life.

No mercy for these enemies of the people, the enemies of socialism, the enemies of the toilers! War to the knife against the rich and their lackeys, the bourgeois intellectuals. Down with the swindlers, idlers and hooligans! They are all the blood brothers the children of capitalism, the offspring of the feudal and bourgeois society, in which a small group of people exploited and reviled the people, a society in which privation and misery forced thousands and thousands on the

*) "New Life", an organ of the intellectuals of the war and revolutionary period which was characterised by a constantly vacillating attitude between bolshevism and Menshevism.

**) Russian critic of the XIX century.

path of violence and venality, degeneration and all human degradation, a society in which the desire inevitably developed amongst the toilers to avoid exploitation, by trickery if necessary, to avoid the wretched labour slavery if only for a moment, to obtain bread if only a small piece and at any price and in any fashion in order not to starve and in order to satisfy the family.

Rich people and swindlers — they are only two sides of the same medal. They are the two main categories of parasites bred by capitalism. They are the chief enemies of socialism. These enemies of the people must be placed under special observation. At the least violation of the laws and regulations of socialist society these individuals must be mercilessly brought to book. Any weakness, vacillation or sentimentality in this connection would be the greatest crime against socialism.

In order to render these parasites harmless to the socialist society, a voluntary, effective, revolutionary and enthusiastic accountancy and control of production and distribution must be organised by the whole people, by millions and millions of workers and peasants. In order to organise this accountancy and control which can be easily understood by every honest, wideawake and prudent worker and peasant, and which do not exceed his capacities, the organisational talents in their own ranks must be awakened, and a competitive zeal on the field of organisational success must be awakened and applied on a national scale. The workers and peasants must learn to understand clearly the difference between the necessary advice of an educated person, and the necessary control by the simple workers and peasants over the slovenliness which is so often to be met with amongst "educated" people.

This slovenliness, carelessness, disorderliness, inaccuracy, nervous haste, the tendency to replace the matter with discussion and to bring the work to an end by talk, are characteristics of the "educated" which by no means come from their bad character and still less from malice, but which come from their habits of life, from the nature of their work, from exhaustion, from the abnormal separation of mental from physical labour, and similar factors.

Amongst the errors, deficiencies and insufficiencies of our revolution, a not inconsiderable role is played by the mistakes etc., which result from these unfortunate — and at a given point unavoidable — characteristics of the intellectuals in our ranks, and by the lack of sufficient control over the organisational work of the intellectuals on the part of the workers.

The workers and peasants are still "shy"; they must get rid of this shyness and undoubtedly they will. Without the advice, without the guiding directions of the educated people, the intellectuals and the specialists it is not possible to carry on our work. Every half-way intelligent worker and peasant understands this excellently and the intellectuals in our ranks cannot complain of the lack of attention and fraternal respect on the part of the workers and peasants. However, advice and guiding instructions are one thing, but the organisation of practical accountancy and control, that is something quite different. The intellectuals give thoroughly good advice and guiding instructions, but they prove themselves ridiculously helpless, shamefully incapable of carrying this advice and these instructions into action, of carrying out a practical control, in order to develop the word into the deed.

And here it is quite impossible to carry out our work without the leading role of the practitioners and organisers from "the people"; from the ranks of the workers and peasants. ("It's not the Gods who burn the broth"). This is a truth which the workers and peasants must take to heart more than any other. They must grasp the fact that at the present period everything relies on the practical work, that the historical moment has arrived when the theory must be put into practice, enlivened by practical application, improved in practice, tested in practice, the period when Marx' words are particularly true: "Every real step forward is more important than a dozen programmes" — every step towards the practical and effective limitation of the activities

of the rich and the swindlers, towards complete control over them is more important than a dozen excellent dissertations on socialism, for "all theory is grey, my friend, and only the tree of life is green".

We must organise competition between the practitioners and organisers from the ranks of the workers and peasants. We must fight against all attempts at stereotyping, attempts to achieve a uniformity from above — to which our intellectuals are so prone. Neither stereotyping nor the imposition of uniformity from above have anything in common with democratic and socialist centralism. Unity as a whole, unity in fundamentals, unity in essentials is not endangered but secured by variety in details, in local circumstances, in the methods with which one approaches the problems, in the way to establish a real control, in the methods of destroying and disarming the parasites (the rich, the swindlers, the idlers and the hysterical intellectuals etc. etc.).

The Paris Commune showed magnificently how initiative, independence and freedom of movement, energetic action from below, and centralism void of all mechanical uniformity can be united. Our soviets are treading the same path. But they are still "shy", they have not yet fully developed, they have not yet got a good grip on their new, tremendous, creative work, the building up of socialism. The soviets must take a bolder grasp of the task with more initiative. Every "commune" — every factory, every village, every co-operative, every supply committee, must compete with each other as practical organisers of the accountancy and control over production and distribution. The programme of this accountancy and control is simple, clear and understandable for all: everyone must have bread, everyone must have good boots, and good clothing and not walk about in thin shoddy, everyone must have a warm home, and must work conscientiously; no single swindler (including those who try to dodge work) must be permitted to walk freely about the streets, instead the swindlers must be put into prison to serve a sentence of the hardest kind of work; no single rich person who violates the laws and regulations of socialism must escape the fate of the swindlers, which will become the just fate of the rich. "He who does not work, neither shall he eat" — that shall be the practical law of socialism. That is what we must put into operation practically. These must be the practical successes of which our "communes" and organisers from the ranks of the workers and peasants must be proud, and all the more those from the ranks of the intellectuals (all the more because they are accustomed to attach a too great importance to their general directions and resolutions).

The communes, the little cells in town and country must work out thousands of forms and methods of practical accountancy and control over the rich, the swindlers and the idlers, and test them in practice. The variety is here the guarantee for the effectiveness, the guarantee for the success in the efforts to achieve the one aim: cleansing Russia from pernicious insolent swindlers, offensive parasitic bugs, the rich and so on. In one place the toilers will throw a dozen rich people and a dozen swindlers into prison, and with them half-a-dozen workers who try to dodge hard work as disgracefully as many of the composers in Petersburg, particularly those in the party printing shops. At another place these people will have to clean the lavatories. At a third place they will have to serve a term in solitary confinement after which they will be provided with yellow passes perhaps so that everyone can keep an eye on them until they improve into honest workers. At a fourth place one or two of the swindlers may be put against the wall right away. At a fifth place perhaps various ways and means will be combined, for instance, release from prison on trial, whereby a speedy improvement of those elements capable of improvement amongst the rich, the bourgeois intellectuals, the swindlers and idlers would be obtained. The more varied the methods, the better and richer will be the total result, the more certain and more speedy the victory of socialism, the easier will the practical work produce the best methods of the struggle, for only the practical work can produce them.

In what commune, in what bloc of houses in a large town, in what village are there no hungry people, no unemployed, no rich idlers, no scoundrels — lackeys of the bourgeoisie, saboteurs, who call themselves intellectuals? Where has most been done for the increase of the productivity of labour? Where has most been done to build new houses for the poor people, to quarter the poor people in the houses of the rich?

* Russian proverb, in the sense that the Gods don't burn the broth because they don't do the cooking, the practical work, at all; for that toilers are necessary.

Where has a regular supply of a bottle of rich milk a day for every child of a poor family been organised? These are the questions around which the competition of the communes, the village communities, the productive and distributive co-operatives, the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers deputies must develop. By such work in the practical daily life the organisational talents must be developed on the field of state administration and be advanced to the top. There are many such talents in the people. They are only below the surface at the moment. We must help them to develop. They and they alone, with the assistance of the Russian masses, will save the cause of socialism.

Karl Liebknecht's Letter to the Zimmerwald Conference.

The following letter was sent by Karl Liebknecht to the first Zimmerwald Conference, at which he was unable to be present as the German Government called him up at the beginning of 1915 to serve in the Landsturm.

What importance Lenin attached to this letter is best to be seen from the extracts which he made from it (in German) and which are preserved in the Lenin Institute. The passages extracted by Lenin are shown below in thick type. Ed.

Dear Comrades!

Allow me to write a few hurried lines. I am imprisoned and fettered by militarism (K. L. was called up as a Landsturmmann. Ed.). Therefore I am unable to come to you. My heart, my head, my whole being is nevertheless with you.

You have two serious tasks. A hard task of grim duty and a sacred one of enthusiasm and hope.

Settlement of accounts, inexorable settlement of accounts with the deserters and renegades from the International in Germany, England, France and elsewhere.

Mutual understanding, encouragement and inspiration of those who remain true to the flag, who are determined not to give way an inch before international imperialism, even if they fall as victims. And to create order in the ranks of those who are determined to hold out; to hold out and to fight, with their feet firmly planted on the basis of international socialism.

It is necessary to make clear in brief form the principles of our attitude to the capitalist order of society. Briefly — so I hope! For here we are all united, and we must be united!

It is necessary before all to draw the tactical consequences from these principles. — Ruthlessly for all countries.

Civil war not civil peace! Exercise international solidarity of the proletariat against pseudo-national, pseudo-patriotic class harmony, international class war for peace, for the socialist revolution. How the fight is to be fought, must be laid down. Only in co-operation, only in the mutual working of one land with the other, mutually inspiring each other, can the greatest possible forces, the attainable successes be achieved.

The friends of every country have in their hands the hopes and prospects of the friends of every other country. You French and you German socialists before all have one and the same fate. You French friends, I appeal to you, do not allow yourselves to be caught by the phrase of national unanimity — against this you are immune — but also by the equally dangerous phrase of the unanimity of the party! Every protest against this, every proclamation of your rejection of the official government policy, every bold acknowledgment of the class struggle, of solidarity with us, for the proletariat will to peace, strengthens our fighting spirit, increases our force tenfold, to work in the same sense in Germany, for the proletariat of the world, for its economic and political emancipation, for its emancipation from the fetters of capitalism, but also from the chains of Tsarism, Kaiserism, junkerism, of militarism of non-international militarism; to fight in Germany for the political and social liberation of the German people; against the power and lust for territory of German imperialism; — for a speedy peace, which also restores unhappy Belgium

freely and independently and gives back France to the French people.

French brothers — we know the special difficulties of your tragic situation and bleed with you, as with the tormented and stoned mass of all peoples! your misfortune is our misfortune, as we know that our pain is your pain. Let our fight be your fight. Help us, as we swear to help you.

The new International will arise, it can arise, on the ruins of the old, on a new and firmer foundation. You friends, socialists from all countries, have to-day to lay the foundation stone for the future structure. **Hold irreconcilable judgment over the false socialists! Ruthlessly urge on the vacillating and hesitating in all countries, also those in Germany!** The greatness of the aim will raise you above the narrowness and littleness of the day, above the misery of these terrible days!

Long live the people's peace of the future! Long live anti-militarism! Long live international, people-emancipating, revolutionary socialism!

Proletarians of all countries — unite again!

Karl Liebknecht.

The Development of the Russian Revolution of 1905.

From a Speech on "Mass Strike, Party and Trade Unions" delivered by Rosa Luxemburg in Frankfurt on Maine on April 17, 1910.

The present, so to say, official period of the Russian revolution rightly dates from the rising of the St. Petersburg proletariat on 22nd January, 1905, from that procession of 200,000 workers in front of the Tsar's palace which ended in a fearful bloodbath. As is known the bloody massacre in St. Petersburg was the signal for the outbreak of the first gigantic series of mass strikes which within a few days swept over the whole of Russia and carried the fiery cross of the revolution from St. Petersburg to every corner of the country and to the broadest strata of the proletariat. The St. Petersburg rising of January 22nd was, however, only the highest point of a mass strike already entered on by the proletariat of the capital town in January 1905. This January mass strike in St. Petersburg undoubtedly took place as a result of the immediate impression of that gigantic general strike which had broken out shortly before, in December 1904, in the Caucasus, in Baku, and for a time held the whole of Russia in suspense. The December events in Baku were, however, nothing but a final and powerful offshoot of that huge mass strike which in the years 1903 and 1904 shook the whole of Southern Russia like a periodical earthquake and whose prologue was the mass strike in Batumi (in the Caucasus) in March 1902.

This first mass strike movement in the unbroken chain of the present revolutionary eruptions is only separated by five or six years from the great general strike of the St. Petersburg textile workers in the years 1896 and 1897, and if this movement appears outwardsly to be separated from the present revolution by some years of stagnation and reaction, nevertheless everybody who is familiar with the inner political development of the Russian proletariat up to the present level of its class-consciousness and revolutionary energy will recognise that the history of the present period of mass struggles begins with that general strike in St. Petersburg. They are important for the problem of the mass strike because they contain in embryo all the chief features of the subsequent mass strikes.

... The phantastic and vague reports of the general strike in Baku had not yet reached all parts of the Tsarist empire when in January 1905 there broke out the mass strike in St. Petersburg.

Here also the immediate cause of the strike was trifling. Two workers in the Putilov works were discharged on account of belonging to the legal Subatov Union. This victimisation called forth a solidarity strike on the 16th January of the whole of the 12,000 workers employed in this undertaking. The social democrats used the occasion of the strike

in order to begin a lively agitation for the extension of the demands, and put forward the demand for the eight-hour day, right of combination, freedom of speech and press etc. The ferment of the Putilov workers quickly spread to the rest of the proletariat, and in a few days 140,000 workers were on strike. Joint consultations and stormy discussions led to the working out of that proletarian charter of civil liberties, headed by the eight-hour day, with which on January 22nd 200,000 workers, led by Father Gapon, marched to the Tsar's palace. The dispute over the two victimised workers had become in a few weeks the prologue to the most powerful revolution of the new time.

Lenin and the Political Mass Strike.

By Paul Merker (Berlin).

In the increasing revolutionary development, which in all countries received a fresh and effective impetus as a result of the crisis in the United States of America, the proletarian masses are confronted with the problem of the means and methods of conducting the revolutionary class struggle. There is being repeated upon a higher basis the disputes between the followers of Marx and Lenin and the opportunists and liquidators, just as they took place in the years from 1904 to 1912, regarding the form of the proletarian revolutionary mass struggle, of the unchaining and spreading of the revolutionary mass movements.

At that time it was before all from the struggles of the Russian proletariat that the international working class derived their experiences of the revolutionary class struggle. To-day, after the victory of the Russian proletariat over the bourgeoisie, it is the struggles of the Chinese, the American, German and Indian proletariat and of the working masses of other countries which are being carried on in ever increasing number.

The decisive fighting methods of the present phase of the revolutionary class struggle are the revolutionary strikes and demonstrations. Strike struggles, organised and conducted in a revolutionary manner, mass demonstrations, carried out with zest and determination in spite of police suppression, are an important means for intensifying the class struggle and the means for developing the fighting will, the fighting activity and the manoeuvring capacity of the proletariat. These are the means for developing the proletarian mass struggles up to the armed insurrection against the bourgeoisie for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship.

Therefore the central question for the revolutionary advance troop in the present phase is, how and under what slogans can the proletarian masses be most effectively mobilised and led into the fight. What are the methods for developing the numerous struggles which are taking place into great mass movements.

These were the questions for the clarification of which Lenin and Luxemburg waged the fiercest fight against all opportunists and liquidators; and these questions were answered by Lenin plainly and clearly, in far-reaching agreement with Rosa Luxemburg, so that the present generation possesses in the teachings of Lenin the key to the development of the proletarian mass struggle.

Lenin conducted an irreconcilable fight against the representatives of the view of the purely economic struggle, and against those who pay no regard to the struggle of the working masses for wages and bread and characterise it as being incidental. Lenin waged a ruthless fight against those who saw in the spontaneity of the proletarian masses the lever for unfolding gigantic mass struggles, and insisted again and again on the absolute necessity of systematic and comprehensive organisation and carrying out of mass struggles.

Comrade Lenin followed with the greatest attention every strike struggle, no matter how trifling it might appear, and every workers demonstration. He drew important conclusions from the statistics regarding the extent and duration of strike struggles, regarding the fight for economic demands and political demands, and proved on the basis of his conscientious investigations the dialectical reciprocal effect between the struggles for economic demands of the workers and the strug-

gles of the working masses for political ends in developing the proletarian mass struggle.

"To-day it is quite obvious", wrote Lenin already in the year 1905, "what actually are the reciprocal relations between economic and political strikes: without their being closely linked up a really broad movement, bearing a real mass character, is impossible; the concrete form of this linking up consists, however, on the one hand, in that, at the commencement of the movement and in drawing new sections of workers into the movement, the purely economic strike arouses backward elements and brings them into movement, generalises and extends the movement and raises it to a higher level."

In another passage Lenin repeats this dictum. He writes:

"Consequently political and economic strikes support each other. The one form of struggle forms a source of strength to the other. Unless these two kinds of strike are closely linked up there can be no really broad mass movement, a movement of nation-wide importance. At the beginning of the movement the economic strike is not infrequently capable of awakening and rousing the mass of the backward, of generalising the movement and raising it on to a higher level."

Lenin specially emphasised again and again that it is the task of the revolutionary advance-guard, to champion the interests of the broadest, most badly paid strata of the toilers. The fight for the interests of these strata is at the same time the fight against the bribed and corrupted upper stratum of the Labour aristocracy, which has been bought by the bourgeoisie and which tries to represent its furtherance of its own interests as being the fight for the interests of the proletariat. Lenin said:

"For this purpose it was of course necessary that under the demands of the workers under the class struggle there should be understood, not the fight for the interests of a small upper stratum, as the reformists too often try to make out to the workers, but that the proletariat really comes forward as the advance-guard of the majority of the exploited, and draws this majority itself into the fight as happened in Russia in 1905 and as it must and will undoubtedly again happen in the coming proletarian revolution in Europe." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 5 page 8. Russian edition.)

Therein lies the confirmation of the revolutionary policy of the Communist International and of the R.I.L.U. among the masses of the unorganised, for ruthlessly breaking through the trade union statutes and trade union legalism, and for the crystallisation of the new forms for organising and conducting the proletarian struggles.

Consequently to unchain political mass struggles -- revolutionary mass strikes and demonstrations --, presumes the most energetic and persistent work to mobilise the proletarian masses for the fight for the seven-hour day and higher wages, against the wholesale dismissals, for unemployment benefit etc. Strike struggles for the realisation of these demands have a revolutionary character and can over night be converted into distinctly revolutionary political fights. The connection of the fight of the workers in the factories with the fight of the unemployed, the most ruthless counter-measures against the fascist methods of suppression employed by the government, the breaking through of the bourgeois legislation regarding collective agreements and arbitration, the employment of revolutionary methods in carrying out the movement, create the presumptions for the coming great revolutionary fights for power.

The carrying out of this work requires the systematic organisation of the workers' struggles. Revolutionary mass propaganda and revolutionary mass organisation -- these are the chief measures of the revolutionary advance-guard for organising the proletarian struggle for power. "To rouse the revolutionary determination of the proletariat", said Lenin, "to support it in revolutionary action and to create organisations for work in this direction in accordance with the revolutionary situation", that is the task of the revolutionary advance-guard in the period of revolutionary upsurge.