

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 18

6th March 1924

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

## CONTENTS

- Karl Radek: Lenin's Life and Work
- Politics**
- M. Bodenmann: A Defeat for the Reaction in Switzerland  
U. Fimescu: The Situation in Roumania
- The Labour Movement**
- M. N. Roy: The Textile Strike in Bombay
- In the International**
- Frida Rubiner: Mass Influx into the CP. of Russia
- The White Terror**
- M. Quinet: A Great Revolutionary Artist who must be saved from the Hangman  
The Campaign against the Working Class in Esthonia
- Co-operative Movement**
- To the Co-operators of all Countries

## Lenin's Life and Work.

By Karl R a d e k.

At the present time when the Communist International is celebrating its Fifth Anniversary, the following article by comrade Radek is of special interest and appropriateness, dealing as it does with the magnificent work, extending over many years, accomplished by our Great Leader in preparing the ground for and laying the foundations of the Third International, and acting as its Guiding Genius in its first critical years. Ed.

For the first time in the history of humanity the news of the death of a statesman not only thrilled the whole world, but went to the heart of millions in every country, and among all peoples. There are countries in which millions mourn for him, other countries in which his mourners number only a few hundred thousand, and again others in which they count but a handful. But there is no people among which there was not some-one who said, on the 22nd. of January: „My leader is dead“.

The death of Lenin gives the proletarian idea an enormous impetus in every country. In every country the proletarians have learnt to fight for the fragments of Lenin's ideas which have reached them in our letters and resolutions. When they had tested these ideas by their own experience, and had seen in them the truth of their life, they were reassured. They knew that the ship of international revolution was being steered by this genius of the international proletariat. And they had faith in his captaincy. But now everything is changed. Every member of the working class who is accustomed to think is now fully engrossed with the thought of how he can best learn from the work and life of Lenin, how he may find in Lenin's books the weapons for his struggle, how he may learn to employ these weapons self-reliantly. In this regard there can be nothing so characteristic as the words spoken by a German communist on hearing of the death of Lenin: „Do not give us a selection from Lenin's works, give us a ll

Lenin's works in the most important European languages, so that we can appropriate to ourselves his manner of thought and his methods, by means of our own independent work.“

Many years will pass before we can erect this monument to Lenin, even in the leading countries of the labour movement, before we can enable the European workers to enter into their full inheritance of knowledge of the life and works of Lenin. Until this has been accomplished, it is the task of the Communists to show what historical rôle has been played by Lenin, and to draw the outlines of his ideas, however roughly and generally.

### Lenin as Founder of the First Proletarian State.

Karl Marx's teachings are laid down in his books. His correspondence represents an adequate commentary to his works. Lenin has left dozens of books behind him. When his letters are collected, these will fill dozens of volumes more. *But the most important commentary to Lenin's teachings is Lenin's completed work*: the creation of the Russian Communist Party and the struggle of this Party for power. It was Lenin's methods which enabled the proletariat to maintain its power under the most difficult circumstances, and it is his methods which Lenin has bequeathed to the Russian proletariat, not only as a means for the maintenance of power, but as a means for the solution of those tasks for the sake of which the working class of Russia seized power.

Marx took part in the revolution in Germany in '48. But as the proletarian elements were too weak in this revolution, he could not play any decisive rôle. The revolution of 1848 in Germany was in itself a belated birth. It came too late to be victorious as a bourgeois revolution, and altogether too early to be led by the proletariat. The revolution of 1848 was followed by decades of reaction, and during this period Marx could only play the part of spectator, and study the mechanism of the bourgeois world. This reactionary period was followed

by the epoch of national struggles, in which the proletariat could again play no leading part. Then the meteor of the Paris Commune appeared on the horizon. Marx's mind alone was capable of grasping the meaning of this transient phenomenon. But here again there could be no question of a leading rôle for Marx.

After the Paris Commune, and until the death of Marx, reaction reigned in Europe. The revolutionary tasks of the bourgeoisie had already been fulfilled in the West. Slowly and despondently the proletariat began to build up its armies again. It gathered together in small groups in different countries, its scattered movements could not be centrally guided. Marx's whole genius exhausted itself in the study of the fundamental laws of development of the bourgeois world and the proletariat which was bound up with it. He was given no opportunity of testing his ideas as the leading genius of revolution in the fire of a civil war.

Lenin stood with both feet on the ground of Marx's teachings, which he understood more profoundly and thoroughly than any other follower of Marx. But Lenin prepared himself, from the first day of his activity onwards, to become the practical leader of the communist revolution. He devoted his whole life to working out those tasks which were not solved till the year 1917: to the preparation of that great breach broken through the front of the international bourgeoisie in October 1917. It is thirty years come next spring that the youthful Lenin wrote as follows in his work: „Who are the Friends of the People?“

„The Social Democrats devote the whole of their attention and activity to the working class. When the vanguard of the working class has possessed itself of the ideas of scientific Socialism, the idea of the historical rôle played by the Russian working class, when these ideas have become widespread and have created firm organizations among the working class, converting the present scattered economic struggles of the workers into a conscious class struggle — then the Russian worker, who is at the head of all democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the Russian proletariat (by the side of the proletariats of every country) along the straight path of open political struggle, to the victorious communist revolution.“

The study of Lenin's teachings on the communist revolution demands above all the study of the methods practised by Lenin as leader in the struggle of the Russian proletariat for power.

The power of conviction evinced by Lenin in his actions as politician, and as leader of the proletarian Party, has been the subject of universal astonishment. Many have regarded this power of conviction as the result of his authoritative character, which rendered him a natural leader of men. Others have seen the source of his power of conviction in his unshakeable faith in Socialism. But the authoritative will does not only attract human beings, it can also have the effect of repulsing them, when the test of history shows that this will had led itself and others into false paths. Lenin's power as a leader lay in the fact that his Party comrades were always convinced that his will was leading them forward on the right historical path.

He could not find this right path through his faith in Socialism alone. Faith in Socialism was equally unshakeable in the leader of the English reformists, Keir Hardie, who led the English proletariat into false paths; and the leader of French socialism, Jean Jaurès, too, was a profound believer in Socialism, as was also the most disinterested man of the II. International, Victor Adler, who guided the Austrian proletariat to the abysses of social patriotism. But despite their great faith, all these leaders did not stand the test of history. Socialism is no religion, Socialism is the science of the pre-requisites of the victory of the proletariat. The iron force of Lenin's conviction found its source in the fact that he had thought out Marx's social tenets as no scholar of Marx had ever done before, that these tenets had become part of his being, and that he applied them as no follower of the Father of Scientific Socialism has done. Lenin has not left behind him many works on the general principles of the Marxian teachings, for he was too fully occupied with the practical work entailed in the creation and leadership of a proletarian party in Russia. But it suffices if we remember how Lenin dealt with the questions of historical materialism in the above mentioned

early work; we only need to compare his treatment of these questions with that of the contemporary writings of Plechanov and Kautsky, and we have ample evidence of Lenin's independent manner of solving the theoretical problems of Marxism. Two or three pages dealing with the difference between dialectics and eclecticism, and inserted apparently quite accidentally in the pamphlet issued by Lenin at the time of the discussion on the trade union question, show how modest he was in designating himself a scholar of Plechanov. Lenin was a great and independent Marxian thinker. And this was the premise enabling this man of iron to become the leading politician of the international proletariat.

Lenin as a thinker, Lenin as a politician of the Russian revolution, developed under conditions rendering the questions of revolution questions of practical struggle. This enabled him to stand head and shoulders above the other followers of Marx.

Lafargue developed in a petty bourgeois country, over which had swept the storms of three revolutions, but in which Capitalism had not yet created the pre-requisites of the new proletarian society. Lafargue's great talent was not given the opportunity of developing into genius.

Kautsky, who was the first after Marx and Engels to try and apply Marxism independently, was only able to utilize Marxism for the purpose of studying the history of society. But with respect to living deeds, and to the questions of the German movement, Marxism only served him as a means for explaining to the proletariat that it is impossible either to circumvent or to spring over the class enemy, and that forces must be slowly collected for the decisive battle. According to Kautsky, this decisive battle was still at such a great distance that, when in his works he hesitatingly approached the subject of the seizure of power, of social revolution, he himself had grasped the contours of this question so vaguely, that he overlooked one of the most important tasks of the proletarian revolution — where the victorious proletariat is to obtain its bread on the day following its victory.

Plechanov, the brilliant interpreter of Marxist tenets, the brilliant defender of these tenets „against any kind of criticism“ lived far from the spot where the tempest arose, far from Russia. And all his great interest in the revolutionary struggle in Russia proved insufficient to concentrate all the forces of his brain upon the study of the practical tasks of the revolutionary struggle of the Russian proletariat. And there can be nothing more characteristic than the fact, that after Plechanov had written „Our Differences of Opinion“, he never devoted a single essay to the detailed study of one of the most important questions of the Russian revolution, the agrarian question.

Lenin, as theoretician and as politician, occupied himself from the first moment of his activity, precisely with the study of the most important fields of activity of the Russian proletariat, and with those main forces which were to participate in the Russian revolution. A comparison of the treatment of the agrarian question by Kautsky, Kschivitzky, and Compère Morel on the one hand, and Lenin on the other, graphically illustrates, not only, the difference between the economic conditions in Western Europe and in Russia, not only the peculiarities of the agrarian question in Russia and in Western Europe, but also the advantages possessed by Lenin as a revolutionary leader, over the chief representatives of revolutionary socialism in West Europe. Lenin not only studied the agrarian question from the point of view of explaining the destiny towards which Capitalism is developing, from the view-point of the correctness or incorrectness of Marxian theses as applied to the agrarian question, but above all from the view-point of the struggle of the proletariat for power, from the view-point of the choice of suitable allies for the proletariat in its struggle,

Kautsky saw these allies only in the agricultural workers. But whether his rejection of the attempt (designated by him as opportunism) to win over the poor peasantry was merely the result of a correct or a faulty application of Marxism, or the result of the passivity of German Social Democracy, the result of its practical renunciation of the struggle for power and the limitation of the horizon of the German proletariat to a horizon of craft interests — this question is best answered by the fact that German Social Democracy did not even know how to begin the struggle for winning over those village strata which Kautsky held to be the allies of the proletariat: the agricultural labourers. Lenin discovered in the peasantry an ally for the struggle of the proletariat for power, and taught

for decades, through all the ups and downs of Russian history, the need for creating an alliance between the fighting proletariat and the peasantry.

Plechanov, although he rejected the illusions of the Narodniki with regard to the independent revolutionary rôle of the peasantry, was unable to concentrate the attention of the Russian working class upon the question of the alliance with the peasantry, of the alliance with that class without whose aid the proletariat will not be able to conquer power, and against whose will it will not be able to realize Socialism. But Lenin proved capable of doing this, and it was here that Lenin, the great independent thinker of the proletariat, became transformed into the political leader of this class. To lead a class struggle means to gain a clear idea of the conditions essential to victory, and never to forget these conditions, either in moments of stupendous victory or in moments of crushing defeat. The attitude taken by Lenin towards the peasant question forms a new factor in the history of the proletarian world movement.

The agrarian question will not play such a concrete part everywhere as it has done in the Russian revolution. In all advanced capitalist countries, the agricultural workers will not play such an important rôle as in Russia, but the question of winning over the strata which produce the bread will everywhere be decisive for the proletarian revolution. And Lenin held the attention of the international proletariat to this conquest of bread above everything else, in his theory and his practice alike.

But Lenin's attitude towards the agrarian question has still another aspect, one possessing great value for the coming struggle of the international proletariat. The representatives of revolutionary Marxism in Western Europe have thrown away the baby with the bath water. Even though they rejected Lassalle's views on the „one reactionary mass“, in actual practice, they have been afraid of an alliance of the proletariat with non-proletarian elements. Lenin, who in the most decisive manner combatted the Menshevik policy of an alliance with the liberal city bourgeoisie, holding this to be a class not suited to accompany the proletariat to the extent of the overthrow of absolutism, insisted, with indomitable energy on the alliance with the peasantry, with that petty bourgeois class whose interests would be served by the overthrow of Czarism. In the same manner he taught the proletariats of other countries not to judge the question of relations to non-proletarian elements from the abstract standpoint of rejection of any alliance whatever, but from the standpoint of the concrete estimation of the interests of the class concerned, from the standpoint of the question: along what portion of the historical path can a non-proletarian class, or a section of such a class, accompany us against the enemy? In a pamphlet on the „Infantile Sicknesses of Communism“ Lenin represents precisely the winning over of the mass allies — however irresolute these may otherwise be — as one of the main pre-requisites of the struggle of the proletariat for power and of the struggle for the maintenance of power.

Lenin's main teaching, in his capacity of politician preparing for the seizure of power by the proletariat, is his tenet of the importance of a proletarian party. Lenin's disputes with Menshevism in the year 1903, on the rôle of the party, on the kind of persons who can be members of a proletarian party, if properly understood, mean an understanding of one of the main levers of Lenin's policy. Lenin taught the proletariat the art of manoeuvring. This was the task which he set the proletariat from the first moment of his historical activity; at the same time he taught the proletariat that it cannot conduct a manoeuvre struggle until it has become united in itself as a mass in the first place. If his teaching on the relations to the peasantry, and to the liberal bourgeoisie represents a lesson on the manoeuvres of a proletarian party, then his organizational views form a lesson on how the proletariat is to guard against being itself converted into the involuntary object of the manoeuvres of its enemies.

The question raised by Lenin during the disagreements on the first point of the statutes of the social democratic party, is no less important than those questions which invariably played a part in all other political conflicts with Menshevism. On the contrary, it may safely be asserted that the solution of this question on the first point of the statutes has been the pre-requisite for the execution of Lenin's whole political line. The working class of Russia lived under the yoke of Czarism, which did not permit it to create a mighty mass

organization. The working class rose in an elementary struggle against despotism, using the weapon of economic and political strikes. The Mensheviks dreamed of the creation of a broad proletarian mass party, but such a party could not have lived under Czarism. In these circumstances, all negotiations for a broad democratic organization signified an empty dabbling with plans, and would in reality have opened the door of the labour party to anyone expressing sympathy with the labour movement, or materially supporting it. This would have meant abandoning the still scattered and feeble workers' party to petty bourgeois influences. Under the conditions created by Czarism, conditions against which broad strata of the petty bourgeois intelligenzia rose in protest, every lawyer, in consequence of the rottenness of European liberalism, claimed to be socialist. The admittance of these people to the workers' party because they recognized its program and afforded it material support meant the abandonment of the scattered labour movement to the petty bourgeoisie. Lenin, who demanded that no-one should be counted a member of the party unless he were working in an illegal proletarian organization, fought for the diminution of the danger of the subordination of the labour movement to the leadership of petty bourgeois intelligenzia. Anyone who has broken with bourgeois society, and has risked becoming a professional revolutionist by his participation in an illegal proletarian organization, does not perhaps give absolute security of his allegiance to the cause of the proletariat by this action, but still it is a security to a certain extent.

Lenin, in indicating the path to be pursued by the proletariat, basing this on Marxian analysis and on the illegal organizations of the professional revolutionists, created the necessary premises for a centralized revolutionary leadership of the proletarian struggle. Even the best brains of European socialism, even Rosa Luxemburg, who followed the struggle of the Russian proletariat with the closest attention, found Lenin's organizational principles the expression of tactics of conspiracy, and feared the separation of the Bolshevik organization from the mass struggle of the proletariat. These fears turned out to be unfounded. During the up-grade period, the Mensheviks created a broad organization, but this organization was led by the vacillating and opportunist intelligenzia. Lenin created an organization capable of leading the proletarian struggle during its most difficult moments, capable of defending revolutionary principles even in the years of revolutionary stagnation, and of creating a mass organization in the period of those historical movements which drive the proletariat forward into class warfare.

Lenin never insisted upon doctrinal forms of organization: out of the illegal organization of 1905, embracing only a few thousand comrades, he first transformed the Communist Party into a mass organization, counting tens of thousands of members during the first and second revolutions; and then he transformed it into an organization containing hundreds of thousands, wielding an influence over millions after the October revolution. Forms have changed, but through all these changing forms, Lenin pursued one idea: that the proletariat needs a revolutionary organization to assure its victory. This organization must be united and centralized, for the enemy is ten times more powerful.

After founding a mass party capable of manoeuvring in face of the enemy, Lenin's first steps were directed towards the preparation of an armed rising for the seizure of power. Even at moments when we were weakest, or when we had been forced back by defeats, he contrived to induce the Party to fight for every inch of ground, for every smallest position, and to devote its energies to even the smallest daily tasks for the gathering together of proletarian forces. But he never forget for one moment that all this work was being done with one object in view: the preparation for the seizure of power by the proletariat.

There is nothing more instructive for a communist, than to compare the works written by Lenin during the period of the victory of counter-revolution, with those written at the time of the highest flood-tide of the labour movement. When the first revolution was suppressed, Lenin fought energetically against those who refused to recognize the victory of counter-revolution, and who wanted to renounce all the difficult petty work of collecting forces, hoping that the revolutionary powers would speedily arise again; and he combatted with equal energy those who lost sight of revolutionary goals and tried

to convert the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat into a struggle for peace. During this period of reaction, Lenin studied carefully the lessons learnt in 1905, for the purpose of being able to utilize these properly for the movement when the next uplift came.

A most valuable contribution to this subject is the article published by him in the year 1908, in the newspaper issued by the Polish social democrats, in which he already raised the question of the mechanical preparation for future armed insurrections, in the light of the experience gained during the Moscow rising.

At the time of the imperialist war, when the labour movement all over the world was being crushed not only by the military apparatus, but by the treachery of Social Democracy, Lenin was working—although at the same time he was supporting every practical step taken by those whose ideals he shared, and devoting much concrete activity to the creation of an illegal organization and to the utilization of legal possibilities—in his Swiss loneliness, on the Marxian tenets with regard to the State, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and thus paved the way for the insurrection of October 1917. Even such fighters as Rosa Luxemburg and Mehring, who never lowered their weapons for a moment before triumphant German imperialism and the triumphant social patriotism of the International, regarded it as a piece of romanticism when Lenin issued the slogan of civil war in the first manifesto of the Bolshevik Central Committee, only two months after the outbreak of the great war. At that time they did not even venture to issue the slogan of a split in German Social Democracy.

Even in this black night of reaction Lenin prepared for the October rising of the proletariat. And when during the first weeks of the February revolution, he returned to Russia and unfolded the idea of the Soviet power to his amazed Party comrades, he taught the Party at the same time to exercise the greatest patience in enlightening the masses still under the influence of social patriotic stupefaction, and to move forward among the masses step for step, in proportion to the growth of the revolutionary crisis. Lenin, who came to Russia with the idea of the Soviet republic, issued the slogan of a constitutional assembly as a stage on the road to the Soviet republic. At that time the slogan of the Soviet republic was his guiding star; but he realized that the masses would only follow this star after first being disappointed in the idea of democracy, in the idea of the constitutional assembly. He did not demand from the masses that they omit the transitional stage of the constitutional assembly, he was willing to overcome this stage together with them. He did not liquidate this slogan until after the seizure of power, when the constitutional assembly proved demonstratively that it formed an obstacle in the way of the peace which was the main object of the struggle.

The whole of Marxism teaches the proletariat how it has to conduct the struggle for power. But that this teaching is contained in Marxism was deeply hidden from the proletariat at that time, not only as a result of the opportunism of Social Democracy, which substituted bourgeois democracy for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also as a result of the fact that the European labour movement, after the year 1871, had developed along the lines and within the confines of bourgeois democracy. Lenin rediscovered Marx's teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat, not only because he was a revolutionary scholar of Marx, but because the Russian proletariat had set its foot on the path towards the struggle for power.

Lenin, as the leader of the October insurrection and the leader of the Soviet power, is the highest embodiment of all that he taught during the period of preparation. "The revolutionary politician has to reckon with millions of human beings"—said Lenin. And as the leader of Soviet Russia he showed to the world proletariat, with unexampled and graphic clarity, and on a millionfold scale, everything which the small circle of Russian Bolsheviks had learned in the course of the preceding decades. By means of the symbol of **sickle and hammer** he reminded the whole European proletariat: **"Seek your allies in the village, for this alliance will give you the bread you need for the revolution"**; by means of the **red star** of the red army he showed the proletariat that **the force of the enemy is to be broken by the force of the proletariat**, of a proletariat followed by those classes of society whose interests demand a struggle against the reaction of the landowners and the capitalists. When he stood at the head of the mighty state apparatus, he pointed out and

demonstrated unceasingly to the proletariats of all countries that power can only be maintained with the support of the **united vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist Party**. Thus Lenin tested his theories in the fire of actual deeds, and it is thanks to this test that he became the teacher of the international proletariat, the founder of the Communist International.

#### Lenin as Founder of the Communist International.

As early as the period of his first sojourn in Europe, before his banishment, Lenin began to study with great interest the West European labour movement, which up to then had only been known to him through the medium of books and which he was now able to study in actual practice. He often narrated the impressions made upon him by the workers' meetings in Switzerland and France; and he often observed that what he had seen, completely contradicted the ideas which he had formed in Russia with respect to the European labour movement. But this great realist did not succumb for a moment to scepticism, but sought for the essentially revolutionary character of the West European labour movement in the midst of its commonplace triteness and humdrum every-day work. It was not until 1906 that Lenin came into close connection with the labour movement and its leaders in Switzerland, France, and England. At this time he returned from banishment, and took part with Martov, Axelrod, and Plekhanov, in the publication of the **"Iskra"**. The **"Iskra"** was not only the fighting organ of Russian Social Democracy, but at the same time the fighting organ of European Socialism. The period of its publication coincided with the blazing up of the conflict between the revolutionary and revisionist tendencies of international socialism. The practical questions of the West European labour movement were dealt with in the **"Iskra"** for the most part by Plekhanov. Lenin devoted his attention chiefly to theoretical questions, but at the same time he accorded much careful study to the practical phenomena of the labour movement. He visited workers' meetings at Munich, and not only listened attentively to the speeches delivered by socialist speakers at the meetings in Hyde Park in London, but also to the speeches delivered by the preachers of the various religious sects exercising so much influence among the working masses of England.

It was perfectly clear to Lenin, after Bernstein's first action, that revisionism represents the expression of the interests of the labour aristocracy and of labour bureaucracy. And now he saw this graphically demonstrated in the types of the labour movement. At the international congresses at Amsterdam and Stuttgart, he observed the leading organizations of the Second International, and it is probable that he felt very solitary. The debates on colonial policy and on the combatting of war danger, held at the Stuttgart congress, showed him the path being pursued by the reformist leaders. The articles which he wrote on the sessions of the International Bureau, after the first revolution, are already permeated with the profound hate which he felt for all these van Kols, Troelstras, Brantings, and the like.

At that time the International was still united, it was not yet dismembered. But Lenin was already aware that the International contained enemies of the working class, and he was aware of the kind of people composing the whole honourable company of the Second International, beginning with the open revisionists, down to and including Kautsky, with whom Lenin had become acquainted in Munich as early as the year 1901, and whom at the very best he recognized to be a man who had his head in the clouds. Comrade Warsky, the theoretician of Polish Marxism, shows in his article on the lessons of the Bolshevik anniversary that he has excellently grasped the fact that at that time, the whole left wing of the Second International, including the best, represented an opposition against reformism within the Second International, and that Lenin alone stood for the principles of the future Third International. It suffices to read Lenin's short review in the **"Enlightenment"** on the book written by the German trade union leader Legien, to clearly recognize that no other human being except Lenin wrote in this manner about this worthy company.

The differences between revisionism and the radical Marxism pursued by Karl Kautsky, were merely differences of the interpretation of Marxian doctrine. In reality, in daily practice, these two tendencies agreed excellently with one another, and it is upon this fact that the unity of the Second International was based. The congress of this International met for some years without any very serious conflicts arising. Such conflicts as arose generally terminated with the acceptance of a common

resolution. In actual practice, the so-called radical Marxists did not even propose the revolutionary preparation of the masses by means of clear and decided revolutionary agitation. In the year 1910 there was a split in the camp of so-called orthodox Marxism. This split came about on account of practical reasons. The result was the so-called left radical section, and the so-called centre headed by Kautsky. The separation took place on the questions of the fight against imperialism, and of the mass strike. At first it appeared to Lenin as if we left radicals had incorrectly formulated our attitude towards imperialism, but were unconditionally right in the question of mass strikes. At the time, when Martov published an article against Rosa Luxemburg in Kautsky's Organ, Lenin published an article by Pannekoek in the Russian central organ, in which he defended the attitude of the left radicals, and morally supported the left.

\*

**The war breaks out.** The dark day comes, the 4th. August. Lenin, sojourning in the Carpathian district, receives the news of the complete betrayal by German and international Social Democracy. In the first moment he doubts the tidings, and hopes that it is merely a war manoeuvre of the international bourgeoisie; but he is speedily convinced of its tragic truth, goes to Switzerland, and takes up his fighting position at once. As early as the end of 1914, I had the opportunity of speaking with him, after his attitude had been firmly established in the historical manifesto issued by the Central Committee of the Party, and in various issues of the "Social Democrat". I still remember very well the profound impression made on me by the conversation with Lenin. I came from Germany for the purpose of establishing connections with the revolutionary groups of other countries. In Germany we unconditionally rejected the attitude of the social democratic majority from the very first day onwards. We rejected the idea of the defence of native country in an imperialist war. We were in conflict with Haase and Kautsky, who went no further than diffident opposition to the social patriotic leadership of the party, and only differed from this in sighing for peace. In our propaganda, carried on in the censored press and in hectographed papers, we agitated for revolutionary war against war. But for me — and through my intermediation also for many German comrades — my conversation with Lenin signified a sharp turn to the left. The first question which Lenin put to me was the question of the prospect of a split in the German Social Democracy. This question was like a dagger stab to the heart to me, and to the comrades standing at the left wing of the party. We had spoken thousands of times of reformism as of a policy pursued by the workers' aristocracy. But we hoped that the whole German party, after the first patriotic throwback, would develop towards the left. The fact that Karl Liebknecht did not vote openly against the war on 4. August is to be explained precisely by the fact that he still hoped that the persecution carried on by the government would induce the whole party to break with the government, and with the defence of the imperialist fatherland. Lenin put the direct question: what is the actual policy being pursued by the Second International? **Is it an error, or is it treason to the working class?** I began to explain to him that we were on the borderland between the period of peaceful development of socialism and the period of storm and stress, that it was not merely a question of treachery on the part of leaders, but of the attitude taken by masses not possessing the power to offer resistance to the war, but subservient to the bourgeoisie; but that the burdens imposed by this policy would force the masses to break with the bourgeoisie and tread the path of revolutionary struggle. Lenin interrupted me by the words: "It is an historicism that everything finds its explanation in the changing epoch. **But is it possible for the leaders of reformism, who led the proletariat systematically into the camp of the bourgeoisie even before the war, and who openly went over to this camp at the moment of the outbreak of the war, to be the champions of a revolutionary policy?**" I replied that I did not believe this to be possible. "Then" declared Lenin, "the survivals of an outlived epoch, in the form of reformist leaders, must also be cast aside. If we want to facilitate for the working class its transition to the policy of war against war, of war against reformism, then we must break with the reformist leaders, and with all who are not fighting honourably on the side of the working class. It is only a question of when this rupture is to be accomplished.

The question of the organizational preparation of this rupture is purely one of tactics, but to strive towards rupture is the fundamental duty every proletarian revolutionist". Lenin insisted on the sharpest form of the ideological struggle against the social patriots, **insisted on the necessity of openly emphasizing the treachery committed, especially the treachery of these leaders.** He frequently repeated these words on later occasions, when we were working together; when drawing up resolutions he invariably adhered to the standpoint of this political definition, and held it to be a measure of revolutionary sincerity and logic, an evidence of the will to break with Social Democracy.

Lenin insisted with equal emphasis upon the slogan of civil war being opposed to the slogan of Burgfrieden (civil peace). Since our polemical discussions with Kautsky, we left radicals in Germany had become accustomed to formulate the slogan less clearly: our slogan was the slogan of "mass action". The lack of clearness of this slogan corresponded with the embryonic condition of the revolutionary movement in Germany in the years 1911 and 1912, when we regarded the demonstration made by the workers of Berlin in the Tiergarten, at the time of the struggle for universal suffrage for the Prussian Diet, as the beginning of the revolutionary struggle of the German workers. Lenin showed us that though this slogan might be suitable for the purpose of opposing the action of the masses to the parliamentary game played by the social democratic leaders before the war, it is entirely unsuitable in a period of blood and iron, in a period of war. "When discontent with the war has increased" — he said — "then the Centrists can also organize a mass movement for the purpose of exerting pressure on the government, and for forcing it to end the war with a peaceful understanding. If our goal, the goal of ending the imperialist war by the revolution, is not not to be a mere pious wish, but a goal for which we really work, then we must issue the slogan of civil war, clearly and determinedly." He was extraordinarily pleased when Liebknecht, in his letter to the Zimmerwald conference, made use of the words: "Against the civil peace for the civil war." For Lenin, this was the best proof that Liebknecht was in agreement with us in essentials.

**The split in the Second International as a means for the development of the revolutionary movement in the proletariat, civil war as the means of victory over imperialist war** — these were the two leading ideas which Lenin endeavored to impress upon the minds of the advanced revolutionary elements of every country with which he was in connection. But despite the fact that Lenin had already, determinedly and unequivocally, adopted the attitude of the future Communist International, he nevertheless took part in the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences of the antimilitarist social democratic organizations. He understood quite well that it was necessary first to awaken the minds of the workers by forming blocs with the centrist tendency, to shake the unity of Social Democracy, and gather together considerable sections of the working masses, in order not to remain content with mere propaganda, but to commence the actual struggle.

Not only did he follow with careful attention the whole of the documents produced by the various trends of thought developing in the course of the struggle — and that he did this, without sparing his energies, is amply proved by the fact that, with a dictionary in the hand, he read from the first to the last word the pamphlet written on the war by the Dutch Marxist Gorter and published in the Dutch language, without knowing a word of Dutch — but he also followed every symptom of revolutionary self-activity among the masses, and attempted to ascertain what stage of political development they had really attained. When an old Leipzig comrade visited me in Berne for the purpose of bringing me a report — a comrade belonging to the extreme left wing of German Social Democracy, but ignorant on questions of principle — Lenin succeeded in obtaining from him a complete picture of the movement, in the most literal sense of the words. I recollect the astonishment of this comrade when Lenin left him no peace until he had told him what kind of interjections the working men and women made at the demonstrations. "They make the usual interjections", said the comrade, "such as are always made on such occasions". But Lenin insisted: "Still you must tell me exactly what interjections they make." And then he got the details which he required. With the greatest attention he followed the smallest matter dealt with by the labour press of Europe and America, in order that he might learn the trend of feeling among the masses, since this

was no longer expressed in the political articles which were accorded ever-increasing attention by the war censor. And our great revolutionary leader sought also abroad, in foreign lands, for this intimate connection with the working masses, in which alone the lever to the movement can be found. He sacrificed whole evenings in taverns, in order to discover the real basis of the movement by means of conversations with Swiss workers, though these by no means could be reckoned as the flower of the revolutionary proletariat. When the comrades leading at that time the left wing of the Swiss labour movement vacillated, he insisted that every one of us should form connections with workers, if only with small groups, for these formed his sole hope.

As early as the year 1916, when we gathered together those sharing our views in different countries, and founded the organization known as the Zimmerwald Left within the confines of the Zimmerwald bloc, Vladimir Ilych insisted on drawing up the program of the future revolutionary international.

A subsequent result of this preparatory work was his book: "State and Revolution." As early as the year 1916 he spoke of the idea of the state Commune, which we at first understood no better than the Russian comrades understood Lenin's famous April theses after the February revolution. Every one of us had read Marx's book on the Paris Commune several times. But we had not observed precisely the new idea in it, the idea of the "State Commune", and it cost Lenin much effort to make his standpoint clear to us. It is highly characteristic of him as a tactician that the experience gained in 1905 caused him, even at this time, to draw our attention to the possible rôle to be played by councils as organs of the state commune. But at the moment of the February revolution, Lenin, being in receipt of only very vague reports on the real situation in Russia, and being applied to for directions from comrades Piatakov and Kolontay, who had gone to Russia, replied as follows: "No confidence in the provisional government. The constitutional assembly — a farce. We must get the Petrograd and Moscow municipal Duma into our hands." In struggling for the state commune, Lenin sought the aid of organs closely connected with the daily life of the masses, without concerning himself to any great extent as to the names of these organs. One result of his program work at this time is his attitude towards the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples. Up to the war, Lenin had dealt with this question from the Russian aspect, as a means towards the emancipation of the Russian proletariat from the influence of Great Russian chauvinism, and as a means towards winning the confidence of the masses of the non-Russian peoples of Russia, in whom he hoped to find allies in the struggle against Czarism.

During the war he approached the question from the international aspect. The pamphlet issued by Rosa Luxemburg on the bankruptcy of German Social Democracy, in which she entirely disputed the possibility of wars of national emancipation during the epoch of imperialism, induced Lenin to take up the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples again. With an unexampled tactical elasticity he showed us — though he most decisively rejected the idea of the so-called defence of native country in the limited West European states — that though the period of national wars is over in Western Europe, this is not yet the case in South Western Europe, nor in the case of the national minorities in Russia and the colonies in Asia. Lenin had not occupied himself concretely with the study of the colonial movement; many of us were much better informed than he on these questions, and with the utmost sincerity he endeavored to gather the concrete material which he required, from books and from conversation. But then he turned this material against us, and in the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples he combatted the attitude adopted by Kautsky, for whom this slogan was an instrument of pacifism, a solution of the Alsace-Lorraine problem. The severe criticism which he levelled against my theses in the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples, was followed up by the demonstration of the importance of this question, which contains the blasting force of dynamite against imperialism. The cunning centrist philosophers of the Hilferding type attempted to prove to the European proletariat that Lenin raised the colonial and national question, at the second congress of the Comintern, in the interests of the Russian state. But already at that time, when Lenin was still living in Switzerland as an exiled and persecuted emigré, he was carrying on an inexorable struggle in regard to this question against Gorter, Pannekoek, Bucharin, Piatakov, and myself. For him this question had the same significance as

the winning over of the peasantry on an international scale as an ally for the world proletariat. The international proletariat cannot be victorious without allying itself with the revolution of the young enslaved peoples of the East and of the colonies. This Lenin taught us as early as the year 1916.

From the very beginning of the February Revolution, it was Lenin's endeavour to destroy the bloc with the centrists, to liquidate the Zimmerwald Union. He was of the opinion that the Russian revolution, which raised the question of revolution in all the countries taking part in the war, would give to us communists the forces of the masses, and would drive the irresolute elements of the centre into the camp of the traitors. He did not allow us to sign the manifesto issued by the Zimmerwald bureau on the Russian revolution, for he saw that this meant confusing the Russian workers by the common signature with Martov, and would interfere with the struggle against Tscheidze and the Mensheviks. The rupture did not take place in 1917, as we were attempting to use the aid of the Zimmerwald bureau for the purpose of inducing the Independent Socialists in Germany to take up the fight against German imperialism; at this time the Spartacus Union had not yet separated from the Independents. After the seizure of power in October 1917 the Zimmerwald Union practically expired. The struggle of the Russian working class actually proved to be the most effectual means of awakening the proletariats of all other countries. The whole of the year 1918 was occupied by the preliminary work for the congress at which the Communist International was founded.

This congress, which took place in March 1919 — at the time when the fighting began against Denikin and Koltchak — brought nothing fundamentally new. Its basis was the ideological work accomplished by the Bolsheviks in the Zimmerwald Left during the war years just passed through. The resolution passed by this congress, the manifesto, and above all Lenin's theses on dictatorship and democracy, formed the bases for the future work of the Communist International. At the time of the October revolution, many of those who read the decrees on peace, and on the land enactments, were of the opinion that these documents would share the fate of those proclamations which are never executed. When the Russian revolution was passing through its most critical moments, when tidings were received that Koltchak had advanced to the Volga, when news came that the young Red Army had been defeated in the south — at this critical juncture the decisions of the First Congress of the Communist International were issued, and there were many comrades, not only in Western Europe, but also among us members of the Russian Communist Party, at that time working illegally in the West, who asked if these documents were not the legacy of the Russian revolution, bequeathed in an hour of deadly danger. The Executive of the Communist International, cut off at that time from the West European labour movement by the wall of the blockade, was able to exercise but little practical influence upon our actions, could help the West European workers but little. The latter made their way forward by themselves, learned to solve their problems independently, and it was not until the year 1920, after the victory of the Red Army over Denikin and Koltchak, that the daily mass work of the Communist International began. And here Lenin at once undertook the leadership of the international labour movement as its practical leader, as the good spirit hastening to the aid of the young communist movement, helping it to consider its first steps, and to find its path onwards.

Lenin drew up three important documents for the Second Congress of the Communist International. Delegates arriving from every part of the world found a translation of Lenin's pamphlet: "Radicalism, the Infantile Disease of Communism" awaiting them. Lenin's work on "State and Revolution" was already known to them, as a torch lighting them to their great goal, the dictatorship of the proletariat. The pamphlet on radicalism shed light on the path of those young communist parties which believed that they could spring at the enemy's throat without delay, that the revolutionary wave would bear them directly to their goal. The young communist parties, rejecting every compromise in their revolutionary zeal, were taught by Lenin to consider the lessons won by the experiences of the Russian revolution. He showed them that the first premise towards the dictatorship of the proletariat is the winning over of the majority of the working class. He showed them that the winning over of the majority of the working class requires the utilization of all those means granted to the advanced workers by the same bourgeois democracy which they are about to overthrow. He showed them that when the road to the barricade

leads even through Parliament, we must preach the idea of communism to the working masses, even from this rubbish heap. He pointed out to them the mass organizations of the workers, the trade unions, which have to be rescued from the hands of the yellow leaders by unwearying efforts. He showed them that a revolutionary minority cannot renounce all compromise, if such compromise can facilitate the winning over of the majority. It is difficult to concentrate into a few words the contents of this incomparable work of our great leader. But it may be safely asserted that even now nine tenths of the leaders of the Communist International have not entirely made the contents of this pamphlet their own.

This little brochure contains in a concentrated form the quintessence of the whole philosophy of Bolshevism, its strategy and tactics, and many years will pass, years of victory and defeat, until we can maintain that these ideas of Lenin have really passed into the flesh and blood of the leaders of the Communist International. The more we read this pamphlet, the greater the wealth of ideas we find in it, the finer the shades of thought. It suffices when I say that after I had been applying the united front tactics for two years, I discovered last year for the first time that these tactics are already contained in this pamphlet, though this never entered my mind when I made my first diffident utilization of these tactics in January 1921, in my well-known "open letter" to the Social Democratic parties and trade unions. The inexhaustable source of instruction afforded by this treatise on the war of the proletariat, or contained between its lines, will be of no less importance for our strategy than Clausevitz's book on military strategy is for the tactics of war. The difficulty in the application of Lenin's teachings lies in the fact that it is impossible to learn the strategy of the proletariat by means of propaganda, by means of comparison with the struggle of the Russian proletariat. The daily experiences of the Communist Parties in the different countries shows us that the main questions invariably arise in quite different forms, and that every Communist Party must be capable of independent thought if it is to rise to the level of the revolutionary strategy of our greatest revolutionary leader.

The second document submitted by Lenin to the Second Congress consisted of his first draft of the conditions of admission to the Comintern. These theses have been much derided. Many protests have been raised against them. But when we read them through, and when we ask ourselves what parties belonging to the Communist International have hitherto learnt to fulfil only one tenth of these conditions, then we begin to realise their political significance. Lenin's book on "State and Revolution" shows us the goal of the communist movement, or rather the first great stage on the road to this goal; his pamphlet on radicalism shows the whole of the thorny path leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat; and theses of Lenin's deal with the question of what a Communist Party should be. It is not worth while to pass any new resolutions whatever until examination has been made into the question of the extent to which these theses have been fulfilled. These theses form the test, the measure of the progressive development of the parties of the Communist International, of their conversion from left social democratic parties into really communist parties.

Lenin's third document was his draft of the theses on the colonial question. These theses have also not yet become part and parcel of the very being of the communist parties of the West, whose bourgeoisie holds hundreds of millions of human beings in its rapacious claws in the colonies. Neither has it fully penetrated the consciousness of our young communist parties in the East. The work being done in the colonies by our English, French, and Dutch comrades not only encounters great difficulties on the side of the police of the imperialist powers, but finds another obstacle in the imperfect preparation of our comrades for work among masses of colonial peoples of an unheard of low degree of culture. Our comrades in the colonies often err along the paths of left communism. Themselves educated by a literature which proclaims the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is only with the utmost difficulty that they can adapt themselves to combining the work of gathering together the young proletariat and the craftsmen of China, Corea, Persia, India, and Egypt, against the foreign and native bourgeoisie, with the attempt to support the national emancipation movement of the young native bourgeoisie against the capitalist centre by which it is being suppressed. Decades will again have to pass before actual practice will be successful in combining the struggles for national emancipation among the colonial peoples with the

proletarian revolution in Europe and America. But one thing is clear: Lenin's genius has pointed out the path to be pursued by the international proletariat.

In the figure of Lenin, and in his works, we have for the first time in the history of class warfare a comprehensive centre, in the literal sense of the words, for the workers of the whole world. For the first time we begin to emerge from the blind alley into which the European proletariat has run, to tread the path of a real world movement. The book written by our Indian comrade Roy gave us the first theoretical example of Lenin's teachings tested in a concrete instance. The struggle carried on by the newspaper published by Roy himself gives us the first example of the periodical application of Lenin's teachings, and we may confidently maintain that this test has shown how far and how deeply our leader could see. At the time of the Hamburg Congress of the Second International, the Hamburg social democratic newspaper printed a poem of welcome to the congress. The poet called upon the Chinese coolie in the rice fields, to the negroes on the cotton plantations of South America, to the black men working in the gold mines, inviting them to gather beneath the emancipating standard of the International. But these are mere empty words. This same Second International is now celebrating a great victory. Its leader, Ramsay MacDonald, has formed the first labour government. And whom has he appointed as minister for the 300,000,000 oppressed Hindus? Sir Sidney Olivier, an official belonging to the old staff of colonial authorities, the governor of Jamaica. This colonial official is the tried and tested protector of the sugar plantation owners of Jamaica. Will he call the Indian slaves of his Majesty the King beneath the flag of the Second International, or will this perhaps be done by Lord Chelmsford, the one-time viceroy of India, now appointed First Lord of the Admiralty by the grace of Mac Donald, leader of the Second International? It is only the Communist International which can organize the colonial peoples, and Lenin's work in showing us this path will never be forgotten in history, nor by the international working class and the whole of humanity.

At the Third Congress of the Communist International, Lenin was still at his fighting post. The revolutionary wave of 1918/19 had ebbed. The German CP., grown into a mass party of the proletariat, had not taken the altered conditions into account, did not observe that the offensive of capital had already set in, allowed itself to be provoked, and plunged into an armed struggle, without possessing even the sympathies of the majority of the working class. We all admit the error committed by the Party. We all rejected the theses submitted by the German central, which drafted a theory of offence at the moment of political retreat. But we, the immediate functionaries of the Communist International, knew that the Party Central, consisting as it did of the old leaders of the Spartacus union and of the best leaders of the Independent party, was the sole possible Central for the German communist movement, and we wished to teach our German brother party as kindly as possible the lessons to be learnt from this defeat. Lenin forced us to alter our theses five times. He forced us to say brutally to the German communists, and to the communists of the whole world: "First win over the majority of the proletariat, and then you may turn to the task of seizing power!" Lenin saved the Communist Party, and with the same decision he supported the united front tactics, which encountered violent resistance in the ranks of the communists — and not only in the ranks of the West European communists. With extraordinary fine feeling he pointed out the main differences existing between Russian conditions in the year 1917, and the conditions under which the West European communists have to fight. He understood excellently that here we have proletarian mass organizations possessing a past extending over half a century, and in the hands of yellow leaders, so that the work before us is extremely complicated, and demands much perseverance. Such a situation calls for a number of compromises, disagreeable to communists, but unfortunately unavoidable if the majority of the proletariat is to be won over. Overburdened with state work, Lenin had no time to follow the detailed questions of the development in the West, and yet he possessed a certain sense enabling him to grasp the essential differences in the positions of the different countries, and the tasks of the different Communist Parties.

At the Fourth Congress of the Communist International Lenin gave a report on the situation in Russia, though he had just recovered from the first attack of that disease which has now robbed us of him. The congress received him with enthu-

siastic joy, and it was with the greatest sorrow that we observed the painful slowness with which our beloved leader had to seek for the words enabling him to express his clearly defined ideas in a foreign language. Before giving his report, Lenin put the question, accompanied by a wink of one eye: "And what shall we say when we are asked about the immediate prospects of the world revolution?", and then added immediately: "I shall say that when the communists behave more sensibly, the prospects will improve." Lenin gave instructions on the methods of war against war to the Russian trade union delegation going to the Hague. This last piece of advice given by Lenin to the international proletariat represents a perfect example of his extraordinary sense of reality. He declared that those who promise the carrying out of a general strike in the case of a fresh outbreak of war, in face of the lessons taught by the imperialist war, are either fools or humbugs. If we cannot prevent the imperialist war, then the masses will be drawn into the war and then we shall be compelled to enter the war ourselves, in order to work for the revolution in the ranks of the imperialist armies. Our task is to exert every endeavour to prevent any fresh outbreak of war. And again Lenin unfolded, point by point, the plan of daily revolutionary work against the danger of war.

One year of work in the Communist International without Lenin now lies behind us. This year brought us two great defeats: in Bulgaria and in Germany. We must learn the lessons of these defeats alone, without Lenin. The revolutionary wave is not rising as we had expected it to rise during the past summer, and if it does not rise next year, then we shall have a number of complicated questions to clear up. We shall have to decide the question of how we can best gather the masses around us during the period of reaction, of capitalist offensive, and how we can combine the daily struggle with the preparation for the fight for the dictatorship. We have 42 parties. Each of these parties exists under its own special conditions. It is a task of extraordinary difficulty to accord due consideration to all these special conditions, and still to carry on united communist work. But we shall accomplish this task. Are we not in possession of the legacy which Lenin has bequeathed us, the inexhaustible store of his ideas, his methods, tried and tested in many attacks and retreats? We shall learn from Lenin's works. As with Marx's tenets, it is not the results and concrete solutions which have here the greatest value, but the method of solution, the way in which this greatest of proletarian revolutionists approached the problems.

The Communist International and the Russian proletariat have suffered a severe loss. But if ever it could be said that death has only taken the body of a leader, in no case could these words be truer than here. And therefore the Communist International will shed no tears by Lenin's graveside, but will turn with tenfold energy to the task of making its own all that is immortal in the teachings of Lenin. And with Lenin's sword in its hand the Communist International will stride forward to victory!

Our beloved leader is no longer among us. We shall accomplish our task by means of the collective thought of the whole of the communist parties of our International.

Lenin's banner and Lenin's teachings arm the Communist International for the whole epoch still dividing us from the victory of the proletarian world revolution.

## POLITICS

### Defeat for Reaction in Switzerland.

By M. Bodenmann (Basle).

The victorious Russian revolution, the revolutionary struggles in Germany, Austria and other countries, found their echo also in Switzerland. At that time the workers expressed their will and strength in a national general strike. The rulers and employers, who generally have nothing but a cynical smile or a brutal "no" for the demands of the workers, displayed social comprehension for the situation of the proletariat. They were prepared to make extensive concessions in the hope of avoiding more serious collisions. In this situation the Eight Hour Day was passed through the Swiss Parliament in 1919 upon the motion of the Federal Council, and became a part of the Swiss Factory Act. The Law came into force at the beginning of 1920.

But already in 1921, after the employers had succeeded in seizing some positions from the workers, especially as regards wages, without any serious resistance on the part of the

workers being offered, a motion signed by a majority of the members of parliament was introduced, demanding the restoration of the nine and ten hour day.

The government complied with this request and laid a bill before parliament in which the eight hour day was recognised "in principle", but which provided that for the next three years the nine hour day would be introduced. Against this bill, which was passed in Parliament by a large majority, the proletarian parties along with the trade union federation, demanded the referendum. Thirty thousand signatures are sufficient to compel the submission of a law to the plebiscite of the people; but the opposition to this law made itself already visible when it came to collecting signatures. Two hundred thousand enfranchised citizens subscribed their names to the petition lists. This huge number of signatures brought disappointment to the law makers, and the government, scenting trouble, postponed the plebiscite on the law which had been passed in June 1922 till February 1924.

The plebiscite took place on February 17th. Months of propaganda preceded the voting and both groups exerted all their strength. On the one side were the Peasants' Federation, the industrialists and the merchants, and on the other side the solid front of the workers. The employers fought with the usual despicable methods. According to their view, the prolongation of the hours of labour would save industry from decay, would cheapen production and do away with unemployment. However, this time such demagoguery failed to catch the workers. With 317,598 votes for and 435,589 against the proposed law was defeated. Thus the former law remains in force, which fixes an eight hour day and only permits the Federal Council in exceptional cases to sanction a 52 hour week temporarily for certain industries. The great majority of the Swiss people have decided in favour of the maintenance of the eight hour day and thus administered a signal defeat to the reaction.

Of considerable interest as regards the result of this vote is the fact that a large number of peasants, although rendered hostile towards the urban workers as a result of the false policy of the Social Democrats through many years and the incitement of the peasant leaders, no longer followed the call of the Peasants' Federation which represents the interests of the big peasants. The results in some of the purely peasants districts indicate that large numbers of the small peasants, instead of lining up with their leaders, placed themselves on the side of the proletariat. For the Communist Party, which ever since its organization has not shared in the stupid baiting of the peasantry indulged in by the Social Democrats but on the contrary, has endeavoured to get into touch with the poorer peasants, this fact is of essential significance.

It is worthy of notice that this struggle over the eight hour day has brought about an inner breaking up of the Left bourgeois parties, the members of which consist partly of the religious minded workers, as well as of clerks and officials.

Naturally, the favourable decision of the people does not mean that the eight hour day is finally saved, or that the reaction is beaten. During the election the Communist Party emphasized this, and in the course of the immediate future will give it special prominence. This single defeat of the capitalists will not prevent them from trying to realize their will in other ways and by other methods. Before all, there remains the hard fact that, in spite of the law, over 150,000 workers no longer enjoy the eight hour day. The next task is to recapture this surrendered position.

As has already been the case, the government will make use of its powers, and under the pretext that urgent grounds exist, permit those factories where so far only 48 hours have been worked, to adopt a 52 hour working week. Against this practice, which actually means the abolition of the eight hour day, the most determined resistance must be made.

As the employers were not able to carry out their will absolutely in the matter of hours, a new attack upon wages is to be expected. This struggle has already been announced in the press organs of big industry. A prolonged struggle over wages will take place very shortly.

How the workers will emerge from this struggle depends to a great extent upon the attitude of the Trade Union Federation. If the previous policy is pursued of, allowing the workers, of the individual concerns to remain isolated in the struggle for the defence of their very existence, the workers, in spite of the victory in the referendum, are approaching new defeats. The Communists will endeavour with all their powers



to ensure that the attacks upon wages and hours of labour, which are of great importance for the whole of the workers no matter where they take place, shall be repelled with the fullest unity and determination.

## The Position in Roumania.

By U. Timescu.

After the completion of the Belgrade Conference, the Roumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Duca, received the foreign correspondents of the foreign press, to whom he explained as follows: "We can be very satisfied with the results of the Conference: very important matters were dealt with, and one cannot fail to recognize the fact, that the Little Entente is to be regarded as one of the most powerful factors of consolidation and of world peace." From what he said of the tasks which hereby fall to Roumania, it is to be inferred that Roumanian Diplomacy will remain true to its glorious tradition: a policy of extortion on all sides. Thus it will force Horthy-Hungary, which is begging for a national loan, to surrender the claims for compensation due to the Roumanian occupation; in Greece, the dynasty must be restored; from Bulgaria, further favours will be extorted for the Roumanian minority living in that country.

In the above-mentioned interview with the foreign press representatives, Duca said, with regard to Soviet Russia: "We are about to meet the representatives of the Russian Government, in order to settle the questions pending between us. I hope that these negotiations will lead to a favourable result." Obviously, M. Duca is of the opinion that the Russians have only to behave themselves nicely, and that he, Duca, will then see what can be done for them.

In a special interview with the Czecho-Slovakian press representatives, the Roumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs denied the rumour spread in Czecho-Slovakia that there was discordance between Roumania and the Czecho-Slovakian allies. How far this denial is to be really believed, the following facts show: Present-day Great-Roumania a short time ago celebrated the fifth anniversary of its foundation. Nevertheless, the "liberated" districts in Roumania are still kept "quiet" by means of "state of emergency". In the former Hungarian districts, there prevails the military regime of General Petala. This General exercises a military censorship, uses that seasoned weapon — mass eviction, and in general maintains his regime by means of terrorist social-national oppression. In Bessarabia a short time ago, exceptional civil conditions were substituted for exceptional military conditions, but solely because the military commander there, General Popovici, who had governed hitherto, had proved powerless and inefficient against the brigandage raging throughout the country. The civilized policy of the Roumanian Government towards national minorities treads the minority rights of the five million Hungarians, Russians and Germans underfoot. Not only in the schools, but even in the Kindergartens a destructive fight against instruction in the erstwhile mother tongue is carried on. In the administration, bureaucratic centralisation prevails; there is no autonomy of towns or districts. This bureaucratic centralization is supposed to be modelled on the French pattern, but in reality, it is an imitation of the administrative organization of the old Czarist Russia. In many other directions also the old Czarism is eagerly copied. Following the model of the "Ochrana", the whole country is covered with a net of espionage. The corruption in administrative offices surpasses perhaps, what one was accustomed to from the Czarist Government.

The Parliamentary democracy extending over pre-war Roumania, distinguishes itself alone by the fact, that the Hungarian, Russian and Bulgarian minorities have no representation in the Roumanian Parliament. To be sure, the members in the Roumanian Duma have absolutely no influence on business of State. The class foundation of the regime of force ruling in Roumania consists in the combination of feudal landownership with the finance-capitalists of old Roumania. Both classes are united in the radical "Liberal Party", where, however, the old landowning (Boyers) families are the real leaders of the active policy. Their power is in no way lessened in spite of agrarian reform. Already in 1918, under the revolutionary pressure of the masses, the first bill on agrarian reform was passed in which the expropriation of the land and its taking over by the Peasants' Councils was provided for. In 1921, however, the bill was very much weakened through the bureaucratic organs of the government and by special government enactments. This agrarian reform

has not fulfilled its purpose, namely, to accomplish a pacification of the peasant masses. The embitterment of the landless village population assumes more and more threatening forms, and is also expressed in the increasing tendency to emigration. The Boyars (landowners) have maintained their position of power unweakened. They have simply turned their ground rents into capital, so that today there are very close alliances between feudal landownership and the big banks of Roumania. The real back-bone of the "Liberal Party" is the bank of the Premier Bratianu: The Romaneasca Bank. The policy of Roumania is determined by the interests of the National Bank. In a book written by a director of the Romaneasca Bank, Ivescu, it is stated that the "national" concerns have increased their share capital fivefold between 1919 and 1921, and control more than three times as much capital as the banks of an international character.

The national debts of Roumania have now reached relatively the same height as those of France. But still nothing at all has been done towards the reconstruction of the country. On the contrary, the former flourishing industries of Siebenbürgen are destroyed, the means of communication are absolutely shattered, and the land, economically, completely isolated.

The opposition parties, however, stand helpless before the government party. Only the Zaronists (Peasants' Party) have a definite program. The leaders of this party even speak of the class-war of the poor villagers against the Boyars and the Banks. They however lack the mass organization necessary to give these fine words expression. The national party, numerically stronger hesitates undecidedly, between an autonomy on Radic's model and a nationalism which surpasses that of the government.

The Parliamentary struggle of all these opposition parties against the Liberal Government, which has bound to itself with many financial threads, the dynasty, and the leading Generals of the army, is at present rather hopeless. This fact naturally oppresses, to an unheard of extent, the great working masses, and indeed, the government not only uses its strength to exploit ruthlessly the working class: the white terror, individual and mass persecution is to destroy the revolutionary workers' movement.

And here also in Roumania, the Social Democrats help the government. With the support of the police they split the already weak Trades Union movement. They are the originators of the police persecution, which since then has prevailed against the Communists, the Communist press and the Communist Trades Union groups. The revolutionary workers nevertheless, in their overwhelming majority, stand true to the flag of the class war, and do not allow themselves to be prevented from continuing their efforts for the reconstitution of a unified Trade Union movement.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Textile Strike in Bombay.

By M. N. Roy.

The capitalist offensive in India has culminated in a general lock-out in the cotton industry of Bombay. Strikes in several mills and prepatation for a strike in many others answered by the owners very drastically. In the last week of January a partial strike occurred in a number of mills and their owners promptly replied by closing down the mills for a week, thus locking out even those men who had not joined the strikers. This high-handed attitude of the employers, added to their flat refusal to consider the demand of the workers, exhausted the patience of the latter, who began the preparation for a general strike, in spite of the frantic efforts of the leaders to prevent it. By Jan. 29, over 100,000 men had downed tools, and the industry was almost paralysed. The next day a notice signed by the Millowners' Association was posted on the closed door of every mill. By this notice 81 out of 83 mills in Bombay were closed down until Feb. 4, and it was declared that unless the men resumed work unconditionally on that day, the period of lock-out would be extended for another two weeks. So on Feb. 1, the city of Bombay counted over 150,000 men without work.

The demand of the men was for continued payment of the yearly bonus, which is equivalent to a month's wages. This is considered to represent unpaid wages. For years the system of bonus has obtained in the textile industry. In July of last

year, the employers declared their intention of suspending its payment from 1924. The plea on which this decision was taken was that of „trade depression“. It is argued by the owners and their supporters that the price of cotton has gone up and the market is has shrunk; the cost of production must be reduced; and, in the words of Jehangir Bomanji Petit, the owners' spokesmen, „the first remedy is to reduce the wages“.

The „depression“, on which pretext the capitalist offensive was launched, is, however, no depression in the proper sense of the word. What did happen was that since 1922, the industry naturally could not be maintained on the level of prosperity which had been reached during the war and the years immediately following it. The profits in that period rose to almost fabulous figures. The situation was abnormal. It was created first, by the suspension of imports from Britain during the war, and second, by the favourable exchange rate of the rupee. Both the causes were eventually removed; in 1920, imports from Lancashire almost regained their prewar level, and the price of silver also went down. Consequently, already by the year 1921, was there a marked decline in the rate of profit in the Indian cotton industry.

But the relativity of this decline, which was seized upon as the indication of depression, is exposed by the rates of dividends paid in the years of prosperity. In some cases they reached 200 p. c., the average being well over cent per cent. According to the report of the Millowners Association, the profit of the year 1921 was 70 p. c. less than the previous year. The net earning in 1921 was 63 p. c. on the capital outlay. That of the following year was 40 p. c. The figures of 1923 are not yet available. But given that the proportional decline continued, it is not true, as the owners say, that the industry is losing money.

On the other hand, nominal wages have increased hardly 80 p. c. above the pre-war level. When the utter inadequacy of pre-war wages in the Indian cotton industry is remembered, this increase is very negligible. Then, it certainly does not compare fairly with the rise in profits, which was several hundred per cent. The average dividend paid by the mills before the war was 8 to 10 p. c. Further, compared with the rise in the cost of living, the 80 p. c. wage-increase loses any substantial value. In the boom period, the cost of living was more than a hundred per cent above the pre-war level. The retail price of some articles of food had gone up as much as several hundred per cent. Even now the cost of living in Bombay is 53 p. c. above pre-war level, according to official statistics.

Internally, the Indian cotton industry does not find itself in a serious crisis, although it is true that to some extent the waves of world depression did affect it. But the real fact is the revival of Lancashire competition. Absence of foreign goods enabled the Indian producers to force their prices exorbitantly high. This cannot be done any longer. The situation changed already from 1920. The fall of prices has caused a continued drop in the rate of profit. But the youthful capitalism of India is loath to return to a normal position from the fabulous rates it has been accustomed to. First the manufacturers held back thousands of bales of cloth and yarn to force the prices up. It was a stupid act, because it only left the market to the mercy of Lancashire. Over-production in India! What a monstrous lie! More than 50 p. c. of the cloth required has got to be imported, and the average consumption is only 13 yards per head per year. By the beginning of last year, the owners were convinced that they must sell cheaper. Not willing to shoulder all the loss (?) they demanded that the workers must share it too.

The first attack was made upon the workers at Ahmedabad, the second largest textile centre. Last year the Ahmedabad owners decided upon a 20 p. c. wage-cut, besides this they had already questioned the workers' right to the bonus. The workers struck, and resisted for nearly three months. Thanks to the sabotage of the labour leaders, who are closely related to the owners, either domestically or economically, and certainly socially, the strike was not general. 30,000 out of over 70,000 men were out. The Indian worker is threatened with starvation on the first day that he is without a job; there is no Union Fund; and the anxiety of the upper-class leaders to break up any strike knows no bounds. All these reasons taken together defeated the Ahmedabad workers. They finally accepted a 15 p. c. wage-cut, and the question of bonus was referred to arbitration. The Bombay men were not unwilling to come to the aid of their Ahmedabad comrades; but the leaders would not permit this.

The victory at Ahmedabad was followed up by the Bombay owners by the decision to discontinue the payment of the bonus. The recent defeat of their Ahmedabad comrades naturally made the Bombay men shy of any immediate action to reply the employers. But as the time when formerly the payment used to be made drew near, they began to be restive. Despite its meagreness, the bonus is a big thing for the Indian worker. The idea that it was going to be taken away became unbearable, and a spirit of resistance was displayed. In the beginning of January, discontent became acute and fractional strikes occurred. At the same time, 3000 workers in the railway work-shop were locked out, on the pretext of some disturbance resulting from the rude behavior of the medical officer. This incident taxed the patience of the working-class. There was an atmosphere of tension. The mill-owners appealed for help and the government responded by sending forces armed with machine-guns and armoured cars to guard the mills in which the workers had struck. The leaders kept on rebuking the men for rash action and ordered them to resume work immediately, leaving the leaders to negotiate. Neither the government nor the employers would listen to the leaders, but the latter's faith in negotiation and constitutional action was inordinate and their hostility to the strike was out-spoken. Throughout the month of January the situation kept growing worse, until the almost general strike was answered by a general lock-out.

The lock-out infuriated the men; the working class quarters of Bombay were heavily guarded by armed forces. On Jan-31 a great mass meeting was held to determine the action of the workers in view of the lock-out order. The workers were determined to resist and declared their will to „hold out for months if necessary“. But the spirit of the workers was not shared by their leaders, who were already disturbed because the workers had gone on strike against their advice. In view of the outrageous attitude of the millowners, neither the leaders nor the nationalist press, however, could withhold full support for the workers' demand. The leaders, nevertheless, sought to terrorise the men by telling them how inopportune the time was for the strike, how the owners had been waiting for such an opportunity to close down the mills, and how the workers would harm themselves by holding out. The meeting passed a resolution asking the government to appoint an arbitration board to decide the bonus question; it was also resolved that the workers would go back to the mills as soon as the board was appointed. So what the leaders forced the men to agree to was practically an unconditional surrender. Of course it still remains to be seen how this resolution will work out. It depends upon the attitude of the government and that of the men when they are faced with the actual implication of the resolution forced upon them by the leaders who by their own profession, stand closer to the interests of the employers than to those of the workers.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### Mass Influx into the Communist Party of Russia.

By Frida Rubiner (Moscow).

According to the results of the great census which was carried out by the Russian Communist Party in 1922, the composition of the Party, as regards social origin, was as follows: workers 44.3%, peasants 20.8%, clerks etc. 22.2%, and others 6.7%. It was however, repeatedly pointed out that the actual percentage of workers was much less. The greater part of the Party members who come from the working class have long since taken administrative and official posts in the Soviet state service, and are more or less estranged from their class. The danger of this deproletarianizing of the revolutionary working class party was realized very acutely during the Party discussion which recently took place, and the conclusions which were drawn therefrom were: 1. the Party must exclude more than ever all non-proletarian elements who are alien to the class, and 2. that new members must be recruited from the factories.

This decision regarding the acceptance of new members goes very far towards meeting certain strivings in the ranks of the workers. If the Russian Communist Party has not grown

numerically in the past years, and, as a matter of fact, has decreased greatly after the purging, it was because of the high claims placed by the Party upon its members. The more the Soviet power established itself, and the more the state structure provided posts and positions with all their advantages and privileges, all the greater was the danger of the governing party becoming bureaucratized and sinking into a slough of corruption. However, the old fighting spirit of the Party has not died. Soviet Russia is passing through a new period in which all her energies are being absorbed for reconstruction by detailed work. However, with the reconstruction of economy, a new bourgeoisie is growing, that type which is called here the "Nep people". The approaching struggle, the struggle against the new bourgeoisie, can only be carried out by the proletariat itself under the leadership of the Communist Party, and for this reason it is first of all necessary to proletarianize the Party itself.

These are the motives that led the Communist Party of Russia to inaugurate the membership campaign which is now being carried on. The resolution on this question which was adopted in the plenary sitting of the Central Committee on January 31st, contained the following words. "The Party conference has taken the increasing trend towards the Party into account, and has decided to bring one hundred thousand industrial workers engaged in the factories into the Party. After the death of Lenin, this trend has increased to an extraordinary extent and this confronts the Party with the task of carrying out an extensive membership campaign extending over three months."

The campaign, which is to end on May 1st, originally had as its objective the obtaining of one hundred thousand new members, but the reports that have been received so far show that this figure will be greatly exceeded. Up till February 12th, 18,527 applications had been received in Moscow alone, and in the provinces 60,692. Originally the following increase was reckoned upon: Moscow organization 25,000, Leningrad (Petrograd) 20,000, Donetz and the Ural 15,000 each, Nijni-Novgorod and Baku 7000 each, Kharkov government 5000, Tula and Ivonovo-Vosnessensk 4000 each. In all cases however, the applications have exceeded the estimates.

One must know the psychology of the Russian peasant and worker in order to understand the connection between Lenin's death and the influx of new members. Characteristic of many is the resolution of the workers in the Dux Aeroplane Factory in Moscow. It reads: "In view of the fact that the worker, the best man, the most energetic leader of the Communist Party of Russia and the best member of its family, Vladimir Ilyitch, has disappeared from the ranks of the Communist Party, we, a group of workers in the woodworking department of the Dux Factory, have decided in this hard moment to enter the Communist Party, and collectively to carry out to its end the work which Lenin left to us as a heritage."

In other words that means that as the leader is gone we must replace him with the united force of the mass.

Among the peasants, the manifestations over the death of Lenin are expressed even more simply and directly. As is well known, the propaganda for the better cultivation of the soil by means of the three field system belongs to the most important cultural tasks of the countryside. In many places the word is now going around among the peasants: "Since Lenin is dead we must go over to the three field system!" Collective cultivation in place of the good leadership.

In the factories, the applications are for the most part handed in collectively, but the acceptance takes place individually after close examination of each individual case in accordance with the conditions of membership contained in the statutes of the Party. Even now, all those who apply are not accepted, and those who are accepted will first have to go through a regular school before they are accepted as full members of the Communist Party of Russia. The Party organizations are displaying an intensive activity in order to pass this great mass of Party candidates by means of preparatory courses, circulars, lectures on the history of the revolutionary movement and over the fundamental principles of Leninism etc. In an article in *Pravda*, Comrade Krupskaya (Lenin's wife) demands that the older members of the Party shall be detailed for the further instruction and leadership of the new members. "Let no one say" writes Comrade Krupskaya, "that these old Bolsheviks have much else to do or more important duties. Twenty years ago in his work "What is to be done" Lenin

demanding that every Party member must be active and thanks to this demand the Party has conquered". The Communist Party of Russia has remained the old party of Lenin. With the mass influx, a new stage along the old tried way is beginning.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### A Great Revolutionary Artist who must be saved from the Hangman.

By M. Quinet (Barcelona).

Shum is the greatest Spanish revolutionary caricaturist. His biting and cruel pencil has given the most life-like, the most revengeful portrayal of our bourgeois society. In inspiration, he can be compared to our German Comrade George Gross. As to his style and method, he stands in close relationship to the Spanish caricaturist Bagaria.

Shum, whose talent is already so ripe, so appreciated, is still quite young: 21 years. And this young artist is condemned to death. On any day, the hangmen can come to fetch him from his cell, in order to lead him to the terrible machine which is used here to carry out capital punishment: the garrot, a machine which throttles, a machine which crushes the vertebrae.

If the international working class does not raise a most formidable protest on the same scale as that to which Mateu and Nicolau owe their lives, Shum, the great artist and valiant revolutionary, will fall a victim to the garrot.

Shum, whose real name is Juan B. Acher, was living in Paris, where during the day he followed his trade of a metal worker, devoting his evenings to designing, whilst away in Barcelona General Arlegui was drowning the workers' movement in streams of blood. Assassinations of militant workers were following one another. One saw political prisoners discharged from the prison only to be massacred on the very threshold. One saw the spectacle of Syndicalist and Anarchist workers hunted down and slaughtered like wild beasts in the streets of the workers' quarter. Shum felt himself to be stifled in Paris. He returned to Spain, in order to take up the fight.

In these days of hell let loose, Shum's pencil served as one of the best weapons for the workers of Barcelona. With his burning irony he scourged, he denounced, he stigmatized the bloody tyranny of the employers and of the generals. The Barcelona working class had only a feeble means of self-defence, terrorism. Being an Anarchist, Shum was the friend and the brother of some of these most self-sacrificing workers. For the rest, he was drawing cartoons expressive of such scorn and indignation as if he poured forth all the righteous rage burning in his heart on account of the assassination of nearly 400 workers.

... One day Shum was found, half-asphyxiated and unconscious, on the scene of an explosion. At the Hospital he was kept under strict observation. When he recovered, he was transferred to the model prison. An inquisitorial examination tried by every means to compel him to confess to be the author of numerous acts of terror. This was a veritable martyrdom which lasted for several months. The "examination" to which the imprisoned convalescent was subjected achieved its object in bringing about his utter physical collapse. Thoroughly exhausted, he ended by "confessing" all that his torturers required of him without restriction or reservation. And this artist, whose sole veritable crime is his having used all his talent faithfully to portray the Spanish bourgeoisie, has recently been sentenced to 59 years of penal servitude and to death.

The Supreme Tribunal has confirmed the death sentence. In the present situation of Spain, governed by a few generals, a prompt execution is to be expected if protest is not made abroad immediately with all the vehemence required.

The artist whom you, comrades, are called upon to save, is a mere youth of 21 years, loved by all the proletarians of Spain who call him "the poet". His life, his work, the tragedy which overshadows his destiny, constitute in fact a kind of epic and lyrical poem. Act quickly, comrades, do all you are capable of doing. Do not permit the hangmen of Primo de Rivera to lead to the garrot the greatest revolutionary artist of proletarian Spain.

## The Campaign against the Working Class in Esthonia.

By P. (Reval)

The Esthonian secret police has carried out one of its periodical pogroms. On the evening of January 21st, mass arrests took place in all the towns and districts. The workers' deputies to the National Assembly were the first victims. According to the constitution they can only be deprived of their liberty with the consent of Parliament, and therefore it is stated that they were caught, so to speak, „red-handed“, or as some papers comment „at illegal public meetings“. The truth is that some of the deputies were arrested at meetings convened „in accordance with democratic usage“, viz. after due notification to the police, secret and other police agents „keeping order“ at the meetings as usual. Some of the deputies were not even present at these meetings. Among the arrested are also nearly all the working class members of municipalities and district Councils. Altogether there were arrested — 5 of the 10 deputies to the National Assembly (the remainder disappeared) and several hundred members of autonomous bodies, members of administrations, trade unions etc., active members of the workers' movement, including even women typists. A portion of the arrested have been set free „until the trial“. Trade unions and the Workers' Party have been declared criminal sections of the Communist International. Their premises are closed and all their business papers and documents have been taken to the secret police department. Workers' periodical publications cannot appear because of the arrest of the editors.

What then is the cause of this „invasion of the Huns?“ Bourgeois papers state that it is not at all a question of persecuting „ideological communists,“ and still less the workers' movement. But, says the bourgeois press, as there are no ideological communists, but only „venal communists“ acting by orders from Moscow and intending to betray Esthonia and incorporate it into Soviet Russia (just like Georgia), these traitors must be restrained. The papers, by the by, gave away the true aim of this campaign of the secret police. In Finland arrests had very good results — after them, communists obtained 2—3 times votes at elections than before, and in our country (said some papers, for instance the „Trudoviki“) these traitors have been treated too leniently hitherto.

The fact is, this tiny republic of speculators is coming all to pieces. The gold received in accordance with the peace treaty is already spent, the last of it being used for the upkeep of the value of the mark. At the elections to autonomous bodies, „the united front of the workers“ (the bloc of communists with the other revolutionary workers and peasants) obtained an absolute majority in some districts and small localities, and about 1/3 of the total vote in the larger cities. In the Reval municipality over 1/3 of the members are communist workers. As a 2/3 majority is required for the decision of very important questions, it is impossible „to govern and rule“ without the workers' support.

But the ruling clique is very much mistaken in its estimation of the strength and perseverance of the Esthonian workers' movement. The Esthonian workers have seen worse days of white terror, and yet never flinched in their struggle. Already on the day after the arrests, the underground Central Committees of the Communist Party and of the Youth Communist League issued a proclamation in memory of comrade Lenin which is distributed in all towns as energetically as before the arrests.

## THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

### To the Co-operators of all Countries!

On 21st January 1924 Lenin died.

Dead is the great leader of the proletariat, dead is the great teacher who cleansed the revolutionary teachings of Karl Marx from the opportunist defilements with which it had been covered by the betrayers of the cause of the proletariat, and who gave back to this teaching its pristine revolutionary brilliance — dead is the creator of the fundamental revolutionary tactics of the proletariat.

There is no branch of the revolutionary work of the proletariat which did not come into contact with the clear, penetrating thought of the great leader, and none upon which his genius did not throw new light.

Lenin had seen how powerless a working class movement is when split up into independent fractions with little or no connection and he constantly aimed at bringing the whole of these fractions together in one powerful working class movement.

Lenin's activities included also the Co-operative Movement.

As far back as 1910, at the Congress of the 2nd International in Copenhagen and later in an article, he set forth brilliantly the task of the revolutionary co-operators at that revolutionary period. And during the Russian revolution he outlined in a series of speeches the new questions which had arisen in the course of the revolution and which threatened to break up the Co-operative Movement. In these speeches he showed brilliantly what were the tasks of the Co-operators during the period of War-Communism as well as under the New Economic Policy.

The last article which Lenin wrote was devoted to the Co-operative Question. In this article he showed the great importance of the co-operative societies, now that the proletariat had come into power, and urgently called upon all to participate in the work in the co-operative field.

Lenin summoned all working people to the revolutionary struggle. And in the sphere of the Co-operative Movement he perceived new problems which could only be solved through the active participation of all engaged in work.

The Co-operative movement is developing into a great and powerful one, but it will only be able to tackle the problems with which it is faced when it adopts Lenin's revolutionary ideas as its own, and follows the paths traced out by him.

This heritage is little known to the co-operators and other working people in the West. For there, the revolutionary movement within the co-operative societies is only just beginning, and expresses itself only in an attempt to find new paths of development. But the co-operators can only find a solution of their problems in the teachings of Lenin.

We appeal to the revolutionary co-operators of the whole world to undertake a serious study of Lenin's ideas upon the revolutionary work of the co-operative societies, and we urge them to follow, courageously and undeviatingly, that way whose main outline has been indicated by Lenin.

We appeal to all sections, groups and organizations of communist co-operators to ensure through unwearying work that Lenin's ideas become the universal heritage of the Co-operative Movement, and that they become transformed into a powerful weapon in the workers' fight for emancipation and into an instrument for socialist reconstruction.

The great leader is dead, but the revolutionary movement which he created will live on and will expand and develop.

The Presidium of the Co-operative Section of the Communist International.