

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 31

29nd May 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

Leon Trotzky: Prospects and Tasks in the East.

Politics

To the Workers of England, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia.

In the International

The Frankfurt Conference of the C. P. of Germany, IV. Report of the Conference. (2)

Maurice Spector: Third Convention of the Canadian Workers Party.

Resolutions of the Conference of the Balkan Communist Federation, VIII. The Problem of Nationalities in Yugoslavia.

IX. The Agrarian Question in Yugoslavia. X. The Struggle against Fascism in Yugoslavia.

Union of Soviet Republics

Kalashnikoff: The Training of Teachers in the Soviet Union.

The Co-operative Movement

Otto Schröder: The Situation in the International Co-operative Alliance.

Appeals

To the French Proletariat and the Proletariat of the Whole World!

Prospects and Tasks in the East.

By Leon Trotzky.

(A Speech delivered at the Communist University of the Toilers of the East on the occasion of the Third Anniversary of the University.)

Comrades!

Although it is not customary at anniversary celebrations to take up time with theoretical discussions, permit me nevertheless to make a few observations of a general character to bear out my statement that your university is not an ordinary, revolutionary, educational institution, but a lever of world historic significance.

The political and cultural movement of to-day rests on capitalism. It is an outcome of capitalism; it has grown out of it and has finally outgrown it. But, roughly speaking, there are two types of capitalism — the capitalism of the imperialist countries and colonial capitalism. The most striking example of the first kind of capitalism is — Great Britain. At present it has at its head the so-called "Labour" Government of Ramsay MacDonald.

Great Britain is the seat of classical capitalism. Marx wrote his work "Capital" in London where he had the opportunity of being in direct touch with and to observe the development of the foremost country in the world. In the colonies capitalism is not a product of local conditions and development, but is fostered by the penetration of foreign capital. This is the reason for the existence of two types of capitalism. The question arises, to speak not exactly in scientific, but nevertheless, in correct terms: why is MacDonald so conservative, so narrow in his outlook and so dull? The answer is — because Great Britain is the classical land of capitalism, because there the development of capitalism was organic, from handicraft through manu-

facture to present day industrialism, and because it was gradual and "evolutionary". That is why, if you were to open MacDonald's skull, you would find an accumulation not only of the prejudices of yesterday and the day before yesterday, but an accumulation of the intellectual dust and prejudices of the last few centuries (applause). At first sight there seems to be a historic contradiction in the fact that Marx was a child of backward Germany, the most backward of the great European countries in the first half of the nineteenth century (excepting Russia of course). Why, during the 19th and the opening years of the 20th century, did Germany produce Marx and Russia, Lenin? This seems to be an obvious anomaly! But it is an anomaly which is explained in the so-called dialectics of historical development. In British machinery and British textiles, history provided the most revolutionary factor of development. But this machinery and textiles went through a slow process of development in Great Britain, and on the whole the human mind and consciousness, are extremely conservative. When economic development is slow and systematic, enlightenment is slow in penetrating into the thick skulls of ordinary human beings. Subjectivists and idealists generally say that human consciousness and critical thought, etc. etc., take history in tow, just like tugs take barges in tow. This is not so. We, here, are Marxists and therefore know that the driving power in history is the productive forces which have hitherto developed, so to speak, behind the backs of the people, and which find it very difficult to penetrate into the conservative thick skulls of ordinary human beings and to kindle in them a spark of new political ideas. I repeat that this is very difficult when the development is slow, organic and evolutionary. But when the productive forces of the metropolis, of a country of classical

capitalism, such as Great Britain, find ingress into more backward countries, like Germany in the first half of the 19th century, and Russia at the merging of the 19th and 20th centuries, and in the present day in Asia; when the economic factors burst in in a revolutionary manner, breaking up the old order; when development is no longer gradual and "organic", but assumes the form of terrible convulsions and drastic changes of former social conceptions, then it becomes easier for critical thought to find revolutionary expression, provided that the necessary theoretical pre-requisites exist in the given country. That is why Marx made his appearance in Germany in the first half of the 19th century, that is why Lenin made his appearance here in Russia and why we observe, what looks at first sight like a paradox, that the country of the oldest, most developed, and most successful European capitalism, I mean Great Britain, is the home of the most conservative "Labour" Party. On the other hand, in our Soviet Union, in a country with a very backward economic and cultural development, we have (we can say it frankly, for it is a fact) the best Communist Party in the world (applause).

It must be said that, according to its economic development, Russia is midway between a classical metropolis, such as Great Britain, and a colonial country, like India and China. Moreover, that which constitutes the difference between our Soviet Union and Great Britain, as far as methods and forms of development are concerned, is still more noticeable in the development of the countries of the East. Into the latter, capitalism penetrates in the form of foreign finance capital. It introduces machinery into these countries, it destroys their old economic basis and erects on its ruins strongholds of capitalist economic development. The progress of capitalism in the countries of the East is not gradual and slow and is by no means "evolutionary", but drastic and catastrophic, frequently much more catastrophic than here, in former Tsarist Russia.

Comrades, it is from this fundamental viewpoint that we must study events in the East during the next few years or rather decades. If you will take the trouble to study such prosaic books as the reports of British and American banks for 1921-22-23, you will find in the figures of the balance sheets of the banks of London and New York a forecast of imminent revolutionary events in the East. Great Britain has once more assumed the role of world usurer. The U. S. A. has accumulated enormous quantities of gold: the cellars of the banks contain three milliard dollars, viz. six milliard gold roubles worth of gold. This is a drag on the economic system of the U. S. A. You will ask: to whom do the U. S. and England lend their money? You of course know that they do not give any to us, to Soviet Russia. Nor has Germany received anything, and France managed to get but a few crumbs to save the franc. To whom then do they give loans? They give them chiefly to the colonial countries, for they finance the industrial development of Asia, South America and South Africa. I will not take up your time by quoting the figures which I have before me. Suffice it to say that, previous to the recent imperialist war, colonial and semi-colonial countries received from the U. S. A. and Great Britain probably only about half as much as capitalistically developed countries, whereas now the financial investments in colonial countries exceed to a considerable extent the investments in old capitalist countries. Why? There are many reasons for this, but the two main reasons are: lack of confidence in bankrupt and emasculated old Europe, with rabid French militarism in the very heart of it, a militarism which foreshadows more convulsions, and on the other hand — the need of colonial countries as providers of raw material and consumers of machinery and other British and American manufactured goods. During the war and at the present day we witness a feverish industrialisation of colonial, semi-colonial, and generally speaking, of all backward countries: Japan, India, South America and South Africa. There is no doubt whatever that if the Kuomintang Party in China succeeds in uniting China under a national-democratic régime, the capitalist development of China will make enormous strides forward. And all this leads to the mobilisation of countless proletarian masses which will immediately emerge from a pre-historic semi-barbarian state and will be thrust into the whirlpool of industrialism. Therefore, in these countries there will be no time for the refuse of past centuries to accumulate in the minds of the workers. A guillotine, as it were, will be set to work in their minds which will sever the past from the future at one stroke, and compel them to look for new ideas, new forms and new ways of life and struggle. And this will be

the time for Marxist-Leninist parties to make their first appearance in some countries, and to pursue a bold course of development in others. I mean, of course, the Japanese, Chinese, Turkish and Indian Communist Parties.

Comrades and workers of the East, in 1883 there came into being in Switzerland the Russian group of "Emancipation of Labour". Is that so long ago? From 1883 to 1900—17 years, and from 1900 to 1917 — also 17 years, together 34 years, — a third of a century — a generation: Only a third of a century has intervened between the organization of the first theoretic-propagandist group of marxist ideas in the reign of Alexander III and the conquest of Tsarist Russia by the proletariat. Those who lived through it, know it to have been a long and difficult period. But from the viewpoint of historical development, the speed with which events developed was most rapid. And in the countries of the East, the pace of development will be (as we have every reason to believe) still more rapid. Looking at things in this aspect, what is the role of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East? It is the seed-bed of "Emancipation of Labour" groups for the countries of the East (loud applause).

It is true, of course, that the dangers confronting the young marxists of the East are great, and we must not shut our eyes to this fact. We know, and you know it as well as we do, that the Bolshevik Party was formed under circumstances of hard internal as well as external struggle. You know that in the nineties of the 19th century a kind of emasculated and falsified Marxism formed a prominent part of the political education of the bourgeois intellectuals — the followers of Struve, who subsequently became a political lackey of the bourgeoisie, joined the cadets (constitutional democrats), later went over to the Octobrists and veered even more to the right. Russia was backward, not only economically, but also politically. Marxism preached the inevitability of capitalism, and those bourgeois-progressive elements which wanted capitalism for its own sake and not for the sake of socialism, accepted Marxism, having previously deprived it of its revolutionary sting. Such a temporary exploitation of Marxism in the interests of a bourgeois-progressive policy was typical of the South Eastern Balkan countries as well as of our own country. Let us consider now if Marxism is running the same risks in the East. To a certain extent, it does. And why? Because the national movement in the East is a progressive factor in world history. The struggle for independence in India — is a highly progressive movement, but we all know that it is at the same time a struggle for strictly limited national-bourgeois aims. The struggle for the liberation of China, the ideology of Sun-Yat-Sen — is a democratic struggle with a progressive ideology, but bourgeois nevertheless. We approve of Communist support to the Kuomintang party in China, which we are endeavouring to revolutionise. This is inevitable, but here too there is a risk of a national-democratic revival. Such is the case in all the countries of the East in which the national struggle for liberation from colonial slavery is going on. The young proletariat of the East must rely on this progressive movement for support. But it is as clear as daylight that the young Marxists of the East run the risk of being torn out of the "group of the emancipation of labour" and of becoming permeated with nationalist ideology.

But you have this advantage over the older generations of Russian, Roumanian and other Marxists that you live and work not only in the post-Marxian, but even in the post-Lenin epoch. Your advantage consists in having sprung directly from the epoch which will be known in history as the Lenin epoch. Both Marx and Lenin were revolutionary politicians with whom theory and practice went hand in hand. As a general proposition, this is of course correct and incontrovertible. But there is nevertheless a distinction, and a signal distinction, between these two historic figures, which originated not only in the difference in the individuality of the two men, but also in the difference between epochs. Marxism, of course, is not an academic science, but a lever of revolutionary action. This is borne out by Marx's saying: "The world has been sufficiently explained by philosophers, it is time to remodel it." But was it possible to make a full use of Marxism through the working class movement during Marx's life, in the epoch of the First and subsequently of the Second Internationals? Was Marxism but into practice at that time? Of course not. Did Marx have the opportunity and the supreme happiness to apply his revolutionary theory to decisive historic action: the conquest of power by the proletariat? The answer is in the negative. Marxist teaching has of course nothing academic about it, for Marx himself is entirely a product of revolution and of a

correct and critical appreciation of the downfall of bourgeois democracy. He published his "Manifesto" in 1847. He went through the revolution of 1848 as a left winger of bourgeois democracy, estimating all the events of this revolution in a Marxist or Marxist spirit. He wrote his work "Capital" in London, and was at the same time the founder of the First International and the inspiration of the policy of the most advanced groups of the working class of all countries. But he was not at the head of a party which decided the destiny of the world or even the destiny of one country. Whenever we want to give a concise answer to the question: who is Marx? We say: **Marx — — — is the author of Capital**". And when we ask ourselves — who is Lenin, we say: "Lenin is the author of the October Revolution" (applause). Lenin more than anyone else, was emphatic in saying that he did not intend to revise, remodel or alter the teachings of Marx. Lenin came, to use the words of the bible, not to change the law of Marx but to fulfil it.

I repeat no one was more emphatic than Lenin in asserting this. But at the same time he had to free Marx from the misinterpretations of his teachings introduced by the generations which separated Lenin from Marx — from the Kautskianism, MacDonaldism and the conservatism of the upper strata of the working class, of the reformist and nationalist bureaucracy. He had to apply to the full the weapon of true Marxism (cleansed from misinterpretation and falsification) to the greatest event in world history. Although Marx himself was able to embody in his theory the trend of events of decades and centuries, yet his teaching was subsequently subdivided into separate elements and in the everyday struggle was frequently assimilated in a mutilated and incorrect form. But Lenin came upon the scene. Under totally new conditions, he collected all the teachings of Marx and demonstrated them in a historic action on a world-scale. You have seen this action and you are associated with it. This places you under an obligation, and on this obligation the communist university of the workers of the East is founded.

There is every reason to believe that the Communist University of the Workers of the East will furnish a nucleus of workers which will act as a class-conscious, Marxian and Leninist leaven in the movement of the proletariat of the East.

Comrades, you will be in great demand, and as I said before, this will not happen gradually, but all at once, and, so to speak, "catastrophically". I advise you to read once more one of Lenin's most recent articles: "Little, but Good". The main theme of this article is the question of organization, but it deals also with the prospective development in the countries of the East in connection with European development. The main and fundamental idea of this article is, that a set-back in the development of the Western revolution is possible. This set-back can be caused by MacDonaldism, which is the most conservative force in Europe. We have before us the spectacle of Turkey abolishing the Caliphate, and MacDonald re-establishing it. Is not this a striking example of the counter-revolutionary Menshevism of the West and of the progressive national-bourgeois democratism of the East? Afghanistan is at present the scene of truly dramatic events: the Great Britain of Ramsay MacDonald is fighting there against the left national-bourgeois wing, which aims at the Europeanisation of an independent Afghanistan. It endeavours to place in power in that country the most unenlightened and reactionary elements, imbued with the worst prejudices of pan-Islamism, of the Caliphate, etc.. A correct appreciation of these two colliding forces will enable you to understand why the East will be drawn more and more to us — the Soviet Union and the Third International.

We witness in Europe, the past development of which caused the monstrous conservatism of the upper strata of the working class, an ever-growing economic deterioration and disintegration. There is no way out for the old continent. This is shown, partly by the reluctance of the U. S. A. to lend money to Europe, based on the well-founded assumption that economically Europe is played out. At the same time we see that the U. S. A. and Great Britain are compelled to finance the economic development of the colonial countries, driving them with whirlwind rapidity on to the path of revolution. And if Europe is going to be kept in the present state of decomposition by this narrow-minded, aristocratic MacDonaldism of the upper strata of the working class, the centre of gravity of the revolutionary movement will be transferred to the East. And then it will become evident that if it required several decades of capitalist development in Great Britain, with the assistance of this revolutionary factor, to rouse our old Russia and the old East out of their slumber, it will require a revolution in the East, which, sweeping back to Great Britain, will break (if

necessary) a number of thick skulls and thus give an impetus to the revolution of the European proletariat. (applause). This is one of the historic possibilities which we must never lose sight of.

I read in the material you sent me about the overwhelming impression produced in Kazan by one of the women students of your university — a Turkish woman, when she addressed the women of that city, including the illiterate and the old. This might seem an insignificant episode, but it is nevertheless of considerable historical importance. The strength and meaning of Bolshevism consists in the fact that it appeals to the oppressed and exploited masses and not to the upper strata of the working class. That is why Bolshevism is being assimilated by the countries of the East not because of its theories, which are far away from being fully understood, but because of its spirit of freedom and liberty. Your own paper tells us over and over again that the name of Lenin is known not only in the villages of the Causasus, but even in the remotest parts of India. We know that the workers of China, who probably never read anything written by Lenin, are irresistibly drawn towards Bolshevism. Such is the powerful influence of this great historic movement! They feel in their inmost hearts that it is a teaching for the oppressed and exploited, for hundreds of millions to whom it is the only possible salvation. That is why Leninism meets with a passionate response among working women who are the most oppressed section of society. When I read about the success of one of your female fellow students in Kazan among the illiterate Tartar women, I was reminded of my recent short visit to Baku where I heard for the first time a Turkoman communist woman, and had an opportunity to observe in the hall the enthusiasm of hundreds of such women, who having heard our message of liberation, had awakened to a new life. I realised then for the first time that women will play a more important role in the liberation movement of the East than in Europe and here in Russia (applause). This will be the case for the simple reason that Eastern women are even more oppressed and entangled in age-long prejudices than men. It is for this reason that the new spirit which is now animating the popular movements, has a stronger effect on women than on men. Although the East is still under the influence of Islam and of old creeds, prejudices and customs, there are signs that this influence is waning rapidly. We can liken the present state of the East to a piece of cloth which has perished. When you look at it at a distance, its texture and design seem to be perfect and its folds are as graceful as before. But a slight touch, a zephyr breeze are enough to make this beautiful material fall to pieces. Thus we have in the East old creeds which seem to be deeply rooted, but which are in reality only a shadow of the past. For instance, the Caliphate was abolished in Turkey and nothing happened to those who made this bold attempt on an age-long institution. This shows that the old Eastern creeds have lost their power, and that in the imminent historic movement of the revolutionary working masses, these creeds will not be a serious obstacle. But this also means that Eastern women, who under present conditions are enslaved and thwarted in all their desires and ambitions, will, with the removal of the veil, see themselves deprived of all spiritual support because of the newly arisen economic conditions. They will thirst for new ideas and a new consciousness capable of allotting them their proper place in society. Believe me, there will be no better comrade in the East and no better champion of the ideas of revolution and Communism than the awakened working women (applause).

Comrades, that is why your university has such a world-wide historic significance. Profiting by the ideological and political experience of the West, it produces the revolutionary leaven which will permeate the East. For you the time for action is imminent. British and American finance capital is destroying the economic foundation of the East. It is creating new conditions. It destroys the old and creates the need for something new. You will sow the seed of Communism, and you will reap a far richer revolutionary harvest than the old Marxist generations of Europe.

But, comrades, I should not like my complimentary remarks to rouse in you a spirit of Eastern conceit (laughter) I see that none of you have interpreted my remarks in that way. For if anyone has become imbued with such overbearance and contempt for the West, it will prove a short-cut to national-democratic ideology. No, comrades, the communist-revolutionary students of this university must learn to look upon our world movement as a whole, and to utilise the forces of East and West for the attainment of our one great aim. You must learn to coordinate the rising of Hindoo peasants, the strike of bourgeois democrats of the Kuomintang, the Korean struggle for independence, the bour-

geos-democratic regeneration of Turkey and the educational and economic work in the Soviet Republic of Transcaucasia. All this must be taken into account in connection with the work and struggle of the Communist International in Europe, and especially in Great Britain where slowly (much more slowly than we should wish) but irresistibly, British Communism is undermining MacDonald's conservative strongholds (applause). I repeat that your advantage over the older generation consists in the fact that you are learning the alphabet of Marxism, not in emigrant circles (far removed from the actualities of life) in countries where capitalism holds its sway, which was our fate, but in an atmosphere conquered and permeated by Leninism. We cannot tell if the last chapter of the revolutionary struggle with imperialism will be unfolded in one, two, three or even five years time. But we know that every year a fresh batch of graduates will leave the Communist University of the East. Every year will produce a new nucleus of communists who have thoroughly learned the alphabet of Leninism, and who with their own eyes saw the practical application of this alphabet. If the decisive events take place in twelve months time, we shall have at our disposal one batch of graduates. If two years will have to elapse, we shall have two batches of graduates, and so on. When the moment for decisive action is upon us, the students of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East will say: "We are ready. We have not spent our time here in vain. We have not only learned to translate the ideas of Marxism and Leninism into the language of China, India, Turkey, and Korea; we have also learned to translate into the language of Marxism the sufferings, aspirations, demands and hopes of the working masses of the East". — When these masses ask you who taught you this, your answer will be: "The Communist University of the Toilers of the East." And thereupon they will say what I am saying now on the day of your Third Anniversary: "All honour and glory to the Communist University of the East". (Enthusiastic ovations and the singing of the "International").

POLITICS

To the Workers of England, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia!

To the German, French and Belgian Proletariat!

An International Communist Conference took place during the present month in Berlin and adopted an attitude towards the Experts' decision. We give below the most important part of the appeal decided upon. Ed.

In order to prevent Revolution, German capital and its state are willing to pay any price. In order to weather the crises in their different countries and to gain time for the preparation of another war, among and against each other, the capitalists of Europe and America have concluded a temporary robbers' alliance, whose "pact" the "Experts" have worked out. The plans of the Experts say:

1. The Ruhr and the Rhineland continue under occupation: Any "failure" on the part of Germany — and such can be construed at any moment — can be followed by further sanction measures.

2. The total of Germany's debts, which according to the former treaties amounted to 132 milliard Gold marks, has not been set out afresh and has not been decreased, that is, the burden of Germany's debt remains unbearable.

3. The German state is to be robbed of the railways; they are to be handed over to the foreign and German mining concerns. The actual disposal lies in the hands of a few foreign commissioners with dictatorial authority, who, through arbitrary tariff policy, dismissal and engaging of workers and officials, arbitrary arrangement of working time, of wages and of rights, have a determining influence upon the whole economic life of Germany. They thereby have the power of crippling all economic life in Germany.

4. The Issue Bank is to be put into the hands of foreign and home capitalists who acquire the right to transfer all the present gold reserves and the Issue Bank itself abroad. Thus the greatest difficulties will be made for a victorious revolution in Germany.

5. The right of determining the amount of rates and taxes is to be taken from the German state. Foreign commissions

receive dictatorial authority to determine arbitrarily certain taxes.

6. The right of determining the customs duties is likewise handed over to a few dictators of the victorious powers.

7. The Reparations sums which Germany pays, are to be used, by means of the loans, to bring the German undertakings into dependency and to buy them up for foreign capitalists.

German capital, the German state, the bourgeois parties, including Social Democracy, have consented to these plans, because they prefer the domination of foreign capitalists, who still leave something to the German capitalists, to the domination of the proletariat. The German heavy industrials and the Junkers hope, over and beyond this, by this second Versailles to make still more business, just as the war and the first Versailles brought them enormous enrichments. So far as the interests of the foreign capitalists permit, the Dawes Commission has made allowances to the German heavy industrials and Junkers at the cost of the proletariat and of the petty bourgeoisie, but above all has promised the following:

1. The big land owners, according to the plan, are spared all burdens.

2. The sum which the big industrials undertake is only half as large as the German mining concerns themselves offered through Cuno in 1923.

3. The greater part of the burden of taxation for reparation purposes is to be met by means of indirect taxes, that means, it is to be raised by the great masses, who also suffer most from the raising of the railway rates and the customs duties etc.

4. The German capitalists receive the support of foreign capital, in the introduction of pre-war working hours and even longer ones,

in the struggle for reduction of wages, in the struggle to completely starve out the unemployed whom the capitalists consider superfluous, in the complete wresting of political rights from the workers, in the defeat of every rebellion of the workers.

5. The German mining concerns acquire a definite if not a prepondering share in the railways, Issue Bank etc.

With all their united will to defeat the German Revolution and destroy German competition, the capitalists of the victorious countries are not of one mind as to the division of the German booty. The variances existing between the demands of the ruling American capitalists and the capitalists of England, France, Belgium, Italy etc., are absolutely unsolved in the Experts' decisions. This solution can only come through the absolute victory of one of the competitors in a

New World War

or by

the Victorious World Revolution.

If international capital were successful in carrying out its plan, the result would be

for Germany:

A permanent enormous unemployment embracing many millions.

Increase in the attempts to withdraw all support from the unemployed, and so hand them over to starvation.

Increase in working hours.

Complete expropriation of the petty bourgeois and lesser bourgeoisie by the German and international concerns.

This second Versailles, after the second lost war, would fulfil the hopes of the German illusionaries still less than the first Versailles fulfilled the Wilson promises. For the accomplishment of the whole program, a capitalist Dictatorship would be necessary, a dictatorship more cruel than the world has yet experienced.

The German proletariat has already reached a stage of maturity as makes such a capitalist dictatorship impossible for any length of time. There exists the highest probability that the proletariat of Germany will make an end of the crisis by setting up its dictatorship by revolutionary methods, under the leadership of the German C.P.

But the enslavement of the German proletariat would only be the prelude to the enslavement of the proletariat of other European countries, beneath the same yoke.

In France and Belgium

the maintenance of Militarism, the burden of taxation on the French masses would become greater. The enslavement of German labour would immediately result in the similar enslavement

of the French workers. The Fascist movement, which is already arising in France, would increase. The imperialist conflicts, which remain unsolved in the Dawes plan, would have to come to development soon and evoke a terrible new war.

Whether Poincaré, Heriot or Briand carries these plans through, whether with Leon Blum in the government or without him, remains a matter of indifference.

For the Working Class of England

the Dawes plan brings no solution of the crisis, or only a slight improvement in its situation. If it prove possible, with the help of this plan, to destroy German competition, then the decline of German labour will also drag down the English workers. German "coolie" wages will result in English "coolie" wages. Orders for German industry mean unemployment for the English workers. It is the proletariat which suffers in any case.

MacDonald can only adorn the rascally war plans of the imperialist robbers with devout Sunday sermons, but he cannot solve the crisis. The anti-class war leaders of the II. International may innovate a dictatorship of the commissioners of the capitalist class. The method of these pacifists must drive the English working class into a new war if Labour does not succeed in setting up its dictatorship in place of the government of these servants of the bourgeoisie.

Against the solution of the Allied international concerns and of the Second International, the Third International sets its revolutionary solution. The Third International, the Red International of Labour Unions, and Soviet Russia remain enemies of the second Versailles, as they were the irreconcilable enemies of the first Versailles.

You, workers of Germany, France, Belgium, England, Italy, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia, you the proletariats of all Europe, we call upon you:

Set up the unity and the international alliance of the workers against the united capitalist!

Close your ranks for the common fight against the iron heel!

Forth to resistance against the colonisation of working Germany!

Forth to resistance against the enslavement of the European proletariat by international capitalism!

Down with the second Versailles!

Long live the International of the fighting proletariat!

Long live the world Revolution!

Central of the C. P. of Germany
(Section of the Communist International).

Executive Committee of the Belgian C. P.
(Belgian Section of the Communist
International).

Executive Committee of the French C. P.
(French Section of the Communist
International).

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Frankfort Conference of the C. P. of Germany.

IV.

Report of the Conference. (2)

The Representative of the Party Minority.

The speaker explained at the outset that it would be easy to convince the central group of there being no need for the existence of a special group if the last speaker had treated the political questions with more clearness, and had shown that if there were differences between the left wing fraction and the central group that they were differences of no account. But the left wing had conducted itself with too little modesty whilst it was in opposition; in its present attitude to the political questions it has become considerably more modest.

The nature of the crisis in the Comintern as portrayed by the last speaker in his report is not correct. We must be perfectly clear as to the character, the importance, and the origin of this crisis, and we must not allow this conference to fall into the belief that a catastrophe has occurred. The crises which the Comintern has had to pass through have been the direct result of its organic growth, and they are indeed a symptom of health.

Take the crisis of 1923. What brought it about? The real causes of this crisis are to be found in the wave of pacifism, allied with democratic illusion, that was started by the advent to power of the Labour Party in England, in the difficulties with which Russia has to contend, in the retreat before German reaction. Undoubtedly in some countries — Russia, Germany, France, Holland, Poland, Bulgaria, etc. — this crisis created a movement to the right in the superficial life of the parties. But it can be safely maintained that today in almost every case this crisis has been overcome. The fact that it was overcome so readily proves better than anything else could, how sound at heart our Party really is.

The big problem that confronts us now that the movement to the right has been defeated and now that the crisis in the Comintern has been overcome, is the following:

how we are to apply the tactic of the Comintern in the given situation.

When we come to analyse the conceptions of the tactic of the united front held by the left wingers, we find that there exist three distinct views. Firstly, there is the view that the tactic of the united front is a dangerous one and that one should have nothing to do with it at all. Secondly there is the view that it can only be accepted when the united front brings no dangers with it. Lastly, the view prevails that the Party should make use of the tactic only when it is sufficiently powerful and healthy to risk doing so.

In answer to the first assertion the speaker declared that to turn down the tactic of the united front is tantamount to renouncing all attempts to win over the majority. No one has yet discovered any other method that would enable us to win over the majority of the working class. Therefore this view must be totally discarded.

The second view according to which the united front is only to be accepted when it brings no inherent dangers with it, must be rejected with equal decision. It is by making mistakes that one finds the right way. If one is fearful of dangers that an application of the tactic of the united front might bring in its train, one must give up all hope of winning over the masses of the working class. A communist who goes into a workshop in order to conduct propaganda must "adapt" himself to the masses. Should that prevent us from getting into contact with the masses, from carrying on our propaganda among the masses? We must see that we are and remain a real Communist Party, but the soundness of our Party will not in itself succeed in beating the foe. It is wrong therefore to uphold the theory: "Fight for the majority, but cautiously!"

The most important question that remains for us to tackle and which must serve as the starting point for the laying down of a tactic is: Where do we stand?

How do we view the immediate future?

This brings us to the problem of the stabilisation. We have to look carefully into this problem and examine in how far this alleged stabilisation of German economy is already undermined. This stabilisation was effected as a result of three main factors. The international factor, especially the endeavour to get France and England embroiled over the German problem, has already been played out. By means of a skilful tactical move Poincaré was able to settle the sharp differences that existed between France and England. The allied powers have, to all intent and purposes, re-established the united front against Germany. The short pause in the carrying out of the Treaty of Versailles has ended and the old difficulties are coming to the fore once more. But even the third factor — the defeat and dejectedness of the German proletariat — can now be ruled out. The German proletariat has been able to get the better of this dejectedness which enabled the German bourgeoisie to effect the stabilisation towards the end of 1923, and it is now engaged in a severe struggle with its exploiters. When the last speaker referred to the strikes that have taken place in recent months as being "only" economic strikes, he must have shut his eyes to the real facts. These economic strikes give birth to a tremendous amount of revolutionary energy which evaporates if we do not understand how to turn it to good account. — With regard to the questions:

Wherein lay the mistakes made in October?

Why did we not make it absolutely clear how matters stood, and what were the real facts of the situation? These questions

must be answered without delay. In those October days no differences existed between the left wingers and these around whom the central group had formed. The question resolves itself at present into one of the rightness or wrongness of the retreat. Our standpoint is that it was not a retreat at all, but a failure of the Party to go into action, an evasion of the fight. It was, however, our bounden duty to take up the fight. We were just as determined to take up the fight as the left wingers were. But now we see you putting the question in a demagogic light: Could we have won through or not? You also maintain that a retreat should never be undertaken as we undertook it. That is not so. A retreat is a fight for the majority of the proletariat; the Party has to explain to the masses why the avoidance of the fight is necessary and then it will be able to retain its hold upon the masses.

The second question that divides us, other than the question of the cause of the October reverse, is the

Question of the United Front.

We would like you to give us a clear and definite answer: Are you opposed to the United Front or not? Is it only to be endorsed when no danger threatens? Are we to attempt to create a party first and then set out to capture the masses, or are we to combine the two tasks, to make ourselves sure that our ideological basis is sound and at the same time to carry on the struggle for winning over the masses? We hear much of late of the Bolshevisation of the Party. Quite rightly, the Party needs to be Bolshevized. It means that an ideological warfare will be waged with the remnants of the Social Democracy, that attacks will be directed against every reformist attempt to side tract, but it also means that K. A. P. D. (Communist Labour Party) tendencies to side tract will likewise be vigorously attacked. The speaker went on to quote from a number of articles written by left wingers and asked the Party majority whether it was of the opinion that the closing of the door upon opportunism, whilst at the same time throwing the windows open, was what was understood by the Bolshevisation of the Party; whether it would not rather characterise such procedure as "KAPDism" pure and simple. Then there is the trade union question. We have still a great deal to do before we can remove the differences that have arisen as a result of unsound reasoning. And it is pure demagoguery when the question is framed in such a way that it serves as a bone of contention between the left wing and the central group. The left wingers maintained that we should have taken up the fight, we, the central group, did not see our way to take up the fight. The real problems upon which we have to bestow our attention, are the problems of our attitude toward the Fascist parties and the Social Democrats, and the

Application of the Tactic of the United Front from below.

It would be false to assert that the German Fascist party is to be attacked not from a national angle, but only from a social one. We have also to fight against the Versailles Peace Treaty, we have to convince the proletariat and the middle classes that we are the party that will be able to regain for Germany her lost national liberty. On the other hand we shall have to counteract the temper of the masses and not allow this temper to carry them off their feet: to counteract the anti-trade union movements, the disruptive movements, the movements directed against Moscow, and the K. A. P. D. movements. — What attitude does the Party majority adopt with regard to the

Trade union question?

It could be readily believed that it would make the main problem the organization of the unorganized, but in the classic home of organization, in Germany, the problem of the masses organized in the trade union is the outstanding problem. The problem of the unorganized can find its solution only when it is brought to bear on the fight against the Social Democrats and the Fascist organizations. It is this fight that must be systematically organized and carried out according to plan. The organization of this fight, the organization of the revolution, is the one basis on which the whole Party can be made into a solid fighting body. If the Party majority intends to make this present conference a first step for the consolidation of the Party, it would be well to make as little as possible of the quarrel among its fractions, but see to it that the road is made clear for a big political campaign. The struggle to get the masses with us, the endeavour to act with clear revolutionary reasoning — that is

the objective. If the Party majority acts in such a spirit it will find that the central group will put no difficulties in its way. There is no call for pessimism, the movement towards the left that the Party has experienced, is all for the good. We are faced with the struggle against reformism, and against attempts to deviate from the proper course. This fight needs courage. Unity can be re-established as a direct outcome of this new phase. If we all stand shoulder to shoulder against the common foe, there will be but one group, but one fraction, just the united Party. Our goal is: to make the party the real leader of the German proletariat, to make it the advanced guard of the German revolution.

The Representative of the Former Majority.

The content and purport of the decisions arrived at by the Moscow Conference were, according to the speaker: great opportunist mistakes were made during the October retreat; those responsible for these mistakes must give up their positions in the Party. A new body of leaders must be formed from members of the centre and the left wing; this new grouping will act as a dam against dangers from the left but the chief danger lies to the right and everything must be done in the Party and in the International to counteract these opportunist dangers that lurk in the right wing.

At present the situation is different from what it was in January. The representative of the central group declared today that both internationally and here in Germany the chief danger is to be sought, not in the opportunism of the right wing, but in the opportunist side tracking made by the left wingers. The letter of the Executive and of Comrade Zinoviev, that were placed before the conference today, also refer to the dangers from the left. That proves that the hypotheses, that the tactical lines drawn up in Moscow, were false. From that one should draw one's own conclusions.

We carried out the January decisions although we believed them to be false. We maintained that the idea of a danger from the right and the designation of our group as being the German and the international danger to be two absurd constructions created solely for party ends. The centre group did not fall out with us because we were acting as Social Democrats or as opportunists, but because we were supposed to be blind to our own Social Democratic blunders and needed to be warned against them. It was never asserted that big opportunist mistakes had been committed.

The central group has made concessions to the left wing in the trade union question, concessions that are most dangerous and the speaker thought the Party would do well to take his warning. The new line of tactics will have fatal consequences for the whole Party.

According to the letters sent by Zinoviev and the Executive and which passes the severest criticism, the Moscow decisions are held to be wrong. If only a fraction of what is being said now had been set down in the January resolution the splitting up into centre group and right wing had not been possible. This criticism is not made less effective by the excuse that there is a time for everything. Nevertheless, the speaker admitted that the old party leadership made big mistakes. The old executive allowed itself to be guided by the standpoint that was characterised by Lenin in his book on "The Infantile Malady of Communism" as being the program of the

attraction of the majority of the working class

to the proletarian advance-guard that has already been created. It presupposed that it would no longer be necessary for us who are in the Party to discuss the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the question of the organization of the revolutionary forces. The chief mistake was that it considered the state of the Party to be so far developed that an insistence upon and training in the fundamental principles of our agitation for the dictatorship to be unnecessary. That explains why the old executive regarded the left wingers as being confusionists and intellectuals, whereas in truth they signalled a big movement that was spreading not only through the C. P. G. but also through the masses of the workers. This lack of insight caused the speaker and his friends to commit the big mistake at Leipzig of uniting with the centre instead of making the above facts the basis of an alliance with the left wing. That was the decisive blunder. Had this not been made there would have been no split.

The fact that

the Theses of the Leipzig Congress

on the united front and the workers' government are already out of date was, in the opinion of the speaker, a good sign of progress. Nevertheless he was not ashamed of the Leipzig decisions. In those days we had to put the general theoretical formulation of the International into practice. When it came to the actual application in our work of agitation many blows were delivered in the air, but not as a result of any desire on our part to be opportunist. We went so far as to regard the formulation of our agitation as being tactical decisions, decisions that under the then existing conditions should not have been applied even in the matter of agitation. We did not realise that we were expecting more of the members than they could undertake to carry out. This lesson has been an expensive one. During action, any discussion with a hostile fraction within the Party cannot be permitted. But the time is now ripe for us to thrash the matter out and come to some sort of a decision on the outstanding problems. The crisis is more acute within the Party than in the working class itself; that is clearly shown by the factory council elections, the elections in Saxony, Thuringia, Mecklenburg and now in Bavaria. If our October retreat had been the black crime it is made out to be by certain fractions, it would certainly have had the consequence that the masses would have left the Communist Party.

The main contention of the left wing, namely, that we did not realise in time the danger that lurked in the Ruhr crisis, is to a certain extent, true to the facts, but the left wingers were also not so far-seeing, and the truth is that mistakes were committed by both sides. If in the Ruhr question, the Party leaders had taken up the tactic advanced by the left wing we should have met with disaster then, instead of being in a position in October to evade it.

With regard to the

Policy pursued in Saxony,

much good has accrued to the whole international movement as a result. Generally we have found that the advice of the left wing amounts to this: that if a difficult situation arises the best thing to do is to run away. In spite of all the blunders, the Party in Saxony has been able to get again in close touch with the masses and consequently the crisis has made itself less felt here than anywhere else. If the Social Democrats have not been routed it is because the left wing of that party is nothing but the reflex of the pressure exerted by our Communist propaganda. The slogan "Destruction of Social Democracy" has not been made use of. Just as we took up the slogan, the Social Democrats began to consolidate their forces.

The chief mistake committed in October was that we were too slow in drawing our conclusions from the revolutionary situation as a whole. But it would be well to take a glance into the past. As early as May we could plainly see that the Ruhr conflict would force us into making a storm attack upon the bourgeoisie. It was first necessary to create in the Ruhr the ground-work for a movement that would reflect the temper of the conflict. We failed to do that because the party had not been reorganized on the basis of the shop nuclei. That, however, was not our fault, as Zinoviev points out. It was a concession that we had to make to the U. S. P. D. during the alliance. Nevertheless, we made our preparations to take up the fight in October. But when the State of Siege was proclaimed we found we could not mobilise the masses in fact, we did not make a serious attempt to do so. We believed that it would no longer be necessary because: "The policy creates the opponent." The belief that we were strong enough to take up the fight, the over-estimation of our own forces and the under-estimation of the opponents', that was not an opportunist blunder, but one that came to us from the left wing. We did not disturb the enemy with the result that he retained the initiative. When we decided to

enter the Saxon Government

we were under the conviction that all preparations were now made and so we dropped the more detailed work. The decision to participate in the Saxon Government was not to be found in the Leipzig theses, and Brandler was opposed to it on the ground that the masses were not mobilised, because there were no armed groups and no control committees — a congress of factory councils would have been ineffective in Saxony —. As a result of these sins of omission the opponent could claim the

initiative even whilst we were in office, and was able to make his attacks without waiting for us to prepare.

It was not until the Chemnitz Conference that it became clear that we had lost contact with the masses. In the situation as it then presented itself we should have taken up the fight with the government troops and shown the same powers of resistance as did our comrades in Hamburg. We must be careful not to make the same mistake as we made in the old Spartacus days, the mistake of calling upon the workers to take up the fight even when defeat is certain. If we want to keep the masses in touch with the advanced guard it is necessary that we make it clear to them that we shall be in a position to win through and will not lead them to defeat.

The speaker finally touches upon the work of the Party during the last four months when he and his friends were no longer responsible for what was being done. The Party, he maintained, has failed to retain a platform; it has not known how to make full use of the industrial movements that have broken out spontaneously in this period. The theses that have been submitted by the left wing majority are not a suitable basis for laying down the new tactical lines for the Party. The radicalisation of the workers and of the Party is to be welcomed. But this radicalisation is more a matter of sentiment and does not strike very deep as yet; it will take some time before it receives a really revolutionary character. He maintained that it would be possible for the new leaders to break up the whole Party in the space of twenty four hours: if they did not understand how to adapt the tactic of the united front to the new circumstances, or if they adopted a wrong tactic in the trade union problem. But if the Party majority promptly does what is necessary in regard to both these questions, then such other matters as have arisen as a result of the reorganisation of the Party will not be dangerous to the Party. Then the Party will be able to concentrate its whole forces on the task of radicalising the working masses and the masses within the Party, and in this way attaining to a genuine Communist policy.

Third Convention of the Canadian Workers Party.

By Maurice Spector (Toronto).

If it translates its resolutions into realities, the third convention of the Canadian Workers Party will have been one of the most important gatherings in its history. Not only were the guiding policies of the past two years re-affirmed (the campaigns for the Labour Party, for industrial amalgamation and more recently for Canadian trade union autonomy) — it was also decided to break new ground by changing our name to that of Communist Party and extending the front of its activity by a campaign to transform the labour party movement into a movement for a Farmer-Labour Party.

Owing to the considerable emigration of Canadian workers to the United States, the Party has had to register a slight decrease in its membership. But there has been no decrease of its influence. This is evidenced no less by our role in the workers' struggle as in Nova Scotia and in the Left Wing at the Trades Congress than by our record in the Labour Party. We have sufficiently familiarized our labour movement with communist policies and established ourselves to take the name of Communist Party openly.

The United Front, in spite of the mistakes made in its application by so many sections of the International, still remains our guiding policy. As Secretary Jack Macdonald noted in his report, "there is always the danger in our united front policy of forgetting that our chief task is the building up of a fighting Communist Party". Here and there reformists have raised their heads who would like to apply to the Canadian Labour Party the notorious precedent set by the British and Australian Labour Parties of excluding the Communists. We will also have to combat more vigorously the attempt of the reformists to undermine the federative basis of the Labour Party by their tactic of fostering individual membership branches.

The chief feature of the report on the political situation was the question of our relation to the farmers. The farmers movement is experiencing an economic and political crisis of such magnitude that the convention considered it impossible for the Party to postpone the adoption of a positive agrarian policy any longer.

The farmer has become the slave of the banks, mortgage houses, insurance companies, implement manufacturers and other Big Business Interests. The average loss per farm in Alberta had been \$ 15, and this during 1923 when the crops had been heavier than ever before. The Progressive Party has functioned chiefly as a wing of the Liberal Party and the resulting disappointment of the farmers is seen in the decline of both membership and interest in the formers organizations, in the defeat of the Ontario Farmer Government and the dissatisfaction with the Alberta Farmer Government. The convention decided to make one of the chief political tasks of the Party the campaign to develop the Labour Party into a Farmer-Labour Party.

In connection with both the political and industrial reports, as well as the communication of the Communist International, the convention discussed the implications of the Nova Scotia struggle. The strike had been epoch-making for Canadian Labour on account of its open political character. It was evidence of the immaturity of the Party however, that there was lack of close co-operation between the districts and the Party centre during the struggle and its political issues had not been sufficiently developed throughout the country. The need for Dominion trade union autonomy to free the hands of Canadian Labour for its political struggles was unanimously recognized.

Resolutions of the Conference of the Balkan Communist Federation.

VIII.

The Problem of Nationalities in Yugoslavia.

The victory of the Entente over the Central Powers overthrew the latter's system of radical oppression, but only to substitute for it a new system which is no less hateful and brutal. The allies and the protégés of the great imperialist Entente Powers, the Serbian, Roumanian, Czech and Slovenian bourgeoisies, have, by means of the power of their armies, taken possession of vast regions which are populated by other nationalities, and have deprived them of all rights, except the right to submit unconditionally to their rule, and are pursuing against them a policy of brutal oppression.

The "Peace" Treaties of Versailles, Trianon and Neuilly have sanctioned this system of oppression of nationalities and have brutally violated the right to national self-determination; the frontiers have not been drawn according to the free determination of these nationalities (the rights of the Bulgarian people in the Zaribroda region were trodden underfoot), but according to the interests of the great imperialistic powers and their vassals, in particular of the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy.

Yugoslavia is not therefore, as the defenders of the Serbian hegemony maintain, the product of a "national revolution" and of the free choice of the nationalities who inhabit it. It is, on the contrary, the product of the armed victory of the great imperialistic Entente powers, and the denial of the right of self-determination of all the peoples who live in the regions occupied by the army of the Serbian monarchy and bourgeoisie.

Thus the fight for the liberation of the oppressed nationalities is necessarily a fight against the imperialist treaties, which seal their slavery under the imperialistic bourgeoisie and the Serbian hegemony. Therefore the proletariat in Yugoslavia must emphasise its struggle on the side of the international proletariat against the imperialistic peace treaties.

The Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian Conflict.

Benefitting by the victory of their allies, and making use of their armies, supported by the counter-revolutionary role of the National Councils, the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy have imposed their brutal domination upon all other nationalities. This domination, which is supported internationally by the imperialistic peace treaties, finds expression in the monarchist and centralist constitution of Vidovdan, as well as in the whole policy of the Belgrade Government, in which the interests of the Serbian monarchy and bourgeoisie absolutely dominate.

Against this domination and this policy of oppression, an ever stronger resistance of all the opposed nationalities has arisen. By reason alone of the numerical, political and economic strength which the Croatian and Slovenian nationalities in Yugoslavia possess, their struggle grows continually fiercer and is rallying all the other nationalities around them. It can be said

that this resistance against the Serbian domination unites all classes of the Croatian and Slovenian peoples. But the Croatian and Slovenian bourgeoisie is prepared to recognise the monarchy, and thereby the Serbian domination, if they are given political and economic concessions in return (regional autonomy which leaves their class domination undisturbed). On the other hand, the widest masses of the people are determined to fight the Serbian domination up to complete right of self-determination. It is in the interests of, and the duty of the revolutionary proletariat of Yugoslavia to stand by the oppressed peoples in their fight against the Serbian domination and for their right of self-determination up to the final decision. The Communist Party will above all try to bring the whole Serbian working population into this struggle by showing them the reactionary character of this domination and of the monarchy. It is to be understood that the CP. of Yugoslavia, in its fight against the Serbian hegemony, must also direct its attack upon the manoeuvres of the Croatian and Slovenian bourgeoisie, who are striving for a compromise with the Serbian bourgeoisie, which protects their class interests, while betraying the interests and efforts of the great masses. Against these manoeuvres of the bourgeois parties, who wish to make use of the masses — only to push them aside at the given moment — in order to have their hands free in their jobbery with the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy, the CP. must show the masses of the oppressed peoples that their interests and their efforts towards self-determination can only be represented by the struggle of the masses themselves in full unity with the proletariat.

Th this end the CP. of Yugoslavia will not stop at vain theoretical arguments, but will take up an intensive campaign against the oppression and for the liberation of the oppressed peoples, whereby it will propose a united front to all organizations which are fighting for the peoples' right of self-determination. First and foremost, the CP. of Yugoslavia will turn to the Croatian Republican Peasant Party, and invite it to give up its muddled pacifist policy and not to give itself up, as certain leading elements wish to do, to the play of the bourgeoisie, which is always ready to betray the interests of the masses, but to come into the energetic mass fight on the side of the revolutionary proletariat.

In Slovenia, the CP. will uninterruptedly expose the ambiguous policy of the Clericals, who would always be ready to betray the interests of the masses, as soon as ever the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy made concessions to the Slovenian priesthood and big bourgeoisie. The CP. will uninterruptedly represent the formation of a united front in the struggle against the Serbian domination with all the workers' and peasants' organizations of Slovenia, and will call upon them to free themselves from the influence of the bourgeois parties and unite with the revolutionary proletariat.

The slogans of the Yugoslavian CP. in its fight for the right of the peoples to self-determination are as follows:

1. The right of the peoples to determine their own destiny in absolute freedom must be recognized in its entirety, and every obstacle that stands in the way of realising this right must be swept aside. The whole struggle for the self-determination of the peoples has as its object, the creation of a situation in which no power will be able to prevent the masses of the people from determining their own fate and choosing the government which they themselves desire.

2. The free choice of the peoples is only possible through the annulling of the hegemonist and monarchist Belgrade constitution. Revision would only mean a compromise of the bourgeoisie at the cost of the masses of all the nations. Since it would leave the domination of the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy untouched, revision would simply make small concessions to the properties classes of the betrayed nations.

3. In consideration of the tendency of the Croatian and Slovenian bourgeoisie to capitulate to the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy, the full right of the peoples to self-determination, and the interests of the masses of the peoples, can only be represented by the fight of these masses themselves in closest co-operation with the revolutionary proletariat. The formation of a powerful Workers' and Peasants' block is the first condition for success in the struggle against the Serbian domination. And the formation of a Workers' and Peasants' Republic is the only form of government which is fitted to guarantee the free choice of the people and to protect the working masses of all nations against the machinations of the bourgeoisie, which wishes to come to an agreement at the expense of the masses.

4. By defending the right of all nations to self-determination, the CP. declares itself against the division of nations by insurmountable barriers. This work of separation and hatred is the work of all bourgeoisies. On the other hand, the revolutionary proletariat is the only power which unites all peoples and is able to sweep aside all barriers. But to attain this end it is historically necessary that every nation be able to determine its own destiny freely and independently from other nations.

The National Minorities in Yugoslavia.

The imperialistic peace clauses have handed over to the oppression of the Serbian bourgeoisie, compact masses of Magyars, Germans and Roumanians in the northern Voivodine district, and Turks, Albanians, Bulgarians and Aromanians in the lions share of the Macedonian booty. The Macedonian problem will be dealt with in a special resolution. In this resolution only Magyars, Germans and Roumanians are to be regarded as national minorities.

The Serbian bourgeoisie also exercises against these the most brutal national oppression, and the dissatisfaction of these peoples is naturally very great. But here also one must set the shameful role of the Magyar, German and Roumanian bourgeoisie in its proper light. Instead of leading an energetic fight against the imperialistic and Fascist policy of oppression of the Serbian bourgeoisie, the bourgeois parties of these national minorities have leagued themselves with the radical party of Serbia, the particular representative of the domination policy. They have betrayed all the just demands of the masses, the great majority of which consists of proletarians and peasants, and fought exclusively for the demands of the propertied classes.

By this policy they have weakened the position of the other oppressed nationalities in their fight against the domination of the Serbian bourgeoisie and monarchy.

The CP. must expose this policy of the bourgeois parties and call upon the masses, so that they do not allow themselves to be deceived, but flock to the revolutionary proletariat and the working masses of the other oppressed nations.

IX.

The Agrarian Question in Yugoslavia.

1.

About 80 per cent of the population of Yugoslavia are peasants.

Before the war the situation of the peasants yielded the following picture:

In Bosnia there were about 100,000 families (650,000 souls) bondslaves of the feudal landowners, who called three fifths of the land their own. The free peasants (180,000 families = 875,000 souls) lived for the greater part (65%) on plots of less than 2 Hectars.

In Dalmatia 41.2% of the arable land was tilled by propertyless peasants.

In Croatia 71% of the peasants families possessed together only 25% of the whole arable land, while a small number of rich peasants and Latifundia owners, who formed less than 9% of the population, held 41% of the land.

In Slovenia the vast forest areas were in the hands of a small group of barons, while the proletarianising of the peasantry gained ground steadily.

In Macedonia, just as in Bosnia, the greater part of the land was found in the hands of the feudal landowners, and the misery of the peasants there was always immeasurably great.

In Voivodina 50,000 land workers cultivated the land which was for the most part in the hands of the capitalistic big property owners.

The position of the peasantry in Montenegro is generally known and has become proverbial.

Even in old Serbia, where the good position of the peasantry was famous, 45% of the peasant population were poor small farmers who possessed less than five Hectars of land.

2.

The war only helped to increase the misery of the peasants in all regions of present-day Yugoslavia. After the war the peasants in Dalmatia, Bosnia and Macedonia confiscated the land of the feudal landowners and refused to pay the "tithe" any longer. In other regions, where there were no feudal owners, there arose a strong movement among the poor peasants, who

set up a demand that that their holdings should be enlarged, and everywhere the effort of the peasant made itself felt as an independent factor emerging into political life. The peasants' revolution had actually made a beginning.

3.

The "People's Councils", which seized power after the collapse of the Austrian army, intervened to check this revolution and lulled the peasants by means of promises. The Serbian army which then arrived, completely throttled the revolutionary movement of the peasantry. The peasants believed the promises of their "People's Councils" and of the Serbian Government. There existed no political power to push the peasants on to seize the land in their own might. All political parties were for a legal solution of the agrarian problem. Even the Socialist Communists were satisfied with promising the division of the land after the seizure of power.

4.

The big landowners and the bourgeoisie, who aspired to get the whole of the land and property into their hands, made use of this hesitation in the revolutionary movement of the peasantry. The Bosnian feudatories had all debts paid by the state, carried out an insurance for compensation for the land which might be confiscated from them, and secured a guarantee that they should not be deprived of the whole of their property. To the peasants were simply left the small plots of land which they had till then held as serfs. The cessation of the feudal system was proclaimed, but the definitive solution of the agrarian question was put off for a later period. The Macedonian feudal lords were successful in holding up for the time being the parcelling out of their property, in order in this way to gain time to frustrate the reform and to insure for themselves the payment of debts and indemnities. In Dalmatia, the land which the peasants had confiscated was taken from them and they were forced to pay the back payments owing to their possessors. The great state-lands in Voivodina, which should by rights have been nationalised and divided among the agricultural co-operative societies, were instead, partly let out to volunteers of the Serbian army, and partly became the object of the most shameless speculation by the rulers and capitalists. The workers who cultivated them remained without land and sank by thousands into indescribable misery. The land-hunger of the poor peasants was only satisfied to the extent to which they yielded themselves unconditionally to the governmental parties and the national policy followed by the Serbian hegemonists.

5.

The peasant masses are already beginning to see clearly that they have been deceived by the government and the political parties of the bourgeoisie, and it is clear that their fight for land is not at an end by a long way. On the contrary, it can be asserted that this struggle is coming forward more sharply again. The peasants' revolt in Dalmatia, the chronic starvation in many regions, the ever more unbearable condition of the poor peasants, of the "Kmeten", Tchiiftschis and of the "Horige" (Serfs), the indescribable poverty of the land workers in Voivodina and Croatia, prove that the agrarian problem can and must lead to a great social conflict, in which the peasants will proceed to open fight against the combined big landowners and the bourgeoisie.

It is the duty of the C. P. of Yugoslavia to follow a policy which will unite the cause of the poor peasants with that of the revolutionary proletariat. In an agrarian state like Yugoslavia, no victory is possible for the proletariat if this is not based upon the wide masses of the peasantry. On the other hand the peasants will only better their condition, gain possession of the land, and be able to free themselves from the oppression of the big landowners and the usurers, if they join in the fight of the revolutionary proletariat.

6.

The C. P. must try first of all, to work out an agrarian program that will render possible a policy of realising a Workers' and Peasants' Block for the formation of a Workers' and Peasants' Government.

As the principal point of the agrarian problem, there must be pushed to the forefront the demand for confiscation, that is, for the expropriation without indemnity of all estate-owners' crown and church lands and great capitalist possessions, as well as their handing over to the propertyless and poor peasants with

all their effects. The state must also afford the peasants material and financial help.

7.

In consideration of the fact that the agrarian problem in Yugoslavia does not present the same picture in all provinces, the C. P. must work out an agrarian program which should contain a communist answer for all questions relating to existing conditions based on the agrarian system. In particular, the program must contain decisions on the provision of credit for the wide peasant masses, the provision of agricultural machines and implements, on the promotion of co-operative systems, on the necessary ameliorations and agricultural aid, on the fight against the usurers, heavy taxation and high prices.

8.

In consideration of the fact that the government has already recognised the right of the landowners to damages, and that it even forces the peasants to pay debts in this regard, or pays the landowners with that gold which the state receives from the before-mentioned population, the C. P. must: a) issue the slogan of the refusal of any further payments and the refunding of the sums already paid; b) all sentenced on account of agrarian unrest are to be immediately granted an amnesty; c) all who have speculated at the cost of the peasants are to be punished and the whole of their lands and all their profits are to be confiscated etc.

9.

The whole of the work of the Party on the land should have as a basis: a) an independent organization and propaganda activity; b) united front with all political and economic organizations of the peasants. In its independent work the CP. will strive: a) above all to strengthen its organizations on the land to as great an extent as possible; b) to organize trade unions of land workers; c) to form special committees of the poor peasants; d) to publish popular pamphlets for the peasants; e) to spread among the peasants, using for this purpose every conflict on the land, leaflets and proclamations; f) to found a special newspaper for the peasants.

In making propaganda the example of the policy of the SSSR. towards the peasants is to be used to the greatest extent. The whole propaganda has to strive for the realisation of a united front of the workers and peasants against the united front of the big landowners and bourgeoisie.

The united front tactic is to be used for purposes of general action, as also in single questions. The Party must make use of every conflict on the land in order to propose the united front to the economic and political organizations of the peasantry. This tactic is to be specially used for the purpose of either compelling the peasant parties, or those calling themselves such, to come out against the government, or exposing them to the masses. Above all the CP. must strive to favour the left elements of those parties which come into consideration for the formation of a Workers' and Peasants' block against the reaction of the bourgeoisie and of the big landowners, and for co-operation in the interests of the formation of a Workers' and Peasants' Government.

X.

The Struggle against Fascism.

The ideology of the Fascist reaction becomes every day more noticeable with the greater and lesser bourgeoisie in Yugoslavia. The first Fascist organizations have already commenced action. In the bourgeois press, especially in the Serbian, the campaign for the correction of "Parliamentarism", in the sense in which Mussolini has corrected it in Italy, becomes more noticeable. The fierceness of the party and nationality struggles causes the organizations which were formed on the model of and with the ideology of Fascism, to appear as instruments of the various parties, and of the national bourgeoisies fighting against each other, and causes their activity to be consumed for the moment in the struggles of these organizations among themselves.

The parties of the leading Serbian bourgeoisie have already formed Fascist organizations. The S. R. N. A. S. (organization of the Serbian Nationalist Youth) serves the radical party. The "Orjuna" (organization of Yugoslavian

Nationalists) is an organization in the service of the democratic party, and both organizations form, although they frequently fight one another, the organization of the Serbian bourgeoisie and serve each other in the policy of oppression of the working class and of the masses of the people of all nationalities.

The Serbian bourgeoisie possesses, in addition, a military organization which is called "The White Hand", which already in reality constitutes the government, forcing its aims, and its policy upon all "parliamentary" governments. This military clique, which is grouped about the king's court, represents the tendency towards a military Fascist dictatorship on the Spanish model.

The Croatian bourgeoisie has likewise created for itself a Fascist organization, the "Hanao" (Croatian Nationalist Youth). This organization is said to organize the defence against the attacks of the Fascist bands of the leading Serbian bourgeoisie. But it has also, like the Fascist organizations of the Serbian bourgeoisie, proved its anti-proletarian character by the defence of the interests of the Croatian bourgeoisie against the demands of the Croatian workers.

That proves to the Yugoslavian proletariat the necessity of preparing for the struggle, which has already begun, and which will become more and more intense. If the working class does not succeed in repulsing and conquering Fascism in its first attack, then it will find itself in the tragic position where its movement will be stifled in blood before it succeeds in raising itself from the difficult position into which it has been thrown by the savage government reaction.

The struggle against Fascism must be begun immediately. It must be carried out both ideologically and with force. The ideological struggle must strive to prevent the spread of the influence of Fascism among the town and country petty bourgeois, as well as among the least class-conscious section of the working class.

The struggle of the working class against Fascism must rest upon a united front. The C. P. must proceed to the formation of workers hundreds.

In the struggle against Fascism, it must never be forgotten that the greatest danger is threatened from the Fascist organizations of the leading Serbian bourgeoisie, and that the principal efforts of the Communists must be directed against them, whereby the other organizations which are opposed to them are to be used wherever possible.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Training of Teachers in the Soviet Union.

By Kalashnikoff.

A short time ago there was held in Moscow the All-Russia Conference for Pedagogical Training, at which for the first time since the revolution, questions of the thorough reform of the Training of Educationists were discussed. The Conference was prepared by the scientific educational section of the State Scientific Council, and all the reports sent in to the Conference were the outcome of long collective work on the part of this body.

The Conference accepted the principles underlying these reports. They consist of the following: the educational establishments must become the centres of popular education, which are in touch with the working masses. They must train politically mature teachers who understand the interests of the Soviet Union and of the revolution. At the same time they must concentrate in themselves the activity of the teaching bodies of their own district, make use of the experiences of the local educational personnel and take part in the uplifting of the level of the work of the educational personnel. The pupils of the educational establishments must from the very first be drawn into the out-of-school and other educational practical work of the district which is correlated with the theoretical work in the school itself. In addition to that, all pupils must have a certain training, for the teacher of the new school must not be unacquainted with modern forms of work, with modern production. Therefore all pupils must have practise in industrial management or in farming. Consequently, every pedagogical establishment must take a special attitude towards production (exactly as it has to be in the ordinary educational establishments). This attitude towards

production appears in every branch of the activity of the pedagogical establishment — the special technical occupations, as also the pedagogical work of the students is bound up with production.

The pedagogical institute, as the cultural organizatory centre of the district, will also be drawn into the production activity of the whole system of popular education of its particular district, that is to the elaboration of the plan of production for the popular educational system, for the schools, to the adaptation of the program to the local conditions, to the methodical inspection of schools etc. The Conference accepted, with certain alterations, the existing system of pedagogical education with the two types of schools: the pedagogical technical school, and the pedagogical institute or faculty. The first follows on the completion of seven school years, has four years' courses and prepares teachers for the schools of the first grade. The second follows the completion of nine school years, has likewise four years' courses and prepares teachers for the schools of the second grade, as well as workers' faculties and organizers for the various branches of the popular educational system.

The Conference was exceedingly well attended and aroused great interest in the province. There were from the province 134 delegates with power to vote definitively. The expression of opinion, which took place, was very interesting and shewed a great change in the field of educational work in the direction of understanding the tasks of the present epoch and the consequent motives for school reform. The communications from the province showed, that in many places in the Soviet Union the new forms of work of the pedagogical establishments which were proposed at the conference, have already been realised as the result of a correct grasp of the tasks of the new school.

In general, this Conference has, on the one hand, struck the balance of the revolutionary erection of the system of pedagogical education, and on the other hand, it has perceived the ways in which the further reform of the pedagogical system must proceed. Here lies the great significance of this valuable conference.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The Situation in the International Co-operative Alliance.

By Otto Schröder (Weissenfels).

As in the Second International and in the International Trade Union movement the Communist problem has for years occupied the central position, so is it also the case in the I. C. A. which has its head-quarters in London. The discussions in the I. C. A. are specially interesting because they can be carried out in a direct manner, as those co-operatives which have a Communist executive are also organized within the I. C. A. The Socialists and the neutrals naturally carry on an unbroken struggle against the Soviet co-operatives of the Russian Union, but nevertheless, the Communist position is becoming stronger from year to year and compels the thorough handling and solution of all decisive questions.

When the last international co-operative congress met in Basle in August 1921 the anti-Bolshevist fever was still so great that it was possible to prevent the election of Russian representatives to the executive. Since then two meetings of the Central Executive have taken place. The first held in Milan in April 1922 brought a completely new situation. A report of an investigation commission was submitted which had been sent to Soviet Russia to report upon the "destructive work of the Bolsheviks". When Mr. May (of London), the general secretary, submitted the report there was on the contrary an outspoken eulogy of the huge achievements of the Soviet co-operatives such as were only possible under the dictatorship of the proletariat on account of the consistent encouragement given to the cause of the co-operatives by the Soviet Government. The reactionary group now moved that an expedition be sent to Georgia, for which the Social Democrat Servy (Belgium) accompanied by the Georgian emigrant, Gugushvili, was nominated. The result of this journey was of course, more an accordance with the wishes of the reactionaries, as we will see later on, and strengthened the hopes of the German reactionaries who were always dreaming that they could make propaganda for the exclusion of the Communists at the next international Co-operative Congress in Ghent in

September 1924, because they would not always abide true to the noble principle of self-help and neutrality.

In the meantime a number of very serious disputes have broken out in the I. C. A. which revealed themselves in the second meeting of the Central Executive held during March in Prague. First there is the question of the "Political neutrality" of the I. C. A. which takes a very different form in practice than it does in theory. Thus behind the backs of the majority of the members, and concerning a cardinal question a factor has been created which the Communist members, who compose about the half of the 25 million members who are organized in 43,000 co-operatives in 24 countries, must look upon as an unheard-of provocation. Not only has a close coalition been formed with the International Trade Union Alliance, but negotiations with the Second International for the purpose of a coalition are about to be begun. Moreover, national conflicts have broken out between the leaders of the co-operatives which will once more reduce the I. C. A. to a farce such as it was during the war. At the meeting in Prague, which was attended by Communist delegates from Russia, Ukraine and Czecho-Slovakia, a conflict arose before even the agenda was reached which placed a hard problem before the neutrality question. On the next day the Fascist government of Zankov in Bulgaria intended to dissolve the great workers and peasants Co-operative Society "Osvoboshdenie" (70,000 members). The Co-Operative Section of the Comintern had called upon the co-operative world to raise the sharpest protest against this and the "Osvoboshdenie" itself as a member of the I. C. A. had applied to the latter body for help. The famous neutralists could not bring themselves at once to respond to the appeal for help and Koselov, the Bulgarian Social Democrat, declared quite openly that the government had the right under the Emergency Powers Act to proceed against the Communist society, since its members had taken part in the rising against the government which was in contradiction to the principles of co-operation. The German Central Committee goes so far as to write in its report of the executive meeting about an "alleged persecution" of the "Osvoboshdenie". Kissin, the Russian delegate, pulled to pieces the insane idea of neutrality which is always used against the Communists, but no longer valid when the English co-operation allies itself with the Labour Party or the Belgian and Austrian co-operation with the Social Democratic Party. A resolution was then adopted which protested against the persecution of the "Osvoboshdenie" by the Bulgarian government and demanded that the independence and freedom of the society should be preserved. The Russian-Ukrainian delegation then presented a statement in which they said that they were voting for the resolution in order to render the decision of the Central Committee in this matter unanimous, but that at the same time they were of the opinion that the resolution was not completely satisfactory. In connection with this question the Social Democrat Renner (Vienna), pointed out the necessity of discussing the question of "Co-operatives and politics" in the Alliance and especially the question of how one could make the co-operative movement an instrument of the working class.

The second important question dealt with was Georgia. Here once more the usual accusatory speech was held against the Communists, in the course of which the story of the destruction of the co-operation by the Soviets and a destruction of the freedom of the co-operatives was once more furbished up. So far the Georgian Co-operative Society had always been represented in the I. C. A. by the emigrant Gugushvili and representation refused to the present executive of the Georgian Co-operative Society. Comrade Kissin declared that some leaders of the I. C. A. worried more about the Georgian co-operatives than the Georgians themselves, who considered the situation of the co-operatives in their land as quite normal and satisfactory. He moved that the present representative of Georgia should surrender his mandate and that the executive of the Georgian Co-operative Union should receive the sole right of sending its representative to the I. C. A. Professor Gide (Paris), who had just been in Russia, supported the statements of Kissin along with May the general secretary, and declared that the Georgian co-operatives are satisfied with their situation. They made no demands whatever for the protection which Servy had proffered them. The existing Georgian mandate was then declared to be cancelled but at the same time the resolution of Servy was adopted, against which the Communist delegation protested most strongly.

A further question which led to a lively discussion was the acceptance of the representatives of the Profintern in the mixed commission of the Amsterdam trade union international and the

I. C. A. An appropriate resolution was moved by the representatives of the All-Russian Co-operative Bank and the Czech representatives and most actively supported. It was emphasised that it was impossible to do without the co-operation of the Profintern because the members of the co-operative movement were composed of members of the Amsterdam and Moscow Trade Union Internationals. Naturally the reformists took up a most decided position against that and it was therefore decided to present the question of the co-operation of the Profintern to the joint meeting of the representatives of the Amsterdamers and the I. C. A., which takes place in Paris in May. The motion of the Second International for the formation of a mixed commission of representatives of the Amsterdam Trade Union International and the I. C. A. for joint work in the co-operative movement was rejected in the meeting of the Central Committee which took place before the executive meeting because Khinchuk, the Russian delegate, demanded that the Third International should also be invited to participate in this joint work. Naturally this rejection only took place so as to avoid the necessity of establishing connection with the Moscow international, a thing that throws a very vivid light upon "political neutrality" in practice.

The 21st International Congress of the I. C. A. will take place in Ghent (Belgium) between September 1st and 5th, where a violent struggle over the disputed questions in the I. C. A. is to be expected. The German co-operative societies in Germany, Austria, and Czecho-Slovakia only wish to take part in the International Congress if the situation in the occupied territory is changed before that time. No representative of the German Central committee came to the last meeting of the I. C. A. because the refuse to set foot on the ground of their hereditary enemies, in spite of the fact that in Prague, Poisson, a French delegate, declared that in Ghent they would not be the guests of the Belgian government but of the Belgian co-operators. The revolutionary co-operators in Germany are conducting an energetic struggle against this chauvinism of the central body and in the meeting in Prague, general secretary May reported that he already had a letter from a German co-operative society in which it was expressly emphasised that they did not approve of the attitude of Hamburg in this matter. For the same reason these co-operatives are refusing to exhibit in the international co-operative exhibition that is taking place in Ghent. It is of interest in this connection that in this exhibition the Italian Fascist co-operatives will be represented.

The situation in the I. C. A. is thus full of political differences of opinion and the struggle between reaction and revolution has begun. If the Communists continue their struggle with all energy in the individual national organisations, there is little doubt that the I. C. A. also — which today embraces all kinds of co-operatives and which proves itself unable to make the great world co-operative organization successfully active in the interests of the workers of all lands — will become a revolutionary world-factor which will render the international proletariat valuable service in its struggle against capital.

APPEALS

To the French Proletariat and the Proletariat of the Whole World!

Comrades, Men and Women!

When Poincaré, at the behest of the French heavy industry, occupied the Ruhr and thereby threatened to plunge the world into war again, the young communists of France and Germany met this criminal action by a methodic and systematic propaganda within the army of occupation, advocating fraternisation of French and Belgian soldiers with German workers.

Subsequently, when the revolutionary proletariat of Germany was preparing a determined attack on the capitalist stronghold, the young communists of France and of the occupied territories increased their efforts a hundredfold and, with the support of the revolutionary soldiery, initiated in the army of occupation a strong movement in favour of the German revolution which, we think, is imminent.

Alarmed by the success of communist propaganda in the army, Poincaré and Degoutte took advantage of the October defeat in Germany and of the shameful betrayal of which a few demoralised proletarians were guilty, to throw scores of military and civilian comrades into prison where torture awaited them.

Workers, peasants and soldiers of all countries!

The prisons of Mayence where communists are dying a slow death, have not yet divulged the secret of the tortures imposed on our comrades to compel them to "confess" what Degoutte wants them to confess, in order to be able to concoct a conspiracy intended to frighten the French bourgeoisie with the spectre of Communism which hovers over Europe. This "highly civilised" country sticks at nothing to achieve its ends, but six months have already passed since then, and the conspiracy has not yet materialised.

The military and police authorities, furious at not being able to make their present to the French bourgeoisie before the elections, gave vent to their resentment in ferocious repressive measures against our French and German military and civilian comrades after the small demonstration on May Day, which no true revolutionaries ever neglect to celebrate, even in prison.

The French executioners, with the help of German Fascisti, looked for scapegoats, but revolutionary solidarity proved too strong for them. A hunger strike was declared by the imprisoned hundred German comrades and the 15 French soldiers in answer to the shameful coalition between the French police and the German Fascisti.

Working men and women of France!

You have liberated from republican jails your Black Sea heroes headed by Marty. You have just succeeded in tearing from the clutches of Poincaré comrade Doriot, whose crime also was to remind the soldiers of their duty to their class!

You will not allow Degoutte to murder in the prisons your Martyrs of the occupied territories, nor the many revolutionary propagandists who helped to enlighten the French soldiers.

You will liberate these new victims of French imperialism.

Proletarians of all countries!

The revolutionising of the army of occupation is the first step towards the real struggle against the peril of a new war. You must support the first revolutionary propagandists in the army!

Use every means — the press, meetings, etc. to help the workers of France in their struggle for the liberation of their imprisoned comrades!

Let the Left Bloc feel from the very first day the weight of the protest of the world proletariat.

Fight for the liberation of the heroes of the occupied territories!

Long live revolutionary work in the army!

Down with the occupation and with those who ordained it!

Down with the militarists in all countries!

Long live social revolution!

Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Executive Committee of the Young Communist International.

Moscow, 19. May 1924.