

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 56

7th August 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.

C O N T E N T S

To the Proletarians of all Countries!

Politics

Karl Radek: A New Stage in the Liquidation of the Versailles Treaty I.

Earl R. Browder: The Presidential Campaign in the U.S.

In the Soviet Union.

G. Zinoviev: The Bad Harvest in the Soviet Union and our Tasks.

In the R. I. L. U.

A. Lozovsky: The Results of the III. Congress of the R.I.L.U.

In the International

G. Dimitrov: The VII. Conference of the Balkan Communist Federation.

Our Problems

G. Dombal: Our Attitude to the Peasants' Political Organisations.

To the Proletarians of All Countries!

Comrades, Workers!

After four years of war and six years of futile conferences over the distribution of the booty, the victorious imperialist robbers are about to squeeze out further profits of their robbery from the German proletariat. The old European League of robbers is being joined by a new and more powerful partner — American big capital. When the forces of the Entente troops upon the battle fields of France were giving out, American imperialism came to their aid with its tanks and hand grenades. After four years of futile reparations war, America, the most terrible and formidable participant in the war, once again enters the European arena.

The labouring millions are again to be subjugated by means of the weapon of mass starvation and the poison gas of pacifist illusions.

This is what constitutes the "new method" of the reparation policy.

The old fascist method of war, the culminating point of which consisted in the occupation of the Ruhr for the solution of the reparations problem and for the consolidation of capitalism, has proved ineffective. It has frightened the victors with the spectre of Communism in Germany and has brought about the fall of the French Franc, the decay of world capitalism and the destruction of the European markets, and has thereby caused an economic and, to some extent, even a political crisis in America.

The method of the Ruhr occupation has proved to be unavailing to achieve the desired end.

The world war ended with the "peaceful war" of the Versailles Treaty. The Ruhr war followed on the heels of the peaceful war. After the Ruhr war the "peaceful war" has begun afresh, this time in the form of a systematic, refined, well thought-out method of extortion against the German proletariat, according to the plan of the Morgan group, which goes under the name of

The Exports' Report.

Anglo-American capital requires Europe as a market, as a colony. For this purpose finance capital pushes forward the labour government as a screen, and employs the more "cultivated" and "peaceful" forms indicated by the best experts, in order to throttle the German proletariat.

To the help of the hangmen there comes their trusted servant: International Social Democracy. Ten years ago international social democracy everywhere voted for the war credits; everywhere it supported its national bourgeoisie; it supported the Versailles Treaty, which was dictated to the vanquished people and set its signature to it; in all countries it furthered the attempt to re-establish capitalism at the expense of the proletariat; it only conducted a sham fight against the Versailles Treaty, against the robberies and against the occupation of the Ruhr. And now it is the first to sing the praises of the plan of the Morgan group. Social Democracy has made use of every one of the 22 reparation conferences in order to dish up new illusions, and it now seeks to make use of the 23rd. reparations conference of the victorious imperialist robbers for the same purpose. On the occasion of every conference the Social Demo-

crats proclaim the beginning of a new era of pacifism and claim that this time the conference will finally bring salvation and "reconstruction". This is done in order to entangle the revolution in pacifist-democratic illusions.

At every betrayal of the working class the Amsterdam International was a true ally of the second International. At the Vienna Conference even its left wing failed to utter a syllable as to the necessity of liquidating the Versailles Treaty. The Dawes Plan was subjected to a formal criticism, but then at the joint conference of the Amsterdam and London Internationals in London, was declared to be "the only possible solution".

What is French Imperialism aiming at in London?

It is seeking to set up for all time the political and military hegemony of France upon the European mainland.

It wishes to perpetuate the Versailles Peace Treaty; it desires to render permanent the enslavement of the German proletariat; it wishes to arm for a new war.

It wishes to suck the blood from the veins and the marrow from the bones of the German proletariat in order to guarantee the reparation payments, as it knows, that the French finances are completely shattered and that the revenue for the year 1924 will scarcely suffice to cover the interest on the state debts. The burden of taxation in France is continually growing, the Franc is deteriorating (the French petty bourgeoisie and peasants at the recent elections gave their answer to Poincaré regarding this). Behind Herriot stands Poincaré with his whip. Both of them are only representatives of French imperialism.

What is English Imperialism aiming at?

It wishes in its own interests to wreck and shatter French hegemony. MacDonald is carrying out the programme which the Conservative Baldwin drew up for the construction of the air-fleet and only cancels a paltry sum from the old armament budget. The Allies, France and England, can neither agree with one another nor can they separate from each other. For the time being they are compelled to avoid a war, because neither of the two countries are ready with their armament preparations, but before all because America has not yet decided which of the two hostile imperialist groups she will support. English capital has to spread new illusions among the English proletariat, because the number of the unemployed has again reached a million and because the wave of aggressive mass strikes, despite the will of the trade union leaders, is advancing.

Salvation is expected from America. But America herself is suffering from an agrarian crisis. Two million farmers have abandoned their farms. The spectre of an economic crisis is knocking at the door: the absorbing power of the home market is decreasing, ruined Europe is not in a position to purchase American goods; South American forms a too restricted field for investment of capital in view of the furious pace in the development of productive forces. Morgan imposes his will on America and in the name of Morgan, Dawes and Hughes dictate to Europe.

The first result of the democratic-pacifist era will be the nearer approach of the

Dictatorship of American Finance Capital,

which has set itself the aim of converting Europe into a colony. As a screen there serves the labour government and the left bloc; sham democracy and sham pacifism. In the background the fascist watchdog is on guard.

Germany

is to made an international colony, an exploitation field for the robbers of all countries. All bourgeois parties in Germany are heart and soul for the Experts' Report. The German fascists cry out against the conversion of Germany into a colony, but in the parliaments they support the state governments of Thuringia, Mecklenburg and Württemberg, the premiers of which have come from the ranks of the German nationalists, and in spite of all their lying pledges have voted for the Dawes Report. The London Conference imposes exhausting taxes upon German industry, but these taxes, right up to the last penny, will be entirely and unconditionally transferred to the working masses, the middle class of the towns and the working peasants. For this reason all the bourgeois parties of Germany are in favour of the Experts' Report and only carry on a sham fight against Entente capital. The Social Democrats and the trade union bureaucrats, — these professional traitors — have this time also

offered their services to world capital and render practical assistance in the setting up of the dictatorship of American imperialism over the whole of Europe.

The London Conference

will mean for the German proletariat the twelve hour day, the dismissal of 50% of all railway workers, a more drastic reduction of the civil service staff than hitherto, extortionate taxation, increase of custom duties, of the railway rates and food prices. The German workers will become the white slaves of democracy, the coolies of pacifism, compulsory strike-breakers on a world scale.

The Twelve Hour Day in Germany

means the introduction of the ten hour day in France. The abolition of legal protection for labour in Germany will be followed by its abolition in France, England, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and other countries. Starvation wages in Germany will lead to unemployment in England.

The London Conference can lead to a new attempt to form an imperialist united front for the

Exploitation of Soviet-Russia

and for the introduction of imperialist control over Germany's foreign trade with Russia.

Workers Proletarians of all Countries!

Tear the bandage of illusions from your eyes! Do not allow a repetition of the August Days of 1914! See the position with your own eyes and do not allow yourselves to be deceived by the professional betrayers of the workers!

Workers of England, America and France! The German proletariat, who are fighting against Entente capital, will not attain victory without your help.

Render active support to every effort of the fighting German proletariat against the sweating exploitation by the Entente and against the predatory policy of America.

May the murderers of the German proletariat hear with utmost clearness the voice of all the hundreds of thousands of workers:

Hands off the German proletariat!

Away with imperialist slavery under the flag of pacifism!

Forward with the proletarian revolution!

Down with the dictatorship of Morgan and of finance capital!

Long live the dictatorship of the proletariat!

Down with the international stock-exchange and its agents, the Second International!

Down with the Versailles Peace Treaty!

Workers of Germany! Forward with the struggle against the Eight Hour Day!

Proletarians of all countries! Form a firm proletarian united front with Soviet Russia!

Protect the German revolution as you protect the Russian revolution! Form a protective wall of millions round the centre of the world revolution — round the German proletariat!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

POLITICS

A New Stage in the Liquidation of the Versailles Treaty.

By Karl Radek.

The Issue of the Struggle over the Ruhr.

On the 16th of July the Allied representatives met in London in order to determine their attitude to the Experts' Report, and to decide upon a number of measures arising out of it. There is not the least doubt that this Conference marks a new stage in the liquidation of the relations of forces which found expression in the treaty of Versailles. However much France may cling to this treaty, no matter how much the government of the Left Bloc, with Herriot at its head, may swear their loyalty to the

memorial to the victory of democracy and pacifism, and no matter how Mr. MacDonald may swear that the Versailles peace must remain undisturbed, all these political manoeuvres can in no way alter the important fact, that the peace of Versailles is being buried, although unaccompanied by any pomp and ceremony.

We said that what we have to deal with is a new stage in the liquidation of the treaty of Versailles. For the occupation of the Ruhr itself constituted an attempt at such a liquidation. The only difference is that on the 11th January 1923 M. Poincaré was endeavouring to alter the treaty of Versailles in favour of the French bourgeoisie, while at the present time England and America are undertaking this liquidation to the disadvantage of the French bourgeoisie. In order to understand the entire change in the situation which has taken place in the last months, it is necessary to examine in the first place what was the aim of the French policy in occupying the Ruhr.

One can observe three tendencies in the post-war policy of France towards Germany. The first tendency is the efforts of the French militarists to dismember defeated Germany. From fear of Germany with its preponderating population, from fear that Germany industry will revolutionise war technics and be in a position, in spite of the present defenceless condition of Germany, to supply better means for a war of revenge, from fear that new groupings in international politics will render it easier for Germany to appear as a military power in the future, these military circles were striving for the occupation of the Left bank of the Rhine, not only for the time prescribed by the peace of Versailles (15 years), but as a permanent guarantee of domination over Germany. They attempted with the help and support of the separatist movement in Bavaria and Pfalz to wrest from Germany the whole area south of the Main. The second group is the French petty bourgeoisie who have lent the state one hundred milliard francs for the restoration of northern France and are endeavouring to make Germany pay the interest on this debt, and who are possessed by the fear of a collapse of the Franc and of a further heavy taxation in the event of Germany failing to pay. With this petty bourgeoisie there are allied the French deposit banks who negotiated the state loans. The third group is the heavy industry which is seeking to impose an agreement upon German heavy industry which will assure it the preponderance in the Franco-German steel and coal trust and secure it the supply of German coke and the export of French iron to Germany. As this group did not reach its aim by means of negotiations with the German industrialists it endeavoured to do so at the point of the bayonet.

All these three tendencies existed it at the time of the peace negotiations. The claims of the military group, which were represented by Marchall Foch, collided with the resistance of England and America, who saw in the realisation of these aspirations the establishment of French military hegemony in Europe. The attempts of French industry to establish economic hegemony over the continent already at Versailles, called forth the resistance of England, who, in the event of its realisation, would have been placed between the two fires of the powerful American and Franco-German competition. The peace of Versailles, by reason of its very nature, marked the rejection of the military and economic hegemony of France by the Allies. It laid down the amount of tribute which the whole of Germany, which was to remain a whole even though reduced in size, had to pay. At the same time the treaty of Versailles provided France with a guarantee against the German revanche.

But as is always the case in compromises, the rejected French claims have found expression in articles of the treaty which permitted France to remain for a definite number of years on the left bank of the Rhine. These clauses were the grounds for a new attempt by France to accomplish her aims, when it became clear that the peace of Versailles, as Briand said, was a beautiful but lifeless ornament. In the first place America has not ratified the treaty signed by Wilson guaranteeing securities to Frances. England, however, has refused to take up such a responsibility alone. This lent new force to the military tendencies striving for the occupation of the Rhine area. Secondly, it became evident that Germany is not in a position to pay the tribute demanded from her by the ultimatum of May 1921. The Allies succeeded in fixing the enormous tribute, but in spite of all their economic experts they never thought what would become of Germany if she paid this tribute. Germany could only obtain the valuta necessary for the payment of the tribute by printing and selling mark notes. Thus there came about the collapse of the mark. Poincaré decided to

obtain the consent of the Allies for taking up the so-called territorial sanctions. The idea of these sanctions was best expressed by the chairman of the finance commission of the French parliament, Dariaque, in his secret report which was published in the "Manchester Guardian" in the summer of 1922.

"The Ruhr district" he wrote, "especially that portion which we possess, constituted the chief element of the wealth of Germany. A great portion of the German large syndicates were formed here, here they have their general staff and their undertakings. The ten to twelve industrialists who stand at their head, hold, either directly or indirectly but in any event in absolute form, the fate of Germany in their hands. They consist chiefly of Stinnes, Thyssen, Krupp, Haniel, Klöckner, Funke, Mannesmann and three or four others. Their importance corresponds with that of Carnegie, Rockefeller, Harriman, Vanderbilt and Gould in America. These German magnates, however, play a role in politics which the American millionaires would never dream of. They have already proposed to take the place of the German state in the payment of reparations, but their conditions remain unacceptable at present."

By means of exercising pressure upon the authorities in the Ruhr basin, Poincaré hoped to put an end to the taxation policy which rendered Germany unable to pay and enriched the coal and iron kings. This policy, which appeared as one of the elements which rendered it impossible for Germany to pay the tribute demanded by the Allies, constituted a common problem in the eyes of Poincaré. The representatives of French heavy industry knew very well that one cannot compel an industrial country which requires an enormous quantity of raw material from abroad to render payment in kind, and that no matter in what form Germany paid the tribute, it would finally consist of exported goods for which no goods would be imported in return. But the French heavy industry drove Poincaré to occupy the Ruhr district, because it reckoned that then, when it became clear that it was impossible by this means to obtain the payment of an appreciable amount of tribute, Poincaré would be compelled to carry out the policy of the Comité des Forges, a policy which did not aim at the exaction of tribute, but the creation of a Franco-German coal and steel syndicate. The Comité des Forges knew perfectly well that Poincaré in the first place represented the policy of the petty bourgeoisie who wish to receive indemnities, but the French iron and coal kings hoped that if he received nothing he would be compelled to adopt their programme. The military circles, on the other hand, hoped that the logic of the struggle would compel him definitely to support the dismemberment of Germany. If she did not and could not pay then it would be necessary to cut a living portion from her body and to be rid one for all of the German danger.

Poincaré, who was afraid of finding himself isolated, endeavoured at first to win over the Allies for the policy of territorial sanctions. When however he became convinced at the Paris Conference that the Allies — who knew quite as well as the French militarists that the territorial sanctions meant annexation by the French — rejected this policy, he decided upon the independent occupation of the Ruhr area. His policy was not only directed against Germany, but also against England and America. It was an attempt to liquidate the peace of Versailles in favour of France. Poincaré did not know whether he would remain in the Ruhr district or evacuate it after obtaining payments from Germany, or whether he would give up the Ruhr in return for being freed from the debts due to England and America, which he constantly felt to be a noose round his neck which could be tightened at any moment.

Poincaré was victorious all along the line. After eight months furious resistance which annihilated the mark, Germany capitulated on the 23rd September last. The German capitulation constituted a second lost war. Poincaré attained the pinnacle of victory. The question for him now was how to liquidate the Ruhr expedition, what concrete demands to place before Germany. But from the pinnacle of victory to the abyss of defeat was but a step. If Germany lost the war of 1914—1918 because she had over-estimated her forces, if Germany lost the Ruhr war because she over-estimated her powers of resistance and underestimated the French power of holding out, so Poincaré lost the Ruhr war after his victory over Germany because he underestimated the consequences of the economic strain. Upon the victory in the Ruhr area there followed the collapse of the Franc.

The Presidential Campaign in the U. S.

By Earl R. Browder (Chicago).

Parties and Candidates.

The United States is now set for its great quadrennial circus by means of which our modern Caesars pacify the populace—namely, the elections in which will be chosen the President of the U. S. for the next four years.

There are four principal centers in the campaign that will influence the final results. These are the republican and democratic parties, carrying over the old and outworn two-party division in American politics; the La Follette independent candidacy, supported principally by committees of middle-class and professional elements, with the labour bureaucracy and the official labour movement largely tagging along behind; and there is the Communist ticket, William Z. Foster for president and Ben Gitlow for vice-president, running on the Workers Party ticket with the support of the committee elected at the St. Paul Farmer-Labour convention of June 17th.

Who are the candidates, and what will they mean to the masses of workers and farmers who will cast their votes in November?

Calvin Coolidge was selected as the republican candidate for president, and Charles G. Dawes for vice-president, at the convention in the city of Cleveland, June 12th. Coolidge is well-known by the reputation he gained in the policemen's strike in Boston, Mass., while he was governor of that state. His persistent protection of the grafters exposed in his cabinet is the outstanding characteristic of his few months as president. He is a cold-blooded, silent, rather stupid puritan, whose chief recommendation is his docility in the hands of his directors.

Dawes is the militant of the republican campaign. He is a blood-and-thunder, fire-eating, Fascist type, gloating in strong language and violent threats. He is head of the Central Trust Co., of Chicago, a part of the Morgan banking interests. He is known for his connection with the Lorimer banking swindle of a decade or more ago. His candidacy is based upon his part in the Allied experts' report on reparations, in the making of which he is understood to have been the personal choice of J. P. Morgan. He is an outspoken advocate of smashing the labour unions.

James W. Davis, nominee of the democratic party after its convention had been deadlocked for two weeks between McAdoo and Smith, resigns as an attorney for J. P. Morgan & Co. to accept the nomination. He was ambassador to Great Britain under the regime of Woodrow Wilson, and became quite close to Morgan in that capacity, and stands for Morgan's foreign policy today. He comes from West Virginia, his political base of operations from which he emerged into national politics, and is aligned closely with the "open shop" coal operators who have murdered hundreds of miners and union organisers, and who provoked civil war in the coal fields with their oppression.

Charles W. Bryan, running mate of Davis on the democratic ticket, is a nincompoop who was nominated as a sop to the disgruntled agrarian elements that have looked helplessly to the name Bryan for leadership since the days of the "free silver" agitation that made William Jennings Bryan a national figure in 1896. He is a brother of Wm. J. Bryan.

Robert Marion LaFollette is running for president as an independent republican, without a party, and with only the organisations of "LaFollette for President Committee" all over the country, in cooperation with the Conference for Progressive Political Action, a melange of labour bureaucrats, middle class professionals, and the Socialist Party. His opposition to the entry of the U. S. into the world war, his identification with railroad legislation, and his record as an unruly member of the republican party, have combined to make him the idol of the bankrupt farmers who are in revolt due to the agricultural crisis. He has adopted a few planks from the demands of labour, such as abolition of injunctions in labour disputes, and tacked them into his essentially reactionary programme of "bust the trusts", and rallied the vast bulk of the mass movement that is drifting away from the old parties to his support. He is opposing the formation of a new party, doubtless because of his fear of the farmer-labour organisations of a class character, which he must destroy before he can build the kind of party he wants—a duplicate of the republican and democratic parties with the small bankers and the middle-class generally in a dominating position.

The Workers Party candidate, William Z. Foster, leader of the Communist movement in America, is running on the platform of Communism, dictatorship of the proletariat, and Soviet rule. He has the support of the farmer-labour elements that met in St. Paul on June 17th, with the exception of those that split off to go with LaFollette.

Graft Exposures and Their Reverberations.

America is the classic land of graft. From the earliest days of the Republic, when even George Washington, "the father of his country", was implicated in irregular land deals, right throughout the history of the United States, bribery of public officials and systematic looting of public wealth has been an established institution.

But never has there been so great a storm of scandal as broke in the investigations that centered, in the public eye, around the Teapot Dome oil fields. Thousands of threads of corruption ran from this steal into innumerable other fields, one exposure provoked counter-exposures of unrelated graft in other fields, until it looked for awhile as if the American workers, since the thieves at the top had fallen out, might get a good look at the inwards of the class government that suppresses them.

As an indication of the extent of the corruption it might be mentioned, that a cabinet officer was shown to have received a bribe of \$ 100,000 for granting an oil lease; that several millions of dollars in bribes were spent on newspapers and public men; two more cabinet officers were forced to resign by disclosures of graft; another was disclosed as trafficking in illicit whiskey; others dispensed pardons to criminals for bribes; the treasury department was looted of several millions by means of forged bonds; the Veterans Bureau for relief of injured soldiers has been the vehicle of other millions of graft; the late President Harding was shown to have been deeply involved in the get-rich-quick gang; and Coolidge was connected up, by disclosures of underground communications, with Ned McLean, newspaper publisher on the inside of the graft ring. The looting syndicate was shown to contain the principal financial supporters of both the Republican and Democratic parties.

But if anyone expected (and of course many did) that any great realignment would be forced by these revelations, they were soon disillusioned. Coolidge, the "principle" of the subterranean messages between Daugherty's office and McLean, friend of Albert Fall, went to the republican convention with 95% of the delegates pledged to his candidacy. McAdoo, of the million-dollar oil fee, went to the democratic convention the strongest contender, with about half of the delegates pledged to him. A few public men were dismissed from office, but in the main, and in the case of all the higher-ups of real significance, they boldly and brazenly held to their lines. By common agreement of both the republican and democratic parties, the graft investigations suddenly cooled down. New revelations there are none, for the word has been passed that the stability of our "democratic institutions" are being undermined, the "faith of the people" in their capitalist government is being shattered, and the whip of bi-partisan discipline, wielded by the men who pay the bills of both parties, has cracked in a most effective manner. The graft disclosures will not be used as the great weapon in the struggle between the democratic and republican job-holders. The only ones who will revive the memories of Teapot Dome and the associated scandals of graft and corruption in all their ramifications and who will interpret the lessons of this capitalistic orgy of a government that represents the interests of the "best people", the ruling class of America, will be the Communists.

Platforms of the Parties.

Between the democratic and republican platforms there is no vital difference on any point. The dominant Wall Street bankers have taken good care that both parties stand this year for essentially the same things. In foreign affairs, both platforms are in actuality based upon the Dawes report; their domestic policies follow the same lines. The democrats favour entering the League of Nations, but propose to refer it to a popular vote and meanwhile to "participate helpfully" in the affairs of Europe. The republicans favour immediate entrance into the world court. The practical working of either policy would be participation in Europe on the basis of the Morgan plan, the Dawes report, for the hegemony of American capital.

Only in the platform of the Farmer-Labour Party do we find a clear-cut statement of policy at all, either domestic or

foreign. The nature of the capitalist parties pronouncements, their black reactionary character, can be best understood by comparing them on a few most vital points with the declarations of the Farmer-Labour Party.

Class Nature of Parties.

The Farmer-Labour Party is frankly and explicitly a class party. The opening statement of its platform says that its purpose is:

"To organise a political party representing the interests of the industrial workers and farmers, and to enter the political arena, to wrest control of the government from the hands of the financial and industrial masters who now rule this country. The Farmer-Labour Party frankly avows its purpose to carry on such a struggle. It declares openly that it is the Party representing the workers in the mines, mills, factories, and workshops, the workers upon the land, and the working farmers. It declares its purpose to take over the government in the interests of these groups..."

The capitalist parties have not, of course, made any statements of the class interests they represent. This oversight on their part, however, may be overcome by glancing at their platforms which consist almost entirely in dealing with the problems of the capitalist class.

Both republican and democratic parties are essentially alike, both represent imperialism and capitalist exploitations in its worst forms. The Farmer-Labour Party presents a clear-cut revolt against capitalist government, against capitalist exploitation, a recognition of the necessity of a class party to capture political power away from the capitalist class, and the determination to use the power of workers' and farmers' government to destroy the capitalist system and institute a proletarian order.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Bad Harvest in the Soviet Union and our Tasks.

By G. Zinoviev.

The bourgeois and social democratic press is spreading lying rumours regarding an alleged famine catastrophe in the Soviet Union. The following article which Comrade Zinoviev has published in the "Pravda" setting forth the means for combatting the crop failure, gives the true state of affairs and must therefore be made accessible to at least all active communists as material for combatting the bourgeois and social democratic campaign of lies.

Moscow, 30th. July 1924. Agitprop of the C. I.

The gross figures for this year's harvest will probably amount to not much under 2600 million pud, in other words: they will not be much behind those of the previous year's harvest. Nevertheless, it is already evident that the failure of the crops this year has affected a number of provinces more seriously than was at first thought to be the case.

Agriculture has for a long time formed the basis of the whole of our economy. Hence the recent crop failure means a severe blow to the whole economic organism of the Soviet Union. The purchasing power of the peasantry, taken as a whole, will (in view of the increased price of corn and the abolition of the shears etc.) this year probably be not less than in the previous year. It is therefore very harmful, and in any case too premature, to speak of any reduction of the plans of production of our state industry.

There is no doubt however that the rate of economic revival this year will not correspond with our earlier expectations. The workers must cherish no illusions in this respect. This year we must proceed with special caution in regard to raising wages, if we do not wish to bring back the famous "shears" and perhaps also encounter political difficulties with the peasantry.

The bad harvest of the year 1924 confronts us with many new difficulties. Before all the proletariat of our Union, the basis and the support of the soviet power, must recognise this fact.

Doubtless the catastrophe is not of the same extent as the catastrophe of 1921. It also cannot be denied that since that time we have greatly increased in economic strength. In fact we have every reason to laugh at the new hopes aroused among the

foreign white guardists. We shall undoubtedly be able to tackle the new difficulties.

We have, however, no reason either to remain idle and inactive or to indulge in self-deception. Before all we must not lose sight of the following danger: that it is possible the bad harvest of this year has not yet reached its lowest point, and that it is not bound to be followed by a good harvest next year.

That is not the worst prospect. What if this year's bad harvest is only the forerunner of a still worse harvest next year or if the present year is followed in turn by a good, a bad and a disastrous harvest? And this is not out of the question.

We talk a good deal of our alliance with the peasantry. Now is the time to realise this alliance through a task which touches the peasants very closely. A friend in need is a friend indeed. The peasantry needs our help precisely now when a relatively little help can rescue whole sections of the peasantry from ruin.

The present tasks must not be compared with those tasks which confronted us in 1921. At that time it was simply a question of saving life, hundreds of thousands of peasants abandoned the stricken areas and fled to wherever they could. At that time it was not the case of saving the economy.

The present misfortune is not so great; it is precisely economic help which is wanted at present.

Everything has its good side. Our Party has not up to now a sufficient point of support in the village, it is far too much a party of the town. During the last few years its connections with the peasantry have become stronger than they were formerly, but they are not yet so strong as is to be desired. Now we have arrived at a situation in which the Party can, and therefore must, practically and effectively improve its connections with the peasantry.

The Party must now show the peasants, not with words but by deeds, that it is supporting them in every possible way. The state organs which are under the leadership of the party must prove to the peasants by deeds that the workers and peasants' state, during the time of need, hastened to help agriculture with all the means at its disposal.

We have already adopted serious measures with regard to providing seed; we must increase our efforts in this direction.

The measures which the government commission, over which comrade Rykov presides, has adopted must be brought to the knowledge of the peasants.

The granting of agricultural credits is now, in view of the failure of crops, assuming greater importance. The same applies to the agricultural co-operatives and still more to every kind of agronomic help and propaganda.

The Parties of the Soviet Union must not restrict themselves to providing mere occasional assistance. They must now come forward with a comprehensive plan which shall embrace the whole state in order to secure our agriculture against the repetition of such bad harvests. In order to combat the consequences of the drought, a large scale programme, extending over 10 years, for the improvement of the soil has been worked out. This plan is more or less clearly set forth in the pamphlet of Prof. Kostjakov and in the article of comrade Krishanovsky. There is no doubt that the central authorities will carry out this sort of work with the greatest energy.

It is necessary that our organisations in the provinces shall understand how to render the idea of improving the soil accessible to the great masses of the peasants. The millions of working peasants must realise that the Party and its Soviet State are hastening to the assistance of the peasants' economy, and have undertaken extensive works, which can only be successful if we arouse the interest of the peasant masses themselves for the same. It is necessary that the peasants in the remote villages of the Volga districts, of the South West, of the Ukraine etc. realise that the Bolsheviks have undertaken work which will extend over years in order to irrigate the districts threatened by drought and to insure the peasantry against repetition of bad harvests. The workers of the largest centres must take under their patronage the districts most greatly affected by the drought. The workers organisations of the whole Soviet Union — especially those of the capitals and other centres — must show real interest for the plans for improving the soil, and support these works in the same measure as they have formerly supported the war industry upon which depended the fate of the civil war.

In addition to our People's Commissariat for agriculture, the other People's Commissariats must bestir themselves and adapt the whole of their work to the situation among the peasants.

For example: the fight against the malaria. No less than half a million peasants suffer from this plague. How greatly would they appreciate real help in their fight against malaria.

What has the people's commissariat for education to do? For a long time we have been endeavouring to devote the greater portion of our attention to the village school and to bring about a change in the compensation of the leading functionaries of a number of People's Commissariats in the direction of bringing peasants in.

Some time past many of our organisations, as for example the recent congress of our Youth League, have paid greater attention to the village. This of course does not only refer to organisations which are situated in the agricultural districts, but also to the capitals and other big proletarian centres.

"We have such and such a number of model institutions in this or that town" reports this or the other authority. To this our Party must answer: "Yes, but what have you done for the village? Pay attention to the village, think of the peasantry. We are a land of workers and peasants."

The road of the proletarian revolution is not strewn with roses. New difficulties are unavoidable in the course of the complete economic reconstruction of the country. These difficulties are only to be overcome and we shall only be able to surmount all emergencies, if we succeed this time in rousing the millions of workers who follow our Party to organised work.

The working class and the peasantry of our republics are knit together by indissoluble bonds. During the whole revolution the working class of our country exercised a powerful influence upon the peasantry. We must not forget however that during the past seven years we have sometimes seen the contrary: the mood of the peasantry penetrated by a thousand ways into the circles of city workers and found an echo in the factories and workshops, and on more than one occasion created very serious political difficulties. This will also be the case now if the Party and the working class does not put forward all its forces.

We have not the least doubt that the vanguard of the workers of the whole Soviet Union will, under the leadership of our Party, do everything to organise help and adopt an economic initiative from the town to the country: in which case we need fear no enemy. The economic reconstruction of the country will proceed faster every year, especially the reconstruction of agriculture. We will then carry out with iron energy the large scale plans for improving the soil, which will insure a satisfactory harvest under all circumstances, and the working masses of our Union will not again and again be troubled with the question, what will the next year bring us.

Forth to the work! The tasks of our work among the peasantry have increased many times. We must at all costs be up to these tasks.

IN THE R. I. L. U.

The Results of the III. Congress of the R. I. L. U.

By A. Lozovsky.

The III. Congress of the R. I. L. U. laid down the tasks of the Trade Union movement, worked out the means and methods of the struggle for the Eight Hour Day, adopted decisions over the further struggle for the Factory Councils and defined the limits for the further activity of the International Propaganda Committees. The Congress pronounced itself in favour of dissolving these Propaganda Committees in the event of the unity of the various Professional Internationals being realised. Further, the Congress discussed the tasks of the followers of the R. I. L. U. in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, it considered in detail the question of strike strategy and the mutual relations between the agricultural workers and the international peasants' council. These were drawn up for the revolutionary trade unions in regard to their relations to the co-operatives, and a whole series of organisational tasks of a practical character laid down. Besides this the Congress adopted special decisions regarding work among the women and the youth, and with regard to the attitude of the trade unions to the workers' sport movement, laid special emphasis upon the necessity of work among the emigrants and issued directions for conducting the struggle against fascism.

The Congress accomplished an important task in giving its judgment upon the situation in the various countries. The Congress adopted a detailed program of action for the followers of the R. I. L. U. in the United States and in Canada. A series of questions have been solved regarding our future work in Spain, in Latin America, in Holland, in the Balkans, in Scandinavia and in Belgium. The Congress devoted great attention to the task of the followers of the R. I. L. U. in England. Here we have a very unique situation: the old traditional English trade union movement is in a state of great fermentation, as a result of which this movement is assuming the form of a left wing. Within this left wing itself there are several tendencies: the most definite of which is the minority movement, which accepts the platform of the Profintern. In view of the ferment prevailing in the whole labour movement in England we were compelled to specify the future tasks in England and the relations of the followers of the R. I. L. U. towards the as yet indefinite and undecided left wing, which however reflects a profound fermentation within the English working masses. For Czecho-Slovakia, where the revolutionary trade unions work separately from the reformist organisations, we had to arrive at decisions over the form of organisation: industrial unions or one big union with sections according to industry. The Czecho-Slovakian labour movement, which is rent by national, political and religious antagonisms, has reacted upon the workers, who are endeavouring to create one big union. The Congress had to correct the exaggerated schematism of a one big union and to point out to the Czecho-Slovakian comrades that such a form of organisation, at the present stage of the development of the labour movement, can retard the process of winning the majority of the working class by the Communists.

Without doubt the central point of the deliberations of the Congress was the question of establishing the national and international unity of the trade union movement. The Congress of the Comintern had already declared that it is necessary to continue the struggle for capturing the trade unions. The III. Congress of the R. I. L. U. again emphasised the old policy, according to which the struggle for unity is not only to be conducted in those countries where the movement has not yet been split, but particularly in those countries where it has already been split, as in France, Czecho-Slovakia etc. Here the struggle for unity has been rendered extremely difficult owing to the fact that in the best cases the reformists claim a legitimate position by declaring: "We are the rightful workers' organisations, every one should join us". When we take into consideration that in France the revolutionary Confederation (C. G. T. U.) has more members than the reformist, then the absurdity of such a proposal becomes clear. The followers of the R. I. L. U. reply to this proposal in the following manner: "We will convene a congress upon the basis of proportional representation of the members of the two parallel organisations. Whoever has the majority will also have the power. The minority shall submit to discipline in the fight against the bourgeoisie and retain freedom of agitation for its political ends. The reformists have up to the present rejected such a solution of the question which is based upon the principle of proletarian democracy. The III. Congress of the R. I. L. U. emphasised the necessity of continuing the struggle for restoring the national unity of the trade union movement.

The Congress however did not restrict itself to these tasks, it proceeded further and indicated as a particular every-day task: **The struggle for unity of the international trade union movement.** We have never denied that the existence of two Internationals weakens the fighting capacity of the proletariat, as a divided trade union movement can never exercise sufficient tenacity in the struggle against the capitalist offensive. The Congress of the R. I. L. U. had to consider the decision of the Vienna Congress of the Amsterdam International, which expresses the wish to include the Russian trade unions in the Amsterdamer International, provided that the dignity (?) of the Amsterdam International is preserved, and subject to the condition that the Russian Unions recognise the statutes and regulations of this International. Precisely during the discussion of the question of the unity of the International Trade Union Movement, the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions received a letter, in which the "dignity" and the unconditional recognition of the statutes were again emphasised and which stated, that they — the Amsterdamers — are prepared to meet a Russian delegation consisting of five members. The leaders of the Amsterdam Inter-

national are very strange people with their "dignity" and with their statutes and programmes. They propose negotiations with the Russian Unions, but demand beforehand the recognition of their regulations and statutes without understanding or at least indicating that they understand, that negotiations are usually carried on for the purpose of drawing up new regulations, and not for the purpose of recognising statutes and programme, in the drawing up of which the All-Russian Trade Union Council had no part whatever. The right wing of the Amsterdam International is carrying out a manoeuvre — in fact a very bad manoeuvre.

The III. Congress of the R. I. L. U., instead of wasting its time over vague and meaningless formulas regarding "dignity", faced the question of uniting the two Internationals by means of convening an International Unity Congress on the basis of proportional representation. The III. Congress, right from the first moment, perceived quite clearly that most bitter struggles will have to be waged in order to solve this problem. The revolutionary workers of all countries, who propose the unity of the two internationals, are sincerely desirous of re-establishing the unity of the international trade union movement. Here however we encounter the resistance of the reformists with their "dignity". The Amsterdamers are in the habit of saying that they are the "only" organisation and that they have the "overwhelming" majority of the workers. Assuming this be the case, what have they to lose if it should come to an International Unity Congress? They would obtain the majority and control the new International. If we found ourselves in the minority, we would observe discipline and continue to struggle for our ideas. One would think that the Amsterdamers, if they are so firmly convinced of their overwhelming majority, would gladly collaborate in the unity Congress. But we have heard nothing of this. All signs indicate that the reformists will reply to our sincere proposal to set up the unity of the whole international trade union movement by evading the question and, instead of bringing forward definite arguments, will stand on their "dignity". What would the rejection of the congress, which we honestly and sincerely propose for the purpose of uniting both internationals, mean? In any case it would mean that they are not so very sure of their majority after all; that they do not trust their own forces. We believe that many workers will be found in the Amsterdam International who grasp the exceedingly great historical importance of the setting up of a real unity in the international trade union movement. They will perceive this and bring appropriate pressure to bear upon their leaders.

The III. Congress of the R. I. L. U. has openly raised the question of the unity of the whole international trade union movement before ten million workers. That is undoubtedly a great gain. At this Congress the revolutionary trade union movement of all countries made a fresh step forwards on the way to uniting and rallying all forces for the organising of the social revolution. At the congress a report was submitted on the conference of the transport workers of the Pacific, which was held in Canton. This constitutes a proof of the gigantic organisational force and power of expansion of the Profintern. We still have much to achieve in the revolutionary trade union movement, but the greater the number of tasks confronting us, the greater the energy and self-sacrifice which the revolutionary workers of all countries will devote to the work.

The work of the III congress of the Profintern kept to the communist path, as there is and can be no other path for the revolutionary trade union movement than the communist path.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The VII. Conference of the Balkan Communist Federation.

By G. Dimitrov.

The Balkan Communist Federation, which was originally founded in 1910 as the Balkan Social Democratic Federation and which consists of the Communist parties of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Greece, has just held its VII. Conference in Moscow.

The VI. Conference had declared the fundamental tasks of the Communist parties of the Balkan countries and laid down their line of tactics, especially in regard to the national and the peasant question — the two chief problems of every policy in the

Balkans. The VII. Conference had to analyze the present political situation in the Balkan countries and, as a result of this analysis, to lay down the special and general tasks of the Communist Parties in these countries and to indicate the means and methods for the successful carrying out of these tasks.

The Communist Balkan Conference declared in the first place that the danger of war in the Balkans, as a result of the acute national antagonisms and conflicts as well as in consequence of the contrary interests of the imperialist powers (France, England and Italy), is an imminent one and pledged the Communist Parties to mobilise all the forces of the working and peasant masses in order to avert this danger.

The Conference further declared that the position in the Balkans is not only revolutionary, but that the revolutionary crisis is reaching its acutest stage; that Bulgaria stands immediately in front of a fresh civil war, as the struggle of the Bulgarian working people against the bourgeois-fascist regime and for the workers and peasants' government being deprived of all legal possibilities, can break out at any moment in an open armed revolt; that the struggle in Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia and Macedonia, and especially the fight of the Croatian peasant masses against the hegemony of the Serbian bourgeoisie and against Serbian militarism, is developing in the direction of an armed rising; that the national movement of the Macedonian people is again reviving and assuming the form of an armed struggle; that Bessarabia, Transsylvania, Bukovina, Dobrusha and Thrace are in a state of ferment, as they are striving for national freedom and independence; that the national struggles in the Balkans are closely bound up with and involved in the peasants' question and the struggle of the peasant masses for land and political liberties. In the face of all these questions, the Balkan Conference emphasised the fact that every individual struggle in the Balkans bears at the same time a general Balkan character, and that victory can only be assured in connection with the Balkan questions as a whole, that means, by the setting up of the revolutionary united front of the workers and peasants of the Balkans.

The Conference pledged the Communist Parties of the Balkans to co-ordinate their actions and struggles, to render the fullest support to the national revolutionary movements and to sever them finally from the influence of and dependence upon the bourgeoisie and of the imperialists and to unite them with the general struggle of the working masses against capitalism and imperialism for the rule of the workers and peasants, while at the same time they have to hinder in every possible way all counter-revolutionary intervention against any armed revolts in Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia or anywhere else in the Balkans.

In order to insure the success of the approaching decisive struggles in the Balkans, the Conference pointed out the necessity to maintain close relations between the Balkan Federation and the Communist Parties of France, England and Italy — the imperialist states which conduct a policy of conquest towards the Balkans — as well as with the Communist Party of Russia, which conducts the policy of the Soviet Union — the only state, which consistently supports all suppressed peoples.

The Communist Balkan Conference has also discussed very thoroughly the inner situation and the activity of the individual Communist Parties of the Balkan countries. It condemned in a most decided manner the right and liquidatory deviations of many leaders and groups in these parties, and especially the opportunist standpoint of comrades Sima Marcovitch and J. Milanovitch in the Yugoslavian Communist Party regarding the national questions, which they regard merely as an ordinary constitutional question. The Conference condemned the attempt of the comrades who had resigned from the C. P. of Greece to form another C. P. and directed an appeal to all sincere revolutionary elements in Greece to rally to the ranks of the C. P. of Greece.

The Conference adopted a number of decisions regarding the organisational and political consolidation of the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries, as well as regarding the practical carrying out of the decisions of the V. World Congress of the C. I. in the Balkans.

Regarding the question of extending the composition of the Balkan Federation by including the Communist Parties of Turkey, Austria and Hungary, the Conference laid stress upon the present situation, i. e. that the Federation must only comprise the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries, which have to solve the general Balkan tasks against capitalism and imperialism.

that is to say: Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece and Albania (as soon as a Communist Party has been formed in the last country). The Communist Party of Turkey, only a small part of which is in the Balkans, can participate with an advisory vote in the work of the Federation; the Federation must come into close contact with the Communist Parties of the countries adjoining the Balkans.

The Conference adopted a special resolution regarding the organisation of Red Relief in the Balkans, as well as a letter of thanks to the International Red Relief for the liberal material and moral support provided for the victims of the white terror in the Balkan countries. After acceptance of two protests: 1. against the terror and the murdering of proletarians in Bulgaria (especially against the murdering of the peasant member of parliament, Petkov) and 2. against the new persecutions of the Independent Workers' Party and the Trade Unions of Yugoslavia and the Communist Party of Roumania, the VII. Communist Balkan Conference was concluded with full unanimity and readiness for more energetic work and struggle against capitalism and imperialism in the Balkans, for the national and social emancipation of the Balkan peoples and for their linking together in a free union of workers and peasants Republics in the Balkans.

OUR PROBLEMS

Our Attitude to the Peasants' Political Organisations in the Capitalist Countries.

By T. Dombal.

If we assume that we are in the period of the further decay of capitalism and of the development of the proletarian revolution on an international scale, and that we are on the eve of the fight for the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a number of countries, then we are bound to recognise that the question of winning over the majority of the peasants is one of the most urgent tasks for the proletariat. This applies specially to those Communist parties who are likely in the near future to have to conduct the fight for power. It follows therefore that the Communist Parties, as the advance-guard of the proletariat and as leader of the social revolution, must render all possible aid to the working peasants in their struggle against oppression and exploitation, in order to become their leaders. Of course this does not mean that we must support every peasant movement whatever, but only those movements and aspirations of the peasants which, either directly or indirectly, are of service to the emancipatory struggle of the proletariat and facilitate the proletarian revolution. The Communist parties can and must support all demands and efforts of the peasants which help to transform the peasants from being the reserves and allies of the bourgeoisie into the reserves and allies of the working class, or which at least will neutralise certain sections of the peasantry during the period of the fight of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the capture of power.

A characteristic phenomenon of the present period is the fact of the independent elementary breaking away in a number of countries of ever larger portions of the peasantry from the influence of the bourgeoisie, the more or less definite approach of the peasants to the side of the proletariat, as being the driving force capable of realising the demands of the peasants and of leading society to future peaceful development. The passing dreams and illusions that the peasants could play an independent leading political role are now — chiefly as a result of the severe defeat of the peasant dictatorship of Stambulieki in Bulgaria and after the futile attempts of political peasants' organisations in a number of countries — being more and more dispelled in favour of a clear orientation of the peasantry towards the working class as the only leader which can annihilate the root cause of suppression and exploitation. The Russian revolution, which is becoming more and more a popular example among the broad masses of the peasantry in the capitalist countries, is a proof of this.

The transformation of the working peasants from a reserve of the bourgeoisie into a reserve of the proletariat finds expres-

sion in the fact that the peasants are forming their own organisations of an outspoken political character. The political activity of the peasant masses is becoming continually stronger. This is a fact with which we must reckon, for it shows that the bourgeoisie is losing one of its strongholds, which is based on the political passivity of the peasant masses. Hence this fact is a sign of the decay of the power of the bourgeoisie and this is all the more welcome as an ever greater number of peasants' organisations are endeavouring to approach the revolutionary organisations of the working class. It would be a mistake to try to stem this movement or to restrict it to the sphere of economic organisations as this would mean adopting a passive attitude, as the Second International has done, towards the peasant question. On the other hand, to strengthen this movement, to take up the organisatory initiative for facilitating this coming over of the working peasant masses to the side of the proletariat, is one of the most important tasks of the Communist parties and of the Peasants' International.

Phenomena are to be observed in the capitalist countries which to a certain degree resemble those which appeared in Russia during the period from 1905 to the February revolution in 1917 and in the period from the February revolution to the October revolution of 1917, with the only difference that things are now proceeding at a more rapid rate.

The first phase was the disappointment of the peasants with the agrarian reform (period of Stolypin reaction) and the coming over of the peasantry from the liberal and petty bourgeoisie into the camp of the pseudo-revolutionary party of the S. R., a party consisting mostly of peasants and filled with illusions regarding the independent role of the peasantry (of the "people") as an independent political factor. (Left development of the peasantry.) The second phase is the coming over of the peasantry to the Bolshevik party.

Bearing in mind on the one hand that we must not permit the Communist parties to be in any way weakened by the entrance of outside ideological elements, as even the poor peasant masses are, and on the other hand that it will not do to leave the endeavours of the peasants in the hands of counter-revolutionary bourgeois elements, we come to the unavoidable conclusion that a definite organisatory activity of the Communist parties among the peasants is necessary.

It is impossible to rely merely on the elementary movement of the peasants masses. Those who do so must call to mind what Lenin wrote in his pamphlet "What is to be done?" on the so-called theory of "Chwostism" (hangers-on). Lenin states, that the theory of elementariness appears as a theory of the substitution of the role of the conscious elements in the movement, and that this ideology of "Chwostism" is a logical foundation for every kind of opportunism which refuses to give a conscious systematic character to an elementary movement. To rely upon the elementariness of the peasant masses and remain indifferent towards them at the moment of the outbreak of the revolution is nothing else but opportunism and the denial of the role of the working peasants as the allies of the working class in the proletarian revolution. We must therefore cautiously, but without vacillations, approach the peasants' movement and take into account the dangers as also the great advantage and the direction of our activity.

In our activity in the organisatory work in the villages, we must not for a moment forget that the only form of organisation of the peasant masses which we must set out for and establish where possible, are the soviets for the revolutionary struggle of the peasants along with the working class and under its leadership, and that other forms of organisations are only transition forms. In order to retain our leadership of these movements we must not reject other forms of organisation, provided they help us to realise our ultimate aim.

The most important condition and our most urgent task appears to be to render this or that transitory form of peasants' organisation into a revolutionary ally of the working class, and not only to secure its ideological leadership, but also the actual leadership in order to create the foundation for an economic peasants' organisation on a co-operative basis and at the same time to convert them into Soviets. Simultaneously we must not refuse to make use of all the peasants' organisations where they prove to be useful or necessary in the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.