

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 62

6th August 1925

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

## C O N T E N T S

Dutt: The Capitalist Offensive in Britain.

Against the War in Morocco

The Conference of Communist Youth Leagues of Europe to the Communist Youth of France.

Hands off China

Chen: Shanghai Organisation for Shanghai Relief.

Workers' Delegations in the Soviet Union

Declaration of the Swedish Workers' Delegation.

Against the Attacks on the Soviet Union

Jacquemotte: Vandervelde as the Accomplice of Capitalism.

Politics

Allison: Imperialism and the British Labour Movement.

Economics

M. S.: Evacuation of the Ruhr — Crisis in the Ruhr.

The Labour Movement

Bond: The Special British Trade Union Congress.  
The Struggle of the German Building Workers.

In the International

Resolution passed by the Tenth Party Congress of the CP. of Germany on the Work of the Communist International.

In the Camp of Our Enemies

Bukharin: The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky, its Apostle. I. and II.

Obituary

Emil Eichhorn.

Boross: John Lékai (John Lasson).

## The Capitalist Offensive in Britain.

By R. Palme Dutt (London)

The British Government having promised to compensate the Coalowners for their "losses" resulting from their renouncement of the reduction of the miners' wages, has by this measure only succeeded in postponing an inevitable struggle. This struggle is all the more inevitable, as it is closely connected with a general capitalist offensive in Britain.

The new capitalist offensive against the workers is the heaviest in British working class history, heavier even than the historic offensive of 1921.

The attack reflects the crisis of British Capitalism in the present world conditions. Exports — the whole basis of British capitalist economy — have fallen over a long period to 75 % of the pre-war volume, at a time when those of France have risen to 106 %, those of the United States to 120 %, those of Germany are bound to be heavily increased by the working of the Dawes Plan, and those of the extra-European new industrial countries have multiplied with extreme rapidity. The visible adverse balance of trade has risen with giant strides from £ 134 millions in 1913 to £ 212 millions in 1923, to £ 344 millions in 1924, and to £ 208 millions in the first six months of 1925. It is estimated that the figures of the last few months represent an actual adverse balance, i. e. a cessation of capitalist expansion and beginning of contraction.

To recover the pre-war position British Capitalism is turning to make the most desperate and extreme attacks upon the workers' conditions.

But this attack has to be made upon the already heavily lowered conditions of the British workers, and at a time when the workers were themselves preparing to demand to win back some of the lost ground.

The workers are already 20% below the standard of a quarter of a century ago (estimate of the Labour Research Department based on government figures). This fall is not evenly spread, but has fallen most heavily on the formerly best-paid skilled workers, above all the engineers and the miners, the backbone of the former "aristocracy of labour". This fact is the basis of the revolutionising of British Trade Unionism.

Already the workers have lost some £ 2000 millions in wage cuts since 1921. One million and a quarter are unemployed. Of the one million miners, over three hundred thousand are unemployed, and two thirds of the remainder are receiving under £ 2 a week. The most skilled engineers, when in full employment, are receiving an average of £ 2.15s a week. Of the railwaymen, 100,000 are receiving under £ 2.10s a week.

It is on top of these conditions that the declining British Capitalism is finding itself compelled by the world situation to deliver new and ever sharper attacks, obviously in the direction of completely rasing the old aristocracy of labour, and thus in fact driving the workers more and more towards mass unity and revolutionary consciousness.

Thus conditions on both sides drive towards a bitter and desperate struggle. 1921 came on the workers still under illusions and hopes of easy future victories. 1925 comes after four years of heavy depression and unemployment, after the disillusionment over the Labour Government, and in the midst of a dawning understanding of the new economic conditions which are facing the British workers.

The Class Struggle in Britain is reaching its most intense period.

### The Working Class Before The Offensive.

After the defeats of 1921 and 1922 the working class went through a heavy period of depression. It was only slowly during 1923 that signes of recovery began, and a renewal of the will to fight and win back some of the lost ground. By 1924 the process was rapid, and the Labour Government was a reflection of one stage of it. During the period of depression the Communist Party did heavy work, at first almost alone, throughout the trade union movement to re-arouse the fighting spirit of the workers; and the fruits of this were visible in the rapid growth of the Minority Movement, which was started in the summer of 1924, and the strong establishment of Communist influence despite small numbers, throughout every part of the trade union movement to-day.

By 1925 the workers in all the principal industries — in particular, the miners, the railwaymen and the engineers — had prepared or were preparing demands to endeavour to win back some of the lost ground. The Miners were demanding the recovery of the pre-war wage, plus the increase in the cost of living. The Railwaymen had prepared an All-Grades Programme. The Engineers were demanding an all round £ 1 a week increase.

All these demands were the outcome of campaigns from below, initiated in the first place by the Communist Party and the Minority Movement, and backed by agitations and mass meetings all over the country. On the other hand these demands, even after they had been forced through to official adoption, were accepted by the right wing official elements, particularly among the Engineers and Railwaymen, with obvious reluctance and disbelief. Fear of the economic situation had deeply permeated all the upper official elements, and instilled a widespread conviction that it was "impossible" to fight. In consequence no serious preparations were made.

The keystone of the Minority campaign was the absolute necessity of a united struggle. The various Industries putting in their particular demands should combine in a Bloc, presenting their demands as a bloc, to stand or fall together. Only by a rapid mass struggle could the weakness of the unfavourable economic situation, lack of funds etc., be overcome. The time had passed when a single Union or Industry could any longer count on winning a victory against the present concentrated forces of capitalism.

This slogan of a united struggle for a wage increase received unanimous and enthusiastic support at every workers' meeting; but it was not put into practice. The revolutionary movement was able by agitation to force the antiquated trade union machine to register the various sectional demands; but the united struggle which could alone give them meaning was more than it proved possible to secure in time against the existing obstacles. For this reason the initiative passed to the bourgeoisie.

The demands were put in, but they were put in without any combination or attempt at strategy; and separate negotiations were left to take their course.

Alone the Miners were in a different position. They could have no hope of a short struggle, and they had no funds to face a long one; the collapse of the exports trade left the owners well pleased to close the pits for a while; big stocks of coal were on hand. Thus the Miners were driven by necessity to the revolutionary course of approaching the other Unions in the engineering and transport industries for a united front. It is with the Miners that the Minority Movement is strongest: they have already secured over a year ago the election of their candidate, A. J. Cook, as Secretary; and they dominate the coalfields of South Wales, Scotland and Lancashire.

The Miners' initiative led to the long-drawn negotiations for a Workers' Alliance. These negotiations were protracted and secret; the project met with ill-concealed hostility from the right wing officials, and with lukewarm benevolence and scepticism from the centre. In the meantime the Miners were engaged in a "Joint Enquiry" with the Coalowners, which only served the purpose of Coalowners' propaganda; and the Railwaymen were entering on the first stages of their own negotiations with the railway companies.

Finally of June 4 the decisive meeting took place. A Conference of all Executive of the Unions concerned met to consider the projected Alliance. No report of this conference has been published; but the outcome was a vague resolution appointing a committee to consider the matter further. This result was welcomed as an advance by some of the elements friendly to an Alliance, including by Cook himself. On the other hand the Minority Movement roundly declared the outcome of this conference to be "the most serious setback and defeat since Black Friday".

It is certain that the failure of the June 4 Conference to reach any positive result was an important influence with the employers in determining the date of their offensive.

### The Launching of the Offensive.

The failure of the June 4 Conference to reach any positive result was decisive evidence to the employers that the workers were wholly unprepared for any effective attack. They waited for the first meeting of the Committee to make sure that no effective steps were being taken. Then on June 23 they delivered their counter-attack simultaneously on the Miners and the Railwaymen.

The capitalist attack concentrated on the two points of most vital importance for the export trade, and therefore for the recovery of Capitalism — Coal and Transport.

At the same time the Engineering employers had already intimated a counter-demand for an increase of hours. The Shippers announced a further cut of £ 1 a month from seamen's wages, which had been conceded as usual without question by the yellow Union of Havelock Wilson. A further attack was pending in the Textile industry.

The Coalowners' demands were for preferably a lengthening of hours. This would have, however, necessitated new legislation, as the Miners' 7 hour Day (actually 7½ hours from bank to bank) is established by the 1919 Act. Failing this, accordingly their demands were for a new Wage Agreement, which would abolish the last remnants of a National Minimum, make Profits, of 13% of proceeds after deduction of all costs (reckoned by the Owners) a first charge, leaving the 87% for wages, the actual rates to be settled by District negotiation. The effects of this programme would be roughly an average reduction of 10/- a week, and in the poorer districts a much heavier reduction. It would smash the Miners' Federation as a national negotiating body, throw the worst drops on the poorest districts, and reduce the miners to the level of the sweated agricultural labourers. Lancashire miners would drop from £ 2.7.10½ on a full week to £ 1.7.11½ (equal in pre-war money to 16/- a week), and Northumberland from £ 2.8.2 to £ 1.14.5½.

The Railway Companies' demands were for an all round 5% reduction in wages. The machinery of negotiation on the railways is long and complicated; and it was presumably calculated that the railwaymen would be still tied up in their separate negotiations, while the miners were being dealt with.

The staggering character of these demands shocked the whole working class movement into clearer recognition of the necessity for action. The mass of trade union opinion was strongly with the miners and insistently demanded a united front. It is significant that just at this time, during June and July, the two most important organs of non-official working class opinion, the London and Glasgow Trades Councils, affiliated to the Minority Movement. The General Council issued a manifesto of support to the miners, and declared:

"The General Council are confident they will have the backing of the whole organised trade union movement in placing themselves without qualification and unreservedly at the disposal of the miners' Federation to assist the Federation in any way possible."

A committee was appointed to execute this resolution and maintain contact with the miners. A Special Trades Union Congress, arising primarily out of the unemployment campaign,

but capable of extension to deal with the industrial crisis, was called for July 24. At the same time the Committee on the Workers' Alliance produced a draft constitution, which was received at a further Conference of Executives on July 17, and passed on for consideration to the constituent bodies. Cook in his speeches declared that "All is well" and that "the Alliance is rebuilt . . . This time there will not be a Black Friday. Even Jimmy Thomas and the railwaymen have recognised that we have got to stand together this time".

### British Capitalist Policy.

What is the aim of capitalist policy that governs the present offensive?

In relation to the working class movement it comes at a critical and even dangerous time from the point of view of capitalist interests. The new direction in which the British working class movement is travelling, the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Agreement, the rapid differentiation of left and right, the appearance of powerful open forces of class struggle in the Minority Movement, the rapid inclination of leading trade union elements under pressure of these forces and of events towards directions of a revolutionary character — all this new situation causes very evident serious concern to the bourgeoisie. But nothing could more rapidly and powerfully confirm the influence of revolutionary trade unionism (whatever the issue of events), and drive home the revolutionary lessons of class struggle and class unity, than the present offensive in relation to the present temper of the worker. This has already been shown even in the opening stage by the by-election in the mining constituency of the Forest of Dean, where Purcell was elected by an almost threefold increased majority in place of the former right wing labour representative, Wignall.

The offensive is politically injurious to the bourgeoisie in the extreme. Nevertheless they are driven to it by conditions which they are unable to control. But it is necessary to have a clear idea what these conditions are.

The common capitalist propaganda speaks of the "bankruptcy" of British industry. The Coalowners solemnly swear that they have made "not a penny of profit" during the past twelvemonths. Sir Allan Smith, leader of the Engineering employers, announces that the nation is faced with "bankruptcy" and that the point has approached of beginning to "live on our national capital". Sir Alfred Mond, one of the wealthiest industrialists in the country and closely associated with Lloyd George, declared at a meeting of his own company (which incidentally declared a very fat dividend) that "there were many industries tottering towards disaster". Mr. Lloyd George himself has made the main burden of his recent speeches the menace of "national bankruptcy". The Chancellor of the Exchequer has spoken dramatically of the threat of starvation, and affirmed that "we have got, whether we like it or not, to get the costs of production down".

Taken literally, all this talk is misleading rubbish and humbug. Profits are in the aggregate higher than they have ever been before. The Coalowners made last year in fact £ 14 millions clear profit, after the payment of over £ 6 millions in royalties to the landlords. The average Dividend on the Ordinary Shares of 1400 Companies, according to the "Economist's" figures, has risen from 8.6% in 1922 to 9% in 1923, to 9.5% in 1924, and to 10.5% in the first quarter of 1925. The Net Profits have risen from £ 80 millions in 1922 to £ 115 millions in 1923, and £ 135 millions in 1924. This does not look much like "bankruptcy". Present profits could easily stand an increase in wages.

In addition the incomes of the capitalist class from the National Debt, the ownership of land, and other charges payable out of production, as well as from foreign investments, are higher than ever. The National Debt is eleven times pre-war, and three hundred and fifty millions is paid on it yearly. The return to the Gold Standard has by a stroke multiplied the value of these holdings, and in effect raised the rate of interest. "Interest on the National Debt must be met", declares a recent Memorandum of the Association of British Chambers of Commerce, calling for a drastic annihilation of practically all State expenditure save on the Debt and on "defence". Incomes from the "Occupation of Land and Houses", according to the Budget returns, have risen from £ 290 millions in 1919-1920 to £ 311 millions in 1922-1923, and £ 358 millions in 1923-1924. Incomes from Foreign Investments have risen, according to the Board of Trade estimate, from £ 150 millions in 1923 to £ 220 millions in 1924.

Thus the "ruined" British industry is still able to furnish very fat returns to the bourgeoisie.

Nevertheless there is a real meaning behind the talk of "bankruptcy", and a real force which drives inevitably to the present offensive.

The fear is not yet the fear of "bankruptcy" or "starvation". But it is the fear of the loss of that predominant position in the world market and in world finance which is the necessary basis of British Imperialism.

The situation is set out very clearly in a Memorandum of the Federation of British Industries. This Memorandum (which has been prepared by the technical staff and is published only as under discussion) analyses with unusual directness the process of Finance Capital and Imperialism. It sets out in the first place the basis of the pre-war position:

"The prosperity of British industry before the war primarily depended on a continuously expanding foreign trade rendered possible by the continuous investment on a large scale of British Capital for the purpose of developing hitherto undeveloped lands."

On this basis of Imperialist expansion was built up the gigantic structure of the exporting industries to the deliberate starving of home development.

"In 1914 Capital and Labour had moved continuously into the great exporting industries rather than into the industries which worked for the home market, and even in those industries which worked for both markets, the tendency had been for a steady development in the relative importance of the exporting branch to the 'home' branch."

These conditions were found to be

„the only conditions in which British industry as at present organised, can prosper”.

The question now is, the Memorandum continues: Whether, with the increase of world productivity and new exporting countries (actually the inevitable result of the process of expansion, through this is not mentioned), it will be any longer possible to win back these conditions. It is of course obvious that the British proportion relatively to the world proportion must inevitably diminish. Such a diminution can only be artificially staved off for a short time by the most drastic cutting of costs in every direction — which is what the Memorandum in fact recommends.

But such a diminution means the collapse of the whole structure.

The only alternative is correctly stated by the Memorandum to be Home Development. "Should steps be taken to stimulate Home Development?" This, however, is of course — though the Memorandum does not say it — the final defeat of Capitalist Expansion and the collapse of the Empire.

Thus the central position is clear. The continuance of the Empire structure depends on the continual provision of fresh supplies of capital foreign investment. If this dwindles, the Colonies drop off and pass elsewhere (the Australian \$ 100 millions loan from New York now under negotiation is an ominous new sign). On this basis is built up the vastly inflated structure of exporting industries, to the exclusion of vital home needs such as housing. But the intensification of world competition, itself the result of this expansion, inevitably reacts unfavourably on the home industries for export. Any decline in these, however, means at once a decline in accumulation for new investment. At once British Imperialism finds itself in vital danger, unless the exporting industries can drive down costs i. e. wages, to such a level as to provide a rapid accumulation to recover the position.

It is the decline of new investment abroad that is the danger signal of the position and gives rise to the extreme panic. The Board of Trade estimates the balance on the trade figures representing capital for new investment abroad as £ 181 millions in 1913, £ 154 millions in 1922, £ 102 millions in 1923, £ 29 millions in 1924 and in 1925 zero. These figures, if not checked, represent the end of the British Empire and the speedy separation of the colonies, and therewith the destruction of the basis of British capitalist industry at home.

The only possible course for British Capitalism is to endeavour to drive down costs in the exporting industries and build up rapid accumulation. This of course means in fact only to intensify world competition, and can be in reality no solution.

But a successful offensive can bring a temporary short-lived recovery.

The Times City Editor expresses the calculation very clearly in his comment on the Australian New York loan (which was agreed to by the British Government on the ground that "it was not likely that sufficient money would be available in London to meet Australia's requirements"):

**"When our export industries are at last placed upon a competitive basis, and we acquire thereby a larger surplus available for investment abroad, we shall of course as in the past be able to finance all the requirements of the Empire"** ("Times", 9. 7. 25.)

Here in a sentence is expressed the basis of the present Capitalist Offensive.

### Prospects.

How far are the British workers awakening to the prospects in front of them?

Of the readiness and determination of the mass of the workers to resist to the uttermost any new attack upon their standards there is abundant evidence. Herbert Smith, the President of the Miners, recently said (as far back as May):

"If a referendum were taken in Great Britain of the workers in the mining and engineering industries there is no question that the men would decide on a general strike."

The situation has strengthened since then, and particularly by the delivery of the capitalist attack. The London Railwaymen held a monster demonstration under the slogan "Fight Now! To Hell with Wage Reductions!" The affiliation of the London and Glasgow Trades Councils to the Minority Movement has already been mentioned. The spirit of the fight is strongly present.

But the conscious understanding of the new conditions, the understanding of the Imperialist issue and its revolutionary significance for the Britain workers, that they can no longer win concessions on the old lines from Capitalism, but must advance against Capitalism, this can only be given by the Communist Party leadership and is of supreme importance to bring into the present fight.

The Labour Party Right Wing is travelling more and more rapidly away from the class struggle, as the class struggle becomes more acute. It is significant that the Labour Executive has just issued a new "Programme of National Reconstruction and Reform" which completely drops Nationalisation and throws the Capital Levy overboard. The Labour Party Executive has further summoned an Empire Labour Conference on openly Imperialist lines. During the recent Anglo-Soviet crisis MacDonald gave open assistance to Chamberlain: and it was the Trade Union General Council alone that voiced the working class opposition to the Government's plans.

The "left" elements in the Labour Party leadership have become seriously compromised with Imperialism by their vote along with Thomas in support of the Government on the question of Imperial Preference, and by their subsequent defence of that vote and of the policy of "cementing the Empire".

The Independent Labour Party has given itself over to a campaign for Industrial Peace under the form of calling for a Parliamentary Commission for a Minimum Wage. It has conducted the most active hostility to the Minority campaign and to any form of united struggle.

The Trade Union Right leaders have concentrated on the contention that "we cannot fight" and that the economic situation compels "sacrifices all round".

On the other hand the Left Trade Union leaders have been forced forward by their position and by the progress of events. The economic crisis sets forcibly before them question after question, to which there is only one possible answer. International Unity; Class Unity at home; Anti-Imperialism; Revolution and the Control of Industry — all these issues become one after another forced upon them by international wage-cutting, the attack on wages and hours at home, colonial super-exploitation, and the destruction of the British industrial monopoly. Thus the Left Trade Union leaders occupy at present the position, not only of the leaders of the workers in the immediate crisis, but also of the spokesmen of the working class elements in the Labour Party — it might almost be said, an alternative political leadership. This was shown clearly in the recent Anglo-Soviet crisis and the China crisis. This is a temporary anomaly until

the political issues are cleared: but in the present stage the language of the Left Trade Union leaders is the closest indication of the advance of the British working class to Revolution.

One or two quotations from recent speeches of the Chairman of the Trade Union General Council A. B. Swales may serve to illustrate the wider effects of the economic crisis upon current working class thought:

"The time is approaching when the workers will have to take over the land and control the means of production in their own interests."

"There can be no solution of the unemployment problem under the present system. Unless something is done by the winter, we shall see a rising of the people. Let us be ready to back them."

"We are accused of going too fast, but it is impossible to go too fast in the interests of the workers at present, and if ever the time comes to wage a bigger fight for the working class, the General Council wants to see its army spread out all over the country."

When language of this kind is used by the Chairman of the General Council, an important stage of advance has been reached.

It is certain that the present period, whatever the course and outcome of the immediate struggle, is the decisive formative period in the growth of the new revolutionary working class that is coming into being in Britain. As an observant bourgeois journal, the liberal "Manchester Guardian", has remarked:

"The last few weeks have done more than a year's peaceful missionary work to foster the growth of class solidarity and the class war in industry."

## AGAINST THE WAR IN MOROCCO

### The Conference of Communist Youth Leagues of Europe to the Communist Youth of France.

The Conference of Communist Youth Leagues of Europe, meeting in Berlin on 21. and 22. July 1925, sends fraternal greetings to the youthful communists of France in appreciation of their heroic struggle against imperialist war being carried on by capitalist France against the brave Riff people, and to all the youthful workers, peasants, soldiers, and sailors, who are fighting on the side of Communist Youth against the imperialism responsible for this war.

The French people still tolerate this fresh massacre of their sons in the interests of the French bourgeoisie. This shows that the capitalists still have mighty means at their disposal for deceiving the broad masses of the peasantry, the petty citizens, and even the workers into approving of a new and bloody war.

The memory of the 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> million dead — who died "that there might be no more war" — is still fresh in the minds of the workers and peasants of France. The wounds of the millions of cripples made by the great war, named the "last war" with conscious mendacity by the capitalists and their Social Democratic followers, are not yet healed. Many are the mothers who are still waiting, and still hoping against hope, for the return of the sons reported as "missed". All hope has not yet died out of their broken hearts. And already death is again sweeping like a storm wind over working France.

The capitalists have dared to begin this war, and once more it is the Social Democrats who have proved traitors, faithful hounds of big capital.

The broad masses are fermenting, but still they tolerate the fresh imperialism war.

The Communists alone, the Party, the Youth, the revolutionary Trade Unions of the CGTU. and the ARAC. (Ex-Soldiers) have replied to the fresh war by setting up the red flag of revolt.

But the masses are beginning to move. Sharp protests have been raised by even the socialist workers and reformist trade unionists, at the Workers' Congresses at Paris and Lille. Our Conference welcomes these helpers, who though they have but recently become co-workers, have always been co-sufferers. Our Conference hopes that they will fight side by side with the communist workers until the end: Until the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in France.

**Young comrades!**

A mighty work is still to be performed. You are only beginning the struggle.

There are two million youthful workers, young men and women, and as many young peasants.

The task set you is to mobilise this enormous army for the fight against the imperialist war of today, and for the civil war of tomorrow. The fight against the war in Morocco will demand an ever increasing expenditure of energy.

We are fully convinced that no obstacle will withhold you back, and that you will fight this battle against imperialism through to the end.

**Comrades!** It is an imperative task to mobilise the broad masses against the war. The mobilisation of the young workers in the army or fleet, at the front or in France, for an even more energetic struggle against the war, is work absolutely necessary if the victory of the proletariat is to be made possible.

**Young comrades!** Workers and peasants, soldiers and sailors, to the work! Increase your energy tenfold, your endurance, your will, and ensure the final victory of communism!

The youth of the working people and peasantry all the world over is on your side!

**Down with the imperialist war in Morocco!**

**Long live the free Riff republic! Long live the fraternisation!**

**Up with the immediate evacuation of Morocco!**

Berlin. 21/22 July 1925.

The Conference of Communist Youth Leagues  
of Europe.

## HANDS OFF CHINA

### Shanghai Organisation for Shanghai Relief.

By Geoffrey C. Chen (Chen-Han-Sun), (Peking).

Geoffrey C. Chen (Chen-Han-Sun), Professor of the National University of Peking, sends us the following article. He is neither Communist nor member of the Kuomintang Party, but he as well as the "Middle Group" of Professors of the Peking National University to which he belongs, play a fairly important part in the national-revolutionary Movement of China. His article is characteristic of the differentiation of class antagonism in the course of the national liberation movement of China. Ed.

At present one hundred and fifty thousands workers in Shanghai have gone on strike. As a protest against Anglo-Japanese atrocity, one hundred and seven thousand two hundred and forty-two factory workers started a general sympathetic strike. Thirty thousand wharf workers joined, followed by four thousand seamen, and then five thousand clerks employed in foreign business concerns, chiefly British and Japanese. This is unprecedented in China. Such a large scale strike in any of the Chinese industrial cities has never been so well and so long maintained. The difficulty in organisation and the inexperience in distributing relief funds are apparent as well as inevitable.

It has taken half a month to ascertain just about how much minimum fund is required for maintaining the strike through the month. Another half month has been necessary to establish a real central distribution organ. As the factory workers must have eight dollars each, wharf workers and seamen six each, and the clerks about twenty each, Shanghai needs at least one million and two hundred thousand Mexican dollars, in order to put up a firm and passive resistance to the cruelty and justice imposed upon the Chinese by imperialistic Powers and foreign capitalists. \$ 1,200,00 (Mex.) per month! Not an easy task for a poorly financed country, a country that lacks much communication means, to feed 150,000 workers when more than a million are already unemployed.

In the beginning of June, when the strike was spreading, the first organisation in Shanghai which dealt with the relief work, was the **General Chamber of Commerce**. This has been the official organ of the Shanghai merchants for many years. Its total membership has never exceeded five hundred, but it includes quite a few institutional members such as the Guild of Silk and Cocoon, the Guild of Carpenters, etc. Rich merchants have always controlled the Chamber. In an apparent democratic

organisation there has long been established a real plutocracy if not modified aristocracy. It has enjoyed a wide fame as the only influential merchants' society in Shanghai, but because of its conversatism and personal monopoly, it has lost real significance in representing the interests of small shop merchants. The latter have actually established a new organisation sometime in 1923. This "**Union of all Shanghai Concession Streets Merchants**", thought not so well known out of the city, has been supported by members who are really patriotic and responsible to the call of a common fight against foreign capitalistic imperialism. This Merchants Union first called all the Concession Street shops to a general strike.

As the **General Chamber of Commerce of Shanghai** is better known in China, relief funds have been in the beginning sent to this organisation. The directors of the Chamber, deliberately tried to utilize the occasion to do away with the **Mixed Court** and to secure directorship in the **Municipal Council**, set up "the **Tsi-An-Hui**" or **The Relief and Peace Society** for the sake of distributing such funds received from all over the country. This distributing organ has been managed entirely by three commissioners appointed by the Chamber's **Chief Director, Yu-Hai-Chin**. They are three so-called experienced persons in previous famine relief management, but advanced in age as they are, they never have caught the spirit of dealing with the new workers. They are experienced in charity work, but not yet in distributing wages. Late arrival at the place for distribution, careless keeping of accounts, and clumsy method of apportioning the money, have caused great suffering on the part of the workers. Sometimes women and children had to sit on the dirt or curl themselves up among a thick crowd in waiting for the twenty cents to be given to each striker. Many a time they had to wait in that heat and on that dirt from eight in the morning till ten in the evening, to starve one day and suffer the misery in order to gain the next day's fee of maintenance.

In the face of such suffering, therefore, the **General Chamber of Workers of Shanghai** did not furnish any fund for **Tsi-An-Hui** to distribute. The **Workers' Chamber** has received money independently and has always distributed it directly.

Up to July the **Second Tsi-An-Hui** has distributed four hundred and seventy thousands dollars Mex. while the **Workers' Chamber** has independently given out something like three hundred and fifty thousand. Now, the friction between these two organs has been constant if not so very consequential. For instance, the **Merchants' Chamber** which had **Tsi-An-Hui** in its control, really desired that the wharf workers go back to their job, whereas the **Workers' Chamber** insisted that if they should resume the job, they might be expected also to move foreign goods by inevitable mistake. The diversity of interests and the lack of responsibility on the part of the Chamber of Commerce, have demanded a new central distributing organisation for the relief funds.

This new distributing organ came to existence on July the Seventh. The three commissioners of **Tsi-An-Hui** had resigned on the Fourth, and a discussion of reorganisation took place on the Sixth. The new **Tsi-An-Hui** is composed of the delegates from the **General Chamber of Workers** and delegates from the **Union of Workers, Merchants and Students**. The **General Chamber of Commerce** will now no longer receive relief funds. The duty of receiving funds has been distributed among four Shanghai banks: **Shanghai Commercial, Bank of China, Hua-Tsi, and Chin-Chen**.

The **Shanghai Union of Workers, Merchants and Students** has been the chief executive committee for all resolutions passed by the Shanghai people in the struggle against the Anglo-Japanese brutality. This executive committee has a special Committee of Executives of four members. Their names are: **Liu-Chun-Min**, representing the **Shanghai Students' Union**, **Lin-Chiun**, representing the **Shanghai Headquarters of the All Students' Union of China**, **Li-Li-San**, representing the **Shanghai General Chamber of Workers**, and **O-Tsu-Hao**, representing the **Union of all Shanghai Concession Streets Merchants**.

The **General Chamber of Commerce** has started the relief work from rather selfish motives. It has never contributed a single cent to the relief fund except a few thousand dollars of telegram fees and running expenses of the old **Tsi-An-Hui**. Now that the Chamber has withdrawn itself from any active work, it has not joined the new distributing organ. From now on the relief organisation has assumed a unified form and will perform a more effective work. During the dangerous period of struggle, Shanghai has had very costly experiences, but benefitted by them, Shanghai may yet strive at a brilliant success in carrying on the fight for China and for humanity.

## WORKERS' DELEGATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

### Declaration of the Swedish Workers' Delegation.

To the Workers and Peasants of the Soviet Union.

Comrades!

The Swedish Workers' Delegation, composed of representatives of every political current in the Swedish labour movement (one hundred delegates having been chosen by various trade union organisations) wishes to express, before its departure, its heartiest thanks for the magnificent reception which you have accorded us.

We shall never forget the brief days which we have spent in the First Workers' and Peasants' State. We did not come to you as judges, not with the intention of looking for faults with petty suspicion; we came full of burning interest, anxious to study the situation in the Soviet Union as accurately as possible, and to observe personally, as closely as possible, the struggle being carried on by the Russian workers and peasants. Our endeavours in this direction have been aided by you to the utmost. We have been permitted unhindered access everywhere, and everywhere we were given all desired formation. Our observations may be summed up as follows:

1. The Russian workers have not only expropriated the expropriators, but have at the same time proved the unlimited possibility of administering the country in the interest of the working people. Ever since the counter-revolutionary bands supporting international capitalism were destroyed, and it became possible to begin with inner constructive work, the economic situation has become stabilised, and national economics make steady progress. This development may be best observed in the present situation of the workers. Not only do working wages rise uninterruptedly and with conspicuous rapidity, but the cultural and socialist development exceeds all expectations.

This does not mean of course that you have already reached your goal. There is still much work to be done. The workers and peasants of the Soviet Union are confronted by the great task of building up the First Socialist State of the World. Although we are well aware of the difficulties involved for the Soviet Union in this task, the more that the Soviet Union is surrounded by a network of capitalist states, and that the heavy inheritance of the past rests on the shoulders of the workers, we are none the less fully convinced that you will attain your great goal.

2. The Soviet Union is the centre of the revolutionary forces of the whole world. The bourgeoisie knows this. And therefore it is the constant endeavour of the bourgeoisie to gain influence over the economic life of the steadily growing power of the workers' and peasants' state.

The new intervention policy is another link in the chain of these bourgeois endeavours. It is the imperative duty of the working class of the whole world to devote the closest attention to these criminal attempts on the part of the capitalists. The slightest attempt on the part of the imperialist countries to interfere with the affairs of the Soviet Union must be prevented by every means. The Swedish Workers' Delegation will fulfil its mission in this regard, and will enlighten the Swedish working class on the situation. The standpoint adopted by the international proletariat must not merely be expressed in the words "Hands off Soviet Russia!", but at the same time in an active support lent to the Russian workers.

3. The work being done for the working class by the Russian Trade Unions is of incalculable value. The Trade Unions work on principles of broadest democracy, they are popularly organised, and they possess great influence and authority on all matters pertaining to life in the Soviet Union. From this we see that the workers of all countries should make it their endeavour to gain an equally influential position for their trade unions.

4. The Swedish Workers' Delegation considers it to be its duty to not only enlighten the Swedish working class on the present situation in the Soviet Union on its return to Sweden, but at the same time to express its solidarity with the attitude ex-

pressed by the English and Russian Trade Unions with respect to the National and International Unity of the Trade Unions as the sole means of abolishing the capitalist offensive.

Moscow, 23. July 1925.

On behalf of the Swedish Workers' Delegation:

Chilbum (Communist), Gustav Loron (Social Democrat), Karl Erikson (Social Democrat), Sten (Social Democrat).

## AGAINST THE ATTACKS ON THE SOVIET UNION

### Vandervelde as the Accomplice of Capitalism.

By J. Jacquemotte (Brussels).

The debate held in the Chamber on 17. July on the budget of the Belgian foreign ministry rendered it possible to ascertain with perfect clearness the standpoint represented by the **Social Democracy of Belgium**, in coalition with the "Christian democracy", within the "democratic" government, with reference to the *de jure* recognition of the Soviet Union. When the **Left Social Democrat Brunfaut**, supported by incontestable documents, refuted the lies spread abroad by the counter-revolutionaries with regard to the Soviet Union, he was not only noisily interrupted by the **Liberals and Clericals**, but was called to order by the **Social Democratic President of the Chamber, Brunet**, for characterising the justified measures taken by the Soviet Union in comparison with the atrocities and crimes committed by Professor **Zankov** in Bulgaria. The **Social Democratic deputy Dejardin** made an attempt to weaken the effect of **Brunfaut's** representations. And even **Brunfaut** acted inconsistently, for in the division he expressed confidence in the **Clerical-Socialist Coalition Government** of **Count Poulet and Vandervelde**.

The most characteristic point about this debate was the attitude taken by the **Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs and leader of the Second International, Vandervelde**. In the most decisive manner he undertook the defence of the interests of those **Belgian capitalists** whose property was nationalised by the proletarian revolution. Whilst adducing the conditions to which the **Poulet-Vandervelde Government** is determined to adhere, which this government is going to force (literally: to force!) upon the Soviet Union, he declared:

"The economic understanding with Russia will certainly be subject to two preliminary conditions: one of these is the recognition of the republics recognised by us, as Georgia and Armenia, now held in subjection; the other is a satisfactory agreement in protection of the interests of our country in Russia.

On the day when these questions are discussed in detail, we shall certainly not be able to oppose a restricted conception of the right of ownership. But it will be of importance for those countrymen of ours who have been damaged in their rights to receive substantial and satisfactory compensation."

Vandervelde as spokesman for the rights of Russian and foreign capitalists, including Belgian capitalists! At one time these capitalists purchased building sites in Russia, erected factories, and won mighty profits by the continuous exploitation of the population of Russia. The proletarian revolution abolished the right of private ownership of the means of production, nationalised the means of production, and began to build up the new state of society, that of the workers, on the ruins of the capitalist order. The proletarian revolution expropriated the expropriators.

But the "socialist" Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, **Vandervelde**, declares: We shall not recognise this revolution until it grants substantial and satisfactory compensation to the capitalists damaged in their rights.

Never before have reformist leaders proclaimed their complete abandonment of the essential principles of socialism and class

warfare with a cynical candour equal to this! Never before have they so clearly characterised their vassalage to capitalism!

It need not be said that the bourgeois deputies, after trying to drown the speech of the deputy Brunfaut in their cries of rage, received Vandervelde's words with the utmost delight. And the onetime Minister Franck was able to state openly that the speech held by the Minister Vandervelde repeated the substance of what had been said once before, by Messrs. Jaspas and Hymans, on behalf of the last cabinets.

The leader of the **Second International** and of the socialist **Belgian Labour Party** defends the rights of capitalists injured in their rights. And yet he is well aware that the Government of the Soviet Union has repeatedly declared that it will consider in the highest degree the interests of the small owners of Russian industrial or state papers. Thus the Government Poulet-Vandervelde, in rejecting the immediate unqualified recognition of Worker's and Peasant's Russia, sacrifices precisely the small owners for the sake, as it hopes, of securing the interests of Belgian big capital.

Whilst Mr. Vandervelde has been demanding the recognition of a counter-revolutionary Transcaucasia in the Belgian Chamber, thus earning the applause of the bourgeoisie, reformist workers from Belgium and France have been visiting Transcaucasia. They have visited all the largest towns, spent three days in Baku, the centre of the naphtha production of Azerbaidjan, and convinced themselves of the enormous technical achievements accomplished by the Soviet Government here. They now solemnly proclaimed the standpoint that the natural wealth of Transcaucasia now in the hands of the workers, shall not be restored to the capitalists — as desire the Vanderveldes and Kautsky — but shall remain the property of the workers. The delegate Huhu has declared, on behalf of the delegation, that they will proclaim the truth to the Belgian workers, who have been deceived by the bourgeoisie and by the Social Democrats as to the conditions obtaining in Soviet Russia.

The brutal candour with which the "Socialist" Vandervelde defends the interests of the Belgian capitalists, against the workers of the Soviet Union, will contribute not a little towards opening the eyes of the workers of Belgian and other countries.

## POLITICS

### Imperialism and the British Labour Movement.

By G. Allison.

One of the outstanding features of the British Working class movement, which is only now being rapidly liquidated, is its exceptionally nationalist outlook. It is true that, both in the political and economic spheres, British labour long before the war participated in International Labour Conferences. It did so, however, always with some reserve, always with the feeling that we were different, higher, more advanced.

The role of British imperialism in world politics goes a long way towards explaining this fact. Before the war, except for occasional crises, the Empire was able to carry on its ramifications with little serious interruptions. Through the medium of intensive colonial exploitation, the home employers were able to reduce the discontent of the British workers to a minimum. The labour movement both amongst the masses and in leading circles accommodated itself to this convenient arrangement. With the exception of the most radical sections, British labour was unmindful of the conditions that prevailed on the Continent, in the colonies, or elsewhere so long as fairly tolerable conditions could be obtained at home.

The post-war situation is entirely different. America has emerged as the supreme imperialist power. She has adopted Canada, enslaved Europe, and is now casting covetous eyes at another cherished British Dominion, Australia.

Britain on the other hand, has been forced to turn more than ever to her colonies and mandated territories. Egypt, India, Mesopotamia, and now China have all felt the extra pressure of British imperialism resulting from the American conquest.

But there is still a greater menace.

The new Russia represents not only a boundary beyond which the frontiers of the British Empire cannot extend, in addition, she is looked upon as a positive danger to the Empire as it stands.

The policy adopted by the ruling class in view of all these events was a far-seeing one. Not only did she take part in the general attack on Soviet Union, but even when it was deemed advisable to cease open hostilities and when Russia was still engaged in deadly conflict with the "Whites", Britain established herself firmly in Mesopotamia, Persia, and the Baltic States.

For quite a time thereafter the real attitude of British imperialism towards Soviet Russia has been apparent. Through the trade agreement and later through the activities of the Labour government it was fairly obvious that Britain was prepared, at least, to tolerate the existence of the Soviet Union and it is only now that the real policy again shows itself.

Amongst the real representatives of British imperialism there is no confusion. Their aim is not only to safeguard the colonies, but is directed against the very existence of the Workers Republic. Through gross misrepresentation and acts of provocation the support for the Soviet Union in Britain is reduced to a minimum and "border hostilities" maintained at highest pitch.

On the other hand we see assembled the supposed "friends" of the Soviet Union. This group which includes within it a wide circle varying from prominent conservatives to supposed Left Wing trade union leaders aims at a more friendly attitude towards the Soviet Union; closer relations and a trading agreement. Fundamentally these two groups are in complete agreement. The "Die hards" quite openly recognise and declare their hostility to the Soviet Union and see in her overthrow the stabilisation of the Empire.

The "sympathetic" groups imagine they see in the Soviet Union a means of temporarily dealing with the serious economic situation in Britain, reviving British industry and simultaneously stabilising the Empire and liquidating all the dangerous tendencies at home.

This idea is clearly portrayed in the attitude of the reactionary leadership in the British Labour movement. The War against the Communist Party and the National Minority Movement is continuing as relentless as ever, but some of these same leaders let the secret out by explaining how "illogical" it is to advocate a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and at the same time to refuse as trade unionists to join hands with the Russian unions.

If further proof is required, the recent happenings in China provide it.

Despite the authentic information supplied by the Labour Press and even its own organ, the Executive Committee of the Labour Party decided to take no definite steps until more news on the "causes" of the Chinese rising was available and even when the situation was the subject of discussion in the House of Commons we find practically no difference between the attitude of the Labour Party and the Cabinet. Both MacDonald and Trevelyan, the Labour Party spokesman, maintained that the duties of the government were first to safeguard the British lives in China, and then, in conjunction with the other interested imperialist powers, to establish a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the causes of the uprising. In other words, the leaders of the Labour Party endorsed the aggressive Policy of Britain in China and pleaded for a more scientific and less brutal form of exploitation. Chamberlain himself can wish for nothing more.

Hence we see that in actual practice the policy of the Labour Party is purely imperialist. It is but a short step from where it now stands to openly supporting an aggressive policy against the Soviet Union.

These facts present the Communist Party and the Minority Movement with their most important task.

To the Left Wing in the trade unions we must say: Are you supporting International Trade Union Unity for the purpose of solidifying the proletarian forces for the international class struggle, or are you sheltering behind a popular slogan to hide your imperialist intentions? To the Left Wing in the Labour Party we must say: Are you for the Empire or for the masses it subjects and exploits? Only by this means can we have a clear estimation of our forces. We know where the masses

stand. Under no circumstances will they allow fresh attacks on the Soviet Union, but through the treachery of its chosen leaders the British working class may find itself tacitly supporting war against the Soviet Union engaged in by the buffer states, but engineered and supported by British imperialism.

Consequently our task is clear. In fighting against the dangers of imperialist onslaughts on the Soviet Union, we have to ensure that mass opinion finds organised expression, and that all the imperialist tendencies within our movement are left behind.

Only then can we feel sure that the Soviet Union is immune from the covetous hand of British imperialism.

## ECONOMICS

### Evacuation of the Ruhr — Crisis in the Ruhr.

By M. S. (Essen).

The German Nationalists are rejoicing. The Ruhr is to be evacuated, to the great surprise of everyone, even before the date announced. The reasons for this rapid evacuation of the Ruhr are not far to seek. France is acting under compulsion. America and England have succeeded in ousting France from her position of supremacy. The Morocco War makes great demands on finances. In order to a certain extent to compensate for this, a rapid evacuation of the Ruhr has been decided on. In this way the cannon fodder which is so badly needed in Morocco, is set free. The demands of the Entente allies are completely guaranteed by the Dawes Plan, above all through the fact that all parties in Germany, from Hindenburg to Crispian are unanimously determined to fulfil its conditions. Although the National-Socialists are rejoicing at the withdrawal of the troops of occupation, a false tone can be heard in this joy, as a severe crisis is gathering over the Ruhr territory.

Does the evacuation of the Ruhr promise any relief to the population? At first glance one would think so. But just as at the time of the occupation everything was at sixes and sevens and the workers were the real sufferers, the evacuation of the Ruhr coincides with a moment in which the workers are being drawn into the general chaos. After the occupation on January 11th 1923, the German Government to a certain extent stood by the population, but could not maintain the passive resistance; its support ended with a complete collapse of German finances.

This time the German Government neither can nor will help the population. A great wave of unemployment is approaching. The capitalists are already threatening to reduce wages and preparing to do away completely with the eight hour day. The consequences of these capitalist measures will not be restricted to the mining industry, but will have disastrous results for the whole population. Up to the present 41 pits are partly or completely idle, 45 more are threatened with being shut down, and it is indicated that this is not the end of the shutting down. In some of the pits in question a large number of miners are employed, so that the shutting down embraces a quarter of the whole mining industry and almost a third of the miners are hit by it. The shutting down in the mines has the effect of restricting the iron industry also. Thus, among others, the GBAG in Gelsenkirchen has only two of all its furnaces at work. A similar situation transpires in the foundries of the Lower Rhine, in Duisburg, Thyssen in Hamborn, Krupp in Rheinhausen etc. All the works are intending to discharge large numbers of men on August 1st.

The powers that be in the Ruhr explain the shutting down and the restriction of work in the Ruhr by stagnation of sales, over-production, inability to complete etc. On closer examination, these arguments vanish into thin air. The only true explanation is that the carrying out of the Dawes Plan has and must have the consequences which the Communists prophesied even before the London agreement was accepted. All the discussions and conferences of the shareholders make it evident that the workers alone are to pay for this crisis of stabilisation. The bourgeois Press also, regardless of the consequences to the working class as a whole, takes the attitude that the workers must shoulder the burden of reconstruction, i. e. of maintaining profits. The destructive effect of this is already evident. By the shutting down of their pits individual communities of 30,000—60,000 inhabitants

(Horst-Emscher, Homburg etc.) are completely paralysed financially.

Germany has become an industrial colony, and now the slaves must be taken in hand. It is specially worth mentioning that all hopes for the success of the capitalist plans are placed in the Trade Unions, emphasis being laid on their always having possessed "insight". The betrayal of the interests of the workers is once again expressly confirmed by a capitalist die-head who admits that the whole question of the Ruhr crisis is no question concerning the Ruhr population alone, when he emphatically states that the solution must apply to the working class as a whole. Thus, enslavement not only of the miners but of the whole toiling population! The demand for precautionary measures indicates that heavy industry is preparing for a big fight. The bourgeois Press gives point blank expression to its wishes that, when the occupation comes to an end, and in view of the situation in the Ruhr coal fields, it is the duty of the Government to increase the police force in the Ruhr so as to maintain peace and order.

The Ruhr crisis is a signal for the whole working class which should not be allowed to die down unheard. The CP. of Germany, as the only Workers' party, will organise the coming serious conflicts between capital and labour. New treachery may be expected from the Trade Unions if we do not succeed in mobilising the members of the Trade Unions against the Reformist Trade Unions bureaucracy. All our forces must be used in the Trade Unions in order to make them a decisive factor in the fight. There must be no solution in the bourgeois sense, that is a further enslavement of the workers and subjugation to the Dawes yoke, the dangers must be met by a social solution and further must lead not only to a rejection of the proposed capitalist plans, but to a solution in the proletarian sense. The control of production to the producers!

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Special British Trade Union Congress.

By R. E. Bond (London).

On Friday July 24th, the much talked-of Special Trades Union Congress was held at the Central Hall, London. This Congress was originally convened by the General Council of the TUC. for the purpose of discussing the question of Unemployment, but owing to the serious developments in the Mining and Textile Industries — a lock-out involving over 100,000 workers had just been declared by the employers in the latter industry — these matters were also included on the agenda.

The Congress was absolutely valueless from the point of view of any lead being given to the masses on the Unemployment problem. Its sole point of actual interest was the weak and spineless lead — if it could be called a lead — from the members of the General Council, and the criticism of this weakness and the demand for a definite fighting programme from a large number of delegates present.

A. B. Swales, Chairman of the Trade Union Congress, presided. He stated at the outset that no amendments or additions would be permitted to the three resolutions appearing on the agenda. This at once disclosed the fact the Congress would simply be a formal discussion, and that there would be no possibility of the Congress formulating a concrete programme of action which would rally the working class movement into actual struggle against the cynical brutality of the Conservative Government towards the vast army of unemployed men and women.

Wal Hannington, the Communist leader of the National Unemployed Workers Committee Movement, addressed the Congress on behalf of the organised unemployed.

He stated that the fight of the unemployed was the fight of the whole working class. The mere passing of resolutions was not sufficient; the workers had got to be roused to definite action on this question. While agreeing with the resolutions to be discussed by the Congress, they did not go far enough, and he suggested lines for activity.

The General Council should co-operate in organising a great National Hunger March on London, culminating with a 24 hour strike on the day the March reached London. A deputation should be sent to the Prime Minister demanding



30/- per week unemployment benefit for each adult unemployed worker, 10/- for wife of unemployed worker, 5/- for each child up to 14 years of age; 15/- for unemployed juveniles between the ages of 14 and 18.

He also proposed that the Labour Party in the House of Commons should hold up all business until the Government gave them satisfaction in dealing with this problem.

"The eyes of the whole country are upon this Congress", declared **Hannington**. "One section, the workers, is looking to you for a lead, for definite action. The other section, the capitalists, are hoping that you will fail in the face of your responsibilities. Which section are you going to satisfy?"

The first resolution declared: "As our industries are to a large extent dependent on export trade, the manifest duty of the Government is to pursue a foreign policy calculated to develop amicable diplomatic relations and trading relations through the medium of the Overseas Trade Acts and the Trade Facilities Acts with all countries, including Russia."

**A. A. Purcell**, fresh from his victory in the Forest of Dean By-Election, moved this resolution. "Capitalism is bankrupt", he declared. "It has stripped from the industrial stomach all that has ever been in it. The people must bring pressure to bear upon the Government so that unless they deal with the problem they must go.

"With regard to the reconstruction of Europe, it is no good howling all kinds of names at the Bolsheviks. Russia requires our goods. Arrangements should be made to let them have them."

"We should tease the Government and compel it to leave Office unless it handles the problem of unemployment in an effective way."

The resolution was seconded by **George Hicks**, Secretary of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers, who stated "that with organisation, singleness of purpose, courage and determination we could compel the Government if they did not deal effectively with Unemployment, to come out before Christmas and beg the suffrages of the country".

In the discussion which followed, several delegates strongly criticised **Purcell's** remarks about "teasing" the Government.

"The Government will stand any amount of 'teasing' or tickling", declared a delegate. "The only thing which will have any effect upon them, is mass action and concrete demands from the workers".

The whole discussion centered around this point. Delegate after delegate pointed out that resolutions have been passed for the last thirty years and that the time had now arrived for action.

**Ben Tillet**, veteran leader of the Transport Workers Union, roused the Congress to enthusiasm by his declaration: "I want some of the old fighting spirit back in our movement. We have grown too respectable, too mechanical, too wise, too statesmanlike. Even our own dear Labour Party while it was in Office developed more 'statesmen' in one month than all the other Parties could in a generation".

The second resolution condemned the changes in unemployment benefit contemplated by the Government, especially the lengthening of the waiting period, and the power given to the Minister of Labour to curtail extended benefit. It declared that as unemployment is admittedly inherent in the present system, any deprivation of the workers of adequate maintenance was inhuman in the extreme. It asserted the right of every citizen to work or full maintenance.

This was moved by **A. Hayday**, M. P., and **Ben Turner** of the Textile Workers seconded. Turner talked about "saving the souls of the people who had more money than they knew what to do with" and quoted extracts from the Old Testament to show "that the question of work or full maintenance was as old as the hills!"

The weakness of the resolution was accentuated by the remark of **Ellen Wilkinson**, M. P. who declared that "they had got to kick up a row somehow and arouse the workers against the cynical apathy of the ruling class".

"What exactly she meant by this, and how the workers were to 'kick up a row' she was careful not to explain.

The type of trade union leader who howls "Bolshevik" every time a definite fighting programme is proposed, was strongly condemned by **Jack Smith** of the Leicestershire Miners, who also advocated the redrafting of the resolutions in accordance with

the speeches of the delegates, thus giving expression to the growing desires of the rank and file.

The third resolution called for pressure upon the Government by the whole Labour Movement, and declared "that the present state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, and organised Labour must not only protest vigorously against the present apparent indifference towards this social injustice, but, in addition, if redress is not speedily forthcoming, it will be compelled to take such action as conditions and opportunity dictate."

This masterpiece of ambiguity was moved by **John Hill**, of the Boilermaker Society, and seconded by **Mary Quail**, who referred particularly to the effects of the horrors of unemployment among the working women. She also strongly emphasised the need for trade with Soviet Russia.

Very strong criticism of the weakness of this resolutions was forthcoming from many delegates. **Griffon**, of the Amalgamated Society of Dyers, went "hammer and tongs" for the members of the General Council. "You have told us nothing new", he said. "All you can say is that unemployment cannot be solved under Capitalism". We know all that, we have known it for years. What we are here for to-day, is to find out what we can do for the unemployed." (Loud cheers.) His attack upon the disgraceful exhibition of the Labour Government was also loudly applauded.

Many delegates demanded to know what exactly was meant by the phrase "it will be compelled to take such actions and opportunity dictate" in the resolution. **Ben Smith**, M. P., also roundly criticised the wording of the resolution and sarcastically remarked that after all these years we were still "recording intense dissatisfaction etc."

All these three resolutions were carried by the Congress, but without enthusiasm. The opinion of a large number of the delegates seemed to be:

"These resolutions do not satisfy us; they contain nothing of a concrete character. But, on principle, we cannot oppose them; therefore it is our duty to vote for them."

At the afternoon session statements on the position in the Mining Industry were submitted by **A. J. Cook**, Secretary of the Miners Federation of Great Britain, and **Herbert Smith**, President of the MFGB., and on the situation in the Textile Industry by **Ben Turner**.

**A. J. Cook** had a splendid reception from the delegates. He stated the MFGB. had the fullest confidence that the General Council of the Trades Union Congress would leave no stone unturned to see that this time the miners' standard of living is protected. He dealt with the results of the existing Agreement upon the miners and described of what appalling conditions the miners would be reduced if the demands of the Coal Owners were acceded to.

"Whatever the position in the coalfields, nobody need ask 'Will the Miners fight?'. They always did and they always will. The Miners Federation stands firm from Lands End to John O'Groats."

"Tell us the truth! The General Council says 'We will back you', but we want to know, if this fight comes what that backing means?"

**Herbert Smith**, amidst applause, declared: "I was hoping at my time of life I had done with fighting, but I have got to go through this fight if it means my last fight on earth, because it is one of the genuine things we have got to stand up to."

"We don't intend being made a shuttlecock any longer, if you people are prepared to help us. We intend to fight whether you help or not. We are forced to fight, if we are worth anything at all. I would rather fight this fight and lose it than not fight at all."

On this point, there could be no doubt at all that the Congress was solidly behind the miners. But, apart from this, little satisfaction could be extracted from the Congress. No battle-cry was sent out to the masses of the workers; no fighting lead was given on the Unemployment question.

The General Council, in spite of its efforts on behalf of International Trade Union Unity, in spite of its work in rallying support for the miners, failed miserably on the problem of unemployment, which increases in magnitude with every day.

Once again the workers have been forced to realise that the only way to deal with this, and every other problem which confronts them under capitalist society is to build a mass Communist Party, a mass revolutionary leadership of the whole working class.

## The Struggle of the German Building Workers.

Appeal of the Revolutionary Building workers.

Moscow, 25. July 1925.

The Secretariat of the International Action and Propaganda Committee of the Revolutionary Building Workers has addressed the following appeal to the Building Workers' Unions in all countries:

Although the building workers of Germany have undergone the hard time caused by the inflation, the almost complete devaluation of the currency, and the constant rises in prices, in the same degree as the workers of other shades, and have suffered a series of repulses in the open struggle against German capital, they have still retained force and energy to hold fast their eight hour day, and to attain some improvement in their wages, despite the mighty associations of the employers, and despite the reformist leaders barring at every step the struggle against capital. During the struggles of 1924, carried on everywhere and at every time under the active leadership of the revolutionary building workers, the building workers prevented the employers from crushing the building workers and destroying their organisations.

In this year the German building workers organised strikes in various places. These were in the main defensive strikes against the Associations of Building Employers, who still continue to utilise the lack of unity in the workers' organisations for their own ends. At the present time tens of thousands of the building workers of Berlin, Saxony, and other parts of Germany are on strike. There are 100,000 building workers engaged in this struggle. The whole of Central Germany is threatened with a lock out. This lock out may spread even further, from one place to another, and will demand great sacrifices from the building workers organisations.

We call upon all branches of industry to join in a united struggle and to afford mutual support. And on the other hand we call upon the sister organisations of building workers in all countries to lend their German brothers an energetic moral and material aid. Every building worker, in every country, and especially in every European country, must remember that the defeat of the German worker creates a precedent for an economic pressure to be exercised by the capitalists of his own country. Immediate aid given to the German building workers is at the same time self-aid.

Long live the international solidarity of the building workers!  
Long live the unity of the workers' struggle!

### IN THE INTERNATIONAL

#### Resolution passed by the Tenth Party Congress of the CP. of Germany on the Work of the Communist International.

The Tenth Party Congress of the CP. of Germany expresses its full concurrence with the decisions of the V. World Congress and of the March sessions of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International.

The Party Congress especially approves of the efforts being made by the Central to apply the tactical decisions of the V. World Congress, and the Bolshevisation theses of the Enlarged Executive, to the tasks of the German Party, and to carry on the policy of the Party in this spirit.

The Party Congress expresses its full confidence in the Executive of the Communist International, and imposes on the new Central of the CP. of Germany and on the comrades who have hitherto led the Party, the duty of combatting determinedly all attacks made on the policy of the Executive and all deviations from the lines laid down by the Comintern.

The Right wing of the Comintern is attempting, like the small Right group in Germany, to prevent the Bolshevisation of the Communist World Party, and to falsify it by opportunist aberrations.

The Party Congress reminds the comrades of the decision come to by the Enlarged Executive in March 1925, to the effect that the leaders of the German Right, Brandler and Thalheimer, fully deserved expulsion from the Party, and expects that this expulsion will be carried out without hesitation, in accordance with the decision of the Executive, should this group continue its anti-Party fraction work in face of the decisions of the International.

The Party Congress indignantly repulses the attacks recently made against the policy of the Communist International by a group of Polish comrades under the leadership of Domski. It calls upon the Communist Party of Poland to call energetically to order this group, which is Left in name only, and is in reality an accurate reflection of the Polish Right and its relations to Bolshevism.

The Party Congress welcomes the successes gained by the Communist Party of England. Despite its youth and numerical weakness, this Party has gained great influence in the revolutionary English Trade Union movement of late years, and is destined to be the leader of the greatest and historically most important regrouping of the English Labour movement.

The Party Congress solidarises completely with the tactics of the Communist Party of France, and welcomes with much satisfaction the unequivocal and Bolshevik standpoint adopted by the French Party with regard to the Morocco campaign.

The Party Congress ascertains with great satisfaction that our Czech sister Party has developed advantageously, thanks to the correct tactics adopted by the Executive at the March Session, and is beginning to overcome the crisis caused by the Right liquidators.

In the Italian Party the Left group, under Bordiga's leadership, is beginning to develop an un-Bolshevik line of action, similar to that recently experienced in Germany and Poland. The leaders of the CP. of Italy have rightly taken up determined combat against this group, for the growing influence of the Italian Communist among the working class, and their success in the Trade Unions, render it especially imperative that this ultra-Left tendency should be overcome.

The Tenth Party Congress repeats its expression of entire solidarity with the leading Party of the Comintern, the Russian CP., already expressed without the slightest hesitation at the Frankfurt Party Congress, at the most difficult moment of the Trotsky discussion. The decision to fight side by side with the CC. of the Russian CP. during the period just past, and the decisions of the last Party Conference, are of the utmost importance for all the Sections of the Comintern. The fresh measures taken in the peasant policy, in the struggle, and in the strengthening of the Soviet apparatus, the Party organisatory development of the Russian CP., and the increased participation of non-partisans, are in equal measure an indication of the stabilisation of the Soviet Union, that is, for the stabilisation of the international proletarian revolution against imperialism, of the economic success of the Soviet power, its foreign political foothold, and of the great and uninterrupted uplift of the standard of life in the Russian working class.

The stabilisation of the Soviet Union, the advance of the Comintern, and on the other hand the difficulties and antagonisms within the imperialist states themselves, are the reason for the hysterical, ill-calculated, and feverish endeavours now being made by all the reactionary powers in the world to combat these two most important of the organisations of the fighting proletariat.

All the stronger, all the more active, all the more systematic and effective must the struggle of our Party and of all Brother Parties of the Comintern be against the international and national bourgeoisie. All the firmer the CPG. stands by the Communist International and its strongest bulwark, the Soviet Union.

(Carried with one dissentient.)

## IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

### The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky, its Apostle.

By N. Bukharin.

The experience of the last few years have shown with the greatest clearness that **Social Democracy** with its party organisation, its leaders, its theoreticians and publicists, represents one of the most powerful supports of the bourgeois regime. In various respects they carry out the directions of the powerful of this world with the greatest persistence as "devoted and true" servants of the latter. When a storm is in the air, when the bourgeoisie is preparing to present some reckoning or the other, when it is necessary to befool and intimidate the citizen, to turn him into an animal shivering with fear, to turn the intimidated philistines into an army of "raging grocers", then Social Democracy is let loose. And these functions are fulfilled by the "Socialist" party excellently. And when the cunning firebrands and the wolves of the speculation exchanges become suddenly generous, like Barmat, then the "Socialists" take their payment with a feeling of their own worth, not on the principle "non olet" (Gold doesn't smell). Permit me, that is earned money!

World history is apparently now entering into some new phase of its development. The land of the proletarian revolution is growing and strengthening. And in the east a giant flame is flaring up, and is reflected in the windows of the London and Parisian banks. Its tongues of fire inspire the ruling class of the whole world with fear. The howl of hate sounds from the houses of the bourgeoisie against us. And whilst the Chinese folk is full of repletion from a hail of lead from machine guns to the glory of humanity, christianity and civilisation and, last but not least, the high rate of colonial investments, a complicated net of trickery and intrigues, of war pacts and conspiracies, of preparations for the financial blockade and for the "new course" in general, is being spun around the Union of proletarian states. We are not so very much afraid of the raging bourgeois clique: it has already broken its teeth once, and will break them again — on the Morocco war, the French finances, unemployment in England, the collapse of the Banks in Germany, the problem of Germany and the Entente, and other hard things. Let it only try!

But, if "it is not attempting it", it will nevertheless prepare itself and arm itself for it. And now Karl Kautsky comes forward as the prophet of this dirty preparation. He has transformed himself dialectically from a tolerable apostle of Socialism into a definite and intolerable apostle of the counter-revolution. Under the conditions which exist to day, he steps before the public with his new book "The International and Soviet Russia". It is difficult to read this book without a feeling of disgust and abhorrence: this raging and powerless expression of counter-revolutionary malice; this doddering senility of ideas revolving in one and the same place; this complete lack of understanding for the social relations; this obtrusive lickspitting towards the ruling bourgeoisie; this psychology of a philistine soured through the "robbery of property" — not even a renegade can sink deeper! And yet he was once someone...

#### I. The International Significance of the Soviet Union.

Once, more than twenty years ago, Kautsky wrote:

"The centre of the revolution is moving from the west to the East. In the first half of the nineteenth century it was in France, and for a time in England. In 1848, Germany also entered the ranks of the revolutionary nations, at a time when England had left their ranks for the immediate future. Since 1870, the last remains of their revolutionary efforts of the bourgeoisie begin to disappear in all countries. Since this time, to be a revolutionary, has become equivalent to being a socialist.

The new century begins with such events that the thought is near that we approach a further move of the revolutionary centre to Russia...

In 1848, the Slavs were the hoar frost which destroyed the people's spring. It is possible that it is now given to the

Slavs to be that storm which will break the ice of reaction and bring irresistibly with a new and fortunate spring for the people<sup>1)</sup>.

Marx, in contradistinction to those worthless "Socialists" who, with the contempt of "civilised" lackeys, speak of the "Mullahs" (Mohomedan priests) from China, "Turkestan people", etc., attached the greatest importance to the colonial revolutionary movement. He wrote upon China:

"When our European reactionaries on their approaching flight through Asia finally come to the stronghold of pre-historic reaction and conservatism, who knows but what they may read upon them: the Chinese Republic. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity"<sup>2)</sup>.

And in an article published in the "New York Tribune" (14th June 1853) Marx wrote:

"One can safely prophesy that the sparks of the Chinese revolution thrown into the loaded mine of the modern industrial system, will cause the explosion of the general crisis so long prepared, and if it spreads itself abroad, it will be followed immediately, by political revolutions on the continent. It will be an interesting sight when China causes unrest in the countries of the occident whilst the Western powers restore 'order' in Shanghai, Nanking, and in the delta of the 'great canal' by sending English, French and American warships."

Naturally, very much has now changed: since that time, three quarters of a century has passed! Very much has also changed since the time when Kautsky wrote his prophetic article upon the role of our proletariat. Even Kautsky himself changed (and became a traitor). It is characteristic however, that the fundamental tendencies of the development prophesied by Marx and Kautsky, have been completely corroborated. This terribly destructive world war; a chain of revolutions with the center in Russia; the quick development of the colonies; the thunder of the Chinese revolution (four hundred million inhabitants!) — has not the "world of pre-historic reaction" stood upon its head?

Let us lift ourselves above this world and attempt to grasp the most essential and the most important of the general situation. What will this "essential" be? The Soviet Union and China. What does the International bourgeoisie fear most? Whom does it above all attack, very often forgetting the difficulties between its own various national sections in the process? The Soviet Union as the most powerful anti-capitalist factor. The bourgeoisie understands perfectly that the victory of the toilers in China and the repetition there of the "Russian experience" would mean the end of the bourgeois regime altogether. One of the most far-seeing bourgeois politicians, Mr. Lloyd George, speaks directly of this. It was not for nothing that once in joke Lenin wanted to dedicate his "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Sickness" exactly to Mr. Lloyd George. This clever bourgeois leader sees the objective social relations much better and clearer and in a much more "Marxist" manner than many a Socialist agent of the bourgeoisie (for the role of agent is inevitably connected with a limited purview). Is the bourgeoisie afraid of Kautsky, of the II. International, of the reformists? No, and never!

It is afraid of the communists alone. It hangs the communists. Kautsky can be calm, the noose will never touch his neck. He will decay "on his own".

Is the bourgeoisie afraid that Amsterdam will become dangerous to it? Not at all.

But it is afraid that the Communist International will penetrate with its influence into the ranks of the proletarians organised in the Amsterdam International.

And the bourgeoisie is afraid of the union of proletarian republics and it attacks the latter in every way that is open to it.

Is that perhaps not the case? Do not these elementary facts, understood by all, facts which even the petty bourgeois understanding can grasp, speak for themselves?

<sup>1)</sup> From No. 18 of the "Iskra" (10th March 1902) in an article from the pen of Karl Kautsky entitled: "The Slavs and the Revolution". Translated from the Russian text.

<sup>2)</sup> Collected works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 1841—1850. III. Volume, Page 445, German edition.

Naturally they do. But the defenders of capitalism are its defenders just because they falsify and distort the truth. In order to please the bourgeoisie they make black white and white black. In order to please the bourgeoisie they declare that the existing is non-existent, that the past is the present and the present the past. In this lying, in this mockery of reality, in this violation of truth there is a peculiar logic: this logic is just the logic of expedience to capitalism.

Capital needs that red be made white. And Karl Kautsky, ready for service, takes the role of falsifier upon himself.

"For years the Soviet Government has been chiefly occupied in enslaving, unnerving and stupifying the proletariat both inside and outside of Russia . . . Soviet Russia is at the moment the greatest hindrance for the rise of the proletariat in the world — worse even than the infamous regime of Horthy in Hungary and of Mussolini in Italy . . .".

Kautsky seriously contends that absolutism is dominant with us now just as it was before the revolution of 1905. Kautsky puts for his "International" so shrewd a question as: would it not be necessary to take up the same attitude towards the Soviet State as

„that taken up by the great forerunner of this International from the very beginning towards absolutism, once again towards the new Russian absolutism“).

And to this question he answers in general in the affirmative! For the chief distinction lies in the fact that the new "absolutism" has its

"head no longer in Petersburg, but in Moscow, further away from Europe and nearer to the Tartars".

This is naturally blameworthy, for, from the standpoint of "educated" exploiters and their lackeys, the Tartars are no people.

The Soviet Government is thus the strongest hindrance for the advance of the proletarian movement in the whole world — this is the "thesis" of Karl Kautsky.

For the moment we will leave the evidence of hundreds of thousands of people who in no way wish to be in agreement with Kautsky, out of the question. We will endeavour, without paying any attention to the obvious absurdity of this childish declaration, to discuss it objectively.

The Soviet Union is thus a gendarme towards the workers, a traitor to the workers and their destroyer. Let us assume that that were the case.

But Kautsky himself does not deny that the present epoch is a threatening epoch for capitalism. From what side does the "storm" come? From the side of the workers. Is that not the case? Yes! But if the Soviet Government played the part of a brake, a suppressor, an international gendarme (as Czarism did in its time), what would that mean? It would mean that capitalism had its best support in the Soviet Union. If, however, capitalism had its best support in the Soviet Union, it would assist and encourage this support with all means, it would finance it and support it materially and morally. Kautsky knew 20 years ago, for instance, that the French Republic saved Czarism in 1905 with its money. or Czarism was a weapon of defence against the revolution.

But now?

The whole international bourgeoisie is now fighting against the Soviet Union and wishes to destroy it, but it is forced to make peace, but only because its own fingers are "too short".

Why does the international bourgeoisie take up such an unkind attitude to "its support"? And permit us in secret to ask, why it takes up such a kind attitude to grey-haired traitors like yourself, Herr Kautsky? Your Party is supplied with the where-withal from Barmat's money bags even.

Why is the name of Lenin and the five pointed star known to the oppressed in all parts of the world? Your malicious attacks however are eagerly taken up, quoted and blessed by the bourgeois "ideologists" and the bourgeois whores of all countries. Why?

Kautsky will owe us the answer and continue to owe it, for the true answer is a smack in the face for the author of the booklet with which we are dealing. Let us look concretely at

the influence of the Soviet Union: let us see, in how far the Soviet Union appears to be a hindrance to the "advance of the working class".

Let us begin with England, the "classical land of capitalism" holding "half the world" in its hard hands. Many years ago when he was not yet a renegade, Kautsky wrote of the English proletariat:

"Nowhere is the proletariat more numerous, nowhere is its political organisation better developed, nowhere is its political freedom greater than in England. And nowhere has the proletariat, up to the present, been more powerless . . .

As a political factor, the English workers stand lower to-day than the workers of the economically most backward and politically most unfree country of Europe — Russia. It is its living revolutionary consciousness that gives the latter its great practical strength, it was the renunciation of the revolution, the limitation to the interests of the moment, the so-called "real-politik" which made the former count for nought in real politics".

And further:

"But the proletarians have raised themselves so high only there where they remained in the sharpest conflict with the bourgeoisie. But the English proletarians to-day can hardly be anything but little bourgeois, distinguished from the others only by a somewhat greater lack of culture, and whose most sublime ideal is to ape their masters, to copy their hypocritical respectability, their admiration for wealth . . . and their spiritless manners to kill the free time . . .")

And at that time Kautsky passionately attacked the Fabians, the opportunists, and the "Real-politikers".

Oh sorrow, to-day Kautsky and the German Social Democrats borrow their ideas from the Fabians. And the "apes", like MacDonald, — at the time of the "Labour Government" which had only one achievement to show, that is, how one holds the train of the Queen and how one bows before the King, have in practice become the leaders of the (by your leave) "International", of Kautsky. But . . . it was, nevertheless, a Labour Government!?

It was, Grandmother! It was, dearly beloved! But can't you remember, little old one, can't you remember, little blind one, how it was?

It came about so; English workers attacked the bourgeoisie and raised the holy Ramsay MacDonald on their shoulders, under the slogan of recognition of the Soviet Union. What sort of a role did the Soviet Union play here?

Even a not very acute person would be able to say what sort of a role it was.

And further. Would anyone attempt to prove that significance of the Anglo-Russian trade union agreement were an alliance with the bourgeoisie and not the freeing from bourgeois influences! For the freeing from bourgeois influence which Kautsky, when he was much younger, excellently described, means the freeing from the influence of the Webbs and the Mac Donalds (who preach on Sunday in the churches), the Snowdens and the other Philistines who have never even thought of the "sharpest conflict with the bourgeoisie". But these people are, however, the comrades and mental compeers of the present day Kautsky! They are the "masters of the situation" in the Second International! They are its recognised leaders! They determine its decisions!

The "Russian influence", that is the influence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the influence of the bolshevik, is the "influence" in the direction of the freeing from the "influence" of the bourgeoisie. Everyone recognises that. And for this reason Mr. Joynson Hicks refuses foreign communists permission to enter England, but would be, however, very pleased at a "visit" of Kautsky. For he has also been a minister who has insulted no "decent bourgeois" nor "robbed" him!

The other pole of the world: China. Perhaps here the Soviet Union and the bolshevik appear as the greatest hindrance to the advance of the working class?

We hope, however, that not even an incorrigible swindler would contend that.

In France, only the Communist Party fights against the repulsive imperialist war, and the parliamentary fraction of

<sup>3)</sup> Karl Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia." (German Edition), Dietz' Nachfolger Publishing House, Berlin 1925. Page 11.

<sup>4)</sup> Ibid. Page 6.

<sup>5)</sup> "The Social Revolution". By Karl Kautsky. German Ed. Berlin 1907, P. 62 and 63.

<sup>6)</sup> Ibid. Page 63 and 64.

Kautsky's comrades goes, though hesitatingly, with the government.

We will not speak much about Germany. We must only call to mind that, when the French marched into the Ruhr district and occupied German towns with block troops in the name of "civilisation" and the "Simple Fundamentals of Right and Morality", the Soviet Union was the **only** state which officially protested against this act of violence. And the Communist Party was the **only** party (as the voice of the **workers**) which raised its voice against the international robbery.

One must be really a characterless calumniator to speak afterwards of "Moscow" and the Third International like the following:

"Only characterless blackguards and ignorant and thoughtless fanatics can maintain themselves in it").

"Characterless Blackguards!" Look at yourself in the mirror, "honourable" and "upright" Herr Kautsky! Where is the root of this burning malice? Where must one rummage in order to understand how this man, who once passed for a recognised marxist, who has read Marx and even published Marx, came to such a life?

It may be that the key is to be found in the following lines from the new booklet of the renegade: In Russia,

"**simple plundering of the possessing classes, such as any robber and thief understands**"<sup>7</sup>). took place.

And the second place in which the world revolution of the bolsheviks is "explained" and "interpreted": The bolsheviks

"saw their salvation in plundering the much richer Western Europe, and for this they once again needed the world revolution, the open or covert war against the governments abroad. This actual, if not always outspoken, state of war meant the cutting-off of Russia from the outside world"<sup>8</sup>).

These parts require no comment. The most excited and malicious property owner and philistine fearing for the safety of his nightshirt and savings bank book, that is our "hero".

The same feeling was expressed, but in a much more talented fashion, by the wellknown Russian Monarchist V. V. Shulgin. In his memoirs we find the following "Philosophy of the Russian Revolution" (the February Revolution!):

"In the overcrowded Buffet and in all the other rooms I found nothing: everything had been eaten up and everything drunk, down to the last glass of tea... The embittered landlord informed me that all his silver spoons had been stolen...

That was the commencement: in this way the revolutionary people had marked the dawn of its 'freeing'. And I understood why all these many thousands had the same expressionless dirty faces: for they were thieves in the past and robbers in the future... We were just at the turning point where they changed these phases... **The Revolution consisted thus in the fact that the thieves have gone over into the following class: they have become robbers**"<sup>9</sup>).

And with regard to "tactics", Shulgin judges logically and in a Kautskyan manner:

"... I feel in me a longing, helpless and therefore all the more furious anger.

Bring the machine guns!

Machine guns — that was my wish. For I felt that the only language which the street mobs would understand would be the machine guns, and that only lead could drive the horrible beasts who had forced their way into freedom, back into their holes...

Oh sorrow! This beast was: His Majesty the Russian People"<sup>10</sup>).

We will see how Kautsky also speaks of machine guns. At the moment, we only wish to stress the very obvious similarity of feeling and thought (one can still speak of thought) between the Russian reactionary and the Social Democratic "theoretician".

## II.

### The Absolutism of the Romanovs and the Absolutism of the Bolsheviki.

Kautsky — we are a little previous here — will invoke various armed forces against the soviet power. But he is not disinclined to coquet temporarily with his virtuousness: he would be, just think!, prepared first of all to try all other means: "simple persuasion, scientific arguments or an appeal to the feelings of comradeship which once bound us, or to a feeling of shame and humanity..."<sup>12</sup>)

We prefer here to speak of the "scientific arguments", for the "feelings of shame and humanity" which expressed themselves so excellently in the Social Democratic blood hunt after Liebknecht and Rosa to the "humanitarian" measures of retaliation of Noske, to the "humanitarian" activity of the Bulgarian Social Democrats in their support of Zankov, and to the "shameful" intimate and truly "human" relations with Barmat, would clearly be appreciated differently by us.

We will turn therefore to the "scientific arguments" of Kautsky. We have already seen what kind of science the "science" of this writer is, and of what nature his "scientific arguments" in the question of the international significance of the Soviet Union are. They are as like as two peas to the "scientific arguments" of the capitalist police departments; their inner mendacity is brought to light by the least touch of criticism. Let us see however, how the "critic of bolshevism" argues in other questions.

One of the chief problems (Kautsky even makes this "problem" the central one) is the question of the present "**absolutism of the Bolsheviki**". Here, it is true, Herr Kautsky does not so much prove as decree. We are however, compelled to follow also his "decrees".

Let us give Kautsky the floor:

"...once again a 'barbarian power' is sitting in Russia which laughs mockingly at the 'elementary laws of morality and right'. Once again we were witness of the 'idiotic indifference' with which Europe (stressed by me N. B.) 'watched the conquest of the Caucasian mountain stronghold by Russia'. The only difference is that now this indifference is not merely limited to the 'higher classes', and that this 'barbarian power' no longer has its head in Petersburg, but in Moscow, farther away from Europe and nearer to the Tartars, and that 'their hands' are not so much in the game in 'each Cabinet', but in each proletarian movement, not only of Europe but of the whole world"<sup>13</sup>).

That is Decree No. I. However, let it temporarily pass without objection and let us proceed to further theses of the Social Democratic "scholar":

"It is true that the bolshevik despotism distinguishes itself from the others with which we have previously had to do, by the fact that the new despots were at one time our comrades."<sup>14</sup>)

However:

"There are in America numerous millionaires who in their youth belonged to the poorest of the proletariat. Their proletarian origin does not hinder them from becoming later the most unscrupulous, the most hard-hearted of the exploiters of the proletariat. We find the same with the Bolsheviki. That they have risen from proletarian conditions of existence to unlimited power does not have the effect that they put proletarian thought and value upon the respect of the proletariat, but only that they distinguish themselves from other ruling classes by particular brutality and shamelessness."<sup>15</sup>)

That is "scientific argument" No. 2.

"Like every other military despotism, like the military monarchies of the Romanovs, the Habsburgs, the Hohenzollern, this despotism can only be overcome by force."<sup>16</sup>)

<sup>7</sup>) Kautsky. Ibid. Page 11.

<sup>8</sup>) Ibid. Page 9.

<sup>9</sup>) Ibid. Page 23.

<sup>10</sup>) V. V. Shulgin: "Dni" (The days): See the collected works "The February Revolution", Memoirs. Collected by Alexeyev. State Publishing House, 1925. Page 96. Russian edition.

<sup>11</sup>) Shulgin. Ibid. Page 89.

<sup>12</sup>) Karl Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia", Page 12.

<sup>13</sup>) Ibid. Pages 5 and 6.

<sup>14</sup>) Ibid. Page 14.

<sup>15</sup>) Ibid. Page 15.

<sup>16</sup>) Ibid. Page 17.

That is the "scientific conclusion" from the foregoing. That is also the whole "philosophy" of Karl Kautsky.

With the exception of the remarks about the previous "comradeship", one can find everything else in any bourgeois pamphlet against the dictatorship of the proletariat in Soviet Russia, both in foreign "works" and in those of the Russian White Guardists from the monarchists to and including the Social Revolutionaries. Our proletarians will read these malicious and counter-revolutionary lines with indignation, but we are writing also for those comrades whose ears are still stuffed with the ("free") bourgeois press, and only for this reason is it necessary to analyse this nonsense.

Above all, each Marxist is shocked in the "analysis" of Kautsky by the criminally frivolous attitude of the author to the class analysis of the state power. He flings the absolutism of "the Romanovs, the Habsburgers and the Hohenzollerns" and the Bolsheviki, all in one heap. Let us for one moment imagine that we are not indignant about this. Let us put all anger and indignation at the theoretical friend of the pogrom who will one day earn the cross of the "Legion of Honour", on one side. Let us examine the question calmly.

If Kautsky had had one trace of honesty, he would have been compelled to put forward the question of the classes.

What was at the basis of the Romanov monarchy? A semi-feudal ownership of the soil lay to the extent of 99 percent at the basis of the Romanov monarchy. The big land owners, dominating still over semi-serfs, formed the class basis of the Romanov monarchy. This "asiatic" (because most feudal) characteristic of the economic basis of absolutism explains completely why a special peculiarity of the "Russian" revolution consisted in the immense significance for this revolution of the agrarian question.

What was at the basis of the Hohenzollern monarchy? The block of the Junkers, the "agrarians", that is the large landowners who had to a great extent slipped out of the feudal uniform into the capitalist one, with the town capitalists, in which the former still held very great power. More or less the same was true of Austria also.

Why was Russian absolutism the most dangerous enemy of the international proletariat? Because this absolutism was the most dangerous reactionary power in the world. And this power was the most reactionary because the economically and socially most reactionary class formed its basis. The international gendarme and the support of the reaction was the state with the greatest remnants of feudalism supported upon semi-feudal large-landowning property relations.

Is this perhaps understandable? And is it also perhaps understandable that Germany and Austria stood nearest to Russia from the standpoint of police functions just because the bourgeois revolutions in these countries had not cleared away the feudal landowning relations in so radical a manner as for instance in France?

One may think what one likes about our revolution, but to deny the fact that it smashed the feudal landowners and swept them from the face of the earth with a thoroughness unequalled before, is only possible for all lunatic. Kautsky in his backward "development" has not yet gone so far. He does not deny the abolition of the large landowners, though this "robbery" is not particularly agreeable to him. But if this is true, how can a man who puts forward claims to being a Marxist (in all seriousness!), throw the Romanovs, Habsburgers, Hohenzollerns and the Bolsheviki, all in one heap together?

Excuse me, citizen! This is not only not Marxism, but not even vulgar Marxism: it is elementary ignorance. Such apologetic gyrations can only be termed "scientific arguments" in the language of Kautsky: as to their value, they are not worth tuppence.

This open and apologetic prestidigitation of Kautsky is so clumsy, so raw, so senseless, that even Theodor Dan, the executor of the fate of the Menshevik Party, felt himself compelled to take up arms against the theory under analysis. Citizen Dan writes, referring to the book of Kautsky:

"Unfortunately, Kautsky in developing his fundamental (stressed by me. N. B.) themes has not produced that which we were entitled to expect from the theoretical leader of Marxism... Instead of such an analysis, Kautsky limits himself already in his first chapter which demands from the present International the adoption of a similar attitude towards Bolshevik absolutism as that demanded by Marx from the First

International towards Czarist absolutism, to enumerating similarities between both 'absolutism'.

But is it possible to limit oneself to a formal logical classification in which this 'child of the revolution' is put under the same heading of 'absolutism' with the Romanov monarchy, instead of a concrete socio-economic analysis of such a historical phenomenon as Russian Bolshevism? Such a method leads to the most unexpected conclusions. Even N. P. Milyukov has pointed out their exceptional nature."<sup>17</sup>)

That is truly a sight for the Gods! Dan and "even N. P. Milyukov" teaching Kautsky Marxism! The unfortunate renegade at his age "makes haste" to run ahead of the bourgeoisie, ready for service, so much that he stumbles, stammers and stutters: the Marxist mask slips from his face and "even N. P. Milyukov" is compelled (probably not without a slight feeling of disgust) to call him to order. You have gone really rather far, Herr Kautsky!

To return: To throw the "power of the Bolsheviki" into one heap with absolutism, is simply not to understand the phenomena, or to mutilate them maliciously. We place Kautsky willingly the choice between the two categories of "moral" and "virtuous" people.

From what has been previously written, it follows that the opinions of Kautsky upon the international significance of the soviet power also from this point of view have received another smashing blow.

Let us turn however, to the further analysis of our theme! If the state in the Soviet Union is not a domination by the large landowners, and at the same time not a domination by the proletariat, then was it? Where is the class root of this state? What does Kautsky think about it?

The best explanation would seem to be the following: The Bolsheviki seized power as a proletarian party; afterwards, however, when they had consolidated themselves in power, they degenerated, ceased to be a proletarian power and went through just such a development as many of the American millionaires who forced their way up from the depths of the working class. The latter however raised themselves thanks to their personal enrichment, and their participation in the state power is the result of their personal enrichment, here however, the personal enrichment has become the result of the seizure of political power. We repeat it: This is the "best" explanation which one can put upon the fragments and notes scattered in Kautsky's work.

If that is so however, then, first of all, all those who hindered the party of the proletariat in its work, all those who sabotaged its work, all those who raised the sword against this party, together with the generals and the bourgeoisie, have played an objectively counter-revolutionary role and deserve the reprisals of the "plebians". To believe that the October overthrow was the work of a "little group of usurpers" would mean to leave fundamentally the basis of Marxist ideology. Here, therefore, is a complete justification of the Bolshevik tactics, as long as the party did not "degenerate".

Let us admit for the sake of argument that this is all "history" and that Kautsky does not demand a judgment upon what was, but upon what is. Very good. One must therefore regard the Bolsheviki as "degenerated", as of the same nature as the American millionaires who have risen from the ranks of the working class.

Let us reconcile ourselves (on paper, dear reader!) with this bitter fate. We will accept this. We will unite with Kautsky for a moment in the assumption that this is all true.

From this point however, real miracles begin. Kautsky has advanced the "American" example to his own undoing. If a bourgeois power of the American type had come in Russia in place of Czarism, that is in place of the state power of the feudal large landowners, this should have been very agreeable for Kautsky. For Kautsky in company with all the German (and not only the German) Social Democrats does nothing but lick the boots of the Americans: one must call to mind how they toadied to President Wilson, one has only to see how agreeably they squint at the pocket of Uncle Sam to-day. Certainly, the form of the government is not the same, but once the class nature is the same, the form is not so important. But why does Kautsky,

<sup>17</sup>) Th. Dan: "Kautsky upon Russian Bolshevism", an article in the Berlin "Socialisticheski Viestnik" ("Socialist Messenger"), of the 20th June 1925.

who now says that the American self-made men are the "most unscrupulous, most hard-hearted exploiters" not draw from this the conclusion that the government of the United States of America must be overthrown? But this inconsequence (or forgetfulness?) can be forgiven the old man... Cannot the reader see how hopelessly the one-time "minister of the Socialist Republic" and now true-hearted subject of Herr von Hindenburg, Karl Kautsky, has erred in his "scholarly arguments"?

Further: no one will be able to deny the fact that the NEP men are exactly from the "American" type of the bourgeoisie: a cunning bourgeoisie, without coat of arms, without tradition, self-made men. We Bolsheviki, however, give them no political rights. Kautsky, however, demands this. How is this "lack of connection" to be explained, esteemed Sir?

And here we see immediately in what channels Kautsky leads the assumption of an American-bourgeois character for our government. For then the fact of the cramping of the new bourgeoisie, the withdrawal of political rights from it, the bitter struggle carried on against it on the economic front, is understandable: it cannot be denied that our state economy has fought, not without success, against the permitted NEP bourgeoisie. From the standpoint of Kautsky these are all unexplainable things, or... it is necessary to let this hypothesis fall and to build up another.

This question could also have been examined from another point of view. Herr Kautsky speaks of degeneration, of millionaires, of lack of consideration for the proletariat, of anti-proletarian policy. But as proof he presents nothing, simply nothing, apart from a howl about the "terror". About the "terror" (Oh! he is terribly shocked, the fears of a child have attacked him!) we will speak later on. Where are there any facts about the material situation of the members of our party in Kautsky's book? Where does he make even an attempt at an analysis from this side (and this side is absolutely necessary if one wants seriously to speak of degeneration)?

In a word, where are those "millions" which are to provide a sufficient argument for the analogy with the American millionaires? The old slanderer has really invested it all himself. Or he has been nourished upon the old wives tales of the monarchist emigrants about the brilliants and the pearls of Zinoviev, those economic side supports of the famous "Zinoviev" letter upon which Mr. Ramsay MacDonald supported himself. With regard to the "respect of the proletariat" and its policy etc.: where does Kautsky find one word about the "Lenin recruitment", about the growth of our party and that of the Young Communist League, about the raising of the material level of comfort of the workers? Where is one word to be found which might suggest some acquaintance with the facts?

But all this is a book with seven seals for Kautsky; he supports himself obviously simply and solely upon "the intuition of genius", and at the utmost upon the café house talk of the white guardists, the best "source" for a serious "scholar".

The hypothesis of the American-bourgeois character of our power must be abandoned on account of its utter impossibility. But nevertheless an answer to the question of the class nature of the soviet power must be given: one cannot in any way get round this question; may however a "Marxist", a conscientious man seek to get round such a question?

Kautsky, as we have seen, sees only the following characteristics: the "dominant class which distinguishes itself from the other (?) dominant classes by particular brutality and shamelessness". However, even a little child can see that such a "Marxist" criterion for the classification of dominant classes is a little too paltry. One must then find the socio-economic basis of the class. It is true that Herr Kautsky has properly mutilated all that he ever learnt: has he not replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat by a coalition with the bourgeoisie. We had however not before heard that the conception class was based upon considerations of "brutality" instead of exact and objective socio-economic criteria.

In one part of the book we find a few "daring" lines which actually must explain what it is all about. Kautsky writes:

"They (the Bolsheviki: N. B.) have reached a point at which they live from the dominance over and the exploitation of the proletariat. But they have no desire to surrender this position to a capitalist class. Therefore they stand to-day above the proletariat and capital and attempt to use both as tools."<sup>18)</sup>

We see therefore that the "American" hypothesis is rejected by the author himself a few pages further on, in consequence of considerations which have occurred to him in the meantime. Now we have a conception of a "class" which stands over both the proletariat and capital. Kautsky writes even that "it has not become a power friendly to capital",<sup>19)</sup> but "utilises" simply everybody and everything.

This remarkable "sociological analysis" really deserves attention. We must examine it more closely. First, however, we must make the following observations:

First of all, according to Kautsky, we can in no way be a peasant power expressing the interests of the peasantry.

Secondly, with Kautsky one can in no way assume that the soviet power is a power of the "organisatory intelligencia" (Bogdanov); on the contrary, Kautsky stresses as far as possible our alleged enmity towards this intelligencia.

After these observations, let us go on to a further analysis.

The Bolsheviki are therefore "above both the proletariat and capital". Very well. Let us examine this "formula"!

Above all, one question: Do these "Bolsheviki" themselves form a class or do they not?

Let us assume that they do: Doesn't Herr Kautsky himself say that this "class" distinguishes itself from the "other dominating classes by its particular brutality and shamelessness"?

The communists are therefore a social class. Let us analyse (always following Kautsky), what sort of a class that is.

Above all one must consider that the Party (with its candidates) numbers about a million people. Of these, the greatest number comes from the working class "from the bench" and from the peasantry "at the plough". The question therefore arises: Do these comrades who live upon their slender earnings and sacrifice everything, belong to the exploiters? Or what? They live in the sphere of productive work in every sense of the word. They create material value directly and give up a part of their labour to the state. Their time apart from their productive work, which Kautsky for instance uses for recovery, they devote to the most tiring social work. To where must they be reckoned?

If Kautsky counts them to the exploiters, then even the cats would laugh at such a learned dodderer.

If however, they are to be reckoned to the exploited, then two classes must exist inside the party, and the one must be the deadly enemy of the other.

There are however still the "employees". Are they perhaps the exploiters? Where is the sign of this? In the fact that their labour does not create immediate material value? If so, then for instance, Kautsky is an exploiter par excellence. For he has never touched a bench, lives in a non-productive sphere and, according to his level of life, he stands far higher than of 99.9 percent of our party officials.

What is left of the "class"? A little group of "responsible officials". Why is this little group a "class"? Where are the constituent characteristics of this "class"?

A dominant class is always characterised by the fact that it has a monopoly of the means of production, or at least of the most important means of production in the particular society. If a little group of people is a dominant class, that means that this little group possesses the "nationalised" means of production as its personal property. In other words: from this conception of Kautsky results that, let us say, the members of the Political Bureau of the Party, and amongst them I, poor sinner, are the possessors and owners of the whole of large scale industry, a finance capitalistic oligarchy which accumulates its profits, now "millionaires". Then, however, this little group would be a class of new capitalist millionaires. But where are these millions? And where is this capitalist oligarchy? And where are these profits? And where is this peculiar concern? Perhaps Herr Kautsky has mixed us up with Barmat? He probably knows something about a so-called "delusive appearance"?

Such absurdities result when one follows the "thoughts" of Kautsky to the end.

Let us however assume that Kautsky speaks of a class figuratively or conditionally. Let us assume that the Bolsheviki are not a class.

What is the result then? A class society without a dominant class! A state without any class nature? Quite simply a sort of embodiment and condensation of "brutality, cruelty and shamelessness"?

<sup>18)</sup> Ibid. Page 25. The stress is mine. N. B.

<sup>19)</sup> Ibid.

Truly, that is a "social philosophy"! Oh Kautsky, Kautsky! Truly, these are "scientific arguments"!

If the Bolsheviks are not a class, they must nevertheless express the interests of some class or the other.

This class is not the larger landowners. They are, as Kautsky himself admits, non-existent, they have been wiped out.

This class is not the capitalists. Kautsky admits that also.

This class is not the peasants, not the intellectuals (even if one regards the latter as a class).

What remains?

The proletariat.

We will return to this question in another connection. Now, however, we will go on to the second question bearing directly upon the matter. We saw, how "successfully" Kautsky analysed the class nature of the soviet power. Let us see now how he formulates the question of the form of the state power.

It will be enough here to limit ourselves to one or two remarks. By absolutism, as is known, a state form is understood in which the fullness of power is in the hands of one person, and in which this situation is legally grounded. Absolutism is the absolute monarchy in contradistinction to the republic or the constitutional monarchy. This word has only this meaning, unless one is twisting words.

It is therefore clear to use such a term for a Soviet Republic, means either to twist words or to be in ignorance of the matter altogether, not to know the ABC. of the state in our country.

Naturally, Herr Kautsky is not so naive. Whilst using the word "absolutism" with intent to deceive, he is protesting essentially against the system of a dominating party, against the system of the dictatorship. He is not pleased with the so to say collective "absolutism" of the proletarian class. Has he not, as previously mentioned, created a poverty-stricken theory according to which the dictatorship is replaced by the coalition? From the standpoint of a coalition with the bourgeoisie, the dictatorship appears naturally as "absolutism". This is more than understandable and requires no further explanation.

With regard to the class nature of our power, it is proletarian.

With regard to its form, it is dictatorial.

That which makes Kautsky furious, that against which he carries on a mad struggle, is thus the dictatorial form of the state power of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat, that is the object of the hatred of the whole international bourgeoisie and their Social Democratic apostle.

## OBITUARY

### Emil Eichhorn.

Comrade Emil Eichhorn, one of the old guard of Social Democratic leaders remaining faithful until death to the revolutionary proletariat, died on 26. July.

Comrade Emil Eichhorn was born on 9. October 1863 at Roehrsdorf near Chemnitz. During the period in which the "Socialist Law" was in force, he joined the then prohibited Social Democratic movement, and took an energetic part in the illegal work of this movement. He was a metal worker by trade, participated in the labour movement from his earliest youth, and was invariably to be found in the front ranks of both trade union and political organisations.

In 1893 he became editor of the "Sächsischen Arbeiterzeitung" in Dresden, and soon after this chief editor of the Mannheim "Volksstimme". In 1901 the workers of Mannheim elected him to the Baden Diet, and in 1903 the workers of Pforzheim to the Reichstag, of which he was a member up to the time of his death.

In the old Social Democratic Party, Emil Eichhorn was one of the extreme Left wing, in company with Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, and the others. On 9. November 1918 the Independent Social Democratic Party called upon him to under take the post of President of Police in Berlin. Whilst the whole of the leaders of the German Social Democratic Party and of the Independent Social Democratic Party betrayed and misled the revolutionary

proletariat of Berlin at every step, Emil Eichhorn held true to the revolution. Hence the inextinguishable hate and rage of Ebert, Scheidemann, and their like, who caused the monarchist White Guards to be marched against the Berlin Presidency of Police on 12. January 1919, a step leading to frightful fighting in the streets. Emil Eichhorn's faithfulness to the revolutionary proletariat of Berlin caused him to be persecuted up to the day of his death by class legislation. The proceedings taken against him in 1919 have never been abandoned, and every time the Reichstag was dissolved, comrade Eichhorn was obliged to seek safety from arrest by flight.

When a treacherous disease kept him confined to his bed for many months some years ago, it was feared that he would not recover, but on this occasion he was able to join our ranks again, and on 7. December the revolutionary proletariat again elected him to the Reichstag.

With the exceptions of Clara Zetkin and Josef Herzfeld, comrade Eichhorn was the only one of the really old guard of Social Democrats to find his way to Communism.

The international working class will be true to his memory.

## John Lékai (John Lassen).

By L. F. Boross.

A few days ago, comrade John Lékai (John Lassen), one of the founders of the Young Communist movement in Hungary and one of the founders of the Young Communist International, died in New York.

His name first became known in September 1918 when he made an unsuccessful attempt upon the life of the Prime Minister Count Tisza, the worst enemy of the working class. His revolver failed him and after maltreatment he was flung into jail. Count Tisza met his fate at other hands six weeks later on the 31st October. Lékai however was freed upon the same day by the first revolution and welcomed enthusiastically. He was however, not able to utilise his freedom for long, for on the 20th February 1919 he was once again arrested — this time by the bourgeois-social democratic "revolutionary" government — as an official of the Communist Youth. He was once again freed upon the advent of the proletarian revolution.

During the war, comrade Lékai was active in the revolutionary anti-militarist group of comrade Otto Korvin who was condemned to death and executed after the fall of the Soviet Republic. The programme of this group contained — in Hungary cut off from almost all foreign information — rather many unclaritys. This group however based itself even at that time upon the best and most revolutionary shop officials of the metal works in the neighbourhood of Budapest and upon the best elements of the revolutionary intelligenzia. It greeted the bolshevik revolution in Russia with enthusiasm and carried on a successful anti-militarist propaganda in the army. The members of this group, and amongst them comrade Lékai, almost without exception attached themselves to the Communist Party of Hungary, formed in November 1918, and became together with the workers returned as prisoners of war from Russia under the leadership of comrade Bela Kun, the first officials of the Party.

Before and during the Soviet Republic, comrade Lékai was secretary or chairman of the Young Communist League which had drawn with it the great majority of the organised working youth after the split away from the old Social Democratic League. During the Soviet Republic, Lékai worked as a Soviet official in the interests of the working youth.

After the collapse he continued his untiring revolutionary activity without regard to his ever growing sickness. At first in Vienna and then in Germany, where he worked as an official of the Young Communist International. In 1922 he went to New York and was active as editor of a party paper, party organiser and writer without interruption until his death.

The Communist International loses in him a persistent honest fighter who dedicated his whole life to the freeing of the working class.