

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 68

3rd September 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: Inprekorr, Vienna.

C O N T E N T S

Albert Treint: Two Congresses.

In the Camp of our Enemies

J.: Letters from Marseilles.

Kautsky and Otto Bauer: Right Cynicism and Left Hypocrisy.

N. Bucharin: The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostie. VIII.

Hands off China

L. Geller: The Murder of Lao-Tchun-Kai and the Fight against Canton.

Appeal of the Chinese Seamen's Union.

Politics

Iran dust: The League of Nations and the Mossul Question.

The Balkans

An Urgent Appeal for Help from the Bulgarian Emigrants

Letter from Sofia.

Economics

H. Erde: The Significance of the German Tariffs in the International Competitive Struggle.

The Labour Movement

M. N. Roy: Industrial Strife in India.

The White Terror

The R. I. L. U. against the Murder Regime in Poland.

K. (Warsaw): The Responsibility of the Polish Socialist Party for the Execution of the three Revolutionaries.

In the Colonies

N. J.: A Blood Bath in Beirut.

In the International

Final Text of Trotzky's Letter on Eastman's Book: "Since Lenin Died".

Book Reviews

Paul Friedländer: The American Labour Press Directory.

Two Congresses.

By Albert Treint.

Marseilles, 26th August 1925.

In Marseilles there are taking place two Congresses: the Congress of the Labour and Socialist International and the Congress of the workers and peasants of South France.

The contrast between these two congresses strikes the eye: here a meeting of leaders who are permeated to the very finger tips with bourgeois ideology; there a meeting of delegates who have been sent from the factories and the villages of an important section of France.

At the moment of writing the Congress of the Labour and Socialist International has not concluded its labours, or more correctly said, has not yet finished playing the comedy which is being followed with ever-decreasing interest by the proletariat. In spite of this, it can be said with absolute certainty that this Congress will not yield anything else than a few artfully-worded compromise resolutions, which, by reason of their ambiguity, will allow of a sufficiently elastic interpretation by every national party when serving their bourgeoisie and will enable the Hamburg International to look after the business of world capitalism.

As a matter of fact, only one important, and very characteristic, decision was accepted without debate in the first session.

Friedrich Adler, who along with Tom Shaw was secretary of the Labour and Socialist International, in a speech which was practically dripping with sentimental references to himself, submitted the reasons why the Executive Committee has decided to remove the seat of the Labour and Socialist International from London to Geneva.

The ex-hero Fritz Adler is an indispensable secretary. But he finds life tedious in London. He no longer derives any pleasure from residing in England. Herr Fritz Adler is suffering from home-sickness, home-sickness for his mother tongue and his own family hearth. He can therefore only remain at his post provided it is somewhat nearer to Vienna. Therefore, the Socialist International, in the person of Friedrich Adler, will pack up its luggage and proceed to Geneva.

The whole thing would be simply absurd, if the matter did not possess a far greater political significance.

Capitalist Great Britain is experiencing great upheavals, — much as this may displease Mr. Henderson. India, Egypt and the British working class are beginning to stir in a manner which is very disquieting to the imperialists of the British Isles. The British proletariat is becoming more revolutionary; the left movement in the trade unions is developing and gaining in strength. The influence of the English Communist Party is growing. Great struggles are preparing. There are approaching signs of a revolutionary situation in England.

The Socialist International therefore prefers to transfer its headquarters to idyllic Switzerland, in the neighbourhood of its good friend, the League of Nations.

As soon as the revolutionary temperature in Great Britain rises, the Labour and Socialist International no longer feels comfortable there. It emigrates to a safer country. This is a kind of white emigration which is very characteristic of the counter-revolutionary character of present-day socialism.

In Geneva the League of Nations and the Labour and Socialist International will become more and more closely connected with each other, and will be better able to combine their efforts against the world proletariat.

* * *

There are a few details to which attention should be called.

In Marseilles, Bracke spoke of Wilhelm Liebknecht, whose son Karl carried on the glorious revolutionary traditions of his father. This is really nothing else but a piece of impudence on Bracke's part. The whole Congress felt uneasy at this reference. Herr Philipp Scheidemann, who is responsible for the murder of Karl Liebknecht and also for the immunity of his murderers, was present in the Hall. It is true that he concealed himself behind the platform.

The Congress has already lasted four days and no one has spoken of the Moroccan war. Otto Bauer, behind the closed doors of the commission of which he is a member, has admitted that it is a political error. That does not mean that Herr Bauer is in favour of a serious struggle against the war in Morocco. But Herr Bauer is of the opinion that if one wishes to deceive the proletariat one must keep up appearances. One must, therefore, at any rate speak of Morocco, especially at a moment when the Workers' and Peasants' Congress is being held in Marseilles, precisely on account of the Moroccan war.

It is very safe for Otto Bauer to mention this question. Austria has no colonies. It is obvious that Mr. Henderson has to be more discreet. There are such countries as India, Egypt and Ireland.

* * *

The placard, thousands of copies of which have been pasted up on the walls in Marseilles, and in which the French Communist Party exposes the true character of the International of social traitors, has made a great impression upon the workers here, a fact which has caused the leaders of the Socialist International to pull wry faces.

The Congress of the workers and peasants from the district of Marseilles indicates a definite step forward compared with the labour congresses of Paris, Lille, Lyons and Beziers. Out of 1200 delegates, several hundred consisted of non-party workers, about 100 socialists and 150 members of the Confederation Generale du Travail. Under the two last categories there were responsible revolutionary fighters belonging to trade unions and the socialist party.

The secretary of the Socialist Youth from Var clearly pointed out the reprehensible attitude of M. Renaud, the socialist member of parliament for Var. He declared the Communist Party to be the only party of the working class, and called upon all workers to rally round the committee of action, in spite of the opposition of the reformist leaders.

At the Marseilles Workers' Congress the revolutionary seamen of the Mediterranean fleet were represented by delegates. Three seamen in uniform spoke at the Congress. They reported upon the mutiny of the "Courbet" and proclaimed the full solidarity of the numerous revolutionary seamen of the Mediterranean with the French and international proletariat.

The whole Congress took place in an atmosphere of indescribable enthusiasm.

The Congress of the workers and peasants in Marseilles expressed itself unanimously in favour of an immediate peace, for the independence of the Rif, for the evacuation of Morocco

by means of fraternisation at the front, by boycott of transport of war material and by preparing a 24 hours general strike.

The Congress greeted the slogan of defeatism with long and continued applause.

* * *

It was decided that the Congress should form a procession and march to the Polish Embassy, in order to express its indignation against the white terror and the execution of comrades Botwin, Hibner, Knievsky and Rutkovski. The police attempted to oppose the formation of the procession, but they were compelled to give way.

At the head of the procession there marched revolutionary fighters of the Central Committee and of the district Committees of Action, communist members of parliament and functionaries, accompanied with red flags.

The demonstration set out from the working class quarter of Chartreux. The whole population greeted the procession and shouted out their applause as it marched past. The procession grew larger and larger. After having proceeded for about a mile, it encountered a formidable barrier of police forces. At the very moment when Doriot and myself attempted to explain in a few words the import of this demonstration and give the signal for the demonstrators to disperse, the police, without any previous warning, attacked with drawn swords and with revolvers ready to fire. Women were trodden under-foot. A pregnant woman was kicked in the stomach. A child of 10 months had to be passed from hand to hand in order that it might escape the brutal attack.

Demonstrators, passers-by and spectators were beaten and thrown to the ground. There were many wounded.

* * *

Marseilles has a socialist municipal council, at the head of which is M. Flaissière. The town and the socialist municipal council have, right from the beginning, accorded the greatest honour to the Congress of the Labour and Socialist International. On the day following however, the police forbade the demonstration of the workers and peasants Congress, without any opposition being offered by the socialist municipality.

* * *

These events are showing in the clearest manner to all workers, who are those who really represent their interests and really fight against war. They will also help to place the socialist leaders in the true light before the eyes of the workers and peasants of Marseilles and the whole of France.

IN 'THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES'

Letters from Marseilles.

By J.

The following series of letters, written by our special correspondent at Marseilles, will serve to provide our readers with a lively picture of the proceedings of the Congress of the Second International and to indicate the real purport of this so-called world Congress. E.J.

I.

Marseilles, 22nd August 1925.

When two years ago in Hamburg we saw the great hall of the Central Trade Union premises decorated with various national colours, many of us were inclined to regard this as a mere accident. The Hamburg social democrats constitute the right wing of even the German social democracy. We thought that they had gone somewhat too far in their eagerness. But now in Marseilles, the same spectacle is to be seen. The great exhibition hall is decorated all round with the flags of all the bourgeois nations. We counted no less than 12 Mussolini flags, ten Horthy, ten Zankov, ten Primo de Rivera flags and, last but not least, ten Tsarist flags, not counting remaining flags of the bourgeois republics and kingdoms. Among each cluster of flags there was modestly concealed one small red flag. As if to make up for this, the delegates' tables are covered with red cloth. To whom has the concession been made in this connection? To the nationalism of the various social democratic parties, or to the revolutionary proletariat? It seems to us that a local bourgeois newspaper, "Le Petit marseillais", is quite right when it assumes that it is the red colour which constitutes the concession.

The congress hall presents the same appearance as that of Hamburg. About 25 countries of the white races are represented

by delegates, in the very best case, therefore, a "white" International — for the two socialist inclined Chinese Paris students who are present only tend to strengthen this impression rather than to remove it. It is a meeting of petty bourgeois and their wives, among them being former Ministers and police presidents, who are not displaying their dignity, but rather the kicks with which they were rewarded.

The International is not designated by a number, it does not like being called the II. International. By way of distinction from the Moscow International, a local bourgeois newspaper characterised it as "International Hambourgeoise". This means: the International which has been founded in Hamburg and at the same time is saturated with the bourgeois spirit. A very apt description.

* * *

Today there was held the opening session. Speeches of welcome were delivered, among them some which already indicate the spirit of the whole Congress. The former Minister of His British majesty, **Arthur Henderson**, delivered the opening speech. It was announced, to the general surprise, that the International is to be transferred from London to Switzerland; to a country, where it has no supporters, as the Swiss social democratic Party is not affiliated to the L. S. I. The reason given for this removal is simply that Fritz Adler is obliged to leave London on family grounds.

Besides the speech of Henderson, that of **Oudegeest** was also of interest. Oudegeest makes great play with the phrase, that the trade unions must be independent from the political parties and also from the International. He refuses to allow the Russian trade unions to enter the Amsterdam International, solely because they are said to belong to the III. International. We have already met this politically independent Oudegeest in Hamburg, where he welcomed the unity Congress of the 2 and 2½ Internationals expressly in the name of the Amsterdam International.

Oudegeest also spoke in Marseilles in order, as leader of the Amsterdam International, to boost the London International. He delivered a highly political speech, in which he expressed his support for the **Guarantee Pact**, which every one knows will guarantee nothing else but a military coalition against Soviet Russia. And this he specially designated as a guarantee of peace. As economic demands, Oudegeest mentioned the socialising of the land, as well as the nationalisation of the mines. It is well known that Oudegeest is working strenuously against the trade union united front, which would render the trade unions a really great power. He is therefore helping to destroy the pre-requisites for a real socialisation. For he does not believe himself that the bourgeoisie will voluntarily deliver over their mines to the workers.

These were the most important features of the opening session.

II.

The International Situation and the Struggle for Peace.

24th August 1925.

The two plenary sittings of yesterday and today were devoted to the most important matters of the Congress. It was intended that they should furnish an analysis of the world situation, and lay down a certain line of policy for the socialist parties indicating how they shall work in order to secure peace. That is the least which one could expect. The outstanding features of the present situation are: War in Morocco; war in Syria; the world-historical uprising of the peoples enslaved by the imperialists, the first great precursor of which is the Chinese revolution; the efforts of the imperialists to set up a military united front against the Soviet Union and against the suppressed peoples. From the Rhine to the Dnieper, from the North Sea to the Mediterranean there extends one mass of Balkanised States, in which 20 nations are delivered over to suppression by two imperialist powers and their vassals. The dangers which particularly threaten the working class are enormous. We have, therefore, a world situation which urgently demands, from an International which claims to have behind it millions of working people, a definite attitude. One by one the big guns appeared before the Congress: the Englishman **C. Roden Buxton**, the German **Hilferding**, the French **Blum** and the American **Hillquit**. And the result of these speeches? Apart from Hillquit's lecture, in which he only enumerated a series of facts from American history during the last century, without indicating their cause and without drawing any con-

clusions, and if we disregard some parrot phrases of the other speakers as to realistic pacifism and disarmament, then it must be said that the speakers have simply maintained silence regarding everything which is taking place in the world, not to mention that they have not drawn the correct conclusions from the events. They simply and solely dealt with the Geneva Protocol, or more correctly said, with the so-called Security Pact. The main point of dispute is, as to whether it shall be decided that the social democratic parliamentary fractions in France and Germany, as well as the English Labour Party, shall support this Pact, or whether these fractions shall be left to do as they please. That was the question. All the rest was mere talk, which contributed nothing towards arriving at an understanding of the situation, but at the very most to an understanding of the counter-revolutionary role of social democracy, so far as it has not already been exposed by its attitude to the Security Pact and to the Geneva Protocol.

One must ask: what purpose is served by all these speeches? Are they intended to bring any benefit to the working class? Were people here active in the interests of the proletariat? Nobody can maintain this. Regarded from this standpoint, the entire congress appears to be without any meaning. But it immediately acquires a meaning if we consider that here it is not the cause of the proletariat, but that of quite another class which is being cared for; that here not the representatives of the workers, but the agents of the bourgeoisie are at work. When one sees it from this point of view the object of all the deliberations becomes immediately clear. Here a real policy is being pursued — a real policy in the interest of a great fraction of the bourgeoisie. **Blum** assured the Congress that when in recent years he read certain diplomatic memoranda, he found in them again the ideas which had already been expressed in the so-called Labour International. A remarkable admission! This was actually the case, but not because the bourgeois governments care for the interests of the working class, but vice versa: because the social democracy and its International look after the business of the bourgeois governments. He asserted that he, as well as **Hilferding**, had spoken as good patriots. He as a good Frenchman, **Hilferding** as a good German. Quite correct — both are good representatives of certain sections of the German and French bourgeoisie, whose policies they defend on the international field.

Herein lies the real import of this Congress — in fact even the purport of the whole so-called Labour and Socialist International, which deserves the name: Socialist International, section of the International bourgeoisie.

III.

The Eight Day.

Marseilles, 25th August 1925.

At to-day's session of the Plenum the mandate Commission submitted its report. It transpired that the International Labour Office is officially represented at the Congress. This, to some extent, symbolises that the so-called Labour and Socialist International is closely linked with that League of the imperialist governments called the League of Nations. Apart from this there are 426 delegates present. Certain countries are represented by a whole number of parties.

Before proceeding to the items on the agenda, the Russian Menshevik **Abrahamovitch** made use of the occasion of the 75th birthday of **Paul Axelrod**, in order to open a cannonade of abuse against the Bolsheviki. He mentioned as a special merit that Axelrod was partly responsible for those celebrated words which **Plechanov** uttered in 1889 at the first Congress of the II. International in Russia: The revolution will either be victorious as a proletarian revolution, or it will not be victorious at all. And now he heaped abuse upon the bolsheviki, who transformed these celebrated words into deeds and who led the Russian revolution as a proletarian revolution to victory. No, the proletarian revolution, the only possible form of a victorious revolution, does not please these gentry. They would prefer a democratic capitalism, just as **Abramovitch** openly declared at the Hamburg Congress. They mock themselves without knowing it. It is worth noting that it was specially the English who received the speech of **Abramovitch** with icy silence. This was all the more striking as one would have expected a warm ovation for an old veteran.

Tom Shaw reported on the eight hour day. Shaw was an English delegate to the Washington Conference. He was Minister for Labour in England. He is a permanent representative at

the Labour Office in Geneva, and he accordingly delivered the sort of speech which might have been expected from him. Before all he praised the Versailles Peace Treaty as being the first peace treaty in the history of the world which paid a sort of compliment to the eight hour day and expressed a word of censure against the worst type of capitalist who exploit the workers too much. Do these clauses of the Versailles Treaty really deserve this praise which Shaw, with the approval of the German delegation, gave them? We recollect under what circumstances the Treaty was set up: In Russia the victory of bolshevism, the first victorious battles against the armies of Koltchak; in Hungary a proletarian dictatorship, whose red Army triumphantly drove the Czechish legions into Slovakia; a revolutionary ferment in the whole of Central Europe, and in France and in England the demobilisation crisis! Truly the capitalists had every reason to make certain concessions to their workers, which found their expression even in the notorious Versailles Treaty. When, however, capitalism, at least in Central and Western Europe, had come through the worst part of the crisis, it no longer showed itself to be so very conciliatory towards the workers, and the governments who were "friendly to labour" suddenly became hostile to labour. Shaw is now tremendously amazed at all this. How comes it, he asks, that the governments, who recently thought otherwise, have changed so quickly. He was particularly annoyed because the English Conservative government has not ratified the Washington agreement, which the representatives of England agreed to at the time. Shaw was Minister for Labour for 10 months. He had the opportunity, if he had only desired, of having the Washington Agreement ratified. But by a strange chance he had only prepared the necessary Bill for this purpose when he was driven out of office by the Conservatives. Shaw enumerated at great length all the countries which have either not ratified the Washington Agreement at all, or have only ratified it under certain conditions — which amounts to non-ratification. A very long list! It appears that there is not a single industrial country which has ratified the Agreement.

Shaw was followed by the late Czechish Minister for social services **Habermann**, who sang a paen in praise of his social Republic, which has such magnificent laws. The next speaker was the vice chairman of the Amsterdam International, **Mertens**, a Belgian. He also lavished praise on his government, which has drawn up a bill which provides for the unconditional ratification of the Washington Agreement. It is true, he insisted that many difficulties stand in the way of the acceptance of this law by parliament. After him there spoke **Janiczek**, an Austrian, who, of course, also praised his Republic.

That was all that was brought forward regarding the item "eight hour day": "parliamentary action" for its ratification, simultaneous interpellations in parliament, and other things of that sort. Everything turned upon the ratification of the Washington Agreement, upon a law which, even if it were accepted, would rather mean a legal violation than a legal establishment of the eight hour day.

The parties of the II. International have long been content to admit that they are not revolutionary parties and do not pursue any definite goal of a social revolution. They acknowledge their adherence to reformism, and in the best cases put forward as their chief task to stand for the every-day requirements of the workers in capitalist society. Now the situation of the working class is growing visibly worse from day to day, the conditions of work are worsening and the bourgeoisie is conducting a great offensive against the eight hour day. Were the parties of the II. International real parties of reformist socialism, then it would be precisely in such a question as the "eight hour day" that they would have to show what they are able to do, and what fighting measures they will resort to in order to prevent the whole life-time of the working class being treated as work-time for capitalist exploitation. But the Congress has no other suggestion than to direct an appeal to the governments to ratify the Washington agreement and to instruct the socialist parliamentary fractions energetically to support this ratification. This is to be done by precisely those parliamentarians who, as is known, proposed themselves the introduction of an "elastic" eight hour day; such an attitude is paramount to complete abandonment of the most elementary every day interests of the workers.

"Socialist International!" What have these people in common with socialism? "Labour International!" What are they doing for the workers? Just as little for the daily interests as for the

permanent class interests of the proletariat. This has been vividly demonstrated once again by the discussion of this important question of the eight hour day at this congress.

IV.

Unemployment, the Women's Movement. Alcohol, Tuberculosis.

Marseilles, 26th August 1925.

To-day's sitting of the Plenum really constituted a festival. Already on the previous evening it was announced that on the next day the Minister of His Majesty King of the Belgians, **M. Vandervelde**, would occupy the chair, assisted by the Minister of His Swedish Majesty, **Moeller**. For this huge event the delegates appeared in great numbers and the ex-Ministers as well as the aspirants to Ministerial posts, applauded enthusiastically when the Ministers in office appeared on the platform.

In Hamburg the question was still being disputed as to whether the new International should permit its members to enter a bourgeois government. It was considered inexpedient to lay down a final decision and it was decided to evade the question in all forms. Nevertheless, it was decided that membership of a bourgeois government is incompatible with the dignity of membership of the Executive. This signified a weak, but nevertheless a certain repudiation of ministerialism. To-day, a ministerial position in a bourgeois government is considered compatible even with the presidency of the Congress, and the Congress even felt honoured by being presided over by a real live minister. "I have become a Minister and yet remain a member of the International", said Vandervelde condescendingly to the Congress. How gracious of him that he has not yet given his International the sack.

It happened that while Vanderveld was presiding the question of unemployment came up for discussion. In the commission serious collisions have occurred in this question between the Belgians and the English. The latter perceived in the German reparation deliveries, particularly in the deliveries in kind, the chief cause of unemployment and demanded that the resolution on employment should pronounce against all reparation deliveries. This ran counter to the wishes of the Belgians. Has Vandervelde signed the Treaty of Versailles in vain? Have the Belgian socialists so energetically supported reparation deliveries all for nothing? **De Brouckere** delivered the report of the commission. He talked all round the subject of unemployment. He particularly warned the capitalists not to drive matters too far, for unemployment could finally even endanger capitalism itself. He did not say much regarding the controversy in the commission. But the English were at their post. **Dollan** delivered a sharp speech against **De Brouckere** and introduced an amendment, which, as a compromise, demanded the "restriction" of the reparation deliveries. This immediately aroused the ire of Vandervelde. He protested on a point of order against the question of the reparations being raised. This had already been decided in Hamburg in favour of the Belgians. It was inadmissible to raise the question again at this Congress. This shylock insisted on the terms of his bond.

The entire debate on unemployment was quite on a line with the previous deliberations of the Congress. The evils were enumerated, some more or less suitable proposals were brought forward in order to abolish them, but it was not said by what means they are to be realised. The reference to Socialism in the resolution obviously aimed at consoling the starving workers with the hopes of a better time in the distant future, just as religion does with its followers.

In addition to the above, the Women's Question, the Tuberculosis Question and the Alcohol Question were dealt with. The most interesting was the alcohol debate. The delegates at the Congress were not by any means backward when it came to a question of sampling the good Southern French wines which Marseilles offers in such a great variety and abundance. As a symbol of their political activity, "to advocate water and to drink wine", the Congress decided to propagate anti-alcoholism and proposed a resolution to this effect. It only required that **Wels** should have taken the chair when this item was on the agenda. But there appeared a stolid Dane who was all too fond of his "little drop", and who took this resolution seriously. He protested against its acceptance, putting forward the very strange reason that he would have "no peace" at home if this resolution were accepted here. Of course he wants to enjoy his "little drop" in peace. The Congress quite appreciated this stand-

point and, accompanied by general amusement, passed the resolution on the Exekutive.

Women's emancipation, anti-alcoholism, fight against tuberculosis — the Congress has time for all these matters. Only the word Morocco has not been mentioned up to the present!

V.

Morocco, Guarantee Pact, Colonial Politics, Soviet Union.

Marseilles, 28th August 1925.

On the last day the Congress had, after all, to take up an attitude to the Moroccan question. It was, however, very characteristic! The demand was put forward that — Spain shall recognise the independence of the Riff area. The governments shall announce their peace terms, and after the commencement of peace negotiations there must be a cessation of hostile activities. In cases of dispute the League of Nations shall decide. Not a word as to what the French and Spanish proletariat should do in order to call a halt to this criminal war. These tame demands were submitted, not by a French delegate out a Spanish delegate. The Congress did not waste any time on this matter and accepted the resolution without any comment.

Now came the turn of the political resolutions. The first was the resolution of commission No. 1 on War and War Danger, which would really deserve to be called a resolution on the Geneva protocol and the Guarantee Pact. The Commission could not come to an agreement as to its attitude to the Guarantee Pact, the question was therefore postponed and was left to a Conference of the three parties of the countries concerned; England, France and Belgium, to decide, as soon as the final text of the Guarantee Pact is published. The Geneva Protocol and the League of Nations came in for high praise in this resolution.

It is characteristic that the old reformist Turati, who already in the old International occupied a right wing position, in the name of several delegations, among them the Austrian, brought forward his objections to the resolution, which appeared to him to be too little Marxist. This remark obtained for him a word of censure on the part of De Brouckère who, from the chair, declared that these objections originate from nations and petty States who bear very little responsibility. A proper ruler's standpoint! According to his opinion, only those have a right to speak who are themselves to some extent responsible for the imperialist policy of their governments. The small nations, who have to suffer the results of imperialist policy, who are the objects of imperialism, have nothing to say in the matter. Another piquant feature of the Congress! The attitude to the colonial question. As a matter of fact the question was not discussed, rather it was postponed, but on what grounds! The Belgian delegate Pierard, declared that the social democrats, contrary to the communists, do not simply stand for the evacuation of the colonies. The colonial question is far too complicated for that. He stated it to be one of the tasks of the International to see to it that Germany obtains colonies again.

The report of the Eastern Commission, which was delivered by Otto Bauer, marked the culminating point. There had been held a number of commission sessions until finally the standpoint of Otto Bauer gained the upper hand, which constituted a compromise between the English standpoint of the recognition of Soviet Russia and condemnation of intervention on the one side, and the standpoint of counter-revolution, which condemns bolshevism and at the same provides a carte blanche for counter-revolutionary revolts, on the other side. Bauer is against intervention, he calls upon the socialist parties of the Border States, these white auxiliary troops of the interventionist bandits, to stand by the Soviet Union. At the same time however, he demands that all those who are working within Russia itself for the destruction of this bulwark, that is, those who carry on the work of the interventionists, shall be allowed to carry on their criminal handiwork with impunity. Hands off Soviet Russia from outside, but a free hand to destroy it from within! Bauer protested against the imperialists for attacking the Soviet Union, but the same Bauer renders them the best services by providing them with arguments for the imperialist attacks, that is, in defiance of the simplest historical truth, to stigmatise the most peaceable country in the world, the Soviet Union, as the destroyer of peace. And now let us consider the resolution which he moved! It definitely demands the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, even the separation of the Ukraine. A Petlura could not demand more.

Inspired by Bauer's speech, a German delegate interjected: "the only social democrat in the hall". Truly a social democrat. He takes into account the mood of the masses, which is everywhere at present friendly to Soviet Russia, so that it would be dangerous at this moment to challenge it; but, under the most transparent veil of friendliness to Soviet Russia, he is carrying on the most sinister anti-Russian policy.

Bauer was followed by De Brouckère, who, in the name of the delegations from Esthonia, France, Poland, Georgia, Spain, Lithuania, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Hungary (Peyer fraction), Finland, Bulgaria and Sweden, brought forward his objections and converted into the exact contrary even that little which the resolution demanded for the Soviet Union. It is true, he afterwards declared that he agreed to the resolution. Of course we did not expect anything else. Did not De Brouckère vote even for the Stuttgart resolution of the year 1907?

With this the Congress brought its labours to a dignified conclusion.

Kautsky and Otto Bauer: Right Cynicism and Left Hypocrisy.

(Leading article, „Pravda“, 14. August 1925.*)

Karl Kautsky's infamous pamphlet on Soviet Russia, the howls set up by unscrupulous slanderers on the subject of the "horrors" of Bolshevist "robbery", the piteous appeal to the imperialist criminals to march into the U.S.S.R. and to introduce "Order" there, — these and the many other despicable actions committed by the now completely crazy "socialist" Philistine, have at last become so odious, that they are giving rise to a serious scandal in that most respectable family known as the Second International. Kautsky has been laying on his anti-Bolshevist cynicism too thick for Herr Otto Bauer, and he has taken it upon himself to empty a tub of ice water over the head of the enraged old gentleman. Bauer has made up his mind to take up the defence of the U.S.S.R. and Bolshevism against Kautsky ... But how does he start it, what arms does he take up in this defence?

"The Bolshevist regime is worse than Horthy's" ... such a furious thesis is drawn up by Kautsky.

Bauer belongs to the "Left", Bauer is a "real" Marxist, Bauer possesses the reputation of a skillful theoretician. From the Austrian and Viennese standpoint Bauer is "objective". Bauer, chosen by four hundred thousand Viennese social democratic workers as "leader", and aware of the elementary sympathy felt by the working masses for the Soviet Union, is not disinclined to make an elegant if superficial bow to Bolshevism.

Bauer differs from Kautsky in believing the Bolsheviki to be the "bearers of the warlike revolutionary tendency".

He differs again from Kautsky in acknowledging us to be "a party supported by a section (?) of the Russian proletariat as an undoubtedly revolutionary and undoubtedly socialist party."

"Nothing could be more dangerous for the future" — declares the great Austro-Marxist authority — than the adoption of such an attitude to Bolshevism by the International" as Kautsky recommends to the International.

But all these sweet words are interspersed by so many bitter pills that the whole political import of the above declarations is reserved.

Otto Bauer is not ashamed to descend to the lie that: "Bolshevism is steering towards war!", and thus to rouse against us the enmity of those who have already been rendered hostile to us by Karl Kautsky whom he "refutes". As if Bauer could fail to be aware that there is no "regime" in the world so filled with strivings towards peace, strivings towards a real peace, as our "Bolshevist regime". As if Bauer would not read bourgeois newspapers from which he must see clearly that the "imperialism of the ruling classes", as whose sworn enemy Bauer himself recognises us to be, is mobilising its forces precisely against us. As if Bauer had never heard anything of the "ring around Moscow" designed by the imperialists.

*) The following article is the reply to an article by Otto Bauer, which appeared in "Der Kampf" (the "scientific" monthly organ of the Austrian Social Democratic Party) of August 1925 under the title: The Congress in Marseilles. Ed.

"Bolshevism is despotic socialism" is Otto Bauer's deterministic "scientific" definition of our order, sowing with this definition the seed of "democratic" panic towards our proletarian dictatorship among the enervated Philistines. May the workmen from foreign works and factories who have visited and still visit the Soviet Union, give the terrified Bauer a better idea of the real nature of our "despotic socialism!"

Kautsky is wrong, and the Russian Menshevik Dan, Abramovitch, and others are right in "defending Bolshevism against counter-revolution (!?), such "truths" are proclaimed by the leader of Austrian social democracy who possesses the "wisdom" of a serpent. Where and when have the Mensheviks ever defended us against counter-revolution? Or has Otto Bauer, who is said to know the Russian language, never read the "Sozialistisches Wjestnik" (Socialist Messenger): Perchance Otto Bauer is unaware of the present occupation of Messrs Dan and Abramovitch, who make each of our smallest steps the occasion of violent declarations that only the hour of our overthrow can bring salvation. Does Bauer not know — is he only pretending not to know? — that in principle there is no difference between Dan and Kautsky, but merely in shades of cynicism and impertinence? We are much obliged to Bauer for his "Menshevik" defence of the Soviet Union. But we are not in need of it. Listen, Mr Bauer. We despise your defense! You are double tongued, Mr Bauer! You recognise our "regime" and our Party as "undoubtedly revolutionary and socialist". You cannot show us any other country on the globe where a "revolutionary and socialist regime" rules. But at the same moment you declare yourself solid with Dan and Abramovitch, with persons who hate our "undoubtedly revolutionary and socialist regime" down to the very bottom of their mean little souls. What value is to be put upon your chatter?

Imperialist reaction is pursuing its old policy of violence. Civilised aeronauts are gassing the colonial slaves who venture to rise for freedom. The roll of cannon is heard on the plateaus of North Africa. In the Far East the imperialists are operating with famine and machine guns to break the will of the Shanghai proletariat, a people who have given proofs of unexampled courage. The cosmopolitan plantation owners of the city, holding a fourth part of the population of the whole world under their yoke, threaten to place their bridle upon a second fourth. Insatiable, they are thirsting to possess the half of humanity as slaves. Aubert's league weaves the threads of black conspiracy against the land of social revolution. It urges the ruling classes to a campaign against the Soviet Union. The Bulgarian people lies in its blood. Heart-rending groans penetrate the walls of the slaughter houses. Shots are heard without end...

And in this same moment Karl Kautsky, grown mad with malice, raises his senile hand, trembling with the despicableness of the deed, to throw a stone at the land of the Soviets? And very diffidently Bauer endeavours to hold back the criminal hand, to advise Kautsky — in a purely "friendly" manner to return to the lap of virtue as personified in Dan! A revolting spectacle, worthy to serve as record of socialist baseness!

The International Bourgeoisie and Karl Kautsky its Apostle.

By N. Bucharin.

VIII.

The Process of Socialist Reconstruction as a Whole and its Contradictions.

Karl Kautsky pronounces his judgment upon the dynamics of our economic development as follows:

"The bolshevik regime in practice does not mean the construction of a new and higher method of production independent of capitalism, it means only a plundering of the possessing classes accompanied by an interruption of the process of production, leading quickly to an impoverishment of the state. Being unable to pull up, they saw their salvation in plundering the much richer Western Europe, and for this they once again needed the world revolution, that is, open or covert war against the governments abroad. This actual if not always official state of war meant the cutting-off of Russia from the outside world." 1)

We will deal at first quickly with the assumptions and the unclean assertions.

We have seen previously that Kautsky designated the intervention a **war of the reaction against the revolution**. An essential part of this intervention was carried out by the struggle against the possible spread of this revolution to Europe. Is that not so? Now it turns out that the revolution constitutes plundering, and is spreading a bait of the plunderers who wanted to plunder the "much richer Europe". But if that is true, one cannot understand why it was necessary to discountenance the intervention. May one not defend oneself against "simple plundering", a plundering which from the point of view of replacing one low form of production by a higher, has no significance?

Kautsky has been so zealous, he has fallen over himself to such an extent with his lies, he has hurried so much to say everything possible to please the bourgeoisie that he has lost the last piece of spoiled and rancid margarine—"marxism" from the torn bottom of his mental knap-sack. And with this last lost piece has disappeared his last trace of "scientific" dignity. Let us assume for a moment that there was and is no proletarian revolution in Russia, but Kautsky knows that in Russia the feudal property owning relations have been completely destroyed. Kautsky knows that these relations represented the chief economic support of the feudal backwardness of Russia. If that is true then it is a fact that Kautsky, even from the above assumption, is a traitor and a renegade. In this case he has betrayed even the bourgeois revolution. In reality, **Kautsky has betrayed both the bourgeois and the proletarian revolution at the same time**. Regarded from a certain point of view, this is even logical, for the imperialist European and American bourgeoisie on whose behalf Kautsky is acting, is counter-revolutionary through and through, all the time and everywhere: in China and in Germany, in Morocco and in England, in Egypt, America and Japan, in short, everywhere. This bourgeoisie sees the revolution everywhere as a collective plundering; the world revolution as a reproduction of this plundering; the leaders of the revolution as the supreme plunderers. This "scientific conception" permeates all the whole of the yellow press, and all the most substantial publications of the Banking powers; this conception haunts the skulls of bishops and kings, of demi-mondaine and generals, of qualified diplomats and police spies, of overseers and provocators in the capitalist factories and social democratic leaders.

Let us leave this theme (we will return to it in another connection) and approach the question of the "methods of production". In the previous chapters we have seen and proved the scantiness of our hero's ideas in this connection clearly enough.

His contention that misery is growing has proved itself to be a lie.

His contention that we are rescuing ourselves by concessions has proved itself to be a lie.

The menshevik fairy tale that our growth is the growth of a victorious capitalism has proved itself to be a lie.

The contention that the fundamental tendency of our development is a development in the direction of capitalism has proved itself to be a lie.

And so on, and very much more of the same sort.

It is a shame that Kautsky has developed into such an unclean slanderer, into such a vulgar, shallow apologist of the bourgeoisie, into such a light minded ignoramus...

With regard to the Bolsheviki Kautsky upholds the so-called "theory of violence", which was so cruelly scorned by Engels in his time. In October and later a great plundering is alleged to have taken place. First of all the bolsheviks plundered their own house, and then they wanted to plunder other people's. They live, in a word, upon "plundering and violence". That is an excellent "conception". But dear reader, does that not rather remind us of the famous French emigrees who made a frugal living by taking in one another's washing?

The "world revolution" in the sense of a plundering by us of other countries, has not yet taken place. It would seem even that previously those "countries abroad", just that "much richer Europe" had plundered our country, and over and above that, not without the benevolent toleration of the party of Kautsky. It is enough if we call to mind the occupation of the Ukraine by German troops. Our world victory, I repeat, we have not

1) Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia". Page 23.

yet won. And what a wonder! We are still alive, we are developing, we are making progress, and soon immense masses of the workers and peasants will be celebrating the eighth anniversary of our victory in Russia. Our esteemed social democratic master has given us a really good explanation.

Let us however, return to the essence of the question. In the previous chapters we saw the fundamental tendency of the development in industry and commerce. We must now understand the process theoretically as a whole. The way of the socialist construction in our peasant country, yes the way of socialist construction in general, is much more clearly before us to-day than it was eight years ago when the proletariat and its Party was suddenly faced with the problem of a positive construction work.

In the Soviet Union we have a tremendous number of various economic forms. In the eastern frontier districts, in the Caucasus etc., we find still here and there corners in which economy is based upon the survivals of tribal organisation, showing clear characteristics of primitive communism. Here and there we can see feudal relations, or natural economy altogether. In agriculture the dominant economic form is petty-bourgeois commodity-production in which the character of this economy is at different levels in various districts. In the middle of individual economic forms we find a number of **collective economic forms** (productive co-operatives, collective economies, agricultural communes etc.). The so-called "soviet undertakings" (that is the state lands) play a comparatively insignificant role. **But the nationalisation of the land must not be overlooked.**

From the peasant economy "originate" various forms of house-industry, small crafts, small and branch industry connected with each other by innumerable forms of mutual economic relations, having altogether a not inconsiderable significance for the general economy of the country. A number of peasant productive co-operative associations (oil extracting work shops, cheese making establishments, starch boiling etc.) stand in connection with the peasantry and its industrialisation.

In the **towns and large communities** we also find various economic forms: Apart from the state industry there is the private undertaking in its "pure" form and the undertakings which have been leased to private persons, concession and co-operative undertakings, "mixed companies" in which both the proletarian state and private persons are interested. The state undertakings however represent an economic power of great importance amongst the various economic forms with their various class contents, before which all other economic forms must withdraw into the background.

From this the whole variegated character of the picture can be seen: in Russia economic forms which usually replace one another in the course of centuries, all exist side by side without over-crowding. A tremendous area: on the one side the economy based on tribal organisation and on the other, state socialised factories. To bring these economic forms, their corresponding economic motives and their corresponding class forces into harmony, that is, to ensure the leading role of the proletariat and the quickest possible development of socialist forms, — all this makes up an extremely complicated task.

If we take a glance at the process as a whole, it will not be difficult to observe the following characteristic.

In the period of war-economy: decline of the productive forces as a result of the intervention etc.: the town takes second place to the village; the more elastic small production finds itself under the quite abnormal and irregular conditions of the productive process (there is no bread, no raw materials, no coal etc., no ordered system of transport etc.) in a better and more favourable situation than the big industry.

In the present period of progress, which begins with the new economic policy and which has taken on sharply defined forms in the last economic year (1924/25), we can see a reversal of the process of development; once again the town leads the village economically. The greater advantages of large-scale production once again make themselves felt with all force; therefore, the state industry leads all other economic forms, and with every month it consolidates its hegemony in the general economic life of the country. The village stands behind the town and the town behind the state industry — that is the actual relation of the economic forms in the Soviet Union.

In our previous chapters we followed these processes as expressed in figures. It only remains to be added that according to the recently worked out plans and preliminary proposals for

the economic year 1925/26, we shall have regained the pre-war level by the end of this economic year, and even rise above it in some places. The organic elements of our **planned economics**, that is, of the principle of rationality applied to the collective economic process, are developing in proportion to the actual growth of our state industry. We are already in a position today to undertake measures which would be entirely impossible to private economics, and there is no doubt whatever that the next few years will bring overwhelming proof of the power of the law of the greater advantages of **large scale economics**, and above all of the economic law of the greater advantages of **planned economics**. This will alter the relations between collective state economics and collective private economics even more decisively in favour of the former.

Thus we state the matter. But Kautsky would not be Kautsky if he did not talk as much nonsense on the subject as possible.

"The Bolshevik method of thought — he writes — which does not regard the abstractions of a theory to be simplifications, but faithful images of actuality, is blind to all stages of transition. It sees solely the dictatorship of capital or the dictatorship of the proletariat, entire capitalism or entire socialism, nothing between*)."

"The Bolshevik method of thought" has naturally found its clearest expression in comrade Lenin's "method of thought". But anyone who maintains that Lenin was blind to stages of transition merely reveals once more his own transition to the blind adherents of counter-revolution. No thinker has ever attached so much importance to the attentive study of forms of transition, and to the variety and numerous shades of these forms, as Lenin. It is really superfluous to adduce evidence for this. The strangest thing about Kautsky's assertions is the way in which he observes the non-existent mote in our eyes, but fails, despite all his cleverness, to notice the beam in his own. Nobody has scolded us so violently as Kautsky for not yet having realised perfect communism. He has accused us of forming an alliance with the concessionaries, and, whilst exaggerating the importance of the concessions out of all proportion, at the same time employs the argument of "entire socialism". It is Kautsky who places his hand on every transitional form, and draws from its existence the conclusion that communism is collapsing, without giving himself the trouble to investigate the direction in which development is proceeding, or in what manner the relations between the various forms of economics are changing, or wherein consist the fundamental dynamics of our economics. And then he comes with an innocent air, and begins to accuse us of a fault in which he himself is plunged up to the ears. This is what he calls "criticism".

We must here deal with a few points of essential importance both for us and for Kautsky. We trust that we have amply proved that we see **not only the goal of socialism**, but the **transitional stages** as well. But that Kautsky sees the "transition" coalition and not the proletarian dictatorship (for which he is "blind"), and that he himself has sunk hopelessly in the bog of this coalition, is another undoubted fact. Kautsky has chosen extremely unhappy examples in support of his arguments. In plain words, Kautsky has fallen into the pit which he has dug for others. For just as transitional forms towards socialism do not exclude a movement in the direction of socialism, but are its premises, in the same way the Marxists must regard the possible forms of transition from the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie to the dictatorship of the proletariat precisely from the viewpoint of the movement in the direction towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the indispensable pre-requisite not only of the expropriation of the expropriators, but at the same time of the subsequent development into socialism by means of economic forms of transition. But Kautsky has entirely "abandoned" the proletarian dictatorship!

Let us return to our main theme.

The growth of productive forces has led in Russia to the hegemony of state socialist big industry. Let us observe the manner in which this process has made itself felt. It is plain that the mechanism of connecting the various forms of economics, above all that connecting state industry with the small farmers, lies in the sphere of circulation, and that the process of circulation connecting the cycles of production plays an eminently important rôle. The process of circulation, as is well

*) Kautsky: "The International and Soviet Russia." Page 22.

known, exercises a very great influence upon the process of production, and vice versa. Therefore the question of the organisatory forms taken by the process of circulation is one of extreme importance to us. And here we encounter the new principle of the gigantic part to be played by the cooperatives — above all by the agricultural cooperatives.

In a country like ours the main problem confronting the victorious proletariat is that of the economic connection between the concentrated industry and scattered agriculture. The lack of unity in farming economics is the cause of the individualist and private capitalist conceptions underlying the work of the peasantry. Since the necessary connection is brought about by the market, by sale and purchase, by the process of circulation which comprise both industrial and agricultural products (grain, raw materials, etc.), it is obvious that the whole character of economic development depends upon the form of connection in precisely this sphere.

Here we see the fundamental difference existing between the capitalist system and the system of the proletarian dictatorship, in which big industry, transport service, credit service (banks), and foreign trade, are all in the hands of the proletariat.

Whilst under capitalist rule the growth of the cooperative established as a result of the private economic interests of the farmer (in his capacity as seller, as purchaser, and as farmer, requiring credit and accumulating capital) is inevitably bound to lead to its capitalist development, under the dictatorship of the proletariat something entirely different takes place, for here the economic atmosphere, the "leading principle" of the whole economic life is entirely different. It is perfectly clear to every Marxist that it is nonsense and methodologically wrong to regard agriculture and its development as something isolated, something outside of all connection with the development of the town, of industry, of credit and transport service, of science, etc. This being so, it is comprehensible that a fundamental change must take place in the character of rural development. This of course does not mean that development can now proceed smoothly along the straight road to socialism, unimpeded by obstacles. But it means that in spite of all aberrations and inconsistencies, in spite of all zig zag deviations, the final trend of every line is to the path to socialism.

How is this?

Marxist literature has frequently drawn attention to the fact that when for instance a credit cooperative allies itself with a capitalist bank, a so-called "community of interest" results. When a selling cooperative enters into connection with large purchasing firms by means of a complicated network of permanent mutual relations, it too becomes dependent, to a certain degree, upon these firms. The same applies to purchasing cooperatives. And as these decisive economic organisations are in the hands of capitalists, the cooperatives are inevitably forced into the system of capitalist relations. When we further remember that the leading members of the cooperative organisation staff are taken from the bourgeois and landowning classes, the picture is even more complete. It may thus easily be realised that in our case the development may be formally the same, that is, the same from the standpoint of the organisatory form taken by the material social economic process, and yet in its essential character, from the standpoint of this material process itself, it is something quite different. We too are "growing into" something, but it is not into capitalist organisations. We are growing into and becoming part of the economic organisations of the proletarian state. It is no amalgamation with capitalist industry, but with the state industry belonging to the working class. It is no dependence upon bourgeois banks, but a credit connection and an ever growing "community of interests" with the credit organs of the proletarian state. Those who see merely capitalist relations in all this, and do not grasp the tendency of the collective process, do not grasp either the import of our revolution or the main lines of our economic development.

The organisation of the peasantry in the process of circulation inevitably implies the development of the collective forms of production, beginning with those branches of agriculture first involved in the process of industrialisation. The policy of rapprochement between town and country consciously pursued by the Soviet power (this factor is taken into account today when the plans for new factories are drawn up) the policy of the increased use of machinery in agriculture, of electrification, etc. will afford an ever increasing impetus to the same tendency arising on the other side. The rôle played by state economics in our economic organisation will thus become more and more decisive.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Murder of Lao Tchung-Kai and the Fight against Canton.

By L. Geller (Moscow).

The news which has arrived during the last few days leaves no doubt that the period of waiting in China is approaching an end, that English imperialism is preparing for the decisive struggle and will deliver the first blow against Canton, which is so hated by the imperialists.

The preparations are apparently concluded. Fresh troops have been ordered from India to Hongkong and the steamer, accompanied by 40 hydroplanes, dispatched from Malta has arrived in Hongkong.

Chang Tso-Lin, who is now serving Japanese and English imperialism with equal zeal, has received a new loan, the receipt of which he acknowledged with the blood of the workers and students shot down in Tan-Tsin and Tsintao.

The murder of Lao Tchung Kai is a link in the chain of these preparatory measures for an imperialist intervention. The imperialists have shown great discernment in the choice of their victim. Among all the functionaries of the Kuomintang party there was none who played such an important role in recent times as Lao Tchung Kai. In him there was embodied in the clearest manner the new phase of development of the Kuomintang Party — the phase in which this party is endeavouring to convert itself into a real revolutionary people's party based upon the working masses.

Whilst many other well known leaders of the Kuomintang have only with the greatest difficulties discarded the old traditions and only after many vacillations have taken up the new path, Lao Tchung Kai — the right hand man of the late Sun Yat Sen in the latest period of the latter's activity — followed with all energy and consistency the line of Sun Yat Senism, which in recent years has assumed the following forms: **fight against all imperialism; alliance with the Soviet Union, as being the only sincere friend of the suppressed peoples of the East; co-operation with the Chinese communists, the leaders of the most advanced sections of the Chinese proletariat; work among the masses of the peasants, craftsmen and small traders to create an organised support and a political basis in the fight against imperialism and for the emancipation and unification of China.** As general secretary of the Kuomintang Party, as well as in his capacity as commissar for labour in the first Canton government, and also as commissar of finance in the present government, Lao Tchung Kai was the most consistent representative of radical Kuomintangism.

During the last few years English imperialism suffered a number of serious defeats in Canton. It suffices to call to mind the fight for the customs offices, the defeat of the fascists, the military victory of the Canton government over generals Chan-Chu-Min, Tan-Shi-Min etc., who acted either directly or indirectly in the interests and on the command of English imperialism.

But these victories only first became possible when the Kuomintang Party, and the Canton government, definitely identified themselves with the masses of the people, supported the peasants' unions against the big landlords, encouraged the development of the Labour movement, co-operated with the Chinese communists, flung aside every illusion regarding the benevolent rôle of America and Japan in China and began to pursue the policy of alliance with the Soviet Union. But it was precisely the late Lao Tchung Kai who carried out this policy in the most far-seeing and clearest manner.

It is quite possible that the death of Lao Tchung Kai will, for a short time, bring a certain amount of disorganisation into the ranks of the Canton government, will strengthen the influence of the opportunist and vacillating elements in the South and revive the hopes of the Right wing of the Kuomintang in the North, which would mean a temporary weakening not only of the political but also of the military resistance of Canton.

The past year however — the year of increased propagandist and organisatory work among the working masses, both in the towns and in the villages of the province of Kwan Tung — has not gone without leaving its mark on Canton. Here we already have a mass organisation which will know how, by means of collective work, to make good even such a severe loss as the death of Lao Tchung Kai.

Appeal of the Chinese Seamen's Union.

For nearly two months we have been on strike as a protest against the inhuman slaughter of our fellow workers and of students who sympathise with us by the British police and soldiers in Shanghai, Tsiantao, Hankow, Nanking and Canton, as well as by military forces specially landed in order to crush without mercy our efforts to fight against the yoke of oppressive foreign imperialism and capitalism.

A great deal of news has been circulated abroad regarding recent foreign outrages here in our country. Of course the greater part of this news emanates from no other sources than of our enemies — the enemies of the working class, the foreign capitalists who are exploiting and intriguing in this country for their own benefit, regardless of humanity and justice.

It is no secret that the British government, influenced by the British capitalists, has, by bribery and other foul means, continually plotted to stage disorder in this country, thereby causing successive collisions and internal wars between different fractions of Chinese militarists. It has thus always been able to proclaim to the world at large that the time has not yet come to abolish extraterritoriality in China. Who is responsible for the present chaos in this country? Who has caused the unbearable troubles and miseries which have to be borne by the poor population? The foreign capitalists, who are very ready to plot in order to gain their ends. Who has to pay the price for all their extravagant wealth? We, the poor workers, and we shall have to continue doing so, unless we set up a united front and overthrow them.

That is what we have been striving for for the past two months, fighting against the iron hand of the capitalists. Are we to be defeated? Workers of the world, unite! Now is the time for us to work and battle together for the great cause — for the attainment of our rights as human beings. Our defeat will be your defeat, our victory will be your victory, shared by us all as fellow workers and comrades. We are fighting an unequal fight, the fight of a David against a Goliath.

You have all extended help to us for which we are profoundly grateful, and such human kindness will bear good fruit in the days to come.

We need your assistance now more than ever. We stand or fall together. The latest outrage committed by foreign capitalism against the workers is, the closing of our offices, the imprisonment and flogging of our leaders and the attempt to disorganise and dissolve our Union. Our enemies, who are also yours, the British capitalists — who are conspiring hand in hand with the American and Japanese capitalists — are intriguing at the present time to urge and induce the most powerful Chinese military General, **Chang Tso Lin**, an ex-Manchurian bandit, to overthrow the present national government, which has great sympathy for us in our present struggle to cast off the yoke of capitalism and imperialism, and to set him up as the imperial emperor of China, against the will of the nation, in order that he shall serve as a puppet in the hands of the capitalists. Once having achieved this end, our enemies will have a powerful and dangerous weapon in their hands, and what chance then shall we have of playing our part in the struggle for human rights?

This puppet General has already repeatedly tried to force us back to work at the point of the bayonet. Comrades, we need your help. We rely upon your intervention at home, to do everything to thwart this plot of the capitalists and to defeat their schemes and intrigues. Do everything possible to divert the attention of your governments to home affairs, so that their hands will be too full to interfere in our fight against capitalism here.

Workers, of the world, unite! Our defeat will mean your defeat! Our victory will contribute to the victory of the cause of the emancipation of humanity.

Long live the fighters in the struggle against the imperialists and the capitalists!

Long live the working class of the world!

Long live the solidarity of the international working class!

Chinese Seamen's Union

(Signed) Bruce Chen, General Secretary.

POLITICS

The League of Nations and the Mossul Question.

By Irandust (Moscow).

The English press is dissatisfied with the report of the League of Nations Committee on the Mossul question, as the League of Nations Committee is inclined, at least from the legal standpoint, to recognise the right of Turkey and not of Iraq to the province of Mossul. The "Daily Telegraph", which is in close touch with the English Foreign Office, states that the indefinite and, to some extent, strange conclusions of the Mossul Commission is giving rise to much thought and to certain uneasiness in competent circles in London.

The conservative "Times" is also dissatisfied with the report of the Commission. It is still more dissatisfied, however, with the Commission itself, with regard to whose "neutrality" it is somewhat suspicious. Although the Commission consisted of a Swede, a Belgian and a Hungarian, the latter being chairman, the "Times" is convinced of the nefarious influence of the Hungarian, and accuses the latter of friendliness to Turkey and of injurious ethnographic mistakes, which have found expression in the founding of a periodical in which it is attempted to prove the racial affinities of the Hungarians, Bulgarians and Turks. Not only that, the "Times" is even dissatisfied with the League of Nations itself. It states that the arrival of the commission in Mossul caused great surprise among the local population, as it created the impression that the League of Nations rules the world and that the British government only constitutes a power subordinate to it.

The "Daily Telegraph" also shares this point of view. It is indignant over the fact that the Commission, instead of confining itself to purely scientific, geographical and ethnological investigations, is dealing with highly political questions and is even considering the question of the competence of the League of Nations and of the mandatory system. The Commission went so far as to consider the possibility of transferring the mandate over Iraq to a third power. The "Daily Telegraph" declares that the League of Nations Commission has quite forgotten that England did not receive the mandate from the League of Nations, but won it herself.

This interesting discussion as to who is to play first fiddle in the capitalist world: the League of Nations or England, is very useful for the enlightenment of the backward peoples of the East.

The Turkish press, on its part, has already pointed out how abnormal a situation is in which a dispute between England, a member of the League of Nations, and Turkey, which has nothing to do with the League of Nations, is decided by the League of Nations, in the leading body of which England plays the most decisive role. Even such a "pro-Western" organ as the Constantinople "Vatan" writes:

"According to the opinion of the 'Daily Telegraph', the League of Nations is simply in the service of England, and is pledged to draw up its report in accordance with the desires and command of England. As the Commission has apparently not done this, the 'Daily Telegraph' is dissatisfied with the report. It further believes that the members of the Commission did not arrive at definite decisions, because they feared to lose, on the one side, the political good will of England and on the other side, the advantages of commercial relations with Turkey. We believed and still believe that the League of Nations Commission in carrying out its task has been guided by its conscience and not by irrelevant considerations. According to the words of the 'Daily Telegraph', however, the League of Nations is an institution in which questions are solved behind the scenes by mutual bargaining, and the members of which vote according to the amount of the bribe which they receive from one or the other parties; all this leads to an altogether corrupt administration. Turkey, it is true, has never regarded the League of Nations as a purely impartial body, but on the grounds of humanity alone it must be washed clean of such serious accusations."

According to the latest reports from Geneva, the Turkish delegation, on the occasion of the ordinary session of the Council of the League of Nations commencing on the 2nd of September, will be given the opportunity of submitting their standpoint with regard to the Mossul question, "although Turkey is not a member of the League of Nations". Such a piece of magnanimity will scarcely satisfy the Turkish people nor reconcile them to the policy of the League of Nations. The Turkish statesmen have already many times declared that the entry of Turkey into the League of Nations depends upon the just solution of the Mossul question.

It is, however, beyond dispute that the question of the League of Nations constitutes for Turkey a problem by itself, which remains independent of the issues of the struggle in Mossul. The best representatives of new Turkey believe that entry into the League of Nations would mean for Turkey the abandonment of an independent policy and the subordination of her political and economic life to the control of the leading great powers of Europe. In spite of the fact that there exist even within the Turkish People's Party advocates of an approach to the West, young Turkey in her many years of tenacious struggle against the economic crisis caused by European intervention has succeeded in resisting the economic and political pressure of Western capital and in thwarting its endeavours to enslave and colonise the country weakened by the war. It may be assumed that the September Session of the Council of the League of Nations will hardly increase the number of the supporters of the League of Nations in Turkey who, after the Peace Treaty forced on her under the cloak of the League of Nations, has been following her own course for five years and is reconstructing her economic power without the aid of slave treaties with Western capital.

THE BALKANS

An Urgent Appeal for Help from the Bulgarian Emigrants.

The following telegram has been received from Moscow from the Committee of the Bulgarian political emigrants in Soviet Russia. Ed.

"The Bulgarian military courts have already condemned 280 workers, peasants and intellectuals to death. The Public prosecutor is demanding the death penalty for a further 800. 4500 persons have been dragged before the military courts. Up to now sentences totalling in all over 5000 years hard labour and 210 million in Levas fines have been imposed. More than a 1000 fighters against the Zankov regime are threatened every moment with death on the gallows.

Will the international proletariat permit these incredible crimes to be carried out? Should it fail in calling a halt to the work of the executioners, it would thereby give a proof of its impotence. The international reaction would be encouraged to follow the example of the Bulgarian blood hounds.

In the name of the numerous Bulgarian emigrants who have fled to Soviet Russia, we address the most urgent appeal to the international proletariat to protect the victims of the white terror in Bulgaria. Immediate action is necessary! The workers of England, France, Germany and of all other countries, who in many cases have known how to carry out their will in the face of far more powerful governments, must show their power to the Sofia government.

The blood of thousands of fighters would be on their consciences if they allowed it to be shed!

For the Committee of Bulgarian Political Emigrants in Soviet Russia:

Georg Bakaloff, Georg Popoff, Todor Dimitroff, Jlesco Terpecheff, Arphir Dimitroff.

Letter from Sofia.

By ff.

Sofia, 22nd of August 1925.

The country is still suffering under the white terror, which has assumed enormous proportions. Among its victims there are, in addition to the thousands of communists and members of the Peasant League, people who are entirely neutral and non-party. Workers, peasants, and intellectuals have been murdered, not on account of their membership of any party, but solely because they are poor people. Even the advanced bourgeois intelligentsia have had to yield blood-sacrifices, as, for example, Josef Herbst, a journalist and Colonel Koeff.

At present the number of arrested can be estimated at 4500. Up to now 280 persons have been condemned to death, while the same fate awaits another 700 to 800 people.

At least 600 persons have been done to death without trial. A number of the murdered victims from Sofia were conveyed on the 17th of August 1925, with chained hands, to the mess room of the Sofia barracks and were slaughtered one after another. Among these victims were: J. Dimitroff, general secretary of the General Trade Union Federation of Bulgaria, Prof. L. Kandeff, general secretary of the red teachers' Union, W. Georgieff, Functionary of the dissolved communist co-operative, "Osvo-boschdenje", and several others, in all 42 persons.

Majmunkova, a woman teacher, and in recent months chief editor of the legally suppressed women's paper "The women worker", and G. Petroff, a bank clerk, were slaughtered on the 9th of June in the church yard.

The white terror does not spare foreigners; eight Jugoslavian subjects were murdered, which led to the closing of the frontier. The conflict was settled by the payment of 200,000 gold leva compensation. The other terms of the settlement were kept secret.

A short time ago a conflict arose with Greece, likewise through the murder of a Greek citizen.

The special courts are working at a feverish rate throughout the whole country.

A few days ago the sentence against the accused communists from Varna was pronounced. 32 were condemned to death, 67 to long years of imprisonment, amounting altogether to 850 years. Fines were also imposed upon the condemned amounting to 12 million Leva.

The Public prosecutor is demanding 130 death sentences in Schumla, 250 in Hascovo and 80 in Vratza. The military courts pronounce judgment in accordance with orders received from above. Every accused is condemned by the military court, although many were arrested before the declaration of martial law.

Defence is out of the question. Eleven bomb outrages have already been carried out against defenders; in hundreds of cases the defending Counsel have been threatened.

The white terror is demanding ever fresh victims. Thus, in the neighbourhood of Samokov, six arrested persons were shot "while attempting to escape". In the immediate vicinity of the Beloyo railway station, 26 persons were murdered under unknown circumstances. In the last two months, in the districts of Petric, Mehomia and Djumaja about 100 people were hung or murdered in connection with the murder of the leader of the Macedonian autonomists, the notorious bloodhound K. Mihajlofi.

The following have been killed: Gabrovski, a lawyer, one of the founders of the socialist labour movement in Bulgaria, and for many years a member of parliament; M. Vassileff, a lawyer, who was killed in hospital where he lay ill, although he had already been acquitted by the court, and M. Popoff, a peasants' member of parliament in the present Zankov parliament. The latter was killed on account of his party activity, as he recently visited some villages for party purposes.

The newspapers of the "legal opposition", among them of course that of the social traitors, are raising a great outcry over the "illegal murders", but remain silent and approve of the wholesale death sentences:

The government is consistently carrying out its plan for the physical extermination of the communists and left-wing members of the peasants' League. All the local leaders and former functionaries of the town and country organisations of the communists and of the peasants' League are being killed.

Bulgarian capital, with the tobacco industrialists at the head, is commencing its offensive. Wages are to be reduced by 20%, the eight hour day and other social achievements are being set aside.

This year's harvest is good, nevertheless bread is sold to the people at a price ranging from 10 to 15 Leva (about 1/10th of a dollar) for 900 grammes. The government is carrying out the will of the exporters. For this purpose a Conference of bread profiteers, under the chairmanship of the Minister of Commerce, was convened. The small producers are plundered and exploited just the same as the working class.

The rent restriction act has been abolished; the rent for one room amounts to 800 to 900 Levas (that is \$ 570 to \$ 640).

Under the "honest" government of Prof. Zankov, profiteering and corruption is growing beyond all bounds. Corruption affairs in connection with cheese, salt and machines are engaging the attention and arousing the indignation of the public.

The misery and the need of the working people were never so terrible and unbearable as at present. But never has the bourgeoisie lived so cynically in luxury as now. Even the humblest fascist now rides about in his own motor car. All the cabarets and spas are overcrowded with the "bourgeoisie of the 9th of June".

Several congresses have taken place, which possess a certain amount of interest and importance. But with the exception of the Congress of the reserve officers, who stand unhesitatingly on the side of the government, all these congresses: that of the middle school teachers, of the higher school teachers, of the hospital employees, of small trades-people have adopted resolutions expressing opposition to the present government.

The Macedonian organisation organised two demonstrations: the "Day of the macedonians", which ended in a fiasco for these most devoted servants of Zankov, and the "Revolt of the Ilinds" which last year was attended by 30,000 people, but this year by merely 3000 people.

An opposition, led by Laptcheff, has made its appearance in the camp of the "Democratic Sgovor". There is open talk of the inevitability of a reconstruction of the cabinet.

The struggle within the government party is being carried on between the party leaders and the military. Although this quarrel has already resulted in a serious division in the ranks of the Party, the military, with "Escadrour" — as the present Minister of the Interior General Russev is called — at the head, is not inclined to abandon the field in favour of the party leaders. The antagonism is very profound, but is kept secret.

As regards the "legal opposition", negotiations are in progress between the radicals, democrats, social democrats and peasant Union, but up to the present without any result. Rumours are current as to various combinations as a means of escape from the crisis:

Up to now none of the opposition parties have raised the slogan: of general amnesty, abolition of martial law, abandonment of the trials etc. They are all united when it is a question of fighting against the Communists and members of the Peasant's League.

The fascists are now energetically attacking the social democrats. Many are of the opinion that the social democrats must be outlawed; the chief editor of the Central organ of the social democrats, the "Narod", after being severely beaten on the 1st of May, has received threats against his life. This is the reply to the sharper criticism of the Zankov government on the part of social democracy which has set in recently.

In spite of the repression and the severe blows which the supporters of the united front have to suffer, they still constitute a serious danger for the government and the "legal opposition". The official leaders of the Peasants' League, Tomoff Turiakoff and others, are committing open treachery against the peasants masses. They do not think of building up the League again and setting it upon its feet. Their shameful organ, "The Peasant's flag", is read neither in the villages nor in the towns.

The masses of the poor peasants are holding firmly and unshakably to the united front; nothing can discourage or divide them. Their grief for the proved and enthusiastic leaders of the united front policy in the Peasant's League, D. Grandcharoff, lawyer and member of parliament, and Petrini, member of parliament, who were foully murdered, is very great.

ECONOMICS

The Significance of the German Tariffs in the International Competitive Struggle.

By H. Erde (Berlin).

In the "House of the People" a further link was added to the chain of international tariffs on 12. August of this year. With the greatest brutality, and with the aid of a breach of the constitution and the employment of force on the part of the police against the communist opposition, the bill was rushed through the Reichstag. More than 900 tariff items, imposing an average of 200 to 250 marks of increased expenses to a working class family yearly, were resolved within a few hours.

We give below a list of some of the most important of these items of the new tariff, affording a general idea of the character of the law. The duties are given in marks per ton:

Goods	Prewar duty	new duty
Raw iron	10,—	10,—
Vehicles	400,— bis 1000,—	6000,—
Scythes and sickles . . .	100,—	250,—
Spindles	100,—	350,—
Iron construction parts . .	45,—	80,—
Gloves	1600,—	2400,—
Worsted yarn	120,—	400,—
Embroideries, laces (entirely or partially of silk)	6000,—	8000,—
Raw silk	360,—	1000,—
Silk fabrics	3000,—	38.000,—

Goods	prewar duty	new duty
Rye	50,—	30,— (50,—)*
Wheat	58,—	35,— (55,—)*
Barley (fodder)	13,—	10,—
Potatoes	—	2.50 (5,—)*
Beef and mutton	80,—	130,—
Pork	90,—	145,—
Tinned meat	600,—	400,—
Clover seed	50,—	130,—
Grass seed	20,—	120,—
Swede turnip seed	10,—	360,—

The adherents of the protective tariff system defended these duties by pointing out their usefulness in trade agreement negotiations (agreement duties on industrial goods being a special slogan of the social democrats), and by drawing attention to the high protective duties imposed by other countries (as justification for the agrarian duties against the main agrarian countries). The tariff system has greatly developed internationally since the time before the war, in all the countries of Europe and America, and the duties have been greatly raised in most cases. One reason of this is that the more intense struggle for markets causes the protective duty to be placed more than ever in the service of price cutting competition. Thus for instance the German capitalists state fairly candidly that they are striving to raise home prices above the world's market prices with the aid of the duties, although the world's market prices already contain the duties imposed by the countries decisive for fixing the price. On the other hand, prices are to be partially cheapened for export, where the competitive struggle demands this.

It thus becomes obvious that the tariffs do not represent any means by which the conflicts of the capitalist world may be alleviated and the crisis relieved. On the contrary! The tariffs merely aggravate the conflicts, and render the antagonisms more acute than ever.

And it is not only the antagonisms among the capitalist competitors themselves which are aggravated by the protective tariffs, but the class antagonisms as well. It is at the expense of the workers and small peasantry that the acuter competitive struggles of capitalism are fought out. The fact that demonstrating workers were shot down in the streets of Berlin the day

*) Custom rates from the 1st August 1926.

after the tariff bill became law shows plainly that the bourgeoisie clearly recognised this inevitable effect of its tariffs.

The German capitalists are already taking an active part in the tariff war. The affair with Poland gives us a foretaste of the things to come.

We can well comprehend that precisely the German bourgeoisie resorts to the means of high protective duties in its vain attempt to find a way out of the blind alley furnished by the Dawes plan, that it accumulates the material for conflicts, and falls back upon the most brutal oppression of the workers. We can well comprehend why it is more intent than ever upon marching its Fascist troops against the rebellious working masses, and we comprehend too why the social democrats, as representatives of the capitalist system, are endeavouring to split and scatter the labour front, and social democratic police presidents order demonstrating workers to be shot down. We are aware that capitalist interests demand this, render it imperative. But the more will and must the masses of the working class awaken to the fact that their interest are diametrically opposed to those of the capitalists, and that it is up to them to frustrate in united struggles the plans of the capitalist robber chieftains and their social democratic Fascist flunkys.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Industrial Strife in India.

By M. N. Roy.

India stands on the eve of a fierce industrial conflict. The textile workers of Bombay have been given a notice of a lockout if they do not accept a wage-cut from Sept. 1. More than 150,000 workers, including 35,000 women and 15,000 children, will be thrown out of work. The Indian workers are badly organised. This is especially the case in the textile industry of Bombay. The Union is weak, and has no funds. Therefore, from the day after the mills are closed, the workers, — men, women and children — will have starvation staring them in the face.

In spite of this gloomy perspective, the workers are unwilling to give in before the capitalist offensive. They have declared their determination to put up a resistance. They have rejected the demand for wage-reduction and are prepared to go on strike to resist it. The workers will be all alone in this fierce struggle. The British Government will, of course, be on the side of the mill owners (mostly Indian) as on previous occasions, and will readily place at their disposal troops armed with tanks and machine-guns to terrorise the workers and to shoot them down, if necessary. Nationalist sympathy will be all on the side of the employers. Even the so-called labour leaders are against the workers resisting the proposed wage-cut. They support the argument of the employers that continued trade depression warrants lower cost of production, without which Indian industry will not be able to compete with the goods imported from Britain and Japan. Since the workers have resolved to strike, in spite of the "leaders", the latter are doing their best to prevent the strike, and will sabotage it, if it breaks out. They acted in the same way during last year's lockout, which lasted nearly three months, and when the workers did not return to the mills until women and children had actually died in the streets of starvation.

The history of the imminent struggle is as follows. In the beginning of 1924 the owners of the Bombay cotton mills locked out over 150,000 workers to enforce a 30% wage reduction. After a heroic struggle, which lasted nearly three months, the workers were defeated. Presently, the payment of a yearly bonus equivalent to a month's wages, was also discontinued. Hardly a year was over, when the employers declared that wages should be further reduced. Their argument was that, owing to British and Japanese competition, the Indian textile industry was a losing concern. The original demand was for a 30% cut. The employers were divided on the issue. One section held that the workers would never give in to that exorbitant demand; and consequently there would be prolonged stoppage of production in India, which would give the British and Japanese the opportunity of flooding the Indian

market. At last the moderate counsel prevailed, and a 11.5% reduction was decided upon, to be enforced from Sept. 1.

Now, some facts about the state of the industry will expose the cold-blooded nature of this demand. The interruption in the import of British manufactures during the war, together with the change in the economic policy of British imperialism, gave a tremendous impetus to the Indian textile industry. So much so, that a number of mills made a profit of 200% in the post-war boom period of 1920—21. Naturally that abnormal prosperity could not be permanent, and a period of comparative slump followed. Immediately the employers attacked the wages which had risen only 80% above the pre-war level.

The average wages in 1914 were seven pence and 13 pence daily for unskilled and skilled labour respectively. They rose to 11 pence and two shillings in 1922. During the same period, the prices went up by 250%. So the real wages hardly increased at all. Since 1922 wages and prices have both been on the decline. Last year wages were reduced by 30%, and 8.5% were added to the reduction by the abolition of bonuses. On the other hand, the prices are still 155% above the pre-war level.

On the top of this, wages are to be cut by another 11.5%. If the owners of the textile industry in India succeed in beating down the Indian workers continually in this way, the disastrous effects will not be limited to India alone. They will affect the textile workers in other countries, particularly in Britain. The imminent industrial conflict in Bombay should, therefore, be made an international issue, and the Indian workers must be given international aid in their struggle against the combined forces of national and imperialist capital.

In spite of the policy of British imperialism to obstruct the growth of modern industry in India, Bombay already before the war threatened to be a dangerous rival of Lancashire. Cheap and unorganised labour compensated all the disabilities imposed upon Indian capitalism in the interest of imperialist monopoly. Then, Japan cannot be dislodged from the place she acquired in the Indian market, taking advantage of the break-down of regular transport during the war. The Cheap labour of Japan and the coolie labour of India made a large hole in British monopoly in India. In order to recover the lost ground, British capital decided to exploit Indian labour directly. Of late, British capital is being invested in Indian textile industry. This new situation has brought about a change in the economic policy of Imperialism. Already during the war a tariff of 11% was granted to the Indian cotton industry. This protection was not granted in fairness to Indian capital. The object was to exclude Japan, on the one hand, and on the other, to prepare the ground for the export of British capital to be invested in Indian textile industry, based on coolie labour and secured by a high tariff wall.

The Bombay millowners, however, still chafe under one remaining disability. It is the Excise Duty of 3.5% imposed upon the textile industry. They vigorously condemn this tax as being responsible for the ruining of the Indian mills. The struggle which has raged around this issue for years is nearing its end. The Government of India has admitted, on principle, that the Excise Duty should be abolished. Two weeks ago, after the lock-out notice had been given, a deputation of the mill-owners was received by the Secretary of Commerce and Industry, who promised a sympathetic consideration of the millowners' case. The latter, on their part, declared after the interview that the Excise Duty would be abolished soon. This concession to the Indian capitalists is obviously due to the pressure of British capital already invested and ready to be invested in the Indian cotton industry.

The capitalists are united in their scheme of exploitation. This united front should be met by the united resistance of the working class all over the world. A joint action of the workers of Bombay and Lancashire is of immediate necessity. The leader of the Lancashire operatives, Mr. Tom Shaw, all along supported the British imperialist policy of obstructing the growth of Indian textile industry by placing it under various disabilities. He has been an ardent advocate of the Excise Duty on the Indian cotton industry and demanded the strict application to India of the principles of Free Trade, which meant British monopoly of the Indian market. What will he do now that British imperialism is forced to abandon the old policy? Will he resist the sinister capitalist design by rallying the textile workers of Britain to the support of the Bombay

workers, who are standing with their backs to the wall before the combined forces of British and Indian capital? Will he pledge the International Textile Workers' Federation, whose President he is, to come to the aid of the Bombay workers in case they are locked out or if they strike to resist the wage-cut?

If the Bombay workers are again beaten, the consequences will be very far-reaching. Defeat of the Bombay workers will be inevitably followed by the defeat of the workers in other Indian textile centres. In consequence, not only Japanese but Lancashire fabrics will be gradually driven out of the Indian market. The result is easy to imagine. The Indian workers possess the will to fight, but without international support, they are sure to be beaten, in spite of their capability of carrying on a struggle for months with stark starvation staring them in the face. Given adequate international support, the Bombay workers can be trusted to put up such a resolute fight as would not only win them a victory in the economic struggle on the question of wages, but would signify a long step forward in the great political struggle against imperialism.

THE WHITE TERROR

The R. I. L. U. against the Murder Regime in Poland.

To the Workers of the World!

At 5 o'clock on the morning of August 21st, Hibner, Rutowski, and Kniewski, three fighters in the forefront of the Polish working class, fell under the volleys of the Polish executioners.

Zankow's laurels are giving the Polish capitalists no peace. They are taking vengeance for their own true agent-provocateurs, the bloody and senseless vengeance of a class moving to its downfall.

But this murder sanctioned by a drum-head martial is not the work of the Polish bourgeoisie alone. In this it was helped by the Polish Socialist Party which prior to the murder had been carrying on during the course of many weeks a wild campaign of calumnies against the communists thus justifying and sanctioning in advance the savage punishment meted out to these revolutionaries. This Party of the Second International is one of the murderers of the Polish workers who dared to raise a chastising hand against their provocateurs. And the International has shown itself worthy of its Party. Not a single word is to be heard from the leaders of the world social democracy protesting against this murder for which preparations were made during the course of a whole month.

We appeal to those workers who have not yet lost faith in the social democracy. Comrades! Ask the Second International leaders now meeting in session why they sent your Polish brothers to death. Ask the republican and royal ministers if they sleet in peace on the night of August the 21st.

The Amsterdam International which met in Congress in Vienna last year recognised the social-democratic as the sole working class party and called upon the trade unions to collaborate with it. Ask the Amsterdam leaders, comrades, if they meant by that that the Polish unions should collaborate with the Polish Socialist Party in the murder of revolutionary fighters.

They will give you no answer, comrades! They have no answer to this question. For the hands and liveries of the leaders of reformism are stained with the blood of Hibner, Rutowski, and Kniewski!

It is by no mere accident that, of the whole Amsterdam camp, only the British trade unions made a strong protest against the brutal excesses occurring in Poland, for only those fighting for the unity of the proletariat found courage to call a halt to the work of the Polish hangmen.

Workers! there are three fighters less in our ranks! But the working class is not used to bewailing its martyrs, for the cause of those who have fallen goes on. Many battles, many sacrifices, lie ahead of us. The White Terror is raging throughout the world; let us close the ranks of the working class more firmly.

New fighters will take the place of those who have been killed but the shame with which the Polish social democratic party and the socialist international have besmirched themselves will never be wiped out.

Workers of Poland! In your struggle against the White Terror and provocation you can rely on the genuine support of the revolutionary workers of all countries.

The Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. appeals to all organised workers to take action against the frenzy of the Terror in Poland and against the reformist henchmen of the bourgeois murderers.

All honour to those who have fallen!

Long live the working class of Poland!

Long live the united front of the world proletariat against the international reaction.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions.

The Responsibility of the Polish Socialist Party for the Execution of the three Revolutionaries.

By K. (Warsaw).

It has availed nothing! Neither the storm of protest of the international proletariat nor even the remonstrances which, it is true, were miserably feeble and belated — of several parties organised in the II. International and of pacifist bourgeois circles.

The ruling clique in Poland had to slake their thirst for blood. Six days had already passed since Bottwin had been murdered!

Our comrades have been murdered. The defender, who declared himself to be an opponent of the communists, endeavoured to convince the "judges":

"Judge according to the laws, observe the elementary principles of legal procedure!"

He requested that the trial be adjourned until the accused, who were severely wounded, had recovered. It was all in vain.

At dawn on the 21st of August the three accused died heroic deaths for the cause of the proletariat.

The Polish government, whose successes in the international and economic sphere appear none too brilliant, could boast of a "victory" over the "enemy at home".

Yet the record for cowardice and baseness in this murder has been attained by the social traitors in the Polish Socialist Party. They have rendered services to the hangmen of the Polish working class which can only be compared with those of the German Noskes.

The delegates of the Polish Socialist Party have gone to the Congress of the II. International after having eagerly assisted at the murder of three heroic champions of the proletariat. The Congress will only pronounce its blessing on their "socialist" deeds.

Before the death sentence had been pronounced, even when the friends of the P. P. S., the French socialists, had spoken at their Congress in favour of the three workers, the P. P. S. issued an appeal which was not, perchance, directed against the white terror. Far from it! The Polish socialist traitors would never think of such a thing. The appeal of the Polish socialists was directed against the terror of the Bolshevik Tcheka in Poland (which of course does not exist).

The scoundrels of the P. P. S. feared that, under the pressure of the Polish and international proletariat, the hand of the executioners might tremble, and exerted all their forces in order to steady this hand so that the death stroke could be delivered with a sure aim.

The P. P. S. unweariedly prepared the murder seeking to make it clear to the government and to public opinion that the Communists, in spite of their assertions to the contrary, are supporters of individual terror. They cried aloud to the public that the communists had organised all the terrorist acts which had occurred in recent times (and which in fact were the work of provocateurs).

In order to leave the Court no doubt that a death sentence was necessary, the P. P. S. also claimed to be themselves victims of the Communist terror, and in the appeal related bogey stories as to intended attempts upon the lives of P. P. S. leaders by Communists. The P. P. S. however are preparing fresh provocations.

The Polish bourgeoisie is triumphing. And along with it its socialist Confederates. Provocation must continue to exist as a system of government. In the struggle against this system there

have fallen another three undaunted, and never-to-be-forgotten communists.

Throughout the length and breadth of Poland the struggle of the proletariat and of the landless peasantry and of the suppressed peoples is becoming stronger under the leadership of the Communist Party — a struggle which will put an end to the rule of the blood-thirsty slaughterers and of the bourgeoisie. The day when the revolutionary tribunal will be set up is not distant!

The pressure of the international proletariat has not been able this time to snatch three champions from the hands of the executioners; all the more powerful, therefore, must be the protest of the working class. Not a single meeting must be held at which the murders committed by the Polish government are not denounced. White Poland must be surrounded with a wall of boycott and sabotage on the part of the international proletariat.

Everything must be done in order to weaken this bastille of European reaction, and finally to snatch thousands of political prisoners from the jaws of death.

IN THE COLONIES

A Blood Bath in Beirut.

By N. T. (Beirut).

The government of "social reforms" of General Sarrail is showing its claws. It was only recently that it appealed to the people for support in its fight against Reaction and Clericalism. The population of Beirut unanimously returned such "advanced" members to parliament as are entirely ready to serve the government in any way. Now, after the government has a "mandate from the people" and can rely upon the people's representatives, it is able, without hindrance, to carry on a policy of suppression of the working population and of pitiless exploitation by the native and French capitalist.

The elections to parliament were scarcely over when the governor of Lebanon altered the Rent Restrictions Act that has been in force since the occupation. Although the law has only been abolished so far as regards shops and bazars, nevertheless, this seriously affects broad sections of the population of Beirut. Here there are thousands of shop-keepers and small traders. Beirut is suffering from a serious housing shortage, and in addition to this is labouring under a severe general economic crisis. The tenants' association applied several times to the government requesting that the period in which the rent restriction act remained in force should be prolonged; but without result. The association proposed that, as a sign of protest, on the 20th of July, all shops be closed and put forward the following demands: Prolongation of the old rent restriction act. 2. That the act be extended to apply to premises belonging to the Vakfiam (religious institution). 3. Introduction of the European calendar in place of the Mussulman. 4. Fixing of a compulsory rate of exchange between the Turkish pound and the Piaster (the Piaster is falling as a result of the collapse of the franc) when paying rent.

On the 20th of July the strike was general; all factories, workshop and business were closed. Early in the morning a demonstration was organised in the main square, where all the government buildings are situated, which was attended by more than 10,000 people and which, at the commencement, was quite peaceable. The demonstrators even carried French and Turkish flags and, convinced of the friendly attitude of the government, cried out: 'Vive la France! Vive Cayla' (Cayla is the Governor). In spite of this, the police arrested several demonstrators. The crowd demanded their release, and on this being refused threw stones at the police. Cayla appeared at the demonstration and suggested to the demonstrators that they should appoint a delegation and called upon them to disperse. This they again refused to do and demanded the restoration of the rent restriction act. Gendarmes were summoned. But as these had received no orders to make use of their weapons, they had to withdraw in face of the hail of stones. The demonstrators now began to throw stones at the barrack of the police and gendarmerie and at the governor's house, demanding the release of those arrested. Thereupon the military appeared on the scenes with machine guns. The order to clear out of the square was only heard by the first rows of the demonstrators. Immediately machine guns opened

fire, and from the other end of the square the police fired with their revolvers. The demonstrators fled into the side streets where they were met by cavalry. The result of this "war plan" was five killed and 30 wounded, three of whom died. On the side of the police there were 20 wounded, among them being 3 officers.

This demonstration, which began with cries of "vive la France" and ended with the shooting down of the demonstrators, has had a very revolutionising influence upon the working population. It is not without reason that all the newspapers are setting up a howl of rage over the "bolshevik danger" which is threatening the country.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Final Text of Trotzky's Letter on Eastman's Book: "Since Lenin Died".

We publish below the final text of Comrade Trotzky's letter, in which he categorically condemns Eastman's work — which condemnation is entirely in accordance with the demands of the International. Ed.

Soon after my return from Sukhum to Moscow, a telegraphic inquiry from comrade Jackson, editor of the "Sunday Worker" in London, informed me of the publication of a book: "Since Lenin Died", which was used by the bourgeois press in order to attack our Party and the Soviet power. Although my reply to Jackson was published by the press at the time, it will be as well to repeat the first part of it here:

"The book by Eastman which you mention is unknown to me. The bourgeois newspapers quoting the book have not reached me. It need not be said that I categorically repudiate in advance any commentary directed against the Communist Party of Russia."

In the following part of my telegram I protested against the insinuations alleging that I was turning towards bourgeois democracy and towards freedom for trade.

I afterwards received the book in question ("Since Lenin Died") from comrade Inkpin, secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, who at the same time sent me a letter to the same purport as comrade Jackson's telegram. I had no intention of reading Eastman's book, much less of reacting to it, being of the opinion that my telegram to Jackson, which was published everywhere by the British and foreign press, fully sufficed. But Party Comrades who had read the book expressed the opinion that since the author referred to conversations with me, my silence could be regarded as an indirect support of this book directed entirely against our Party. This placed me under the obligation to devote more attention to Eastman's book, and above all to read it carefully through. On the basis of certain episodes in the inner life of our Party, the discussions on the methods of democracy in the Party, and the state regulation of our economics, Eastman arrives at conclusions directed entirely against our Party, and likely, if given credence, to discredit the Party as well as the Soviet power.

We shall first deal with a question which is not only of historical importance, but of living actuality at the present moment: the Red Army. Eastman asserts that the Red Army, owing to the change of persons, has been decomposed in its leadership; that it has lost its fighting capacity, etc. I do not know where Eastman has got all this absurd information. But its absurdity is obvious. At any rate we would not advise the imperialist governments to base their calculations on Eastman's revelations. Besides, he fails to observe that in thus characterising the Red Army he revives the Menshevist legend of the Bonapartist character of our army, its resemblance to a Pretorian guard. For it is plain that an army capable of "splitting" because its leader is changed is neither proletarian nor communist, but Bonapartist and Pretorian.

In the course of the book the writer quotes a large number of documents, and refers to episodes which he has heard second hand or even from more indirect sources. This little book also contains a considerable number of obviously erroneous and incorrect assertions. We shall only deal with the more important of these.

Eastman asserts in several places that the Central Committee has "concealed" from the Party a large number of documents of extraordinary importance, written by Lenin during the last period of his life. (The documents in question are letters on the national question, the famous "will", etc.) This is a pure slander against the Central Committee of our Party. Eastman's words convey the impression that these letters, which are of an advisory character and deal with the inner Party organisation, were intended by Lenin for publication. This is not at all, in accordance with the facts. During the time of his illness Lenin repeatedly addressed letters and proposals to the leading bodies and Congresses of the Party. It must be definitely stated that all these letters and suggestions were invariably delivered to their destination and they were all brought to the knowledge of the delegates of the 12th and 13th Congresses, and have invariably exercised their influence on the decisions of the Party. If all of these letters have not been published, it is because the author did not intend their publication. Comrade Lenin has not left any "will"; the character of his relations to the Party, and the character of the Party itself, exclude the possibility of such a "will". The bourgeois and Menshevik press generally understands under the designation of "will" one of Comrade Lenin's letters (which is so much altered as to be almost illegible) in which he gives the Party some organisatory advice. The 13th Party Congress devoted the greatest attention to this and the other letters, and drew the conclusions corresponding to the situation obtaining. All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated "will" is nothing but a despicable lie, directed against the real will of Comrade Lenin, and against the interests of the Party created by him.

Eastman's assertion, that the Central Committee was anxious to conceal (that is, not to publish) Comrade Lenin's article on the workers' and peasants' inspection, is equally untrue. The different standpoints held on this subject within the Central Committee — if it is possible to speak of a "difference of standpoints" at all in this case — were of a purely secondary significance, dealing solely with the question of whether the publication of Lenin's article should be accompanied by a declaration from the Central Committee or not: a declaration pointing out that there was no occasion to fear a split.

But in this question also a unanimous decision was arrived at in the same session. All the members of the Political Bureau and of the Organisation Bureau of the Central Committee present, signed a letter addressed to the Party organisations containing (inter alia) the following passage:

"Without entering, in this purely informative letter, into the criticism of the historically possible dangers pointed out at the time by comrade Lenin in his article, the members of the Political Bureau and of the Organisation Bureau, consider it necessary, in order to avoid all possible misunderstandings, to declare unanimously that there is nothing in the inner activity of the Central Committee giving occasion to fear the danger of a "split".

Not only is my signature attached to this document along with the others signatures, but the text itself was drawn up by me. (27. January 1923.)

In view of the fact that this letter, expressing the unanimous opinion of the Central Committee on Comrade Lenin's proposition with regard to the workers' and peasants' inspection, also bears the signature of comrade Kujbyshev, we have here a confutation of Eastman's assertion that comrade Kujbyshev was placed at the head of the workers' and peasants' inspection as "opponent" of Lenin's plan of organisation.

Eastman's assertions that the Central Committee confiscated my pamphlets or articles in 1923 or 1924, or at any other epoch, or by other means have prevented their publication are untrue, and are based on fantastic rumours.

Eastman is again wrong in asserting that Comrade Lenin offered me the post of chairman to the council of people's commissars, and of the council for labour and defence. I hear of this for the first time from Eastman's book.

In attentive perusal of Eastman's book would doubtless give me the opportunity of pointing out a number of other inaccuracies, errors, and misrepresentations. I do not however think that it would be of interest to go further.

The bourgeois press, especially the Menshevik press, make use of statements of Eastman, quote from his reminiscences, in order to emphasise his "close relations", his "friendship" with

me (as my biographer) and by such indirect means attaching an importance to his conclusions which they have not and cannot have. I must therefore devote a few remarks to this matter.

The character of my real relations to Eastman is perhaps best shown by a business letter, written by me at a time before there was any thought of Eastman's book "Since Lenin Died".

During my stay in Sukhum I received from one of my friends in Moscow, a collaborator in the publication of my books, the manuscript of a book by an American journalist, M. Eastman: "Leo Trotzky, a youthful portrait." My collaborator informed me in his accompanying letter that the manuscript, which had been sent to the State Publishing Office by the writer, for the purpose of being published in the Russian language, had made a strange and unusual impression among us on account of its sentimental tone.

In my letter of 3. April 1925 I replied as follows:

"Even without being familiar with the contents of Eastman's manuscript, I am perfectly in agreement with you that the publication of the book is inopportune. Although you have been kind enough to send me the manuscript, I cannot read it. I have absolutely no inclination to do so. I readily believe that it does not suit our taste, especially our Russian and Communist taste.

Eastman has been endeavouring for a long time to convince me that it is very difficult to interest the Americans in Communism, but that it is possible to interest them in the Communists. His arguments have been fairly convincing. For this reason I gave him certain help, of a limited nature. The letter which I sent him shows these limits¹⁾. I did not know that he had the intention of publishing this book in Russia, or I should probably have advised the State Publishing Office at that time not to publish it. I cannot however prevent Eastman from publishing this book abroad; he is a "free writer"; for a time he has lived in Russia and collected material; at present he is in France, if not in America. I am not sufficiently intimate with him to ask him as a private favour not to publish this book. And such a request would hardly be in place."

I repeat once more that the subject of this letter was a biographical sketch, the description of my youth up to about 1902. But the tone of my letter leaves no room for doubt on the nature of my relations to Eastman, relations which differ in no way from those maintained by me to other foreign communists or "sympathisers" who have turned to me for help in understanding the October revolution, our Party and the Soviet state — there can be no question of anything more.

Eastman sneers with vulgar aplomb at my "Don Quixotry" in my relations to the comrades of the Central Committee, of whom I have spoken in friendly terms even in the midst of the most embittered discussion. Eastman seems to think himself called upon to correct my "error", and he characterises the leading comrades of our Party in a manner which cannot be designated as anything else but calumny.

We see from the above that Eastman has attempted to erect his construction on completely rotten foundations. He seizes upon isolated incidents occurring within our Party in the course of some discussion, in order by means of distorting the meaning of the facts and exaggerating the relations in a ridiculous manner, to slander our Party and undermine the confidence in it.

It seems to me however that the attentive and thoughtful reader will not require to examine into the assertions made by Eastman and his documents (which is not possible for all) but that it suffices to ask: "If we assume that the malicious characterisation of our leading Party comrades given by Eastman is only partly correct, how is it possible that this Party should have emerged from long years of illegal struggle, how could

¹⁾ On 22. May 1925 I sent the following reply to Eastman's repeated requests:

"I shall do my utmost to assist you by means of certain information. But I cannot agree to read your manuscript, for this would make me responsible not only for the facts, but for the characterisations and estimates as well. This is of course impossible. I am prepared to undertake the responsibility, if only a limited one, for the information on the facts which I send you in reply to your request. For everything else you alone bear the responsibility." This work is concluded up to 1902.

it stand at the head of masses of millions carried through the greatest revolution of the world, and further the formation of revolutionary parties in other countries?"

There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman. It contains within itself its own refutation. Whatever Eastman's intentions may be, this piece of botched work is none the less objectively a tool of counter-revolution, and can solely serve the ends of the incarnate enemies of communism and of the revolution.

1. July 1925.

L. Trotzky.

BOOK REVIEWS

The American Labour Press Directory*.

By Paul Friedländer (Vienna).

The Labour Research Department of the Rand School Science in New York has published an excellent guide to the American labour press, in the English language. The booklet, containing 82 pages, has been compiled by Solon de Leon with the assistance of Nathan Fines. It is perfectly unique in its kind.

The directory enumerates the periodicals of the following organisations and movements: the American Federation of Labour, the national and international unions affiliated to the Federation, the independent trade unions, the Industrial Workers of the World, the Trade Union Educational League and related groups, Workers' Education and Research. It further gives a list of the socialist and communist daily newspapers, of the co-operative publications, of the organs of the Farmer-Labour movement, and of the religious bodies with socialist tendencies, and of many publications dealing with the interests of the workers, even the official government publications of the various federal states of the U. S. A. A few brief sections give a survey of the socialist and communist labour press of Canada and other countries, including European countries, and finally of international publications.

In general the following information is given: Name of the newspaper of periodical in question, how often it appears (daily weekly, monthly, etc.), the year it was established, size, price, editor, publishers, circulation, of what institution it is the official organ. These statements are accurate and reliable so far as the United States are concerned, but are incomplete and deficient as regards the European countries. (Even when we bear in mind the fact that for the European countries only the very most important publications of the labour press are mentioned.)

The synoptical and carefully arranged compilation on the labour press of the United States (dealing with about 600 newspapers and periodicals) is interesting and instructive from various points of view.

Thus the sections dealing with the trade union press involuntarily mirror the manner in which the workers in the United States are scattered into craft groups. The circulation of the

separate periodicals shows at the same time how greatly the influence exercised by the various trade unions on the trades in question varies. For instance, the section on the unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labour mentions no fewer than five periodicals for various groups of railway employees, with extremely varying and in part fairly large circulations (104,875 and 100,000); besides this five further papers for various groups of railway workers and employees, enumerated under the heading of "Independent trade unions" (these too having fairly large circulations). A striking picture of disunity!

It is thus comprehensible that the Trade Unions Educational League, belonging to the Left wing of the labour movement, as well as the groups affiliated to this league, have for some years past been issuing various periodicals which aim at promoting the movement towards the amalgamation of the different craft organisations. Their circulation is still somewhat small (between 500 and 10,000). The "Workers' Monthly", published by our comrade Earl Browder since 1924, has however already attained a circulation of 25,000 copies.

The "I. W. W." also issue a number of periodicals with comparatively small circulations (the "Marine Workers" having the largest). A sign of their weakening influence in recent years.

Whilst the trade union organs, apart from the publications of the I. W. W., are, for the most part, published in the English language, the political daily papers and periodicals give a graphic picture of the multifarious languages and nationalities represented in the United States. At the same time the enumeration of these publications shows with all clearness that it is but a small part of the working population which is reached by the labour press. The field is still left almost entirely to the bourgeois press.

It is worth noting that though it is but a short time since the communist press came into existence, there are already more communist than socialist daily papers. Of the communist daily papers the "Daily Worker" (Chicago), established in 1924, has already attained a circulation of 25,000 copies. The German "New Yorker Volkszeitung", which has existed since 1877, has a circulation of 22,000 copies. The Russian daily "Novy Mir" a circulation of 14,000, the "Ukrainian Daily News" 15,000, the Jewish daily paper appearing in New York (established in 1922) has even reached a circulation of 50,000, there is a Finnish daily paper with a circulation of 9800, another of 13,800, a Lithuania daily paper has a circulation of 15,000, a Hungarian daily 15,000; the circulation of the Czech daily paper is not stated. Besides the 11 communist daily papers there are 8 socialist dailies. (It must however be taken into account that a number of trade union and co-operative papers can also be described as socialist.) It is a remarkable fact that among these the largest circulations has been attained by the "Jewish Daily Forward" (205,000 copies). The "Milwaukee Leader" has a circulation of 40,102.

These few observations will suffice to show what information may be obtained, and what conclusions drawn, from a booklet supplying such data as this American Labour press Directory."

As already mentioned, the sections dealing with countries outside of the United States are inadequate. It would therefore all the more meet a real want if similar guides to the labour press of the most important countries of Europe were published.

*) „American Labour Press Directory“, New York 1925.