

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 41

14th July 1927

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.

CONTENTS

N. Bukharin: An Abrupt Turn in the Chinese Revolution.
Politics.

Philipp Dengel: Whither is Germany Steering?

Gabriel Péri: The Failure of the Naval Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

China.

Sydor Stoler: The International Workers' Delegation in Hunan I.

Hundred Thousand People in Changsha Greet International Workers Delegation.

Against Imperialist War.

L...n: The Development of the German Chemical Industry as a War Industry.

Herni Barbusse: The International of Ex-Servicemen and its Fight against Imperialist War.

N. L...r: Bolshevism and the War of 1914—1918. I.

Revolutionary Movements in the Colonies.

Luhani: A Revolutionary Republican Movement in India.

The Labour Movement.

James Shields: Trade Unionism and the Organisation of the Native Masses in South Africa.

Clara Zetkin.

The E. C. C. I. to Clara Zetkin.

The Balkans.

Help the Struggling Greek Workers!

In the International.

M. N. Roy: The V. Congress of the Communist Party of China.

J. Berlioz: The Results of the National Conference of the C. P. of France.

Willi Schlämm: The IX. Party Conference of the C. P. of Austria.

The Co-operative Movement.

J. T. Murphy: Communist Aims in the International Co-operative Movement.

In the Camp of Social Democracy.

M. Pokrovsky: After Seven Years.

White Terror.

Felix Halle: The Reopening of the Case for Max Hölz.

Obituary.

Jar: Antonio Garcia Quejido.

Ten Years Ago.

N. Lenin: The First Soviet Congress and the War. II.

The Offensive is still Progressing.

The First Reverses at the Front.

N. Bukharin: The True Causes of the Resignation of the Cadets.

Chronicle of Events.

An Abrupt Turn in the Chinese Revolution.

By N. Bukharin.

The revolution in China is entering on a new stage of its development and is at the present moment at the apex of its sharpest transition.

The facts show this with the greatest clearness.

The agreement among the generals, from Chiang Kai-shek to Tang Cheng shi, means that all the decisive, armed forces of the bourgeoisie are grouping themselves round the hangman of Nanking.

The coalition of Chiang Kai-shek, Feng Yu Hsiang and Jen Si-shei means in fact the consolidation of this camp. In spite of inner conflicts and differences of opinion, the Canton troops of Li Ti-sin, together with and in one bloc with this coalition, are conducting a furious struggle against the workers and peasants.

The class basis and the class aim of this coalition are excellently set forth in the declaration of Feng in which he stated, among other things, that in the territory of Wuhan

"the merchants, traders, owners of industrial enterprises and pieces of land are suppressed by the workers and peasants. The Chinese people (!! N.B.) do not want such despotism. Even the families of the soldiers at the front are suppressed; their property is confiscated and a number of crimes are being committed in the name of the nationalist party... Some Reds have gained entrance into the Party in order to dominate the Kuomintang movement..." (Manchester Guardian 25th June.)

This is how Feng justifies his ultimatum to the government.

The attitude of Wuhan is the attitude of complete capitulation. As a matter of fact there already exists an understanding with Nanking. This fact is not altered by the vacillations of some (Wang-Chin-Wei, Chang-Fa-Kui) and the flight of others (Da-Nin-Da). On the one hand there are symptoms of decay, on the other a definite course towards Nanking.

Here it is not merely a question of the dangerousness of the situation, that the Wuhan government has on all sides the mouths of the revolvers of the generals pointing at its temples. In a firm social and class revolutionary situation persons and groups always display courage. The main question here is that the bourgeois radicals and the intellectuals who are becoming radicalised are frightened by the sweep of the agrarian and peasant movement, which has assumed a most acute form and now does not admit of any "manoeuvring"; one must either place oneself at the head of the agrarian revolution or fire on the peasants. The tremendous acuteness of precisely this question pushes Wuhan behind Feng and Co. into the camp of counter-revolution. The revolutionary role of Wuhan is at an end.

This is expressed politically in the energetic preparation for the expulsion of the Communists from the Kuomintang; and there is not the least doubt that the C. C. of the Kuomintang will accept this ultimative demand of General Feng and will fulfil it, not out of "fear" but out of "conviction".

At the same time there has set in a systematic attack on the workers, peasants and Communists, which assumes the form of armed fight and reprisals. Tang Cheng-Shi, who had gone to Changsha in order to "investigate" the affair of the counter-revolutionary coup of the generals, has fully and entirely approved of the shooting of the peasants. The peasants have proved to be guilty, because, as one can see, they have committed "errors". Tang Cheng-Shi had four Communists executed and instituted the terror against our Party. His troops began to break up the trade unions. The workers' guard was disarmed. The last news we have received states that in Wuhan itself the Commander of the 35th Corps has issued an order for the expulsion of the Communists from his corps; those who wish to remain in his corps must openly declare their resignation from the Party; those who do not submit to the orders are threatened with shooting.

These facts prove in an eloquent manner that Wuhan has collapsed, that its revolutionary role is at an end, that it has had its day as a revolutionary force, as an organising centre of the revolution. Under such conditions, for the Party of the revolutionary proletariat the following conclusion is absolutely necessary: **One must not remain a single moment longer in the "government" of Wuhan.** Therefore the Executive Committee of the Comintern was entirely right when it pointed out in good time the necessity for the immediate withdrawal of the Communists from the Wuhan government.

This withdrawal must be effected in a demonstrative manner and must be accompanied by a political declaration of the Party; a declaration which, while explaining the objects of the Communist Party in entering the government, exposes the present policy of Wuhan its fight against the labour movement, its bloc with Nanking, its cowardly silence on the occasions of the executions and shootings, its contempt for the mass of the people.

In this declaration the Communist Party must also lay down its attitude to the Kuomintang.

What conclusions must the Chinese Communists draw from the present events in regard to the Kuomintang? Will withdrawal from the National government involve withdrawal from the Kuomintang also?

In our opinion, **no.** The treacherous behaviour of the Kuomintang leaders can just as little compel us to withdraw from the whole front of the organisation of the Kuomintang as the treacherous behaviour of the leaders of the British Labour Party removes from the agenda the question of the fight of the Communists for entry into this mass organisation.

Meanwhile, in contradistinction to Great Britain, the state of affairs in China is such that the Communists in the local organisations of the Kuomintang, especially there where these organisations consist of workers and peasants, not only possess influence, but frequently also possess leading influence. Finally,

one must not lose sight of the fact that the Communist Party must now go over to **illegality.** If it wants to be a really revolutionary Party, if it is to equip the masses for the decisive fight against the enemy, who has now welded together his front throughout the whole of China, then the Communist Party will be compelled to build up its illegal apparatus. But in such conditions it would be particularly wrong and absurd to break with the entire organisation of the Kuomintang along the whole front.

The tactics of the Communists towards the Kuomintang in the present epoch of the Chinese revolution will be determined by these considerations. The Communists must appeal to the masses of the Kuomintang against their leaders. They must increase their work in the depths of the Kuomintang by putting through their platform, by emphatically condemning the "leaders". They must put forward the popular demands of the masses and rally round them the lower membership of the Kuomintang. On this basis they must prepare the Party Conference of the Kuomintang. Even then, when the C. C. of the Kuomintang adopts a resolution on the expulsion of the Communists (which is highly probable), they must fight for their positions in the Kuomintang in the same way as the Communists did in the Labour Party and as they are doing in the British trade unions.

It is of course necessary that the Communist Party of China conducts a correct policy. Meanwhile, the leadership of the Communist Party of China has in recent times obstinately sabotaged the decisions of the Comintern. Whilst the local functionaries of the C. P. of China led the masses in the fight and frequently died heroically at their fighting posts, the Political Bureau has often violated the instructions of the Comintern.

The following are the facts: The Comintern has systematically given directions regarding the independence of the Communist Party of China, the necessity of letting loose the agrarian revolution, the arming of the workers and peasants, settling accounts with the counter-revolutionary generals and democratising the Kuomintang. The C. I. has day after day urged the C. P. of China along the way of further developing the revolution. Day after day it has declared in the sharpest manner the insufficient determination of the Communist Party of China and the poverty of its slogans.

With regard to the Kuomintang there was pointed out the inevitability of its conversion into a miserable tool of the counter-revolutionary generals in the event of it not following a decisive course towards developing the agrarian revolution and organising the armed forces of the lower strata of the population. In the instructions there was repeatedly and systematically pointed out the inevitability of the treachery of the generals, the necessity of crushing the counter-revolutionary officers by the peasants, the necessity of organising revolutionary tribunals for trying reactionary officers etc.

The C. I., while repeatedly characterising the hampering of the agrarian revolution as a criminal policy, called for the organising of the immediate and actual seizure of the land by the peasants from below.

The C. I. attached extraordinarily great importance to the organising of military units consisting of revolutionary workers. In the directions it was expressly proposed that some special corps of workers be set up in which a great number of Communists should be mobilised.

The line of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and its various representatives was subjected to the sharpest criticism. The C. I. warned that it would not stop short of open criticism in the press of the course of the leadership of the C. P. of China, if this course was not changed in the direction of a bold unloosening of the workers' and peasants' revolution.

If after all this, dishonest politicians from the Opposition write: "The instructions of Bukharin were not carried out, because they were of no value; so far as they were carried out, however, they did not serve that class for which they were intended", then these dishonest politicians justify the sabotage of the revolutionary decisions of the Comintern. One must lose the remnants of elementary honesty, one must become a furiously blind and malicious calumniator in order to be able to write and spread such things.

The leadership of the C. C. of the C. P. of China has certainly not stood the fiery test. It must be openly said that it has suffered shipwreck. The Political Bureau of the C. P. of China has hindered the development of the agrarian revolution the whole time by opposing to the inner problems of the revolution the military campaign against Peking and such like. Their formula of the revolution is somewhat as follows: "divert attention to the exterior, united anti-imperialist struggle", to "exorcise" the growth of class antagonisms, as if it were possible to check the historical process of the class struggle, as if the aims of the Communists were not the fight for the hegemony of the proletariat even in the national revolution, but the fight against this fight!

The attitude of Chen Du Siu with his formula: "First Peking and then we shall see"; the attitude of Tang Ping San who spouted liberal phrases; his attitude regarding "vacation" from the government in order "to improve his health", this miserable and cowardly quasi explanation; the vote in the Political Bureau of the C. C. of the C. P. of China against the decisions of the Comintern (June 26th) and the rejection of these decisions as "unpractical"; finally, not only the lack of an organisation for defence against reaction in Wuhan but the actual assistance to Wuhan (voluntary handing over of arms on the decisions of the Polit Bureau of the C. C.) — all this proves that there are social democratic elements in the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

Characteristic is the fact that the opportunist leaders of the Party of the type of Chen-Du-Siu advocated withdrawal from the Kuomintang (hear, hear!). This would lead to their even greater estrangement from the masses and render easier their compromising activity.

The C. C. of the Young Communist League, contrary to this attitude, in these critical days, fully and entirely endorsed the "unpractical" decisions of the C. I. and protested emphatically in a resolution against the vacillations and wobblings of the C. C. of the C. P. of China; and at the same time adopted a correct attitude both in the question of the confiscation of the land and in the question of arming the workers and peasants, as well as in the question of democratising the Kuomintang.

From this there must be drawn that conclusion which the Comintern has drawn: Extraordinary Conference of the Party, new elections to the Central Committee, ruthless criticism of the leadership, carrying out of the directions of the C. I., decisive fight, up to expulsion from the Party, of those who are of the opinion that the Party has to act according to the behests of the bourgeois leaders of the Kuomintang.

The Communist Party must, under all conditions, be the main lever of the movement. If there prevails in its leadership such a helpless confusion, there can of course be urged as an extenuating circumstance the youth of the whole Party. Yet there are limits for extenuating circumstances. The Young Communist League is not older than the C. P. of China, and nevertheless it has adopted a correct line. Precisely because the Party is the main lever of the movement, one cannot avoid adopting all measures in order to draw the appropriate lessons from the behaviour of the C. C. The E. C. C. I. appeals therefore to the Party members and demands the convocation of an extraordinary Conference, no matter how difficult this may be under the conditions obtaining.

(To be continued.)

POLITICS

Whither is Germany Steering?

By Philipp Dengel (Berlin).

We know that the statements of diplomats and ministers with regard to international relations are often not worth the paper on which they are printed. We know that shortly before the decisive days of August 1914, all the Cabinets and foreign offices of the imperialist countries issued declarations of peace whilst at the same time the last preparations for launching the

attack were being made. We attribute no more significance to the declarations made by Herr Stresemann in the Reichstag than to the mendacious declarations made before the outbreak of the world war. We are all the more justified in this since Herr Stresemann, before making his so carefully arranged statement, had sent secret information to the leaders of the bourgeois parties so as to give simultaneous documentary evidence that his public explanations were of little value.

The bad or good intentions of Herr Stresemann indeed, do not enter into the question. The question is rather that of what decision the German bourgeoisie will be driven to take by the determining interests of the ruling class in Germany.

The momentary economic situation in Germany will not deceive anyone as to the persistently critical nature of the situation as a whole. True, the iron and steel industry shows record production, the coal industry remains above the pre-war level, a large part of the textile industry is very busy, the chemical industry is regaining lost ground, the engineering industry is attaining its highest figures of production since the war and so on. At the same time the apparatus of production is being improved and extended, the capacity for production is growing enormously. This growth, however, is not balanced by a corresponding growth of exports of goods. The export of goods remains on the whole stable, allowing of course for fluctuations, the export of finished goods especially, shows no tendency to increase.

How is this stagnation in the development of exports to be explained?

Firstly, by the fundamental alteration in the situation in Europe in consequence of the war. The effect of the war on Europe was first of all a general impoverishment of large parts of Europe (Eastern Europe, the Austrian Succession States, the Balkans) and secondly the forced development of national industries, above all in France and Italy, and in a lesser degree in Holland, Spain, Hungary, the Balkan States etc. At the same time the permanent crisis in England throws difficulties in the way of any extension of sales to that country.

The second barrier to the expansion of the export of goods is the impossibility of the export of capital on any large scale. There is indeed some export of capital (for instance the 300 million credit to the Soviet Union); but it is comparatively very slight and it is counterbalanced by an import of capital which is still to-day largely applied to financing the state of affairs in the country.

The third barrier — the most important — is Germany's relative impotence in foreign policy. This impotence in foreign politics, which results from her military impotence, makes it difficult for Germany to conclude favourable commercial agreements, forces her to make concessions, even to such feeble States as Poland, forces her to endure the most rigorous measures, as for instance those of the United States. It puts obstacles in the way of the question of reparations being brought up again in the near future. It compels Germany to submit to the colonies being barred to German competition etc.

How can the German bourgeoisie improve this situation? One measure is further to intensify competition. The formation of monopolies and rationalisation have been carried through on a large scale. There remains the step of further increasing the pressure on the workers.

The German "Mining Gazette" demands — in addition to a reduction of social welfare work — a further reduction of wages by 30% as a prerequisite for Germany's "capability of competition" abroad. These forceful measures of course, on the one hand cut both ways for the German bourgeoisie. They not only have the effect of radicalising the workers but they also weaken the home market, thus undermining the basis for a permanent capability of competition. Nevertheless, the German bourgeoisie will try to take this path which, needless to say, involves the intensification of the political pressure on the workers.

But the most important point for the German bourgeoisie in this connection is that it acquires the possibility of freer, more intense imperialist action.

A friendly approach towards the Soviet Union would, to a great extent, free Germany from the fetters of her foreign political obligations and from her political impotence. At the time when the war was being continued by imperialist France, capitalist Germany tried, in a vacillating way, to follow this path until 1923. A change began with the conclusion of the war in the Ruhr and the defeat of the German workers in 1923. A necessary change.

A friendly approach towards the Soviet Union would have meant an understanding with the Soviet Union with regard to the methods of foreign policy as a whole, i. e. the rejection of imperialist methods, of fight against imperialism, the support of the war for liberation of all oppressed peoples against imperialism. Did the German bourgeoisie want to follow this path, and was it able to do so? This was impossible because imperialism and the tendency to imperialist activity is an inevitable accompanying symptom of capitalism. This is why Germany joined the League of Nations, that union of imperialist States for the suppression of colonial peoples, for combined despotism over dependent States and the oppressed classes. This is why Germany is now forcing her way into the Mandate Commission etc.

The German bourgeoisie cast the die when it joined the League of Nations (Locarno Treaty); it threw in its lot against the oppressed peoples, against the Soviet Union, on the side of imperialism.

Since Locarno, considerable "progress" has been made along his path. The resistance of a section of the bourgeoisie, especially of agrarian capital in the East, to the orientation towards the West has ceased. It is just from this side that the most vehement agitation against the Soviet Union is being carried on.

What is the significance of the last conference at Geneva as regards the relation between imperialist Germany and the Soviet Union? Stresemann has admitted in the Reichstag that secret understandings, (he denied there being any agreements, but it is not a question of the word but of the fact) had been come to with regard to a combined opposition to the Comintern in Geneva. With regard to the significance of this understanding, the bourgeois Press, as for instance the "Vossische Zeitung" wrote that the Comintern indeed had been named, but the Soviet Union was meant.

It is worth calling attention to the expositions of Alfred Weber, the Heidelberg professor of national economy in the "Frankfurter Zeitung" of June 18th:

"The step taken by our Foreign Minister in becoming the sixth member of the Ambassadors' Conference, without reservations, in an action which the whole public can clearly interpret as being directed against Russia, gives cause for profound qualms.

Does the Foreign Office see clearly enough that the policy of acting as intermediary between West and East, the only high trump card of foreign politics which we hold in our hand, must not be a continuation of the zig-zag policy of the pre-war times, the curves of which finally thrust us into the abyss? It was already alarming enough to trace in the questions of the commission for colonies and mandates that the greatest imponderable factor on our side to-day throughout the world, our 'immaculateness' with regard to colonial imperialism, was being endangered in favour of a policy which was, of necessity, almost exclusively a question of prestige. And now: nothing could have blown more effectually upon the very definite and very significant sympathy which we enjoy in the whole world to the East of us, as though this sympathy were mere vapour, than what has happened. Is it certain that it will not be blown away by such a cold wind?...

Is it now the definite intention of the Foreign Minister to travel westwards?"

It is well known that Professor A. Weber is in very close touch with certain circles of the Foreign Office. His warnings are not a matter of fiction but are based on real facts.

The Social Democratic Press, on the whole, tries to veil the anti-Russian policy of the German imperialists, just as it denies the aggressive intentions of English imperialism and

lays all the blame for the fact that relations between England and the Soviet Union have become more acute, at the door of Bolshevism. In view of the facts and of the unrest amongst the workers, however, a few Centrist Social Democratic papers cannot but admit certain things.

Further evidence that Germany's foreign policy has finally swung into the wake of English imperialism is given by the steps taken by Stresemann in Moscow under Chamberlain's instructions, in order to exercise pressure on the Soviet Government,

"to moderate the measures taken against Poland since the murder of Ambassador Wojkov".

This is not only insolent in view of the toleration and support of organisations of White Guardist conspirators on Polish territory shown by the Pilsudski clique, in view of the comedy of justice against Comrade Wojkov's murderer, it cannot be described as anything but a clear demonstration of the future attitude of imperialist Germany towards the Soviet Union in the event of Poland taking definite measures of war against it. Poland receives the benevolent support of the German Government at the moment when the Soviet Union demands nothing but the expiation of the murder committed against the Soviet Union and the dissolution of terrorist White Guardist organisations which, on Polish territory, are preparing attempted murders, acts of terror and attacks on a large scale against the Soviet Union. This step taken by the German Government is verily a symptom of great significance.

Other phenomena also go to show that German foreign policy is linked up with the policy of English imperialism in a very far-reaching measure. It was striking that, after Stresemann's return from Geneva, the German Nationalists, who had played a very hostile accompaniment to the negotiations in Geneva, suddenly became very friendly towards Herr Stresemann.

The key to this phenomenon is obviously to be found in the promise Stresemann had received from Chamberlain to support Germany in her efforts to get the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in respect of the limitation of armaments relaxed. The well-informed "Zeitkorrespondenz" publishes guiding lines for the future construction of the national militia, which make it possible to increase the trained cadres fourfold. At the same time we learn that German military attachés are being permitted in England and Italy. There are further many signs that illegal armaments are being prepared and carried through with much energy.

In view of this situation, it is the duty of the C. P. of Germany to mobilise the working masses and to develop the highest degree of activity in order that the fight against reaction and against economic pauperisation may be followed by preliminary steps for the overthrow of the bourgeois bloc government and of the rule of the bourgeoisie altogether.

The Failure of the Naval Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

By Gabriel Peri (Paris).

The Geneva Conference of the three great Powers — Great Britain, the United States and Japan — which was proclaimed to be a Conference for naval disarmament and which has been sitting for several weeks without showing any tangible results, has now openly failed. One does not need to be a great prophet in order to be able to predict that it will be adjourned in a day or two. Thereby there is exposed the swindle of "naval disarmament" which the imperialists had placed on the scene.

After a number of proposals of the three Great Powers had been dropped as no formula could be agreed upon, the delegates of the Japanese imperialists submitted a formula of compromise. But even this did not meet with any success. In round figures the Japanese proposal laid down the following tonnage for cruisers and torpedo boat destroyers: Great Britain 480,000 tons, United States 450,000 tons, Japan 310,000. These figures are somewhat lower than those proposed by the United

States delegates, but which Great Britain rejected as being insufficient. What is noticeable in this proposal is the fact that Japan wishes to allot a bigger tonnage to Great Britain than the United States, which again runs counter to the idea of Coolidge, who wants the United States and Great Britain to possess fleets of equal strength. In addition, the Japanese proposal means an improvement in the position of Japan, which was much worse off under the old Washington formula, according to which the ratio of dreadnoughts for Great Britain, United States and Japan respectively, was 5:5:3.

As a result, after tedious negotiations, the proposal of Japan fell through. It has thereby become obvious that all the cunningly thought out political combinations, by which it was intended on the one hand to throw sand into the eyes of the masses and on the other hand to cheat one another, have been brought to nought by the sharp economic and political antagonisms among the three great imperialist powers.

The United States was aiming at obtaining, without any fresh expenditure, the same power in naval units as Great Britain, which latter would thereby lose power in this respect. And this at a time when the struggle for the Pacific is growing acute.

Japan, whose finances are exceedingly bad, had the greatest interest in getting the best out of the Conference without abandoning any of its naval armaments.

Great Britain, finally, as mistress of the seas, defends the ocean routes over which her fighting forces passed yesterday and pass today in order to threaten revolutionary China and nationalist Egypt and to hold them in check, and which are destined tomorrow to maintain "law and order" in awakening India.

At the Geneva Conference Great Britain defended her domination of the sea against the two other great Powers. For Great Britain the result of the futile negotiations is that her fleet remains un-reduced. On the other hand, the imperialists of the United States do not think of abandoning their programme of becoming equally strong at sea as the British imperialists. And, therefore, work will be feverishly carried on in the future in the American shipyards. It was perhaps even the intention of Coolidge and his colleagues to use as a pretext the failure of the disarmament Conference in order to be able to continue arming, pointing to the obstinacy of the other powers. They have in this way created a favourable platform for the coming Presidential elections.

We have on two occasions in the last four months seen how bourgeois pacifism, which all bourgeois governments try to use as a screen, has collapsed like a soap bubble. In the months of April and May it was the Preparatory Commission of the League of Nations Meeting for Disarmament, with the collaboration of the "socialist" heralds Paul Boncour and De Brouckère, which provided the world with a striking example of unfettered militarism, and which was finally postponed without achieving any results. And now it is the naval Conference which has likewise proved bankrupt.

The disarmament of the capitalist Powers, without which Geneva and Locarno are nothing (it was no other than Lloyd George who said this), has proved to be impossible and fraudulent. Thereby the deceitful propaganda of the socialist leaders for Geneva and Locarno and for disarmament is placed in its proper light; it is no longer possible to deny their co-responsibility for the crime of the coming imperialist war. The competition in armaments still goes on; the great campaign against the Soviet Union is still being prepared. In China more and more troops and ships of the "civilised" powers are being concentrated. And everywhere the flames of war are rising: in the Balkans, in the East, in Central and South America.

These "disarmament Conferences" have achieved one good thing: they have helped to dispel the pacifist illusions which still prevail among the broad masses of the workers.

CHINA

The International Workers' Delegation in Hunan.

By Sydor Stoler (Secretary of the International Workers' Delegation).

I.

Our visit to the Hunan Province, though it was rather short, nonetheless constitutes a very important chapter in the work and studies of the International Workers' Delegation.

During our ten weeks' stay in China we had the unusual good luck to pass through a large portion of the territory occupied by the Nationalist Government. The territory we covered represents, so to speak, a cross-section of the whole complex of political and social forces and relations to be found in revolutionary China. We passed through a complete scale of these political and social forces, beginning with Canton, the starting point and until recently the center of the national revolutionary movement, through the province of Kiangsi, where we saw and felt very definitely the process of differentiation in the national revolutionary front, then on to Wuhan, the seat of the Central Kuomintang and of the Nationalist Government.

First Canton and the Kwantung Province, where we came into contact with vigorous trade union and peasants' movements which were hindered in their development by the reactionary forces that were still in the saddle, with a little and shrewd Napoleonic type of a Tupan — General Li Chi-Hsin playing the role of the overlord...

Then through Kiangsi, where we found the movement younger, less vigorous and experienced, yet a rapidly growing revolutionary mass-movement. In this province we first came into contact with open and flagrant reaction. We reached the city of Konchow just at a time when the masses of workers and peasants were mourning the loss of their leader Chin, who had been assassinated by Chang Kai-shek's hirelings. As we proceeded further North, toward Nanchang, we found ourselves thicker and thicker in the midst of a reaction that stifled the atmosphere with numerous crimes against the workers' and peasants' organisations and against the Central Kuomintang.

At Nanchang we found reaction in full bloom. Similarly at Kiukiang.

It was upon our arrival at Hankow, that we breathed fresh air again. The enthusiasm we found among the masses in the Hupeh Province and the attitude of the Central Kuomintang and the Nationalist Government towards the workers and peasants reassured us once more....

Our train left Hankow shortly before midnight on April 19th. At every station, without a single exception, all along the line, all through the night and the following day, the Delegation were greeted by masses of peasants and workers who crowded the platforms with banners and bands. Every half hour or so we were roused by a distant discharge of firecrackers, that made the neighborhood rattle. This was the signal to us that we were approaching a station and that we were expected to come out and address the crowds which came to greet us. For over twenty four hours we were so to speak in a fever of expectation... We divided our comrades into shifts, each one taking a turn at speaking, while the others attempted to rest...

Torrents of rain poured down all through the night and the following day. But as we progressed, the crowds at the stations became larger and larger. At the Hsien-Lin Station (still in the Hupeh Province), hundreds of peasants had been waiting in the rain for more than four hours (our train was of course late — because of the long stops and meetings).

A big mass meeting was held at Yochow on the following day. The train had to stop for several hours. A huge procession marched through the town to the so-called "School of October 10th" which had been founded and run by American missionaries, but which has been taken over by the Nationalist Government. More than 6000 people attended this meeting.

At about six o'clock in the afternoon we reached the station Milo, where a mass-meeting with 5000 people was held. There

we learned that reaction is still running high in that neighbourhood. The peasants are suffering untold misery under the rule of the gentry. The Kuomintang has not yet been organised in this town. The Trade Unions are in the preparatory stage. Some 70 peasants' groups (not yet Peasants' Union) are already in existence; but they are still very weak.

We arrived in Changsha shortly before midnight of April 20th. We were met by many thousands of people who had been waiting for over ten hours at the station (accumulated lateness and a misleading telegram account for this delay).

With music and cheers and revolutionary songs and slogans resounding through the night and arousing the entire city a long procession through the town brought us to our quarters — the former Y. M. C. A. Building.

This was the first symptom of significant and deepgoing changes that have already taken place in Hunan... What was formerly the Y. M. C. A., is now "The People's Club". This People's Club, a modern, splendidly kept building with its spacious meeting hall and stage (where many of our meetings were held), with its recreation rooms and playgrounds and dormitories, resembles very much some of the "People's Clubs" and "Workers' Clubs" in the Soviet Union. It was there that we first saw former mansions and aristocratic clubs turned into Workers' and Peasants' Clubs... The People's Club of Changsha is visited daily by hundreds of peasants' and workers' families who come to see and inspect the Club.

In no other place visited by us did we find such a powerful and well-organised mass-movement. The planfulness and method which were reflected at every mass meeting and gathering we witnessed, convinced us of an unusual maturity of the mass-movement in Hunan, and also of the presence of a strong, clear-headed, really revolutionary leadership. The revolutionary fervour, the enthusiasm and responsiveness of the masses in Hunan impress one at the outset that the revolutionary movement has furrowed deep here into the consciousness of the masses.

The Trade Unions in the Hunan Province are the class organisations of the workers; they are the revolutionary school of the working masses, and they can serve as a barometer for determining the degree of organisation, discipline, military, fighting capacity and revolutionary consciousness of the working class. There are 430,000 workers organised in the Trade Unions of Hunan. The front ranks of this powerful working class army is of course occupied by the industrial proletariat — about 90,000 strong.

It is interesting and instructive to note the process of growth and development of the Hunanese Trade Unions. At the time of the February 7th, (1923) incident (the Wu Pei fu massacre) the number of workers organised in the Trade Unions of this province was only 20,000. By the 30th of May 1925 their number rose to 70,000. At the time when the Northern Expedition began (in the summer of 1926) the Trade Union membership rises to 110,000. And finally, since the Nationalist Government was established in Hunan the Trade Union membership has constantly increased, and it is now fast approaching the half-million mark.

The workers and their Trade Union organisations in Hunan also played and still play a very prominent part in the stamping out of reaction, which from time to time is trying to raise its head against the revolution.

The problems that still confront the Trade Unions of Hunan are:

1. **The betterment of the conditions of the workers and the raising of their standard of living.** Some progress has also been made in this field. We were informed that most of the industrial workers in this province work ten hours a day, and that the printers, textile workers and railwaymen generally have the eight hour day. But there is still an enormous task before the Trade Unions in relieving the hard and unbearable conditions of labour of the mass of the workers, particularly of the women and children.

2. **The struggle against the reactionaries.** The gentry, the corrupt public officials and the compradores have formed a solid united front against the Trade Unions. As a result many workers have lost their lives in this struggle. This was the case in Changsha, in Shantung, in Shi-Kwan (antimony mines) in the Suey-Ko mountain district and also along the Yueh-Han Railway line. This brings us to:

3. **The problem of training and arming the workers and Trade Union pickets for self-defence.** We were very glad to hear that the Government has furnished the Trade Union pickets with a number of rifles. However the main question of arms still awaits its solution, because of a keenly felt lack of arms. There is a general desire on the part of the workers to receive military training in order better to be able to defend the revolutionary government and to fight the reactionaries. This, too, is a good symptom, and a source of strength for the revolution.

I shall now pass on to the peasants and the land question. It should be pointed out here that not only in Hunan, but everywhere, literally everywhere we went, in every town and village and district of Kwangtung, Kiangsi, Hupeh and Hunan which we passed through, and from every organisation connected with the Chinese Revolution, as well as from every government and political organ with which we came into contact — the problem that was on everybody's lips was: the Peasant Question.

In Hunan, where the Revolution has shot its deepest roots and where the trade union and peasant movements represent powerful revolutionary factors which have actually shaken the old feudal system to its foundation and begun the social revolution, the peasant question and the land problem are literally crying for their solution. Again and again, whether in our interviews with the representatives of the Provincial Government, or of the Kuomintang, or with the leaders of the Trade Unions, the Peasants' Unions, the Women's Union or with the representatives of the Nationalist Army — the peasant question came up as the central theme, the decisive problem... "Something must be done..." "Delay is dangerous"... "The land question must be solved"... These were the words expressing the sentiments of everyone we spoke to.

(To be continued.)

Hundred Thousand People in Changsha Greet International Workers Delegation.

Hankow, April 25, 1927.

Tom Mann, Earl Browder and S. Stoler, of the International Delegation, returned to Hankow yesterday after a five-day trip through Hunan to Changsha, and return. When asked about his impressions of Changsha, Tom Mann said to a representative of the "Peoples Tribune":

"Never before have I seen such spontaneous demonstrations of revolutionary enthusiasm as we witnessed in Changsha. In my 71 years, 46 of which have been spent in dealing with mass movements and mass organisation, I have learned to be quite critical, and I can feel the depth of the emotions which stir the people. In Changsha I was convinced, as were all of us, that here the heart of the Chinese revolution was beating. On our first day there, we spoke with more than a hundred thousand people; the entire population seemed fired with the same spirit; and throughout was the most perfect organisation. We were really inspired by our visit."

The delegates were also deeply stirred by their contacts with the revolutionary forces along the railway to Changsha. In the 24-hour ride, they found that every station, 28 in all, meetings were gathered, of peasants principally, waiting to meet the delegation and demanding speeches from them. This continued even throughout the night without respite, although the train was seven hours late in starting, and the crowds had to wait all that time. For six or seven hours during the night a cold rain, with a high wind, added to the discomforts of the waiting crowds but in no case had a meeting dispersed before the arrival of the train.

The train was ten hours behind its original schedule in arriving at Changsha, which was after 11 o'clock at night. To the astonishment of the Delegates, they found a crowd of 30,000 people awaiting them, most of whom had been there throughout the day. An impromptu meeting was held at the Station, followed by a lantern-procession through the city.

At the mass meeting called by a joint committee of the Trade Union, Peasant Union, and Student Union, there were more than 80,000 persons present. A few hours later, at the meeting of the Kuomintang, there were 12,000. Other meetings

were held with the Provincial Kuomintang, Provincial Government, Labour and Peasant Pickets, Labour Research Classes, Changsha Military Academy, Union of Employees of Foreign Firms, Communist Party; and interviews were had with leaders of all different organisations. Another street demonstration was held on the evening of the departure of the Delegation.

"After seeing and feeling Changsha", said Tom Mann, "I feel that, no matter what may be the temporary setbacks from time to time on the surface, the real revolution deep in the hearts of the Chinese people, is unconquerable by any combination of forces. The Chinese revolution has become the very fabric of their lives. It will perform its work thoroughly. I am sure that the same spirit that animates the masses of Hunan will permeate soon throughout China."

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

The Development of the German Chemical Industry as a War Industry.

By L...n (Berlin).

The chemical industry of Germany is a munition industry of the first order. On the day on which war breaks out, the entire German chemical industry will be placed entirely in the service of war.

With a view to veiling the significance of the chemical industry from the public, the bourgeoisie and its minions do all they can to disprove the above fact, obvious as it is. These tactics were illustrated by the **Chemists' Day**, held at Essen early in June. It was one of those parade celebrations, at which for the hundredth time the chemical industry's "love of peace" was proclaimed to the world. The reports which were made by various well-known bourgeois professors, betrayed nothing of the intensive preparations for further imperialistic wars. One of them referred to the "Development of Anthraquinone Dyes", another to the problem of "Chemistry and Coal", and the last of the series to "Technical Training as a Basis for the Industrial Guidance of Mankind".

Without entering into these reports in greater detail, we must emphatically point out that the real rôle and actual importance of the chemical industry has been passed over entirely, purposely, and with full intent. Not a word as to the preparation of poisonous gases, not a word about the significance of the nitrogen industry for the manufacture of explosives; no mention of the strenuous efforts constantly made in the laboratories for the purpose of discovering one deadly variety of gas after another.

The same harmless character as displayed at Essen is evinced by the "I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G." (I. G. Dyestuffs Industry, Ltd.) of Frankfurt o. M., the latest prospectus of which contains the following reference to the firm's activity:

"The object of the enterprise is the output and sale of dyes, pharmaceutical and photographic articles, nitrogenous combinations and chemical products of all kinds, and the management of other allied branches of industry."

Despite the mysterious addition "output of nitrogenous combinations and chemical products of all kinds", this description of the activity carried on by the "I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G." appears innocent enough.

But such manoeuvres on the part of the bourgeoisie, in which the Social Democrats are always ready to take part, must not be allowed to deceive the working class. Their eyes must be open to the fact that the German chemical industry is a war industry down to the very least of its constituent enterprises.

The coming war will be a mechanical war. Gas warfare will play a great part therein. The production of gas is closely connected with that of medicaments and tar-dyes. Since the end of the world war, no fewer than 1,000 varieties of poison gases have been invented, in regard to which the imperialists naturally maintain strict silence. Practically all the knowledge accessible to the general public dates back to the war period.

Let us take two typical cases in point, phosgene, the main French, and mustard-gas (Yperite), the main German gas used during the war.

Phosgene (COCl²) even in a greatly diluted form, will kill a man in two hours. Other gases, which are devoid of colour, smell, or taste, can be inhaled for as long as six hours without the victim being conscious thereof. Death frequently results only after 24 hours. The so-called mustard-gas (Yperite) is particularly dangerous. It is heavier than the air and will continue for several days to permeate the atmosphere in low-lying regions, such as shell-craters, valleys, dug-outs, or houses; indeed, it will sometimes retain its efficacy for weeks and months. Mustard-gas eats through any gas-mask which is not fire-proof, penetrates clothes and boots, and acts immediately on the skin. It is transferable; that is to say, a soldier unconsciously infected with mustard-gas will also infect his whole company, his hospital-ward, and so on. Even water can be infected by mustard-gas.

It is not possible to keep great quantities of gas stocked in a condition "ready for use". The gases would be disintegrated and lose their efficacy. Therefore the gas-bombs and gas-shells left over from the war can no longer be employed. It is all the more important, therefore, that every imperialistic State should possess an extensive and reliable chemical industry. Various reports from chemical circles tell us that it is just such materials as can be used both for the preparation of medicaments or dyes and also for gas-production, that are being piled up in the works on a very great scale.

The manufacture of explosives is dependent on the production of nitrogen. But the manufacture of explosives is very closely allied with the celluloid, artificial-silk, and photographic industries. The artificial-silk industry in particular, which has of late years experienced such a vigorous rise, has a series of stages of production in common with the manufacture of explosives. The raw materials stocked in the works for the making of artificial silk could at any moment be equally well worked up into explosives in the place of blouses, stockings, and the like.

The development of the chemical industry in the war and post-war periods has been ably reviewed in a memorandum prepared for the **World Economic Conference** under the heading "A Comprehensive Memorandum regarding Various Industries".

The artificial-silk industry shows the most prodigious progress. Putting the artificial-silk output of 1913 at 100, we find a world production in 1925 of 660 per cent. This rapid development of the artificial-silk industry continued throughout 1926 and 1927.

There are no very exact data to hand in regard to the development of the chemical industry in general, but we can attain to some conception thereof by considering the development of **nitrogen production** and the output of sulphuric acid.

The "Comprehensive Memorandum" above mentioned affirms that in 1925 the sulphuric-acid output of the world stood at 126 per cent. of the level of 1913. The sulphuric-acid output of the United States is already 200 per cent. in advance of the 1913 level.

The development of the chemical industry is best illustrated by a consideration of the nitrogen output. In 1925, the nitrogen output of Europe figured at 246 per cent. of the 1913 total, and that of the United States at 298 per cent. The most vigorous advance was made in Asia. The Asiatic output of 1925 stood at 1,100 per cent. of that of 1913. This figure shows the rapid growth of the Japanese and Chinese chemical industry.

Let us turn again to the German chemical industry, which suffered far less than many other industries by the Versailles treaty, since no large German territories of importance for the chemical industry were forfeited. The German chemical industry is concentrated in two regions, the one centre being in **Central Germany** (Bitterfeld, Leuna) and the other in the **Rhenish territory** (Cologne and Mannheim). The chemical industry of the Rhenish country is one of the reasons why the new German imperialism is fighting so strenuously for the evacuation of that region. It was to this fact that the British major and chemist Victor Lefebure referred years ago in his book "The Riddle of the Rhine", which riddle he declared to be nothing more nor less than the German chemical industry.

The main places of production are as follows:

For **coal-tar dyes (war gas!)**: Leverkusen, Ludwigshafen, Höchst, Mainkur, Wolfen, Offenbach, Uerdingen, and Griesheim.

For **nitrogen (dynamite!)**: Oppau, Wolfen, Bitterfeld, Höchst, and Leuna.

For artificial silk (dynamite!): Wolfen, Premnitz, Bobingen, Rottweil, and Worringen.

The question often arises whether and how Germany would be in a position to take an active part in a coming war. A glance at the chemical industry shows the resources at Germany's disposal if it were, side by side with the imperialism of Great Britain, to enter into hostilities with the Soviet Union.

Before the war, Germany produced 74.1 per cent. of the total tar-dye output of the world. In 1925 — despite the treaty of Versailles — Germany was still the greatest producer of tar-dyes, turning out 42.86 per cent. of the total world output in this commodity, followed at a respectful distance by the United States (24 per cent.) and Great Britain (10 per cent.).

The significance of the chemical industry for Germany is also to be seen by the figures of the foreign trade statistics. The exportation of chemical products is one of the foremost items, representing an important asset in the long row of negative foreign trade balances of the last few months. The German imperialists are therefore greatly interested in a new war. The enormous consumption of chemical products (gas and explosives) in a modern war will represent tremendous profits for the chemical industry and thus for German economy in its entirety.

It is a matter of course that the I. G. Dyestuffs Industry, Ltd., the wealthiest of the German trusts, should exercise a decisive influence on the policy of the new German imperialists. Chemical capital must and will lead to war, for it is only in a case of war that its capacity can be fully exploited.

The capitalism of the chemical industry represents a formidable menace to the proletariat and the working masses. The powerful chemical trust exploits the masses to-day with the intention of driving them into a war to-morrow by hurling them against the Soviet Union in the interest of yet greater profits. It is therefore up to the entire working class and particularly to the workers of the chemical industry, to declare the most bitter war on the capitalists of the German chemical trade.

The International of Ex-Servicemen and its Fight against Imperialist War.

By Henri Barbusse (Paris).

The entire activity of the International of Ex-Servicemen (I. A. C.) focuses at present in the fight against imperialist war, against the menace of the Soviet Union by the rapacious capitalist Powers, and against the intervention of the colonial Powers in China. This was most clearly and definitely expressed at the recent Congress of the I. A. C. in Brussels. The most important resolutions passed on the occasion in question outlined this struggle and the tasks it involves. The I. A. C. was founded in the first place for the purpose of bringing together the ex-servicemen in an association of international scope, of opposing a repetition of an imperialistic war, and of preparing preventative measures in this connection.

The initiative for the foundation of the I. A. C. was given by a number of comrades of the French association of ex-servicemen, the A. R. A. C., among them Raymond Lefevre and myself. The A. R. A. C. itself had already been in existence since the beginning of 1917. In contradistinction to other associations of ex-combatants then in the process of formation, it was based on a programme which was not limited to material demands of the war-victims, cripples, and ex-combatants but rather set itself the task of organising and conducting an opposition to militarism. Nor was this opposition envisaged in any vague pacific form, but aimed at attacking not only the results but primarily the causes and roots of war as such. These causes are of a social character and are inherent in the existing order of things; on the one side the ruling classes that decide on and profit by war, and on the other the suppressed classes that have to bear the brunt of the war and pay for it with their lives and fortunes.

We have, therefore, from the very beginning been of the opinion that, both in the A. R. A. C. and in the I. A. C., our anti-militarism was a matter to be fought out on the basis of the class war and in its entire political significance. In France we were the first association of ex-servicemen to re-

publish the formula of "political neutrality" adopted by other similar organisations. For we were fully aware that any such attitude would involve complete submission to the official policy of a maintenance of the capitalist, nationalistic, and imperialistic system.

The A. R. A. C. took occasion to declare, at its congress at Lyon in 1919, that the fight against militarism and imperialism must needs be carried on on an international scale. To this end the associations of ex-servicemen in other countries, whose statutes embodied similar principles to those of the A. R. A. C., were to be united in an international organisation. The appeal of the A. R. A. C. met with general approval. In 1920 our first international congress was convoked at Geneva, and in the course of time we were joined by a number of associations in Germany, England, Italy, Austria, Belgium, and so forth.

The Geneva congress of the I. A. C. resolved on a "charter", or constitutory programme, which established that the fight against war is inseparable from the fight against capitalism. Since then, all the announcements of the I. A. C. have been inspired by the same spirit of the class war.

The associations which had joined the I. A. C. comprised members of various political parties, Communists, Socialists, Anarchists, etc. We were of opinion that in spite of differences of standpoint it would be possible to organise a united anti-militarist action and to wage war against war at all costs in the sense already outlined. It was our desire to rouse the lamentably forgetful masses by means of systematic agitation, to show them the economic consequences of war and the sanguinary fraud which the imperialistic policy of industrial and banking capitalism represents, to bring them to an understanding of the danger of new wars such as are being fomented by the bourgeois authorities all the world over, and to persuade them to resist any such attempt.

In this connection, however, we had no intention to take the place of any political organisation already in existence, for it was, and is, our sole desire — parallel with such organisations as oppose the bourgeois systems of oppression — to make our reputation and influence practically known and felt among the victims of and combatants in the imperialistic war of 1914—18 and all subsequent wars.

On various occasions, the I. A. C. has already performed an effective and rousing work of agitation; it has been the moving force in various oppositional movements and revolts against the existing order.

Despite, or perhaps rather just on account of, our militant attitude, we have naturally from the very start been exposed within our own international organisation to the more or less tacit opposition of various national associations. They accuse the executive committee of the I. A. C. of being in tow of the Communist Party and the Communist International. We have not allowed ourselves to be deterred at all in our activity by these cheap "accusations", for it is well-known that there is no organisatory connection between the I. A. C. and the Comintern. True to our Geneva programme, we have waged our anti-militarist fight in the proletarian and revolutionary spirit. Thus it came to pass that we were often acting hand in hand with the Communist parties, merely because we had common aims and employed common means to attain them. On the other hand, Social Democratic organisations frequently refused to act in concert with us.

The I. A. C., moreover, was often obliged to oppose certain acts and measures of the Social Democrats most emphatically. Had it not done so, it would have been denying its most sacred principles. Or was it perhaps not within the scope of our most serious tasks to oppose the war credits which were championed on various occasions by Social Democratic deputies, or to protest most energetically against certain military laws, such as the mobilisation law of Paul Boncour, even though they were cloaked by the Social Democratic fraction in Parliament? Was and is it not our duty to pit our whole influence against colonial expeditions and against intervention in China, irrespective of the fact that Social Democratic leaders have on occasion advocated such campaigns?

The Social Democratic parties have in part viewed our actions with great displeasure. They encourage certain unions of ex-combatants, on which they exercise a decisive influence, in their opposition to the leaders of the I. A. C. Thus it came about that at the Brussels conference the reformist Workers'

and Peasants' Union of Mutilated War Victims in France (F.O.P.) seceded from our movement. (The A.R.A.C. naturally remained within the limits of the I.A.C.) In spite of the numerical loss thus suffered, the I.A.C. has in a certain sense been strengthened by the desertion in question, since the F.O.P. was at all times not so much a help as a hindrance. (The Austrian association likewise left the I.A.C. some time ago.) The F.O.P. attempted to carry with it the Belgian section of the I.A.C., but the congress of Belgian ex-combatants on July 10th will, it is to be hoped, have frustrated this treacherous act.

At the same time we may observe all the world over, in America as well as in Europe, that there is a tendency to strengthen the International of Ex-Servicemen in the face of the renewed menace of war. Furthermore, the Russian union of Ex-Servicemen has joined us, a fact of no small importance.

Thus the International of Ex-Servicemen both can and will set itself with renewed force to fulfil the great tasks with which it is faced under the present highly fateful situation.

Bolshevism and the War of 1914—1918.

(Important quotations from Lenin's Works.)

By N. L...r (Moscow).

During the period of the war of 1914—1918 Bolshevism formulated and developed in a more detailed manner the Marxian point of view on war, which it had previously defended within the II. International. In the main, what was said by Bolshevism in 1914—1918 holds good also at the present moment.

We, therefore, summarise what Lenin said in 1914—1918.

1. The Evaluation of War.

How can the nature of wars be evaluated? War cannot be regarded as an isolated fact. The words of Clausewitz: "War is the continuation of politics by other (namely: violent) means" may be considered as a correct expression of Leninist point of view.

"Apply this view to the present war. You will see that for decades, for almost half a century, the governments and ruling classes of England, as well as of France, Germany, Italy, Austria and Russia have pursued the policy of robbing colonies, oppressing foreign nations, suppressing the labour movement. This very policy, and only this, is continued in the present war. Particularly in Austria and in Russia the policy in peace, as well as in wartime has been one of enslavement, and not of liberation, of nationalities." (Vol. XIII, p. 98, Russian Ed.)

Thus, it is evident that not one contemporary imperialist state can wage any war, other than an imperialist war.

"The war of imperialist countries is in a triple sense a war of slave-owners for the intensification of the worst kind of slavery. It is, firstly, a war for the strengthening of the enslavement of colonies by means of a more equitable division and their further more amicable exploitation; secondly, for the intensification of the oppression of the foreign nationalities within the 'great' empires, themselves, for both Austria and Russia (Russia much more so and much worse than Austria) maintain themselves only by such oppression, intensifying it through war; thirdly, for the ramification and extension of wage slavery, since the proletariat is thus divided and subjugated, while the capitalists gain, fattening on the war, exciting race prejudice and intensifying reaction which has raised its head in all, even the most free and democratic, countries." (Vol. XIII, p. 97, Russian Edition.)

Can the argument about a defensive war, which would permit the Socialists to stake the stand of defending their "fatherland", be applied to such a war? No, it cannot. In a war waged by imperialist countries it does not matter, who began first.

Marxism conceived as a defensive war that kind of war, when a country with a progressive social structure fights against a reactionary country. So it was, for instance, in the

period of the Napoleonic wars. In our times, not only the struggle of the colonies for liberation from the yoke of imperialists should be included in this category, but also other cases (see Bukharin's speech on the imperialist war at E. C. C. I. Plenum).

"If, for instance, tomorrow Morocco would declare war on France, India on England, Persia or China on Russia and so forth, these would be 'just', 'defensive' wars, independent of the fact, who was the first to attack, and every Socialist would sympathise with the victory of the oppressed, dependent, subjugated states over the oppressing slave-owning piratical 'great' empires.

Imagine, however, that a slave-owner owning 100 slaves, wages war against a slave-owner owning 200 slaves, for a more 'equitable' division of slaves. It is clear that the application to such a case of the conception of a 'defensive' war or of 'defense of the fatherland' would be historically false and would practically mean the duping of the common people, of the petty bourgeoisie and of the ignorant crowd by the clever slave-owners. That is exactly how the nations are being fooled by means of a 'national' ideology and the conception of the defence of the fatherland by the present day imperialist bourgeoisie in the present war between slave-owners for the fortification and intensification of slavery." (Vol. XIII, p. 94, Russian Edition.)

Does this mean that in the present epoch only imperialist wars are possible? No, it does not mean that, in view of the fact that capitalism develops irregularly, that along with the imperialist countries there are in existence colonial and semi-colonial countries.

"In the imperialist epoch national wars on the part of colonies and semi-colonies are not only probable, but inevitable. In the colonies and semi-colonies (China, Turkey, Persia) live up to a thousand million people, i. e., more than half of the earth's population. National liberation movements are here either already very strong, or else are growing and ripening. Every war is the continuation of politics by new means. The continuation of the national liberation policy of the colonies will inevitably result in their waging national war against imperialism. Such wars may lead to an imperialist war among the present 'great' imperialist empires, but may, again, not do so; this depends on many circumstances." (Vol. XIII, p. 439—440, Russian Edition.)

What is the nature of these wars?

"National wars against imperialist empires are not only probable and possible, but are inevitable, progressive, and revolutionary, although, of course, in order that they may be successful it is necessary to have either the united efforts of a vast number of inhabitants of the oppressed countries (hundreds of millions in India and China taken by us as an example), or a particularly favourable combination of circumstances in the international situation (for instance, a paralysis of the intervention of the imperialist countries due to their weakening, their war, their antagonisms and so forth), or a simultaneous uprising of the proletariat of one of the big empires against the bourgeoisie (this last enumerated case is the first from the point of view of desirability and advantage for the victory of the proletariat)."

It is the duty not only of the Socialists of these countries, but even more so of the Socialists of the imperialist countries to support this "just war".

"War against imperialist, i. e., oppressor-countries waged by the oppressed (for instance, by colonial peoples) is truly national war. Such a war is possible now also. 'Defence of the fatherland' on the part of a nationally oppressed country against a nationally oppressing one is not a deception, and Socialists are not at all opposed to 'defence of the fatherland' in such a war." (Vol. XIII, p. 345, Russian Edition.)

This slogan, if we analyse it, means 'class truce' and rejection of the class struggle of the oppressed classes in all belligerent countries, because the class struggle is impossible without striking a blow to one's 'own' bourgeoisie and one's 'own' government, and to deliver a blow

to one's own government in wartime is high treason, is helping to defeat one's own country. He who recognises the slogan 'Neither victory nor defeat' can only hypocritically be in favour of the class struggle and for 'disturbing the class truce', and actually rejects an independent proletarian policy, subordinating the proletariat of all belligerent countries to the absolutely bourgeois task of protecting the existing imperialist governments against defeat." (Vol. XIII., p. 81—82.)

Such were also the tactical slogans of Bolshevism:

The main Bolshevik slogan was: **Convert the imperialist war into civil war!** This slogan was the logical outcome of those decisions of the International which obliged us to retaliate on war by an energetic class struggle. It is the only real slogan, because only the proletarian revolution can bring about real peace.

The defeat slogan was the concrete form of this:

"A revolution in time of war means civil war: on the one hand, the conversion of the government war into civil war is facilitated by military failures ('defeats') of the government, and, on the other hand, it is impossible to aim at such conversion without helping to bring about defeat.

The Jingoists reject this slogan, because it alone is an open call for revolutionary action against one's own government in time of war. Without such action millions of revolutionary phrases about war against 'war and conditions', etc. are not worth a farthing.

Anyone who seriously wants to prove that the slogan of defeat of one's own government in the imperialist war is wrong must prove one of the following three things: 1. That the war of 1914—15 is not a reactionary war, or 2. that no revolution is possible in connection with that war, or 3. that co-ordination and co-operation of the revolutionary movement of all belligerent countries is impossible." (Vol. XIII., p. 80, Russian Edition.)

Is not the slogan of defeat of all belligerent imperialist countries an absurdity?

"Only a bourgeois who believes that a war started by the governments must also end as a war between those governments, can find the idea 'ridiculous' and 'absurd' about the Socialists of all belligerent countries jointly being in favour of the defeat of their 'own' governments. On the contrary, it is precisely such action which would correspond with the secret thoughts of every conscious worker and be in line with our activity directed towards the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war." (Vol. XIII., p. 107, Russian Edition.)

The defeat slogan is of course a slogan of high treason, if we regard it from the bourgeois point of view, but the peace slogan is elementary if we regard it from a revolutionary, internationalist point of view.

"When the Italian Social Democrats before the war raised the question of a mass strike, the bourgeoisie replied absolutely correctly from their point of view: This would be high treason, and we would regard you as traitors. This is true, as it is also true that fraternisation in the trenches is high treason. Whoever is against 'high treason', as Bukvojed, against the 'dismemberment of Russia', as Symkovsky, reasons from the bourgeois and not from the proletarian point of view. A proletarian cannot but strike a blow at his government, extend (in deed) his hand to his brother proletarian from the 'foreign' country at war with 'us', without committing 'high treason', without helping to defeat, without helping to dismember 'his' imperialist 'great' power." (Vol. XIII., p. 82, Russian Edition.)

Lenin regarded this slogan particularly applicable to tsarist Russia.

"The application of this is particularly correct in Russia. A Russian victory entails an intensification of world reaction, an intensification of reaction at home, and is accompanied by the complete enslavement of the nations of those districts which have already been annexed. On this account the defeat of Russia is under all conditions the lesser evil." (Vol. XIII., p. 51, Russian Edition.)

(To be continued.)

REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS IN THE COLONIES

A Revolutionary "Republican" Movement in India.

By Luhani.

Among local committees of the Indian National Congress, the Committee at Nagpur (in the Central Provinces) is one of the most active and most advanced centers of the political activities of the petty-bourgeois and intellectual rank and file of the Congress. During the revolutionary movement of 1921 and also, later on, in 1923, the Nagpur Congressmen were very prominent in organising "civil disobedience", that is, mass direct action against the British authorities.

Since the beginning of this year the Nagpur Committee has been showing great disaffection with the official leadership of the Congress. On April 25th of this year, this committee adopted a resolution censuring the Congress leaders for their recent policy of co-operation with the British Government in the Legislative Assembly and for their general orientation towards the Right. The resolution also laid emphasis on the importance of work "outside the legislative bodies" and the organisation of peasants and workers.

Passing from censure to action, the Nagpur committee passed another resolution by the casting vote of its President **Manchershah Avari**. According to this resolution, "civil disobedience" was to be started then and there. The immediate aims of this direct action were to be the annulment of the Arms act (prohibiting the use of arms by the Indians) and the explosive Substances Act (making the possession of explosives a punishable offense) and the release of the national revolutionary leaders imprisoned under the latest repressive laws of the government.

Avari followed up the resolution by organising the next day a big demonstration at Nagpur in which six thousand people participated and in which volunteers (including women) marched with naked swords past the official quarters of the British authorities. The carrying of swords was meant to signify the defiance of the Congressmen to the Arms Act.

Within a few days the movement took on a very popular character, though always confined to Nagpur. The action of the Nagpur Committee was, however, supported by another local committee of the Congress in the Province of Madras where, as in the central Provinces, there is a pronounced Left orientation among the congress rank and file.

An increasing number of volunteers — always including women, a new and significant feature — began to take part in the demonstrations under the auspices of the Nagpur committee. The tactics of the volunteers have been to deliberately violate the Arms Act by carrying swords and to offer themselves to be imprisoned. Some of the volunteers were eventually arrested.

Meanwhile, passing from its immediate objects, the movement took on the character of a revolt against the British Government. Avari, the leader of the movement defined "the freedom of India" as the objective of the volunteers whom he organised under the name of "The Republican Army". Avari went to the extent of issuing notices convoking meetings, etc. signed by himself as "The General of the Republican Army". In one of his speeches he said "Who has won Swaraj without fighting? It is our right to rebel and throw out the government. When Englishmen kill our men, why should we not kill them?"

Before taking decisive action against the Nagpur volunteers who came to be known as the Nagpur Republicans, the British Government wanted to see what repercussion there would be throughout the country. The openness of the revolt and its Republican slogans were certainly producing a considerable effect and beginning to attract mass support. It was developing as a rallying point for all the Left elements within and without the Congress and forcing on the official leaders of the Congress the choice between reformism and revolution, in other words, co-operation with the British Government or a revolt against it.

As a matter of fact, the **All-India Committee of the National Congress** during its sessions at **Bombay** in May 15-17 of this year was formally asked to define its attitude with regard to the Nagpur revolutionary movement. A Left wing resolution, moved at the Bombay session with a view to commit the whole congress to support the action of the Nagpur Committee, was thus worded:

"The All-India Congress Committee congratulates the organisers of **Satyagraha (Civil disobedience)** at Nagpur and recommends the Working Committee to take the necessary steps including the collection of funds with a view to carry on the campaign to a successful end."

It was very significantly pointed out during the discussion on the resolution that the Nagpur movement was to be supported if not for its immediate revolutionary value, at least as a means "for educating Indians in the use of arms". At the instance of the president of the Congress, the left wing resolution was replaced by another resolution which said:

"The All-India Congress Committee requests the Working Committee to send some accredited representatives to Nagpur to inquire into the Satyagraha movement there and to make a report as to the facts of the situation and the steps, if any, that may be taken by the Working Committee in furtherance of the object of the movement."

After this, the British Government found their way clear to take steps to suppress the movement at Nagpur. The most prominent of the volunteers were sentenced each eighteen months imprisonment and **Avari** himself to four years imprisonment. Other volunteers, however, have appeared on the scene and are carrying on the movement.

The significance of the Nagpur revolt lies in the fact that since 1921 it is the first symptom that the social classes whose interests have been betrayed by the reformist policy of the Right leadership of the Congress, are ready for decisive revolutionary action against British Imperialism.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Trade Unionism and the Organisation of the Native Masses in South Africa.

By James Shields (Johannesburg).

Once again the question of linking up the forces of the working class movement in South Africa has been raised in trade union ranks, and once again it has been relegated to the dim and distant future. This question of workers' unity, the most serious problem which confronts the South African working class, has been raised time and again in the organised labour movement, but just as frequently has it been turned down by the privileged upper stratum, the white labour aristocracy. The latter indeed are so hostilely antagonistic to the native and coloured workers that they prefer to drag along in the slough of stagnation and decay rather than achieve solidarity and triumph through the aid of their fellow-exploited.

When the matter of taking common action with the non-European workers was raised this year at the Annual Conference of the **South African Trade Union Congress**, it was made clear that the white trade unionists still held to their old dogmatic standpoint with the same incredibly foolish persistence. The above mentioned Conference took place at **Capetown** on April 15 to 17th, and in most respects it turned out to be a comparatively ineffective gathering.

The proceedings were on lines similar to those of last year's Congress and dealt in the main with amendments to the Constitution and resolutions from affiliated organisations. There was a regular pot-pourri of amendments dealt with but very few were incorporated in the Constitution. Some wanted the T. U. C. to take up a "No politics" attitude; others wanted the word "employees" taken out of the Constitution and "workers" substituted in its place. The discussion on the latter point brought the leading delegate of the **Engineering Union (A. E. U.)** to his feet with the declaration that he for one (and it appeared

to be the opinion of a number of others) had no objection to including mine-managers in the trade unions. The "refined" and "sedate" term "employees" which many considered so conveniently all-embracing was allowed to stand.

Numerous resolutions were passed decrying unemployment, the Sedition Bill, indentured labour, etc., and demanding out-of-work pay and a forty-four hour week for industry. One resolution passed denounced imperialist intervention in China and pledged support to the struggling Chinese workers. White trade unionism in South Africa will readily pay lip service to the class struggle of non-European workers provided it takes place in other lands. No sooner do they turn their eyes and thoughts, however, than their whole attitude undergoes a complete change. This was demonstrated clearly by the manner in which they shelved the report of the **Brussels Conference** at this particular Congress. All the resolutions passed by the **League against Imperialism and for National Independence** which were submitted by the T. U. C. delegate who had attended Brussels were allowed to lie un-read on the table, and the written report giving a brief summary of the events that had transpired at the Congress, was passed over almost in silence.

Whilst the T. U. C. was sitting at **Capetown**, a telegram was received from the native workers' Union (I. C. U.), also in session at **Durban**, asking for a common front against the capitalist enemy. This appeal was turned down after some discussion in which some of the delegates declared that the white workers would be up in arms against any such proposal, whilst others against took refuge in the excuse that "lacking a mandate from their Unions" they could do nothing in this matter. Thus in this fashion was one more example given of how the South Africa European workers are determined to sacrifice working class unity and solidarity on the altar of racial prejudice.

The decision of the white trade unions on this point though not unexpected is bound to have serious consequences for the movement as a whole. In the first place it will condemn the Unions to prolong inactivity and render them powerless to put up a fight against the shackles of the Conciliation Act, and in the second it will make easy the fierce anti-working-class offensive being inaugurated by the **Hertzog** Government. The S. A. T. U. C. is in a poor position for putting up a defence against employers' attacks, for its last Conference shewed a representation of only 10,000 workers as compared with almost twice that number a year ago. In addition to this it has to encounter a rival in the shape of the **Cape Federation of Labour Unions**, a body of similar strength located in the Cape Province, which is ambitious of becoming the national centre of trade unionism in the country.

The antagonisms existing between the various trade union groups all contribute towards making the problem of attaining workers' unity a very serious and difficult one. The reactionary outlook of the white workers gives little hope for the future of anything tangible being secured from that direction to assist in building up a united-working class front. It is mainly to the efforts of the down-trodden non-Europeans, beset by grave obstacles though they are, that one must look for the sound growth of a solid proletarian basis.

At the present time native trade unionism is passing through an exceedingly difficult period as a consequence of its most prominent leaders going over to the viewpoint of the masterclass. Whether it will succeed in weathering its present crisis or not, seems none too clear at the moment. Although the rank and file of the movement are sound, they are still pretty backward, and this gives a free hand to the violently opportunist bureaucrats who are in control to engage in inflicting incalculable harm. Already their efforts have resulted in almost killing the movement in the **Cape Province** and they are seeking might and main to transform the I. C. U. into a "respectable constitutional body" deserving of the good wishes of the boss class.

At the Seventh Annual Congress of the I. C. U. (**Industrial and Commercial Workers Union**) held in **Durban** during the second week in April they curbed the enthusiasm of the few sincere rank and file delegates present and very effectively stifled rank and file opinion. This Congress was in the nature of a "packed" gathering, and was mainly composed of those whose chief concern is to hang on to paid official positions. The bureaucratic leaders dominated the proceedings throughout and

after skilfully playing on the radical sentiments of their followers pushed through a resolution debarring any member of the I. C. U. from associating himself with the **Communist Party**. There are quite a number of native workers in the C. P., and according to this decision they will henceforth be forbidden trade union membership.

Never was a Congress more contradictory than this one. It passed resolutions of protest against the Sedition Bill, Government Native Bills, Colour Bar, etc., but when it came to ways and means of organising opposition to these measures, its erstwhile "revolutionary" leader, **Kadalie**, could only move that a "day of prayer" be held as a protest. Fear of the rank and file made the Congress turn this motion down and decide in favour of demonstrations of protest.

One resolution passed decided that the I. C. U. should celebrate **May Day** in order to "demonstrate the international solidarity of labour and symbol of class struggle", but this profession of solidarity sounds rather hollow coming as it does from men who are persecuting militant communist workers. The precise motive which lead the I. C. U. leaders to send greetings and appeal for common action to the **white** trade unionists is not very clear, for whilst the native rank and file would undoubtedly welcome a rapprochement, their opportunist leaders wish to avoid it. The deceit and cunning of the latter is difficult to fathom.

For their organisation they claim a total membership of 100,000, but this figure, one is inclined to think, is a bit exaggerated. The precise details of the organisational strength, finance, etc., are very carefully kept secret, even the delegates to the Annual Conference having the financial report withheld from them.

The foregoing facts in connection with South Africa Trade Unionism illustrate the grave difficulties and obstacles which beset it. Where it is not weak numerically, it is generally the prey of unscrupulous reactionaries who are very little concerned with its vital interests.

The building up of organisational unity between black and white is a very difficult task, and its achievement would appear to be still a matter of years of patient, persevering work.

More immediate and beneficial results can be obtained by the unification of the masses of non-European toilers, and indeed a big impetus has now been given to this line of development by the return of the **Brussels** native delegates.

One of these delegates is **J. T. Gumede**, a prominent native leader of the **African National Congress**. Formerly a strong racialist, he has come back from his trip to Europe with a new understanding and a new outlook. He now perceives that the only hope of salvation for the millions of toiling blacks lies in a militant policy of struggle against capitalism conducted by a united front of workers and oppressed peoples. Since his return from Europe he has outlined this policy to mass meetings of natives at all the most important centres in the country, and everywhere it is finding increasing support.

At the **African National Congress** Convention to be held in **Bloemfontein** on June, 28th, **Gumede** will raise the question of adopting new tactics to promote unity of the non-European masses. For some years past the two important native organisations, the I. C. U. and the A. N. C., have kept aloof from each other. **Gumede** will now urge that the A. N. C. will take the lead in promoting an all-in native movement, having the I. C. U. affiliated to it as its industrial backbone, in order to fight for the immediate political and economic demands of the oppressed Africans.

This policy is bound to meet with the support of the non-European masses who desire nothing more than an immediate closing of ranks in order to effectively combat their exploiters. If the A. N. C. shapes its policy on these lines, it will be the means of developing a mighty forward movement against the **African imperialists**, and will put to the critical test the opportunist leaders of the I. C. U. South African capitalism is mortally afraid of the awakening to active life of the toiling masses of non-Europeans, and once a solid front of oppressed Africans pursuing a militant policy can be attained, then most assuredly will it have good cause to tremble.

CLARA ZETKIN

The E. C. C. I. to Clara Zetkin.

Moscow, 5th July 1927.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International has sent the following letter to Comrade Clara Zetkin:

"The E. C. C. I. sends its comradely greetings to you on the occasion of your seventieth birthday. Your birthday is at the same time an anniversary of revolutionary marxism and of proletarian internationalism.

You, comrade, have devoted more than fifty years of your life to the cause of the proletarian class struggle. You are the living embodiment of the revolutionary traditions of the German and of the international proletariat. Your way is the way of all honest, determined and revolutionary elements in the camp of the working class.

In the time when the proletariat began to collect its forces, organise itself and school itself for the class struggle, you, together with **Franz Mehring** and **Rosa Luxemburg**, bore the revolutionary lessons of Marxism into the broad masses. You fought mercilessly all attempts to misrepresent revolutionary Marxism. You bore the lessons of Marxism to the masses as the greatest lessons of the irreconcilable class struggle, as the lessons of the proletarian revolution and of the dictatorship of the working class.

Whilst **Kautsky** degraded Marxism to a justification of the passivity of reformist bureaucrats and retreated step by step in the face of **Bernstein's** revisionism, you steered, despite everything, "against the stream", in the struggle against the falsifiers of Marx, the vain and petty trade union and party bureaucrats. Even when it was necessary to oppose **Bebel**, probably the best representative of the old social democracy, you did not hesitate. Your work in the Second International was the exemplary work of a revolutionary Marxist in the time when the proletariat was collecting its forces for the struggle. You have not transformed Marxism into an innocuous parlour socialism unconnected with the class struggle, as the theoretical philistines of the social democracy have done. Rather you bore the lessons of revolutionary Marxism into the ranks of the workers, amongst the millions of oppressed proletarians, amongst the lowest ranks of the proletariat, amongst the working women, amongst the wives and daughters of the proletarians. Generations freed from the yoke of capitalism will remember with gratitude your work for the emancipation of the working women, your work for the inclusion of the women's struggle in the general struggle of the proletariat, your work for socialism.

You have held high the banner of revolutionary Marxism in times of 'peace' and in the times of war. Even in difficult times, when almost all socialists betrayed their banner, you did not let it drop from your hands. In those days when **Plechanov**, **Guesde**, **Kautsky**, not to speak of the lesser important of the reformists and bureaucrats, harnessed themselves to the war chariot of imperialism and betrayed Marxism and the revolutionary class struggle, you stood in the centre of the small group which saved the honour of the German and the international working class movement. Whilst **Ebert**, **Scheidemann**, **Thomas**, **Henderson** and the others were honoured with seats in the cabinets, your lot was that of which all revolutionaries must be proud. Bourgeois Germany flung you into prison. After the war came the real split in the German social democracy. The opportunist wing turned itself into a wing of the bourgeoisie, into a bourgeois workers party. The present social democracy has forsworn Marxism. The name of **Bernstein** is written on its banners. The **Kautskys** have capitulated before **Bernstein's** revisionism, but the **Zetkins** have held up the banner of marxism, the banner of the proletarian revolution. The founders and the leaders of the Second International to-day are **Noske** and **Wels**, **MacDonald** and **Henderson**, **Renaudel** and **Thomas**, the enemies and murderers of the working class, the servants of international capitalism, the privy councillors of His Majesty.

The Communist International mourns that the great pioneers of the proletariat, **Rosa Luxemburg** and **Karl Liebknecht** were murdered at the bidding of **Noske** and **Wels** and have not experienced the days of storm and fame accompanying the de-

velopment of the revolutionary struggle over the whole world. But the Communist International is proud that you, Clara Zetkin, were amongst its founders. The Communist International is fortunate to see you amongst its leaders to-day. The Communist International and its German section are proud that such old and tried fighters of the proletarian cause, such tried and trusted Marxists as you are fighting in their front ranks to-day. The Russian revolution and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are proud to have in your person a self-sacrificing friend, comrade and pioneer to defend the cause of the Party, of the revolution, of Leninism against all attacks, with all the power of your burning zeal, your great heart and your revolutionary passion.

On your seventieth birthday Clara Zetkin, we express the conviction that in the near future, the proletariat of Germany and other countries which has seen such leaders as Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Mehring and you Clara Zetkin, will rally in its overwhelming majority around the banner of Communism-Leninism under which Liebknecht, Mehring, Luxemburg, Knief and Jogiches fought and under which you are still fighting to-day. Your whole life has been devoted to the struggle for the international revolution, for the German and for the Russian revolution, to the struggle of all the oppressed for the emancipation of the whole of humanity. Upon your seventieth birthday the Communist International expresses its firm conviction that you will be fortunate enough to experience further fruits of your fifty years work and struggle.

Long live Clara Zetkin, the old fighter for revolutionary Marxism and the international working class movement!

Long live Clara Zetkin the oldest leader of the Communist International and the Communist Party of Germany!

Long live the coming revolution in Germany!

Long live the proletarian world revolution!

The Executive Committee of the
Communist International.

THE BALKANS

Help the Struggling Greek Workers!

Proclamation of the Balkan Communist Federation.

In conjunction with the lock-out of the tobacco workers in Greece, a fresh wave of persecutions has commenced in that country.

Forty thousand workers were threatened with this lock-out and within a few days a mass-strike ensued. The government employed against the workers every measure of violence within its power. For the last two weeks a reign of military terror has been raging in Macedonia and Thracia. The workers, for their part, organised tremendous demonstrations. As a consequence of a collision between the workers, on the one side, and, on the other, the police and military forces, including cavalry, 60 to 70 workers were wounded, 100 were deported to the Islands and 265 were arrested, among the latter being three Communist members of parliament, who, in spite of their right of immunity, were charged with criminal offence because they had given support to strikers and demonstrating workers. Greece is experiencing a period of very severe and widespread persecution of Communism and the Labour Movement.

The persecution of the Greek workers is being extended to the whole of the Labour Movement of Greece.

It is evident that this barbarous campaign of persecution and the uncurbed agitation against the Communists is intimately connected with imperialistic, military and reactionary plans in general in Greece.

The crushing of the proletariat, its organisations and its vanguard (the Communist Party) is a preliminary to the definite enlistment of Greece into the anti-Soviet bloc and to the exploitation of Greek territory and the forces of the Greek nation for the preparation of war.

A still clearer proof of this is the fact that in the moment of the wildest attack upon the Greek proletariat, the government moves nearer and nearer to the royalist officers and tolerates freely and even actively promotes the growth of the monarchist movement, involving though it does, the danger of a coup d'Etat.

The Balkan Communist Federation appeals both to the Balkan and the international proletariat and to all anti-imperialist organisations, groups and elements to lend urgent and full support to the Greek tobacco workers, locked-out and on strike, as well as to the whole of the Greek proletariat.

Moral, political and material support is extremely necessary.

The hangmen of the Greek proletariat and the imperialist agents must be clearly stigmatised in the eyes of the whole world, and the struggling Greek proletariat must have immediately substantial proofs that it is not alone in its fight, but that the whole solidarity, sympathy and help of the Balkan and international proletariat is behind it.

June 1927.

The Communist Balkan Federation.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The V. Congress of the Communist Party of China.

By M. N. Roy.

Hankow, May 13th 1927.

The last Congress of the Chinese Communist Party took place two years and four months ago. The Party was then illegal and had only 950 members. The V. Congress represented a membership of over 50,000. This phenomenal numerical growth of the party does not adequately represent the growth of its political influence. The Communist Party, based upon mass proletarian and peasant organisations of the entire country, is the foremost factor in the present political situation.

The growth of the Chinese Party is unparalleled in the history of the Communist International. The Party has grown in the thick of a gigantic revolutionary struggle. It embodies the organised expression of the struggle of the toiling masses against imperialist domination and its native allies. It is the party of the proletariat steeled in actual fight, including a number of armed insurrections. It is the leader of the peasant masses in their revolt against feudal bondage and patriarchal reaction.

Two months before the V. Congress the Communist Party was asked by the Kuomintang to accept office in the national government. This was a recognition of the predominating position of the Communist Party — of the hegemony of the proletariat. Hitherto the proletariat fought and sacrificed for the revolution. Now the time has come for it to participate in the organs of power and responsibility. Acting upon the resolution of the Communist International, the Communist Party accepted the ministries of Labour and of Agriculture and Internal affairs. In this stage of the revolution the importance of these two ministries is supreme. The Communist Party has become not only a legal mass party wielding decisive influence upon the political situation; it has come in possession of state apparatus which can be the instruments for further development of the revolution.

Class differentiation inside the Kuomintang has rendered its relation with the Communist Party closer than ever. The defection of the big bourgeoisie reduced the contradiction inside the Kuomintang ranks and has transformed it into a revolutionary bloc of the town petty bourgeoisie, peasantry and proletariat with certain strata of the national bourgeoisie marching with it. The proletariat being the backbone and driving force of this bloc, the relation between the Communist Party and Kuomintang has greatly improved. This improvement assumed organisational expression in the creation of joint committees.

The V. Congress of the Communist Party of China had a number of fundamental problems to solve. The solution of these was not very easy. When the Congress assembled, nationalist China was menaced with imperialist intervention, a cordon of counter-revolution was formed under imperialist inspiration and with imperialist aid, to choke the revolution; and consequently the nationalist ranks, even to some extent the urban masses, were somewhat panic-stricken. The entire revolution stood badly in need of a clear outlook and a determined leadership. The revolution had to be guarded against pessimism and defeatism. It needed a perspective to be able to

meet courageously and surmount successfully immediate difficulties, however, grave. The historic role of the V. Congress of the C. P. was to put this clear perspective before the revolution and to contribute to the crystallisation of a determined, courageous leadership indispensable in the period of revolution. The Congress has discharged this role, and by doing it has demonstrated that the proletariat is the backbone of the revolution. Owing to the fact that it is still based upon a coalition of classes, the revolution cannot be exclusively under proletarian leadership; but the proletariat is the only force that can and will guarantee the leadership against the danger of vacillation and deviation. The proletariat is not leading the revolution. It exercises hegemony in the revolutionary struggle.

The main task of the V. Congress of the Communist Party of China was to make a **correct estimation of the situation**. Upon this depended the possibility of giving the revolution a **clear perspective and a courageous leadership**. This task the V. Congress has accomplished by dispelling all doubt as regards the potentiality of the basic forces of the revolution. In analysing the political events, past and present, from the point of view of the proletariat, the Congress rejected the theory that the betrayal of the big bourgeoisie and threat of imperialist intervention constitute a check to the development of the revolution. On the contrary, these facts indicate that the revolution has entered the stage in which it bases itself upon the **exploited classes** whose interests, political and economic, do not admit any compromise with imperialism and native reaction. The proletariat and peasantry must determinedly fight imperialism and its native allies. In the course of this fight the entire energy of the toiling masses will be mobilised, thus deepening the social base of the revolution, promoting further development and guaranteeing its victory.

The Congress has pointed out how to resist imperialist aggression and to defend the revolution against the counter-revolutionary block reinforced by the big bourgeoisie. To lead the revolution along the line indicated by the Congress, firm determination and unflinching faith in the power of the masses are necessary. Since all the reactionary classes have turned against the revolution, the task of the revolution, in this stage of development, is to strike resolutely at the root of reaction wherever possible, particularly in the territories of the nationalist government. Therefore the V. Congress of the Communist Party of China has declared that **essentially the national revolution must become an agrarian revolution**. Imperialist domination in China is supported by militarism and the allied forces of reaction. The social base of militarism and reaction is the **feudal character of Chinese national economy and political power**. The Congress has resolved to lead the peasantry in a decisive struggle against feudalism. The slogan is: **Land to the peasant**; the peasant should have the political and military power to take possession of the land belonging to the big landowners. In taking this revolutionary decision the Congress has proved that the proletariat alone is able to lead the peasantry to make an agrarian revolution which is not only the basic condition for a successful fight against imperialism, but for free economic development of the country.

Peasant revolt is the most characteristic feature of the revolution in its present stage. In the provinces occupied by the nationalist army there exists a tremendous peasant movement. In several provinces peasant unions have become the predominating organised power. Peasants are arming themselves and disarming the forces of reaction. They are confiscating landlords' lands. This situation was reflected in the Congress of the Communist Party. The peasant masses are up in revolt. The proletariat must assume the leadership of this revolt. This was the consideration that governed the deliberation of the Congress.

The third important decision of the Congress was as regards the **character of the state** created by the revolution. The Congress found that, developing under the hegemony of the proletariat, the revolution is bound to establish a **democratic dictatorship of the proletariat, peasantry and petty bourgeoisie**. The present nationalist revolutionary government contains in it the germs of this democratic dictatorship. The participation of the communists in this government — in all its organs — will contribute to its development as the organ of democratic dictatorship. The Congress did not overlook the existence of timid and vacillating elements among the petty bourgeoisie, and proved the necessity of combating these elements as essential

conditions for the consolidation of the revolutionary bloc of the proletariat, peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie.

Leading members of the Kuomintang participated in the opening session of the Congress and declared their determination to strengthen the bloc with the Communist Party. Comrade **Wang Ching-Wei** was present when the representative of the Communist International reported on the perspective and character of the Chinese revolution. He expressed his complete accord with the report and declared that the petty bourgeoisie must march with the proletariat towards Socialism.

The historic significance of the V. Congress of the Communist Party of China lies in the fact that it has pointed out to the proletariat and its allies how to develop the revolution further as a mighty agency for the destruction of capitalism. The development of the Chinese revolution under the leadership of the **bourgeoisie** would create conditions in China favourable to capitalist stabilisation of the entire world. This, in its turn, would spell defeat for the Chinese revolution.

The V. Congress of the Communist Party of China has proved that the Chinese revolution will and can be led further only under the hegemony of the proletariat, precluding capitalist development of China under the supremacy of imperialist finance. Thus the Congress is not only of national, but international significance — a landmark in the history of the fight for Socialism.

The Results of the National Conference of the C. P. of France.

By J. Berlioz (Paris).

The National Conference of the Communist Party of France, which took place at the end of June, was held **under the shadow of the campaign of suppression on the part of the French government**. A number of those attending the Conference, among others the reporter on the international question, Comrade **Bernard**, had long been sought for by the police; others, as Comrade **Semard**, are again to be placed behind prison bars.

Wide circles of the French working class, even including certain elements in our own Party, do not yet know how to estimate correctly the offensive of the **Poincaré government**. Even if the proceedings of the French government of "National Unity" against the revolutionary portion of the working class and its organisations are intended to prepare the ground for the elections next year, it must nevertheless be recognised that the offensive against the working masses has a far wider objective; i. e., to deprive their class organisations of their leaders and to weaken the resistance and fighting power of the workers. By this means the bourgeoisie hope to achieve three things: 1. the carrying out of industrial rationalisation, 2. to enforce the new military laws, 3. to prepare for war on the Soviet Union.

The National Conference of the C. P. of France was **thoroughly alive to the war danger**. Both the opening speech of **Cachin** and the report of Comrades **Semard** and **Monmousseau**, as well as the report of Comrade **Bernard** and the speech by **Rénaud Jeane**, in which he clearly and concretely analysed the coming military laws, which are being rendered even worse, if possible, by the counter-proposals of the socialists, clearly illuminated the present situation and characterised all optimism as dangerous.

The National Conference was therefore perfectly unanimous that an **energetic campaign must be conducted against the danger of war**. It was in this spirit that it adopted its decisions: mobilising of the working and peasant masses for defence of the Chinese revolution; approval of the line of the Comintern with regard to the policy towards the Kuomintang; emphatic condemnation of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U., as its fractional activity can only damage the unity of the Bolshevik Party, which unity, however, is the precondition for the fight of the Soviets against encirclement and against the attacks of the capitalist powers; organising of the working class defence against the capitalist attack on wages; fight against the new customs tariffs and against the further growth of militarism. In all these resolutions the main attention was directed to extending to the Russian Revolution the necessary help.

Nevertheless it must be said that the National Conference, although it provided so much theoretical clarity on this question, was too theoretical. Too little was spoken of the practical work which is to be carried out in the various districts of France, in the workers' organisations, among the peasant masses, and also among certain sections of the middle class who are pacifistically inclined. The recent experiences were not adequately analysed, as for example the reduction of the wages of the miners, which was carried out almost without resistance, and also the defeat in the textile workers' strike of Roannais. Further, sufficient concrete instructions were not given regarding the methods of realising the united front, for capturing the big factories, for strengthening our trade union work and for the organisational activity of the Party.

The Left errors of the former leadership still hamper the Party, in spite of the new course followed since December 1925. Nevertheless, the report of Comrade Thorez, which gave an exhaustive analysis of the political and economic situation and laid down the next tasks of the Party, indicated the way of approach to the masses. The Party members are rallying more firmly round their present leadership, which has their complete confidence. The National Conference unanimously approved the line of the present leadership, which coincides with the line of the Comintern.

The opposition was as good as non-existent. Not a district had sent oppositional delegates. There were only a few Ultra-Left present who, through the mouth of Comrade Calzan, raised oppositional demands, among others the convocation of an extraordinary World Congress of the Comintern for the discussion of differences — as if they had not been sufficiently discussed in the C. P. S. U. and in the Comintern —, and who wished to point out imaginary opportunist dangers in the line of the Party.

The fact — which for the rest has long been insisted on by the Party leadership — is the existence in the working class of a certain passivity which our Party has not succeeded in breaking down. Broad masses of workers desire that the "Bloc of National Unity" shall collapse as a result of its own policy, and are waiting for the next "Left" elections in which they hope for a new Bloc of the Left which will be an improvement on the old and in which the Communists shall also take part. The Party must try to overcome this attitude; it must lead the masses along the way of economic struggles as the strike of the Breton fishermen, which is now proceeding, or the movement among the miners and metal workers of the Mosel district. These struggles must be extended into great battles with the government and the rationalising capitalists.

The Party leadership has therefore just initiated a broad campaign for combating the war measures of the bourgeoisie as well as its economic and political offensive, which campaign is being conducted with quite concrete slogans.

The National Conference was largely occupied with the trade union question. During the whole of the National Conference a trade union Committee was sitting which dealt before all with the question of trade union unity. It is necessary at the present time, on the eve of the National Congress of the reformist trade unions (to be held on July 26th), to conduct a strong propaganda among the workers for the realisation of trade union unity. The National Conference has laid down the following definite aims in this question: 1. Increasing the membership and influence of the C. G. T. U., which must be capable of leading the workers of all tendencies in a broad united front of struggle for their demands; 2. ideological strengthening of the Left wing of the C. G. T., which will render it possible to place the question of trade union unity on the basis of the class struggle; 3. organisatory measures in order to create a mass trade union movement.

Simultaneously with the National Conference of the C. P. F. there was held the meeting of the National Council of the Socialist Party of France. It discussed Paul Boncour's law regarding the mobilisation of the nation in war time. As is known, the socialist parliamentary fraction voted for this law at the first reading. In the meantime a strong movement has commenced among the socialist working class against the Paul Boncour law. Hence the leaders were compelled to make a number of purely formal concessions and to suggest a few amendments to the law, which are not of any practical importance, in order to have a pretext to vote against the law at the second reading. For the rest, the meeting of the National

Council of the Socialist Party was entirely dominated by the Right wing. As a result the proposal of a united front which our National Conference made to the socialist National Council was not even discussed by the latter. In spite of this we will fight unweariedly from below for the united front, and we shall succeed in adding to certain favourable results which we have already achieved, as in the Province of Saint-et-Oise, where almost all the socialist sections have declared themselves to be in agreement with our fight against the danger of war.

The IX. Party Conference of the C. P. of Austria.

By Willi Sch lamm (Vienna).

Great sections of the Austrian working class are living in the illusion that Austria is a peaceful island in the middle of a stormy international sea. This ideology which is furthered by the Social Democratic leaders, is one of the reasons for the glaring and lop-sided relation of forces between the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party of Austria, coupled with the other illusion that it is possible in Austria, of all places, to gain power with democratic means.

The truth is of course, that Austria has its place in international politics. It has also a very important role mapped out for it in the anti-Soviet front of the imperialists. The government of Austria is beyond all cavil an organ of Great Britain. Austria will not take any direct military part in the war of course, but it will serve as a great munition factory and as a strategical base for the advance of the Central and South European satellites of Great Britain. Even to-day the Austrian bourgeoisie is fulfilling this function assigned to it. It is taking an energetic part in the anti-Soviet campaign, and despite the terrible unemployment in Austria it is demonstratively preventing the development of economic relations with the Soviet Union. Only a few weeks ago a great Austrian firm, the metal industrialist Jacob Neurath, was put out of action upon the initiative of the government, because the firm in question had established business relations with the Soviet Union.

The internal policy of these Austrian servants of imperialism runs parallel with their foreign policy. Their internal policy is an unmistakeable and brutal move to the right. When two months ago the parliamentary elections showed a considerable increase in the votes polled by the Social Democratic Party, the latter gave the Austrian workers — and also the foreign workers — to believe that it would mean a "turn to the left". What happened was exactly the opposite, as the Communist Party of Austria had pointed out: Austria got the most right wing government of the bourgeoisie since the revolution, an active government of the bourgeois block which, after accepting the half-fascist "Landbund" into the governing coalition, proceeded to carry out the policy of Seipel for "restoring" Austria, i. e. increase of customs duties, reduction of the sums expended for social purposes, increased taxation, cultural reaction etc.

Despite the electoral victory of the Social Democracy, it is unmistakeable that the Austrian bourgeoisie has consolidated its position. A certain stabilisation cannot be denied. Austrian industry has, considering its situation, adapted itself to the post-war position fairly rapidly. A radical concentration has taken place upon the basis of a limitation of the productive apparatus accompanied by a process of rationalisation. Austrian industry is adapting itself to its small internal market and its weak exports whilst agricultural production still has very good possibilities in the home market. The economic policy of the government makes for the agrarianisation of the country. This policy is one direct to the right.

In these circumstances, the Austrian proletariat is faced with great tasks in order to defend itself and to prevent the carrying out of the anti-Soviet role assigned to Austria. Although the newly-founded "Institute for Enquiry into the Causes of Industrial Booms and Crises" is of the opinion that the prospects for Austrian industry are good, this does not mean that the mass misery will be reduced, on the contrary, it will be increased on account of the process of rationalisation.

Just as in all other countries, the Austrian "left wing" Social Democratic Party shows itself to be the most reliable sup-

porter of capitalist reconstruction, and more than that, of the anti-Soviet crusade also. Its hypocritical pretence of defending the Soviet Union did not prevent it damning the defensive measures adopted in the Soviet Union after the murder of Voykov as "recrudescence of barbaric terror", thus supplying the war maniacs with welcome arguments. The Social Democratic Party of Austria makes no attempt to hide the fact that in case of complications which an imperialist war might bring with it, it is determined upon the "defence of the Fatherland" and in its interests upon an open coalition. The "left-wing" S. D. P. of Austria has openly and willingly accepted its place in the plan of the war maniacs.

The tasks of the C. P. of Austria are therefore all the more difficult. It must now show itself to be a worthy bolshevist leader of the proletariat, despite the fact that at present its forces are still weak. The IX. Conference of the Party which took place on the 18th, 19th and 20th June clearly placed this task before the Party.

The IX. Party Conference recorded the consolidation of the C. P., a consolidation upon which the expulsion of the little renegade group around Frey could have no influence. The Conference registered the promising partial successes and commencing developments (shop councils elections, the campaigns against the reaction etc.) without ignoring the causes for the defeat suffered at the parliamentary elections and the deficiencies of the Party. The trade union work of the Party is insufficient as also the recruiting activities for the Party itself, which were neither systematic nor continuous. By placing the question of the struggle against the danger of war into the foreground, the Party Conference also raised the questions of the trade union work and the recruiting work.

The Party Conference also declared that the Party had the possibility and the duty of directing its attention to the development of a left-wing movement inside the masses of the Social Democratic workers. That there are good prospects for such a movement is shown by the growing sympathy of the Austrian Social Democratic workers for the Soviet Union, and above all, by the very promising movement for international trade union unity which held an All-Austrian Conference on the 12th June in Vienna. This Conference decided to carry on a campaign for the affiliation of the Austrian trade unions to the Anglo-Russian Committee and to make preparations for the sending of a second Austrian workers delegation to the Soviet Union.

For the C. P. itself, the Party Conference formulated four tasks: 1. An energetic campaign for the building up of the factory nuclei. 2. The greatest possible increase of the Leninist educational work inside the Party. 3. The concentration of forces inside the Party, and 4. Organisation preparation in case of police persecution and above all for anti-war activities.

The overwhelming majority of the delegates to the Party Conference was in favour of the policy of the Central Committee. The small group around Tomann, which cut off connection with Frey in good time, expressed special wishes concerning the composition of the C. C., but otherwise agreed with the opinions of the Party majority.

Only in one essential question was there any difference of opinion: These comrades are of the opinion that in order to strengthen the agitation of the Party for the proletarian dictatorship, the Party should, having regard to the weakness of Austria, work for a Danube-Balkan Soviet Federation with the inclusion of Austria. With the approval of the Party Conference, the C. C. rejected this proposal. Quite apart from the dangerous support which this policy would give to the British agitation for a similar federation of States, and apart from the fact that this policy would not be understood by the masses of the Austrian workers who are hostile to the old monarchy of nationalities and in favour of a unification with Germany, this policy is in contradiction with the foreign political tasks of a bolshevist party. In a country like Austria, it is not the task of a Communist Party to work out a system of possibilities for socialist reconstruction, but to bring the struggles of the Austrian proletariat into harmony and closest contact with the revolutionary factors in the neighbouring countries, and in this respect, Germany will play at least as important a role as the successor States of the old Habsburg monarchy.

The IX. Party Conference entrusted the old Central Committee, with the addition of new and younger forces, with the leadership of the Party. This stabilisation of the Party leadership alone is a not unimportant success for the Austrian C. P.

which was torn for years by wild fractional struggles. Indeed, the normalisation of the Party life in general has made important progress. The Central Committee was elected with 41 against 13 votes. The minority voted against the C. C. solely because its demand for the election of Tomann as a full member of the C. C. was rejected. Tomann was elected as a candidate of the C. C. The Party Conference decided with the majority mentioned for a concentration of forces, but with the necessary and dearly bought care.

Apart from this question, the IX. Party Conference documented the final unification of the C. P. of Austria. The Party Conference defined our communist tasks in Austria with sober optimism and without exaggerating our prospects of success. The Party has created all the preliminary conditions for a united fulfillment of our tasks. After years of retrogression, the Communist Party of Austria has now indubitably commenced to advance.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

Communist Aims in the International Co-operative Movement.

By J. T. Murphy.

In every country outside the Soviet Union the Communists are accused of having no interest in the Co-operative movement apart from that of disruption. No matter what proposals they make, they are looked upon with suspicion. The proposals are rarely examined, motives are ascribed to the movers of the proposals, and usually the discussion takes the form of a tirade upon the suspected motives of the proposers rather than the relation of the proposals to the problems that lie before the co-operative movement. This has been the case in our experience in practically every country during recent years.

It is difficult to know what our opponents really mean by disruption. If we say that by disruption they mean that we desire to give the co-operative movement another direction than that which it is taking at the present time, they would indignantly deny it. They would argue at once that all co-operators have the right to have their opinions and to seek for changes in the co-operative movement if they think it desirable. To which we can only reply it may be so, providing that the changes suggested are not made and suggested by Communists.

It is difficult to say other than this from our experience. For example, the **British Co-operative News** refuses to discuss anything with the Communists, although the editor and his correspondents may talk about the Communists, may misrepresent them, may distort their proposals to their heart's content. In the American co-operative movement we have a very similar position where all kinds of articles are being utilised in a campaign to hound the Communists from the co-operative movement in America. The recent correspondence between the **Centrosoyuz** and the **German Co-operatives** is sufficient evidence of the cordial relations of the German co-operatives to anything associated with the Communists. Yet what are the aims of the Communists in the co-operative movement throughout the world?

Our aims can be summed up comprehensively as follows: We seek to clear the co-operative movement of illusions as to what it can and cannot accomplish in the midst of capitalism to prevent the co-operative movement from being utilised as an instrument of the bourgeoisie and to harness its great powers in the struggle of the workers against the capitalists. Probably no movement is so full of illusions and so susceptible to the cultivation of illusions. Here is the great recruiting ground for the idea that by the development of the economic resources of the co-operative movement it will be possible to pass peacefully to Socialism, i. e., the workers will have no need to fight against the bourgeois state but out of their own meagre economic resources they can build up an economic power which will outcompete the trusts and all the mighty powers of bourgeois enterprise.

With this leading idea running through all their propaganda the co-operative movement becomes a nursery of pacifism. Where this has led the co-operative movement, we know only too well both in the experiences of the Great War of 1914-18 and in the present war on the Chinese Revolution. In both cases

the co-operative movement has been quietly harnessed to the Governments conducting the war.

It is characteristic of the co-operative movement that rarely do its leaders make any attempt to fundamentally examine the course which the co-operative movement is taking and question at all these basic defects. They proceed in a truly petty bourgeois fashion and practice the gospel of *laissez faire*. Naturally, when the Communists come along and challenge them on these fundamental issues of the class struggle, they are annoyed. The more annoyed they become, the more violently they are transformed into ardent supporters of the most reactionary bourgeoisie. Nevertheless it is our task to expose these illusions and to tell the truth to the co-operators concerning the road upon which it is being directed by its present leaders.

But our work consists not only in negative criticism and exposure of false ideas but in putting forward proposals based upon the principle of developing the co-operative movement in the interests of the class which gave them birth and which alone can utilise them as a means to a new social order, i. e., the proletariat. For example, this principle governs our proposal for the united action of the co-operative movements and the trade unions in their respective struggles. On the one hand, we propose that the co-operatives should function as the commissariat of the workers in the strike actions of the unions. On the other hand as a means of making this course of action effective, our work is not confined simply to the days when strike action is upon us, but is directed to bringing in the workers en masse into the co-operatives as a most effective means of economising their resources and preparing for strike action with their unions. What disruption there can be in such a proposal, it is difficult to see.

Yet many things flow from this line of policy. It necessitates an advocacy of the investment of trade union funds in the co-operative movement, it provides facilities for the education of the workers and the use of their own resources as a class, it facilitates an extensive mobilisation of class resources and the means of neutralising a considerable element of the bourgeoisie in the class struggle. But whatever facilities it may provide in this direction, it cannot take away the necessity of making clear to the masses the fundamental direction which such a movement takes in its relation to the bourgeois state.

This brings us at once to a further dividing line between us Communists and the Reformists who still hold the reins of the co-operative movement. The latter make a creed of political neutrality, and the more they defend it the more they become the advocates of the preservation of the existing order. Our aim in this respect cannot be avoided however much we may offend those who accuse us of disruption. If it is disruption to tell the workers the truth concerning the relation of the state to the working class movement and to show from experience, even from co-operative experience, the need for conquering this state, then we are disrupters. There is no political neutrality in the co-operative movement and can be none. There is either loyalty to the working class or loyalty to the bourgeoisie.

In place of "political neutrality" we place the class aim of the proletariat and insist that any attempt on the part of the co-operatives to ignore this issue plays into the hands of the enemies of the co-operative movement. Hence, as in the realm of economic struggles we seek a united front of the trade unions and the co-operatives in the common struggle against the bourgeoisie, so in politics, we seek to harness the co-operatives to the working class movement and to give it a distinctly proletarian character and aim.

It follows most logically that, as the struggles on these issues are not entirely local issues but part of international class war issues of the age, our aims are similar in relation to the international aspects of the co-operative movement. For the same fundamental reasons that we combat the isolation of the co-operatives from the labour movement and the mass struggles of the workers in the various countries, we insist upon the need of combatting the so-called neutrality policy of the **International Co-operative Alliance** and set before international co-operation the necessity of transforming this body into an Alliance governed by working class principles working in co-operation with a single international trade union alliance governed by similar principles.

It is this policy and aim which has governed our criticism of its policy in the British coal strike and its line of action

and its illusionary propaganda in connection with the Economic Conference of the **League of Nations**. In the coal strike it deserted the masses, and in the economic conference it has gone forward with a programme which is hardly distinguishable from that of the experts of the League of Nations itself.

Therefore, in setting forth our policy and our aims within the co-operative movement of the whole world, we Communists feel that in no wise are we the disrupters of this movement but are the real custodians of its interests. We destroy its illusions and bring it face to face with reality. We reveal to this movement who are its enemies and show how to conquer them. We face the co-operative movement therefore neither with apologies nor with fear, but with the certainty of victory. Along this path the **Communist Party of the Soviet Union** has led the co-operative movement of its Republics triumphantly. Along this path the Communist Parties of other countries will yet lead the international co-operative movement to similar victories.

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

After Seven Years.

By M. Pokrovsky.

Good friends never forget to supply me with interesting reading. I have hardly finished with the amusing conversations between **Noi Jordania** and the British generals when I have before me again some works by the same author. So far the British generals are not yet on the scene, but they are close behind the scenes, as the reader will soon find out. This time, however, it is not a stenographic record, but original letters. True, we must use them in translations but whether a translator "falsifies" more than a stenographer has not yet been decided by history.

The documents are unusually fresh. One of them, signed by "**Oliko**", says:

"While we write this letter, the British police are breaking up the safes in the walls of the Soviet Co-operative (Arcos) in order to find stolen documents and other (Bolshevik) shady affairs. This is only an excuse. The police searches are made with an entirely different aim in view" (!!).

How well informed! But it must not be forgotten that we are dealing here with representatives of the "Georgian Government". No joke:

"The Congress of the Social Democratic Labour Party of Georgia", we read in the resolution of the recent Congress of the Georgian Mensheviks, "considers the **N. Jordania** Government exiled abroad as the legitimate government of Georgia; it approves of its activities in general and particularly of the unification of the subjugated peoples in the Soviet Union with a view to destroying Russian imperialism. The government is authorised to find reliable allies among the states (which will help Georgia with money and goods, etc.) both during the period of the liberation movement and after the occupation of Georgia to support Georgia and render all possible assistance in the struggle against any imperialist steps that might be taken by Russia against Georgia."

Time in the Soviet Union is fleeting very rapidly, but it is dragging in exile. In my last article I was afraid that everybody has already forgotten here about 1919, and here, you will agree, just as if it had been yesterday, **Gegetchkori** is negotiating with the British generals. We see people waiting for seven years for goods to arrive from Great Britain. It must be admitted that they are a patient lot.

Naturally, the government is well informed as to its "reliable ally", both as to the time when the raid is made on Arcos and as to the real aim of the raid, etc. That its ally is primarily Great Britain is self-evident. Also in this respect no changes have taken place during these seven years. **Jordania** writes to his correspondent in Georgia that

"the Anglo-Russian antagonism has now reached a phase when it can no longer be settled through peaceful negotiations. Either Russia or England will rule Asia, that is how the question stands today. At the present time Britain

is concentrating all anti-Soviet forces. This constitutes the crux of European politics today. In this possible imperialist, clashing of forces Georgia's position is clear".

But Great Britain is no longer the only possible ally. In a letter to the Menshevik C.C. — this letter is somewhat older than the "Oliko" letter, and is therefore more interesting — another member of the "government" and another Noi, this time Ramishvilli, writes:

"The anti-Russian bloc is about to realise its aims. Hitherto, England was leading. Now Japan is also in the leadership. A new government has been formed there headed by General Tanaka who wants active interference in China. This signifies the strengthening of Japanese influence in Manchuria and driving the Russians out of there. Thanks to the Chang Tso-lin policy, the whole world found out that Russia cannot fight, and that is why she is pushed up against the wall from all sides, and that is why she is ridiculed."

Let us stop for a while. It is a well-known fact that there are wise people in this very same "Russia" who seriously think that all the hullabaloo about war is nothing but the speculation of the "dominating faction". And here we find secret Georgian documents where it is written in black and white that a war is being prepared against "Russia" and that "Russia" is being provoked; they express great resentment at the fact that we do not succumb to the provocations. Perhaps, after all, this will convince our wiseacres.

It is natural for one in Ramishvilli's place to speculate as to the chances of the different sides in the expected war. "Russia" — it is characteristic that the state of which Georgia constitutes a component part is persistently designated by Jordania and company as "Russia" — has no chances whatever; it cannot fight and the fracas "must end with its dismemberment". "A highly interesting period is coming which we follow very closely and we will not lose sight of a single favourable instant to re-establish our independence".

This position reminds one of the position of a carcass over a carrion. "Independence" involuntarily reminds one of the British generals in 1919. But this is not so important. There is another more complicated question. The "carrion" is still firmly on its feet and even, according to the views expressed by another, not a Georgian but a Turkish letter, threatens "to bite like a mad dog". So that although "Russia" has no chances whatever it is still necessary to see what chances England has. And here is a "proletarian and national organisation" as N. Jordania designates the Georgian Social Democratic Party, laying its greatest hopes on a split of the European proletariat.

"The influence of the avowed opponents of Bolshevism among the workers has been rapidly increasing" is what Ramishvilli joyfully reports to his C.C. "In point of fact half of the labour fraction of the British Parliament cherishes an avowed hatred of Bolshevism (is it only half?)... If as a result of the Chinese events there should be war, the British government will recruit in the course of two weeks a voluntary army of half a million".

It would seem that there could be no more optimistic perspective, would it not? But the beginning of the next sentence betrays the "proletarian" author. He says: "It would be much easier to defeat Bolshevism in France..." Aha! In other words a Bolshevik defeat in England is not so easy after all, eh?

Only after taking the example of France with its "followers of Renaudel" did Ramishvilli find courage to say the following:

"It may be boldly stated that once Russia will be trapped, and she will have recourse to the sword, neither the working class of Europe nor that of America particularly will give her any support..."

Thus, outside of Georgia, in Europe, all hopes are based on the "labour fraction", to wit, MacDonald and Co., and on the "followers of Renaudel" and other Socialist scoundrels, on the one hand, and on the "trap" which is being laid for the Soviet Union by the shrewd British diplomats on the other. These are the hopes from the "proletarian" side. And what about the hopes on the "national" side, viz., on Georgia?

In this respect, of course, the Georgian bourgeoisie is the first ally. The National Democrats must enter the "Committee of Independence".

"According to our information the National Democratic Party is too weak. It has no Central Committee. It is necessary to organise such a centre so that the latter would be able to strengthen the Amiradjibi and the Gvazava. If it will be impossible to establish such a centre anywhere else, then establish it somewhere in your neighbourhood*)."

If there is no Miliukov then you must invent one. N. Jordania does not write in vain in his letters, that: "our aim is to utilise all anti-bolshevik elements". The circle of such "elements" is not limited to the bourgeois democrats. Miliukov and the Patriarch Tikhon (if he were only alive) could also be utilised. In a questionnaire which Ramishvilli sent to his correspondent there is the following point:

"6. The position of the church: Is the church still persecuted, are the clergy being arrested or exiled (give their names)? How many churches have been destroyed? Are religious services interfered with or not? Is there a special church tax to that end? Are there any cases of ridiculing religious people? Are the Armenian and Moslem temples persecuted?..."

Bear in mind that we are connected in England with the Archbishop of Canterbury through our council and we have a special representative, Ivaniitski (R. Ingilo), at the Vatican. There are rumours here that the heads of your churches consider the recognition of the Roman Pope...

At any rate... you must send us all information concerning the church. This is of great importance in Europe."

We know too well that "it is of great importance in Europe". At the time of the Conradi trial one of the main witnesses for the defence was Madame Kalash who sang in the beautiful French language the song that in Moscow "all churches are closed, the clergy is persecuted, there are no religious services", and similar chants. The bourgeois, who occasionally shuts down the factories in order to force the workers into submission through starvation, but never closes the churches, was overtaken by pious rage.

But the list of "anti-Bolshevik elements" is not yet complete, and we take the liberty to call the attention of both Nois to another group which is even more reliable than the clergy and even than Mrs. Kalash. This group consists of the former tsarist agent-provocateurs many of whom are undoubtedly still in hiding somewhere beyond the Caucasian borders as also within its borders. They are people who have been tested as to their hatred to the Bolsheviks and they have much experience in conspirative work too. They would be of great use.

Experience in secret work is now more essential than ever before. Perhaps I have emphasised too much in saying that the Georgian Mensheviks have not changed much since 1919, and I can already hear some objections that I have forgotten my dialectics. A few samples of dialectics we have already seen in the fact that they are now clinging to the tails of two imperialist sharks at the same time, — one in the Atlantic Ocean and the other in the Pacific, and not as before. But the main dialectic is hidden, of course, in the present tactics of the Mensheviks.

In the first place, if you think that they are preparing an insurrection, then you are greatly mistaken.

"Georgia" (read Jordania and Co.) "as all other Russian nationalities (!) wants the defeat of Moscow but it will not take direct part in the struggle but will remain neutral until the perspectives will become clear. This can be made clear by our government in Europe. It will enter into the active struggle only when our independence will be guaranteed. Our tactics during the war must be the Czech tactic, namely, not to rise!"

On this point Ramishvilli fully supports "the president of the Government". "Should war begin (which appears to be inevitable) we must take every measure that the people do not fall victims of the Bolshevik provocation (!) and do not revolt. Noi speaks of Czech tactics during war, and he is quite right. The Georgian fighters must act the same way". But Noi No. 2 makes an interesting addition. He says:

*) N. Ramishvilli's letter to Abessalom (Prazhsky).

"The enthusiasm with which the people greeted the war against Germany must not be repeated during the mobilisation..."

That is saying something! Of course what kind of a rising can there be if one must "fear" that the people will go to the defence of their Soviet fatherland with "enthusiasm". In the light of these fears the disclosures scattered in the quotations given above, right at the beginning of this article, from "Oliko's" letter are an ill-omen for the Mensheviks.

"I know and I bewail the impotence and disintegration of the Party. I weep over the weakness of my Party, but I do not lose hope... The situation of those who lost their country and are now abroad is unbearable. We are always faced with the perspective of being buried in a foreign land".

It was necessary to give up the idea of an insurrection, as there are no masses who would follow the lead. Apparently, the Georgian Fascists think themselves better off. Much is spoken about them in the letters, and from the tone in which reference is made to them it is clear that they are the most serious opponents. Georgian Fascism subsidised by Italy is not our subject. We are not going to deal with it now. We should only observe that the "Czech" tactic of the Mensheviks does not at all signify "peaceful" tactics.

"From today on, we must establish highly conspirative connections with the staff of the Georgian army, says Ramishvilli to "Abessalum", "so that at a favourable moment we may be able to rely on them to arrest the Bolshevik officers and soldiers in the army".

The "Czech" tactics are tactics of plots in contra-distinction to the tactics of mass action.

These are tactics of the coup d'état, in contra-distinction to revolutionary tactics, they are not at all the tactics of peaceful propaganda and legal protests.

Not having behind them any masses in Georgia, it is natural for them to seek allies outside of Georgia. On this point we find the most interesting parts of their correspondence.

"The Bolshevik order destroyed the Georgian nation, its national system and culture", writes Jordania ("the Bolshevik order" accomplished this in an extraordinarily conspirative manner so that not only outside observers, but even the Georgian people themselves could notice it. What devilish bloody people the Bolsheviks are), "but it advanced nationally other, non-historical (!), nations and directed them on the path of regeneration.

We were for instance the eye-witnesses of the creation of the Ukraine. This 40 million strong nation represents such an enormous power that should it want to separate from Moscow (!!) the latter would have to concede involuntarily. The other nations would follow afterwards. For us this would facilitate methods as the Ukraine would stand between us and Moscow and would liquidate our common borders therewith (Moscow).

The dismemberment of the Soviet Union into national units can be accomplished in a better organised form if the Ukrainians would take this task upon themselves. Under such conditions... the Georgian nation would enter the framework of the Ukrainian nationalist movement". (The reader, if he pleases, can put here as many exclamation marks as he likes).

Let me first of all congratulate the Ukraine for being classified among the "non-historical nations". I must say that as a "Russian historian" of the old order I feel greatly offended. The devil take it! The Ukrainians are not a historical nation?! Excuse me! And what about the Komelnitzky episode, is it not history?

Then, I cannot but congratulate also the Georgian nation with Noi Jordania's plan to hide it behind the broad shoulders of the "non-historical" Ukrainian. This is a great honour indeed. I must frankly admit it suits me better than when I see Jordania and Co., sitting not behind, but a bit lower under the British Generals. What can I do. I am only an old "Russian historian" after all. As long as I live I will repeat only what I have imbibed with my mother's milk.

Noi No. 2 concretises the general reveries of Noi No. 1.

"Our perspective is mostly connected with the second policy outlined by Jordania", says Ramishvilli to Abessalum (Jordania mapped out three possible ways of the "regeneration of Georgia": 1. the collapse of Bolshevism from within, 2. national uprisings in the border lands and 3. an Anglo-Russian war), "namely, the consolidation of the nationalities. This is precisely why we organised the 'Committee of Caucasian Independence' and published the 'Prometheus' in the French language. This Committee is comprised of our representatives and representatives from Azerbadjan and the mountain republics, two from each republic. The 'Caucasian Committee' is closely connected with the 'Turkestan Independence' and with the 'Ukraine' (Levitsky, Petliura's representative). It is our aim to separate from Russian by common action of these nations and by the establishment of a military alliance both during the war with Russia and after it".

Thus, not only is a mass rising in Georgia impossible and undesirable, but isolated action by Georgia will lead nowhere.

"The nations which are in the same position as we have at last realised that in order to destroy the enemy, unity and joint action is necessary", says Oliko, "the Ukraine, Caucasia, and Turkestan have united... Their joint action is an accomplished fact. The consolidation of a united front is a question of the near future".

We may rest assured that before very long there will be a scrap amongst them. For the Ukraine, the Sochi Denikin episode (see "Georgia Under British Rule") is a guarantee. Father Levitsky surely thinks that Kuban is Ukrainian. And from the point of view of Jordania's political geography this should be so, if one looks at it. But it is unlikely that we shall ever see this "immediate future". The dialectics of history have brought about a situation when the once seemingly powerful national groups have become metamorphosed into weak groups of plotters which have no roots in the masses, as they themselves admit. This is definitely so in Georgia. This is more than probable in the Ukraine and in Turkestan. The dialectics of history was always on the side of the Bolsheviks, and where else could it be?

THE WHITE TERROR

The Re-opening of the Case for Max Hoelz.

By Felix Halle (Berlin).

On June 23rd it was six years since Max Hoelz was sentenced by an Extraordinary Imperial Court sitting at the Provincial Court, Berlin I, in which district Hoelz was betrayed to the police, to imprisonment for life and permanent loss of civil rights for high treason combined with manslaughter and attempted manslaughter. This judgement also covered Hoelz's responsibility for the belligerent actions of his troops: Hoelz was condemned on account of the requisitions and blastings and, in a great number of cases, on account of robbery and misuse of explosives. The judgement was valid immediately and Hoelz was transported to the prison at Münster in Westphalia. Subsequently Hoelz was transferred to the Silesian prisons at Breslau and Groß-Strehlitz.

Hoelz courageously admitted responsibility for the belligerent actions of the revolutionary troops, but he categorically denied the accusation of foully murdering the landed proprietor Hess and firing at a traveller named Hildebrand in Eisleben. At the time, the judgement aroused great indignation among the workers, because Hoelz had thrown himself into revolutionary affairs with unusual altruism and circumspection. Bitterness was added to the indignation over the sentence by the fact that the leaders of the coups d'état of the radical organisations of the Right were not sentenced at all or were given sham punishments.

In spite of all efforts, it has not been possible to discredit the legal judgement against Hoelz in the minds of the bourgeois class and to prove its untenableness. It was only in No-

ember, 1926, that the writer of these lines was able, as counsel for Hoelz in the matter of amnesty, to submit to the Ministry of Justice a claim to produce evidence to prove the invalidity of the judgement passed by the special court. A miner of the name of Erich Friehe reported himself to Dr. Apfel, the Berlin lawyer who in October 1926 was counsel for the defence for Hoelz when he was re-tried, and admitted having committed the deed for which Hoelz was condemned. Furthermore, the principal witness for the prosecution, Uebe, has retracted in writing evidence upon which the previous judgement was based. Acting on my instructions, Erich Friehe gave himself up to the head office of the Prussian Department of Justice. But before the preliminary examination of Friehe could be brought about the defending counsel had to go to a great deal of trouble and make direct application to the Imperial Minister of Justice, the Public Prosecutor and the Prussian Minister of Justice.

From the reports of the leading bourgeois newspapers, the general public has learnt that for some strange reason the accused was examined very late on, while the witnesses were examined beforehand. Before a sitting of the members of the Imperial Amnesty Committee Friehe and Uebe repeated the evidence, which makes untenable the judgement passed upon Hoelz by the special court. Yet another witness, Keller, evidence at the main trial contributed to the conviction of Hoelz, has gone back on his original statements, so that the interpretation accepted by the Special Court as ground for convicting Hoelz has proved untenable in this respect also. The widow of the landowner Hess previously gave to the late Dr. Laskowski, former legal adviser to Comrade Hoelz in Breslau, a declaration to the effect that she had doubts about Hoelz's guilt and would be prepared to advocate the pardoning of Hoelz in case the real culprit came forward.

Under the impression made by the data gathered and carefully arranged and on various occasions made accessible by the defending counsel to the Press at home and abroad, a marked change has taken place in opinion on the Hoelz case entertained by the Social-Democratic and Democratic bourgeois Press. First of all, the defending counsel was given opportunity of expressing his view of the case in the leading Liberal newspapers, "Vossische Zeitung" and "Berliner Tageblatt" and subsequently the regular writers on legal matters in these papers expatiated on the subject for the edification of the readers. In this way, the interest of wider circles of the populace was aroused in the Hoelz case, and a non-political committee for the purpose of rectifying the glaring error of justice in the Hoelz case was formed. This committee included personalities from among Germany's intellectuals — to mention names known throughout world — Professor Albert Einstein and the distinguished author, Thomas Mann.

Naturally, this action has given considerable support to the endeavours of the purely proletarian organisations for the release of Max Hoelz.

This widening and deepening of the moral basis of the fight for Max Hoelz's release has aroused the anger of various reactionary papers, and in consequence there arose in the Press a discussion with the author Thomas Mann, because certain newspapers belonging to the Right do not approve of his unanimous attitude in favour of the proletarian revolutionary. Sharp attacks have also been made upon the other personalities on the committee. The real cause of these attacks must be sought in the circumstance that it will finally be impossible to maintain the judgement against Hoelz in view of public feeling.

The attitude of the working class and the population of other countries will also have a bearing upon the outcome of the Hoelz affair. It has already been seen from the Dreyfus case that the judgement of the foreign press exercises considerable influence upon a trial. Especially in regard to the maintenance of appearances, class-justice in a Democratic Republic requires to give an impression of impartiality. For this reason, it cannot for ever afford to allow the invalidity of a judgement involving serious issues to be demonstrated at home and abroad. If all who recognise the significance of the Hoelz case will do what is in their power to bring about a fresh trial and amnesty for Hoelz, this fight for the liberation of a proletarian revolutionary will not be in vain.

OBITUARY

Antonio Garcia Guejido

By Jar (Madrid).

After a long and painful illness, Antonio Garcia Quejido, a working printer, has died at the age of 70 in Madrid. Garcia Quejido was, together with Pablo Iglesias, the founder of the Worker's Socialist Party of Spain, in which party he was an active militant worker until 1921 when he left it to join the Communist Party. Garcia Quejido devoted fifty-five years of continuous work to the Spanish Labour Movement.

In 1879 he was secretary to the first Socialist group in Spain. During his years of service there he was sent to prison many times, in Madrid, Valencia and Barcelona. In 1888 the Union General de Trabajadores (General Workers' Union) was formed and Garcia Quejido was its first president. By that time too Barcelona was the centre of an active Anarchist movement. Garcia Quejido worked against it, having a continuous struggle against Anarchism. This campaign of Garcia Quejido's however was not backed by other leaders of Socialism who did not know or did not want to know how to put an end to the campaign against Anarchism, with the result that Barcelona was abandoned. Garcia Quejido alone understood the great importance of converting those masses of Anarchist workers to Socialism.

In 1894 he attended the International Socialist Congress at Zurich; in 1896 the one held in London; in 1900 he went to the Paris Congress and in 1902 to the Stuttgart Conference.

Garcia Quejido was also the founder of the Spanish Workers' Printers' Federation. From 1897 till 1899 he was the secretary of the National Committee of the Socialist Party. From 1909 to 1913 he was an elected member of the Town Council of Madrid, and from 1919 to 1923 he was an appointed Provincial Deputy, from 1920 to 1921 Vice-President of the Spanish Socialist Party until the formation of the Communist Party of Spain in that year.

In 1901 Garcia Quejido edited a Socialist review called the "New Era". He also wrote a pamphlet "Pablo Iglesias in the Labour Party". In the last years of the past century Garcia Quejido also founded a Socialist library; he edited a Spanish translation of the first volume of Marx' "Capital", the only one extant in the Spanish language. Garcia Quejido himself set the type for this book.

In 1923 he published one of the most interesting theoretical books written in Spanish: "Karl Marx and the International". From 1922 to 1924 he was the editor of the "International Book Editorial" of the Communist Party of Spain.

Garcia Quejido had more influence and moral authority over the Spanish Labour movement than any other militant worker. He belonged to the "Heroic age" of Spanish Socialism. His faith in Marxism was strong and never failed; he represented the intransigent Marxist school. Consequently, when the Communist Party was founded in 1921, Garcia Quejido, like other veteran Socialists, such as Isidoro Acevedo and Facundo Perezagua, joined the Communist Party without hesitation. His speech at the Congress which caused the split will always be remembered by Spanish Communists. We, those who were in favour of the formation of a Communist Party, were accused at that time of being young men with no love for the history of the Socialist Party, so that we did not dare to destroy its unity. Then Garcia Quejido, who had worked in the party for fifty years, began to speak and declared that he was joining the Communist Party because he considered that it was the party which represented the ideology he had been fighting for his whole life.

Garcia Quejido and Pablo Iglesias worked together for fifty years, but their activities were always divided by important differences in their theoretical views. These differences increased towards the end of their lives. While Pablo Iglesias' ideas were developing towards Reformism, so that he did not approve of the Russian Revolution and he worked for co-operation between the Socialist Party and the Bourgeoisie,

Garcia Quejido was an active fighter in the Communist International, working incessantly for the oppressed and persecuted, and denouncing in no measured terms the treachery of Spanish Socialism.

Pablo's old age was peaceful and happy; he did not suffer need. Garcia Quejido, though 70 years of age, worked as a proof-reader in a printing works until two months before his death. He was obliged to earn his living up to the last.

At Pablo Iglesias' funeral representatives of all the Spanish bourgeoisie were present; even Primo de Rivera sent a representative. At Quejido's funeral only workers were present: all the members of the Communist Party of Madrid, non-Party workers and almost all the workers in the printing trade in Madrid. The funeral was conducted by Isidoro Acevedo, Garcia Quejido's comrade during the struggles of forty years.

In Garcia Quejido we have lost one of the pioneers of the Spanish movement. Hand in hand with Pablo Iglesias and Anselmo Lorenzo he was the creator of the Spanish Labour movement. His whole life was a vivid example of sacrifice for the revolutionary ideal. Furthermore he was the only old Socialist who never accepted a paid position under the Spanish Government. He died as he had lived — working until the last moment, and fighting for the Communist International. His life will always be an example to the young revolutionary elements belonging to the Communist Party.

TEN YEARS AGO

The First Soviet Congress and the War.

By N. Lenin.

II.

If, in proposing peace without annexations, you understand by it the "status quo", you will see that in the end your proposal will result in a separate peace with the capitalists. For, if you make this proposal, the German capitalists, who now have against them America and Italy with whom they at one time concluded treaties, will say: "All right, we accept this peace without annexations; it is not a defeat for us, it is a victory over America and Italy." You will sink to that separate peace with the capitalists of which you accuse us because in your policy, in reality, in your practical steps, you do not on principle break with the bankers, the representatives of imperialist rule throughout the world, which you and your "Socialist" Ministers in the Provisional Government are supporting.

The victory of Imperialism is the beginning of an inexorable and inevitable split of Socialism into two camps in every country. Anyone who now continues to speak of Socialism as an entity or as something which can be an entity, deceives himself and others. The whole course of the war, the whole two and a half years of war have, from the first moment, led up to this split, since the Basle Manifesto, which was signed unanimously, declared that this was a war on the basis of imperialist Capitalism. There is no word of "defence of the country" in the Basle Manifesto. Before the war, no other manifesto could have been written, just as now no Socialist could propose writing a manifesto about "the defence of the country" in the case of a war between Japan and America, unless it involves his own skin, his own capitalists and his own ministers. You are writing a resolution for international congresses!

The German Social Chauvinists are not worse than those who, in our Ministry, are carrying on the same policy of secret treaties and spoliation and who conceal the fact with innocent, pious wishes in which there is much that is good — in which, when they are said by the masses, I recognise the absolute honesty — in which however I cannot and do not admit that there is a spark of political truth. This is merely your wish, war remains exactly as imperialistic and is carried on for the sake of the same secret treaties. You call upon other peoples to turn out the bankers, but you are supporting your own.

When you spoke of peace, you did not say to what peace you are referring. As regards peace on the basis of the "status quo", no one answered us when we pointed out this crying contradiction. In your resolution, in which you speak about

peace, you cannot say that this is not a "status quo". But it is equally impossible for you to say that it is a "status quo", i. e. a restoration of the position which existed before the war. What then is to be done? Shall the German colonies be taken away from England? Just try to do it by peaceful agreements: Everybody will laugh you to scorn. Just try to deprive Japan of Kiochow and the islands in the Pacific Ocean without a revolution!

You have become entangled in contradictions from which you can find no issue. When we say "without annexations", we mean that this slogan is for us only a subordinate part in the fight against world imperialism. We say that we wish to liberate all peoples, but that we will begin with our own. You talk of a war against annexations, of a peace without annexations, but in Russia you continue the policy of annexations. This is a monstrous idea. You and your Government, your new Ministers are, in reality, continuing the policy of annexations in Finland and in the Ukraine. You try to pick a quarrel with the Ukrainian Congress; through your Ministers, you forbid it to meet. Is this in keeping with your policy of no annexations? This policy is a mockery of the rights of a people which suffered for decades and centuries under the blood-thirsty régime of the Tsar because its children wanted to use their native language. This means being afraid of individual republics.

Workers and peasants have nothing to fear from them. May Russia become a union of free republics. The masses of workers and peasants will not carry on a war to prevent this. Every people should be liberated, but above all the peoples hand in hand with whom we in Russia have made the revolution. Unless such a step is taken, you condemn yourselves to be a "revolutionary democracy" in words, but in reality to carry on a policy which is quite counter-revolutionary.

Your foreign policy is anti-democratic and counter-revolutionary, whereas a revolutionary policy might confront you with the necessity of a revolutionary war. This however is not inevitable. In recent times the reporters and the Press have discussed this point in detail. I attribute much importance to dealing with this point in extenso.

What practical issue from this war suggests itself to us? We say: Revolution is the only issue from this war. Support the revolution of the classes which are oppressed by Capitalism, overthrow the class of the capitalists in your own country and thus give an example to the other countries. That alone is Socialism. That alone is a fight against war. Everything else is merely promises or empty phrases or pious, innocent wishes. In every country there has been a split in socialism. You continue to get more and more confused by maintaining relations with the socialists who support their Governments, and you forget that in England and Germany the true Socialists who represent the Socialism of the masses, are isolated and are thrown into prison. It is they alone who represent the interests of the proletarian movement.

What would happen if the oppressed class were to come into power in Russia? If we are asked: "How will you alone free yourselves from the war?", we answer: "No individual country can free itself from the war." Every resolution of our Party, every speech of our agitators declares that it is nonsense to imagine that any individual country can detach itself from this war. Hundreds of millions of persons, hundreds of millions of values are in the clutches of this war. There is no other way of getting out of it, than that of the transference of the power to the revolutionary class whose duty it is to tear down imperialism, that is to break the threads of the financial and bank magnates and the annexationist theses. Until this is actually done, nothing is done. The revolution confined itself to giving you, in the place of Tsarism and Imperialism, an also-republic, a republic which is thoroughly imperialist and whose representatives, though they be representatives of the revolutionary workers and peasants, do not wish to behave democratically towards Finland and the Ukraine, which shows that they are still imbued with the fear of secession.

If anyone says, that we are striving for a separate peace, he is mistaken. We declare that we do not want any separate peace with any capitalists, especially not with the Russian ones. But the Provisional Government has concluded a separate peace with the Russian capitalists. Down with the separate peace! (Applause.) We will not hear of a separate peace with the German capitalists and will not enter into any kind of

negotiations with them. Neither will we have anything to do with a separate peace with the English and French imperialists. We are told that a breach with them would be equivalent to an understanding with the German imperialists. This is not true. We must break with them without delay, because the alliance is one for the purpose of spoliation. The alliance we shall defend, is that with the oppressed class with the oppressed peoples.

Remain true to this alliance, and then you will be the representatives of revolutionary democracy. This task is no easy one; he who recognises this task will not forget that in certain circumstances it will hardly be possible for us to avoid a revolutionary war. No revolutionary class can, on principle, entirely reject a revolutionary war, for in that case it condemns itself to ridiculous pacifism. We are not Tolstoyans. When a revolutionary class seizes the power, when its State renounces all annexations and when the bankers and large capital no longer have any power — which is not easy to effect in Russia — this class will carry on a revolutionary war, not in words but in deeds. We have no right to reject a war of this kind; it would mean lapsing into Tolstoyan and narrow-minded bourgeois view of life, and forgetting the whole science of Marxism, the experiences of all European revolutions.

We cannot extricate Russia alone from the war. Russia is gaining new and powerful allies who do not believe you at present, just because your standpoint is naive and full of contradictions, for the very reason that you give other peoples the advice: "Down with annexations!" but tolerate annexations in your own country.

You say to other peoples: "Overthrow your bankers!" but you do not overthrow your own. Try a different policy. Publish the treaties and expose them at the meetings to ignominy before the eyes of every worker and peasant. Declare resolutely: "We will have no peace with the German capitalists and we will break completely with the Anglo-French capitalists. Let the English clear out of Turkey and cease to wage war on account of Bagdad. Let them also clear out of India and Egypt. We refuse to fight so that they may retain intact the loot they have grabbed, neither will we stir a finger to help the German robbers to retain their spoils." If you do this — up to the present, you have only said it, and, in politics, no faith is placed in words, and that with justification, — if you not only say it but do it, your allies who already exist will testify to their existence.

Pay attention to the mood of every oppressed worker and peasant. They feel and regret that you are so weak, that, in spite of having arms in your hands, you allow the bankers to retain their position. Your allies are the oppressed workers in every country. Things will turn out as they did in reality in the 1905 revolution. At first it was very feeble; but what international result did it have? How does this policy, seen in the light of the history of 1905, determine the foreign policy of the Russian revolution? Now, you decide the foreign policy of the Russian revolution in complete agreement with the agreement with the capitalists. The year 1905, however, showed what the foreign policy of the Russian revolution should be. It showed it by the fact that after the 17th of October 1905 there were mass demonstrations in the streets of Vienna and Prague and barricades were erected. After 1905 came the year 1908 in Turkey, 1909 in Persia and 1910 in China.

If you actually appeal to "revolutionary" democracy, to the working class, to the oppressed, and agree to no compromises with the capitalists, you will have as your allies, not the oppressing classes, but the oppressed; not the peoples among which, for the time being, the oppressing classes have the upper hand, but the peoples which are now being torn to pieces.

Our situation is such that we may indeed be threatened by a revolutionary war, but it will not necessarily come, for the English imperialists will hardly be able to carry on a war against us if you give a practical example to the peoples in the countries adjacent to Russia. Give evidence of your intentions by liberating the Armenian Republic. Prove by an agreement to this effect with the Councils of Delegates of Workers and Peasants in every single country that you are in favour of a free republic; then the foreign policy of the Russian re-

volution will be truly revolutionary and truly democratic. At present it is so only in words, but in reality it is counter-revolutionary, because you are bound by Anglo-French Imperialism and only shrink from saying it openly because you are afraid to admit it. It would be better if instead of this cry of: "Overthrow the foreign bankers", you were to own up to the Russian people, the workers and peasants, that you are too weak to shake off the yoke of the Anglo-French imperialists, that you are their slaves and that that is why you are fighting. It would be a bitter truth but it would be of revolutionary significance and would bring us nearer to the end of this war of spoliation.

This is a thousand times better than an agreement with the French and English Social Chauvinists, than calling congresses to which they will send delegates, than continuing this policy that prevents you plucking up the courage to break with the imperialists of one country while you prefer to remain allies with another. With the support of the oppressed classes of the European countries and of the oppressed peoples of the weaker countries which were gagged by Tsarist Russia and which are still gagged, as for instance is the case with Armenia — with their support you can give them freedom. If you supported their workers' and peasants' committees, you could place yourselves at the head of all oppressed classes, of all subjugated peoples, in a war against German and English Imperialism, which could not combine against you, because they are engaged in a struggle to the death. Whilst they are in a position from which they can find no issue, success may attend the foreign policy of the Russian revolution; an honest, genuine alliance with the oppressed peoples; there is 99 per cent probability that this policy would be crowned with success.

The Offensive is still Progressing.

From the Russian War Despatch of July 11th 1917.

In the Dolin direction, our troops continued to pursue the enemy who had been completely defeated by General Kornilov's army on the front Yezupol-Stanislava-Bogorodshany towards the North-West. Towards midday, our brave troops, under the command of General Tcheremissov took the town of Halicz, and sent their advanced guard across to the left bank of the Dniester. At nightfall, our troops reached the Lomnica valley on the front from the mouth of the Lomnic to Dobrovlany and, after a short fight, sent troops to the left bank of the river, occupying the villages of Bludnyky and Babina. Divisions which attacked the Bogorodshany to Zolotonia front, broke the resistance of the enemy and reached the Passech-Liessourka-Kosmatst line.

In the course of the day's fighting, we took more than 2000 prisoners and captured about 30 guns. In the three days' fighting — July 8th, 9th and 10th — in the direction of Dolin, we took prisoner more than 150 officers and 10,000 men, captured about 80 guns, including 12 heavy ones and further a large amount of trench-fighting material and machine guns as well as a considerable quantity of war material and munitions.

The Answer of the Masses to the Counter-Revolutionary Agitation.

Petrograd, July 8th. ("Pravda"). In many factories meetings are being held which take an attitude of opposition to the agitation of the bourgeois newspapers against the Bolsheviks. The meeting of the workers in the "Ochten" powder factory for instance, passed the following resolution.

"In view of the abominable agitation of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois Press against the progressive and intrepid fighters of the proletariat, such as for example Comrade Lenin and other Socialist comrades ... the workers resolve ... to boycott all bourgeois newspapers which take part in the agitation, and the meeting calls upon the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet to take energetic measures against the despicable agitation and the open counter-revolutionary campaign of the bourgeois Press; the meeting suggests that in case of need the Soviet should proceed to confiscate their printing works as being instruments of the counter-revolution."

Conclusion of the Soviet Congress.

Petrograd, July 8th. The Session of the 1st National Congress of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet came to an end yesterday.

Stockholm, July 8th. As the bulletin of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet reports, the All-Russian Congress of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets has passed the following resolution:

"In the interest of unity of action on the part of Russian democracy, the Congress considers it necessary to form a centre which should combine the Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Soviets.

The All-Russian Congress of the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets is the supreme organ of the Soviets and conducts all its social and political activities. The Congress is to meet in Petrograd at least once a month.

The Central Committee is responsible to the All-Russian Congress for all that it does.

The Central Committee, whilst observing all the resolutions of the Congress, conducts the steps of the whole Russian democracy, protecting and extending the conquests of the revolution and combining the activities of the local organs. The Central Committee remains in constant and direct contact with the Socialist Ministers, controlling their activities in the field of home and foreign policy and helping them to carry out their measures and to prepare draft bills.

In the periods between the meetings of the Congress, the Socialist Ministers are responsible to the Central Committee for their home and foreign policy.

In respect of international democracy, the Central Committee holds the position of the authorized organ of Russian democracy.

All resolutions passed by the Central Committee are binding for the united Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets.

The Petrograd Town Committee forms a local committee within the Central Committee and conducts the organisations of the Petrograd workers and soldiers and is responsible not only to the All-Russian Congress but also to the Petrograd Soviet."

When this resolution was put to the vote, the Bolsheviks abstained from voting. They pointed out that this organisation would not lead to the desired end, that of forming a powerful and united centre to carry on the revolution with all energy.

Lenin on the Congress.

"The great secession" is the characteristic feature which helps us to understand the 6th of May (the formation of the Coalition Government). As a matter of fact, "the great secession" began, or to put it more exactly, became clearly evident, at that moment. There was not only a "great secession" of the bourgeoisie from the Government, but also of the Mensheviks and Narodniki from the revolution. The significance of the Congress of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which is sitting at the moment, is that it has shown this very clearly. (Lenin, vol. XIV., T. I. S. 246).

The Development of the Trade Unions.

Petrograd, July 7th. ("Pravda"). The statistics of the Trade Union Conference show that there are more than 50 trade unions in Petrograd with a membership of over 250,000. The largest union, that of the metal workers, has 100,000 members in Petrograd, the union of commercial and industrial employees 25,000, the printers' union 20,000. The number of trade union members has been doubled in the month of May alone.

The Tsar wishes to subscribe to the "Freedom Loan".

Petrograd, July 11th. ("Russkiye Wedmosti"). The Provisional Government has received a statement from the ex-Tsar and his family, in which the Tsar and his family express their desire to subscribe to the "Freedom Loan" out of their private means. The amount subscribed will depend on whether the National Treasury allocates money for the maintenance of the family of the Tsar.

The First Reverses at the Front.

Petrograd, June 16th. (From the military despatch.) The fighting on the Landestreu-Lodziany-Krasna front continued throughout the day. After violent fighting, the Austrians were dislodged from the village of Lodziany and driven back towards the Lomniza. Under the pressure of the reserves brought up from Rozantov however and in view of the heavy losses among our officers, our troops were forced to retire and to establish themselves at the East end of Loziany.

The Offensive Serves as an Excuse for Suppressing the Nationalities.

Petrograd, July 17th. (Petrograd Telegraph Agency.) On July 16th the Provisional Government published the following statement with regard to the Ukrainian question:

Having taken cognisance of the communications of Ministers Kerensky, Terestshenko and Zeretelli with regard to the Ukrainian question, the Provisional Government has passed the following resolution: As supreme organ of administration for Ukrainian affairs, a special general secretariat will be established, the officials of which will be appointed by the Government in agreement with the Central Council of the Ukraine, and will be supplemented on a just basis by representatives of the other nationalities living in the Ukraine and being represented there by democratic organisations. The body referred to will be under the obligation to carry out measures with regard to life in and the administration of the country.

As the Provisional Government considers it imperative to maintain the integrity of the fighting force of the army during the war, it regards as impermissible any measures which might destroy that integrity, as for instance temporary changes in the plans of mobilisation in the way of an immediate acceptance of the system of reinforcing the army according to territories or of the transference of the right of command to some social organisation or other. At the same time the Government considers it possible to continue to aim at a close national union of the Ukrainians in the army and at the reinforcement of divisions of troops exclusively by Ukrainians, in so far as such measures are, in accordance with the decision of the Minister of War, possible from the technical standpoint and do not reduce the fighting enthusiasm of the army.

Resignation of the Cadet Ministers.

Petrograd, July 16th. (Reuter.) Shingariiev, the Minister of Finance, Manuilov, the Minister for Education and Prince Shachovskiy, the Minister for Public Support, have resigned. Prokopovitch has been appointed Minister for Commerce and Industry and Tsharnovsky Minister of Education.

The resignation of the Russian Ministers is connected with the Ukrainian problem. The retiring ministers refused to consent to the resolutions with regard to the Ukraine, as, in their opinion, the Constituent National Assembly alone can decide the relations between the Ukraine and the rest of Russia.

Stockholm, July 16th. In socialist circles, the resignation of the Cadets is explained as follows: the retirement of the three Ministers, among whom Shingariiev is the leading Cadet, is the outcome of the bourgeois policy of isolating revolutionary democracy. Furthermore, Shingariiev had been urged by revolutionary democratic members of the council existing in his ministry to radicalise his draft-bills with regard to war profits and income tax and to prepare a compulsory loan. The bourgeoisie offers resistance to all these plans.

The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

What is Happening in Germany and Austria?

(Article in the "Pravda" of June 11th 1917.)

The "well-being" of William II. and of King Karl has long been disturbed. The wave of indignation against the war of spoliation is rising higher and higher in the depths of the masses of the people, both in Germany and Austria. The deep fermentation which is going on in the "lower strata", is reflected in the anxiety of the "upper strata". Since the strikes and demonstrations in connection with the sentence passed on

Friedrich Adler in Austria, one ministerial crisis has followed another. King Karl has been obliged to grant a partial amnesty to the Czechs who had been sentenced for "high treason". The re-groupings in the Government however have not been able to arrest the movement. Yesterday we received a telegraphic communication to the effect that a peace demonstration had been held in Brünn in which more than 20,000 persons took part.

In Germany, the movement of the masses of workers against the war, against the increase of prices and against imperialist reaction has not stood still for a moment. Only recently there were strikes in Germany in which 350,000 workers joined. These strikes arose on the grounds of a campaign against high prices but assumed a political character.

Yesterday's newspapers reported:

"In Stettin, 220 persons were brought before the Court Martial for taking part in hunger riots; 140 persons, amongst them 72 adults and 68 juveniles, were sentenced, 40 persons were acquitted, the rest were handed over to the ordinary courts."

Discontent with the war is steadily increasing. The German workers and soldiers are also fed up with the war of spoliation.

And now, the ruling classes in Germany, who feel that the ground is being cut from under their feet, are beginning to quarrel amongst themselves. There is however less and less prospect of an issue from the military situation for both groups of belligerent Powers, and economic ruin is constantly becoming more threatening. The "twilight" of bourgeois society is approaching mercilessly.

The bourgeois and social patriotic newspapers are full of accounts of the conflicts within the various groups of the German bourgeoisie, of the conflicts between the Centre party and Bethmann-Hollweg, the Imperial Chancellor, of the stumbling-blocs which the various bourgeois cliques are throwing in one another's way. They do not however see the essential point, that the disputes in high circles are a reflection of the great popular movement in the lower circles. In Germany and in Austria, as in other countries, the proletarian revolution is maturing. — This "trifle" is overlooked by the Social Patriots and the Liberals.

The German Scheidemanns (translated into Russian: the Plechanovs, Zeretellis and Tchernovs) wish to save things by a coalition government. It is reported that a deputation consisting of six Social Democrats waited on the Imperial Chancellor on Friday and made various energetic and importunate representations to him with regard to the situation which has arisen. The deputation is said to have demanded a definite answer from the Chancellor as to whether he stood by his declaration of August 1st 1914, according to which Germany was prepared to consider the restoration of the status quo in every respect. The deputation is said moreover to have demanded the formation of a Parliamentary Cabinet in which the leaders of all parties in the Reichstag should sit, as well as the introduction of the general franchise in Prussia.

You, Herr Scheidemann, have as little chance of saving the German capitalists as have Tchernov and Zeretelli of saving the Russian capitalists.

The True Causes of the Resignation of the Cadets.

By N. Bukharin.

The secession of the Cadets from the Government was the logical completion of their tactics of sabotage. The news of the commencing failures and of the imminent defeat at the front had reached the ears of the Ministers, and they acted as cold, cynical calculation dictated. They laid the blame for the tactics of the offensive on the Socialists. They themselves refuse to take any responsibility for these tactics. They wanted a free hand as soon as the news of the inevitable and unavoidable began to arrive. When the results of Kerensky's war adventure became clear in its whole extent, they had to stand aside. Let the socialist fools sit there as "those who are responsible"! Was it possible to think out a better way of discrediting them?

Using as a pretext their disapproval of the resolution of Kerensky, Zeretelli and Tereshchenko with regard to the Ukrainian question (these Ministers were working towards union with the Ukrainian Central Rada), the Cadets left the

Government in a body. The only one remaining was Nekrassov, who seceded from the Cadet party. Prince Lvov declared that the Ukrainian question was merely an excuse and that the real reason was to be found... in the want of harmony between the socialist and bourgeois points of view.

The resignation of the Cadets revealed the true value of the Cadets' phrase about "sacrifices for the benefit of the fatherland" etc. At the decisive moment, they carried their sabotage of the State to the utmost limit. "They threw themselves into the camp of the enemies of the revolution", wrote the "Isvestija", without understanding that it was a case of a deep-laid and long-prepared plan of operation.

("From the Fall of Tsarism to the Fall of the Bourgeoisie.")

Chronicle of Events.

July 8th.

At the Trade Union Conference, the Menshevik Kolzov reported on the economic fight. He said that at the present time an attack on capital was undesirable and impossible. It would be wrong even to dream of a great strike campaign.

A great mass meeting of the whole garrison took place in Tiflis under Bolshevik banners and slogans. Bolshevik resolutions were passed unanimously.

July 9th.

Ukrainian organisations present a memorandum to the presiding body of the Soviet Executive, containing the following demands: that the Ukrainian General War Committee be recognised as a national authority; that the Ukrainian soldiers be grouped in special divisions; that the battalions on the march which consist of Ukrainian soldiers shall not be sent to the front except with the consent of the Ukrainian General War Committee.

Disturbances in Kiev in connection with the difficulties of the food supply.

July 10th.

The Soviet Executive sends Tcheidse, Dan and Liber to Finland to negotiate with the Seim and Finnish Social Democracy with regard to the relations between Finland and Russia.

July 11th.

Domiciliary visits to the warehouses and businesses in the whole of Petrograd. Large stores of hoarded foodstuffs are found.

End of the Trade Union Conference.

July 12th.

Annual Conference of the Bolshevik Party convened for the 7th August.

Results of the elections to the Moscow Town Duma: S. R. 116 seats, Mensheviks 24, Bolsheviks 23, Cadets 34 and Popular Socialists 3 seats.

July 13th.

Kerensky receives disturbing telegrams from Brussilov regarding the temper of the 5th Army, with the request that Skobelev and Lebedev, the Minister for the Navy, be sent to the army at once.

The 2nd Machine Gun Regiment protests against the offensive and demands the taking over of power by the Soviets.

July 14th.

Opening of the first Military Women's Congress. The congress decides to send a telegram of greeting to Kerensky and views a parade of the Women's battalion.

Skobelev and Lebedev examine the situation in the 5th Army. The commander of the army gives as the causes of the unrest among the soldiers the Bolshevik agitation and the circulation of the "Pravda" and the "Trench Pravda".

July 15th.

The Government adopts a declaration regarding the Ukrainian question.

The Ministers of the Cadet Party — with the exception of Nekrassov, the Minister for Transport — state as a reason for their resignation that the declaration abolishes all power of the government over the Ukraine.