

COMMUNIST PARTY *of* GREAT BRITAIN

PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT

A Short Course of Economic Science *by* **A. Bogdanoff**

Translated by J. Fineberg.

Paper 3s. 3d. Cloth 5s. 4d. Post free

•

The A B C of Communism

by **BUHARIN and PREOBRAJHENSKY**

Translated from the Russian by Eden and Cedar Paul. Second Complete Edition.

Paper 3s. 3d. Cloth 5s. 4d. Post free

•

The International Outlook

by **KARL RADEK**

24 pages 2d. Post free 2½d.

1s. 11d. per dozen post free

•

Order from *The Communist Bookshop*
16 KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, W. C. 2

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

A Monthly Organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 16 King Street, Covent Garden, W. C. 2

EDITOR: THOS. BELL

BUSINESS MANAGER: THOMAS HINES

Volume 5

MARCH 1925

Number 11

C O N T E N T S

Editorial View - - - - -	409
The Paris Commune <i>J. T. Murphy</i> - - - - -	415
The Wall of the Communards. Poem <i>L. A. Motler</i> -	420
The Economics of the World Opium Conference <i>Jack V. Leckie</i> - - - - -	421
The Employers' Offensive and How to Meet It <i>J. R. Campbell</i> - - - - -	426
Agricultural Problems in Russia. <i>P. Gu Rov</i> - - -	431
Links of October - - - - -	436
Trotsky and the Party - - - - -	446
Book Review - - - - -	457

Notice to Contributors, &c. M.S.S. and letters relating thereto should be addressed to Editor, COMMUNIST REVIEW, 16, King Street, W. C. 2.

Subscription Rates. HOME—Single copies, 6 months, 3s. 9d. postpaid. One year 7s. 0d. postpaid. ABROAD—Single copies 6 months 3s. 9d. One year 7s. 0d. postpaid. Home and Abroad—Bundle orders, 12 copies for 4s. 6d. postpaid, sale or return.

All business communications to Manager, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Editor : THOS. BELL

THE EDITORIAL VIEW

THE third round of the fight for international trade union unity has given the points to the Amsterdam reactionaries. The British delegation did well in remaining solid for the united world congress, and by their attitude, have earned the appreciation of the organised working class movement in Great Britain.

It would be futile for us to go all over the ground again as to the reasons which prompted the majority at Amsterdam to put "humiliating" terms to the Russian Trade Unions. To all who are acquainted with the international labour union movement, the career of Oudegeest, Jouhaux and Sassenbach speaks for itself. What is of practical moment for us is to get clear on the next steps to be taken. And these, we think, are quite easy to discern. *The immediate task before the whole trade union movement in this country is the realisation of the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Unity Committee.*

What is the importance of such a step? It means, first of all, that the declarations of the British and Russian trade unions as well as the sentiments expressed in many sections of our movement for unity, must become something other than mere words. There must be an organic connection between the British and the Russian trade unionists. With such an alliance we would have a lasting foundation for international working class unity. In the second place, with the establishment of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the task of defeating the reactionary elements of Amsterdam would be definitely advanced.

All the world knows that just as the British Labour Party is the keystone to the Second International, so British trade unionism affiliated as it is, through the General Council, is the keystone to Amsterdam. It is because of this that the entire bourgeois press is so wroth with the British delegation, and so anxious to split it by raising bogey cries of Communism. Moreover, given an Anglo-Russian alliance, the struggle for international unity would be greatly assisted in France, Czecho-Slovakia and other

countries where there are powerful "left" trade union elements fighting the Amsterdam reactionaries.

But while the formation of the Anglo-Russian committee is the next step in this country, for which support throughout the whole trade union movement must be mobilised, we must be clear on *what for*. It would be a mistake to look upon this unity committee as an end in itself. An Anglo-Russian committee in itself would be a mere ornament unless it had set before it some specific task. What is that task? Clearly its job is to realise a single front of the organised working class in every country to defeat the present international offensive of capitalism. This is the meaning of the demand for a world congress, and none other.

It is perhaps opportune to recall here that it is not the first time that the trade unions of Great Britain have been in the forefront of the movement for international unity. As far back as 1864, when the International Workingmen's Association was formed, the British trade unions played a leading role in its formation. Their association unfortunately, only contemplated very limited aims. The International, for them, was a means, not an end. They certainly had no revolutionary political ends, they had nothing in common with the revolutionary aims of, say Marx and Engels. This, we gather from a letter addressed to Engels by Marx, who declared expressly that the movement for electoral reform had killed the influence of the International in England, since, having secured the legality of the trade unions, the leaders had no further need of alliances with the working men of other countries, and gave their allegiance to the Liberals.

But a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since the collapse of the First International. Trade unionism in this country has had many tremendous experiences. It has passed through many industrial battles, victories and defeats. It has had its legal status questioned time after time, and seen the law twisted to suit the bourgeois class when occasion demanded. (Witness the Taff-Vale Railway decision, in the Osborne judgment, and the present attempt to revise the legal position of the unions in relation to the Labour Party.) It has built up a political Labour Party only to see it become the plaything of the Liberal and Tory parties it sought to destroy. Unmindful of the lessons of the First International, large sections of it still pursue the limited aims of its predecessors, in fighting for half-pennies and pennies in wages, and for changes in working conditions instead of concentrating its whole strength towards the revolutionary struggle for *political* power.

If the present urge for international unity is to avoid the

mistakes of the past, a number of preliminary essentials must be attended to. First, while striving for the goal of international unity, it is important to unite the ranks within the particular industries as closely as possible, and get rid of the overlapping and disunity that prevails in many of these at present. Unity in a single industry is essential for national unity. At the same time national unity without an international alliance can never effectively cope with modern imperialism whose tentacles reach everywhere. That is the strongest reason why the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee should be pushed forward with all possible speed.

But even International Trade Union unity is nothing if it does not serve as an aid to the working class in its struggles against the *political* domination of their exploiters. We see before our eyes at present, a violent reaction of the bourgeoisie bent on maintaining by brutal force its power to exploit the great mass of the toilers. The international of the working class must go beyond the limited aims of wage battles, the prevention of black-legging in industrial disputes, and the mere regulation of labour conditions. It must aim at taking political power out of the hands of the capitalists and imperialists. In other words, it must try to realise the federation of workers' republics on the basis of common ownership and working class control over all the industries and means of life. That is the ultimate goal of a real working class international.

* * * * *

From the reports which have appeared in the official organ of the I.L.P. of the several Divisional Conferences held during the month, it is evident that the I.L.P. is not in a very good state of health. The *New Leader* tries to gloss over the internal problems of the party by bold headlines of what the party is going to do, and announcing from time to time the formation or resurrection of new branches, much on the lines of the ordinary company promoter. One is left to read between the lines as to what is the actual position, but from a perusal of the Divisional Conference reports there can be no doubt as to the existence of two definite political currents within the Party. One, the political careerist type which is out to exploit the I.L.P.'s associations with the Labour Party as the best means of securing parliamentary promotion, the other, the genuine proletarian section, which is honestly striving against capitalism, and which has been caught with the specious and rhetorical arguments of the party propagandists. The former is the parliamentary, opportunist element, comprising all kinds of ex-liberals and intellectuals, bent on

maintaining its position as a leading *fraction* within the Labour Party, shaping its policy and direction while securing for the I.L.P. leading party positions of influence. The latter, the proletarian section, with little time for parliamentary niceties and the buffoonery of the would-be statesmen and pacifists.

Perhaps the best illustration of what we mean, when we speak of these two currents within the I.L.P. is to be found in the circumstances which attended the anti-monarchist outburst of Mr. Kirkwood in the House of Commons upon the Prince of Wales. In this incident, Kirkwood undoubtedly sounded the true proletarian note in charging the bourgeoisie with using the Prince as a clown and showman. Perhaps a more apt description of the young man's occupation would be *commercial traveller to the British Empire*, for there is little doubt that all his little pleasure trips are invariably combined with business.

Thus, referring to the prospective visit of the Prince to the Argentine, the *Sunday Times* for February 8th, in its leading article points out that capital investments in the Argentine are round about £600,000,000. From the standpoint of imperialism with such powerful interests involved, the sum voted for the Prince's excursion is a mere bagatelle. The importance of Kirkwood's outburst, however, lies more in the sound working class instinct which prompted him to the attack than in anything he said.

But what of Ramsay MacDonald, Philip Snowden and the other prominent I.L.P.'ers who voted with the Tory Government? Judged from the standpoint of the Socialist movement to which the I.L.P. is traditionally attached, a movement which has always been republican in principle, MacDonald and those who voted against Kirkwood, have now openly declared for the monarchy. Having proclaimed this, what is the I.L.P. going to do about it? Does the party accept the anti-monarchism of Kirkwood, Wheatley, Maxton and Johnston, *i.e.*, the republicanism of Socialism, or does it stand for the monarchism of MacDonald, Snowden and Pensonby?

Clearly there are two antagonistic currents in the party, one proletarian and anti-capitalist, another, purely parliamentary and bourgeois. This is the answer to the query put by the *New Leader* in its issue of February 13th, *viz.*, "What's wrong with the Divisions?" (Divisions of the I.L.P.). This is the real meaning of the large votes at the Scottish and Welsh Conferences in favour of Communist Party affiliation to the Labour Party. This is the real explanation of the over-loading of the agendas of the Midland, North-East, and Southern Divisional Conferences with

"Left-wing" resolutions. It is the class struggle within the I.L.P.

At all these conferences, young enthusiastic proletarians were struggling to express themselves against the snobbery and bourgeois respectability of the MacDonalds and the Snowdens. They had come into the I.L.P. believing they were joining a party that is out to fight capitalism. Instead, they find the party under the influence of romanticism and pacifism totally unrelated to the realities of the class struggle, and of professional politicians from the Liberal Party.

So long as the I.L.P. continues the policy of trying to beat the bourgeoisie at running governments on capitalist lines it can bring nothing but disappointment and confusion into the ranks of the working class army. That is why the Communist Party makes its special appeal to every working man and working woman inside the I.L.P. to join up with the Communist Party and help to build up a genuine working class organisation determined to fight capitalism and all its institutions every inch of the way.

* * * * *

This month marks the 54th anniversary of the Paris Commune, when, for the first time in the history of the modern working class movement, the workers of Paris tried to set up a Socialist republic. The Commune will always be revered by every militant in the workers' movement for its heroic attempt to break through the rule of the capitalists, and to wrest the political power out of their hands. Many lessons are to be learned from the mistakes and successes of the Communards.

In an informative article on another page of this issue, by Comrade J. T. Murphy, the reader will find a number of apt illustrations of these lessons and parallels which have a very important relation to the recent events in the trade union and political labour movement.

Not the least important lesson from the Commune is its demonstration as to the depths of cruelty and savagery to which the bourgeoisie are capable of descending, when their property and power is really endangered. From the Communards, the capitalist class exacted a toll of nearly 100,000 lives. The stories of how this butchery was carried out may be read in the capitalist papers of the period should any of our readers think we are in any way trying to colour events in 1871.

On the other hand, the white terror now raging in Bulgaria, Esthonia, Poland, Jugo-Slavia and in Germany, shows how unalterable is the bestial nature of capitalism, and how futile it is

to hope to change its nature by "appeals to reason" or "democracy."

The supreme lesson of the Commune is that the bourgeoisie will adopt any and every measure to maintain its power from hiring criminal provocateurs and individual assassination to wholesale slaughter. Therefore the alternatives before the working class are, either the dictatorship of the proletariat, or the dictatorship of capitalism. But, as the Commune has demonstrated, a strong centralised Communist Party is indispensable to ensure the success of the dictatorship of the working class.

Every militant should turn this month to the graphic pages of Lassagary's "History of the Commune," and Marx's "Civil War in France." He will find in the story of the Commune the precursor to the glorious Russian Revolution of 1917, which derived much of its inspiration and guidance from the successes, defeats and examples of heroism of the workingmen and women of Paris of 1871; he will find the justification for the Communist International, the incarnation of all the Commune stood for.



The Paris Commune of 1871

(Some Parallels and Lessons)

ON March 18th, millions of workers throughout the world will recall the heroic days of the Paris Commune of 1871. Amongst these millions, increasing thousands of workers in this country may be numbered. We reverently join this throng, who now see in the Paris Commune the first great historic flashlight on the proletarian road to power. For the first time the workers seized power and exercised a dictatorship. But the lessons of this experience have been too often obscured in our commemorations by the memory of the horror inflicted on the workers by the counter-revolution. This horror we can never forget, nor shall we ever fail to do homage to the men and women who fought against overwhelming odds. The horror we shall strive to avenge. Our homage, we must translate into an emulation of the will to fight manifested by the Communards. But they will not be avenged, nor will our emulation be of avail if we fail to study the *causes* of the defeat of the Commune.

Since the Paris Commune, there have been three Russian revolutions, besides the German revolution, and the numerous revolutionary risings in other countries of Europe. There is, therefore, a vast amount of concrete revolutionary experience to enable us to draw historical parallels. But, we can see in our own experience in Britain, characteristic phases of the class war, which are illuminated by the experiences of the Commune, then, history will speak to us with authority, and the anniversary of the martyrdom of the Communards be transformed into a call to revolutionary work.

The two outstanding weaknesses of the Commune which overwhelm all others in importance are—the lack of central leadership, and the failure to regard the war upon the bourgeoisie as a military task, as well as a political one. Practically all other weaknesses can be traced to these two fundamental weaknesses. The second, that of the role of force is dependent upon the clear recognition of the first. Let us see.

The Paris Commune was the product of the military defeat of the French by the Germans in 1870. There preceded the

Commune the declaration of a republic in which the working men of Paris played a conspicuous role. Marx declares in his immortal work "The Civil War in France" (which should be studied over and over again) that there was not a single dissentient voice throughout France. Working men and peasants, as well as bourgeois, were in accord. But in the midst of this turmoil, wherein class forces broke free from their grooves, the ruling class at all costs sought to save itself while the others were not sure what they ought to do. The months between September, 1870, and March, 1871, are months of deepening chaos. The ruling class, corrupt and rotten to the core, was steadily losing its hold, but the proletariat had no party, no leadership, which understood the nature of civil war. The most they had were the beginnings of trade unionism, and those associated with its leadership could only think in terms of loose mass organisations, and these, more local than national.

The peasants were still worse off, being more parochial, less capable of national organisation. Thus, proletariat and peasantry alike were dependent on elemental movements. Forced by suffering and outrageous floutings of every instinct, national and class, they could outrise, but—when they rose—they were totally dependent upon leadership rising spontaneously, too. This kind of leadership is all right, but it won't win the class war for the workers, and especially when the leadership conducts parliamentary debates when it should be at the barricades.

This is the actual history of the Commune.

The working men of Paris rose *en masse*. So also did the working men in a number of other towns. They took the reins of power, then formed their workers' council—the Commune. The mass action was a sound instinctive response to the needs of the situation, but it lacked clarity and purpose. There was no party leadership concentrating within itself the interests of the proletariat; no party acting promptly and with decision. While the composition of the Commune shows that it was proletarian to the fullest degree in social make up, it did not undersand its tasks. It formulated, it talked, it even went in for "democratic elections." It permitted Thiers and his forces to retreat to Versailles to re-organise and prepare the counter-revolution, and to cut off Paris from the peasantry. Thiers was enabled to negotiate with Bismarck in the smashing of working men's Paris. Everything cried aloud for prompt action, for the exercise of a dictatorship, for single leadership, and for military measures to prevent the gathering counter-revolution. But the one fundamental

pre-requisite for these things was missing. *There was no party of the proletariat, no Communist Party.*

What bearing it may be asked, has this on the situation here? Let us see. At the present moment we are in the midst of a developing offensive against the workers, led by the most reactionary government of modern times. The miners are faced with a critical situation, and are calling for the help of the railway workers and the transport workers. The railway employers have tabled a programme of demands. The railway employers have tabled counter demands. The engineering workers have for nine months been negotiating for a £1 per week advance, and are faced with a flat refusal. The postal workers have met the same fate. The transport workers are faced with militarisation proposals. It is admitted on all sides that not a single one of these organised bodies of workers can win out on their own. Yet, the leaders of all these organisations are fearful of united action. They are hiding behind craft union constitutions, and praying that the workers will wait for the next elections.

Still the miners do not want to fight alone. 1921 comes back vividly to their minds, if it ever left them. This lonely fight, supported only to the end by the small Communist Party, was lonely only because the leaders of the other organisations and some of the miners' leaders too, saw the implications of united action, and shrank back from the challenge to the State power of capitalism. Their slowness to come to the miners' aid now or even to line up together for the demands already agreed upon, is due to the fact that they also remember 1921, and still funk the challenge. Torn by social-democratic theories, preferring to talk instead of to act, they will only go into a fight when pushed and then will forever be studying how to secure a stoppage of the fight, instead of a victory of the workers.

The *will* to united action is not there in the leadership, nor is it organised in the ranks of the trade unionists. The Party of the proletariat, the Communist Party, is still too small. It does not yet unite the revolutionary workers in the unions, and the factories. It has not yet secured the organic leadership of the mass organisation of labour. With what result? Just as the counter revolutionary forces facing the Paris Commune could manœuvre, could prepare forces for action while the council talked, so the capitalist class of this country can out-manœuvre the divided labour forces, and prepare to crush the workers when they are driven to mass action without a party to lead, and answer blow for blow.

Carry the development of this situation one stage further. Presume that the miners, railwaymen, transport workers, etc., do bring their unions together for common action. At once the days before Black Friday are repeated. The leadership is the same. Its arguments, its apologies, we have heard, and would hear again. Only a revolutionary party can face such a situation pregnant with the elements of a revolutionary crisis.

The Paris Commune of 1871 proclaimed in deeds to the workers of the world that a proletariat cannot deal with its revolutionary tasks without a Communist Party. The crisis of 1921 in Britain proclaimed the same lesson. 1925 re-emphasises that the proletariat which faces again the hours of crisis in the war with capitalism without a mass Communist Party is doomed to further smashing defeats with their accompanying blood-letting of the workers.

The latter sequel was most vividly and terribly illustrated by the Paris Commune itself. Surely no one can read of those days without feeling bitter anguish that the workers were so tolerant to their class enemies, so believing in the goodness of human nature. Marx writes, "From the 18th of March to the entrance of the Versailles troops into Paris, the proletarian revolution remained so free from the acts of violence in which the revolution, and still more the counter-revolutions, of the "better classes" abound, that no facts were left to its opponents to cry out about, but the execution of Generals Lecomte and Clement Thomas, and the affair of the Place Vendome."

But sentimental humanness in the hour of crisis with enemies all around means also revolutionary passivity, which plays into the hands of the butchers of counter revolution. The call to arms, to military endeavour, came too late. The heroism was called to the front weeks after the vital days had passed. Revolutionary energy which comes too late is no compensation for leadership that did not see the right moment in which to strike. And oh, what a price! Postgate declares that Marx's estimate of the losses inflicted upon the proletariat are far too moderate, and states that 100,000 Parisian workers were lost to France through the agency of Thiers, the leader of the counter-revolution.

Again, it may be asked what has this to do with Britain? In recent weeks, the Labour Press, and especially the *Daily Herald*, has contained the declarations of leaders of the Labour movement in reply to the question "what should a Labour Government do in the event of a national strike in 'essential services'?" Not a single leader faced the real role of a Labour Government. Not one pointed out that immediately a Labour

Government attacks the vested interests of capitalism, it passes from the stage of Parliamentary conversations to violent conflict with the ruling class.

Mr. J. R. Clynes said the Government must govern, and could not become a partisan of the workers—in other words, break the strike by force. Mr. Wedgwood declared the Government must maintain essential services, must feed the people, in short, break the strike by force, and a Labour Government would be better able to do it because it was on familiar and friendly terms with the trade union leaders! Mr. Bramley dodged the issue and so did Mr. Swales, and a number of others.

But Mr. George Lansbury publicly exposed the Labour Government as a strike-breaker, revealed its plan to break the railway strike in 1924, and told us how Colonel Wedgwood was placed in charge of the job. He went further and told us how the decision of the General Council and the Labour Party in calling upon the Government to take over the concerns involved, by use of the Emergency Powers Act, and pay the wages demanded by the workers was ignored by the Labour Government. Then with his characteristic hatred of all violence, he faced the Labour movement with only a moral tirade against force, in short, left the workers helpless before the organised power of the State, repeating in perspective the historic tragedy of the Commune.

We all have a deep affection for Comrade Lansbury, and admire him as a great agitator, but a sermon in the hour of deadly crisis, when power is the arbiter, is fraught with terrible calamity for the working class. Then the workers need a single, powerfully organised, audacious leadership, and not sentimental appeals.

At no time in the history of the British working class movement have these fundamental lessons of the Paris Commune been more important than now. Had the Parisian workers been led by a powerful Communist Party, how different history would have been written? What working class lives might have been saved by the swift disarmament of the bourgeoisie, what a change could have been wrought by a party with its roots deeply and widely spread in every town and city! But it was not so. Its revolutionary history is written. Ours has still to be made, and every phase of the struggle to-day cries aloud for the lessons of the Commune to be applied. Remember the Commune and speed the building of a mass Communist Party in Britain, that the Commune's temporary triumphs may be our permanent victories, and its tragic defeats may be avenged.

J. T. MURPHY.

The Wall of the Communards

Pere Lachaise.

*Nothing. A wall. But for each ominous denture
A worker's life, fast as each bullet sped,
Laid at your feet its calycanth of red,
O living Commune, desperate, glorious venture;
Round you their heart's blood girt a sanguine ceinture
And on your hair a crimson crown was spread,
Yet of the cause of these uncounted dead,
Fate hath not written, doubting, "Peradventure!"*

*Sure as the morrow's rising of the sun,
Sure as the snowdrop's striving through the snows,
Sure as the green bud burgeons to the rose,
Winter to Spring, and night its course shall run,
And hell in vain Eurydice shall keep,
Their heart's blood watered what our scythe shall reap.*

L. A. MOTLER.

Economics of the World Opium Conference

ON Dec. 16th, the World Opium Conference, after six weeks abortive discussion, adjourned until 12th Jan., 1925, to allow the various delegates, representing 37 different countries an opportunity to consult their respective governments. The dispute involves two things; one, the regulation, the other, the abolition of the world opium traffic, the principal antagonists being America versus the British Government in India. America stands for the restriction of the drug traffic to the *scientific and medical* needs of the world; the British stands for the regulation of the trade on the basis of the world's *legitimate* needs.

Already at the Hague in 1912, an international opium conference agreed upon the following points:

- (1) The suppression of opium smoking;
- (2) The restriction of exports and imports of prepared opium to opium smoking countries;
- (3) The adoption of measures for the suppression of the illegal cultivation of the poppy in China.

Towards the conclusion of the Versailles Peace Treaty Conference, the articles of the Hague Opium Convention (1912) were included in the Covenant of the League of Nations. In subsequent conventions—notably 1922, Great Britain, in spite of America's protest, successfully induced the League to interpret the Hague Articles as meaning *legitimate*, as opposed to *scientific and medical needs*. America stated that this constituted a complete perversion of the original intention, and in 1923 requested that a world conference should be held again in 1924, when the matter could be thrashed out to a more satisfactory conclusion.

As regards the Articles of the Hague Convention, it has been found in practice that they have been outrageously flouted by *all* the chief signatories. The prohibition against the export and import of *prepared* opium was simply got over by exporting and importing *raw* opium.

In the 1924 Conference, India supported by England, France, Portugal, Switzerland, Germany, etc., was the chief opponent of

America, who, in turn, was supported by China, Japan, Persia, Canada, Irish Free State, etc.

As India has since been condemned for her opposition to America, it is necessary at this juncture to clearly understand the extent of her responsibility. In 1919, she won a form of so-called self-government which functions in two parts (1) the Central government has control over the army, navy, air fleet, central police, salt tax, income tax, post, railroads, etc., and the right of "*control over the cultivation of the poppy, together with the manufacture, sale and export of opium;*" and (2) the Provincial Government, which controls education, fisheries, forestry, etc., and excise . . . By virtue of the fact that England appoints 33 per cent. of the Assembly, and also that the English-appointed Governor-General, with the assent of the King, has absolute power in India, *it can be clearly seen that the attitude of India's English delegates at the Conference was in reality the attitude of the British Government in India.*

Not only is Tagore and Ghandi opposed to the traffic, but the Swarajists, also. If Britain were sincerely anxious to remove the traffic she has the power to enact in India the same Dangerous Drug Acts which protect the people of England, and which have also been adopted by all the self-governing Dominions. "*As it is, every Oriental country subject to European control—China, Siam, India, etc.—has to submit to standards, which, on the threat of heavy penalties, have already been excluded from the conquerors' own territory.*" (*Ethics of Opium—Ellen N. La Motte.*)

In India, the entire cultivation of the poppy (220,991 acres in 1921-22) together with the manufacture, sale and export is a government monopoly. During the six years ending 1921, India supplemented her home production of 45,802 chests (each 140 lbs.) with an additional 41,369 chests from Malwa and the native states—a grand total of 4,786 tons. In 1919-20, there were 17,000 shops selling intoxicating drugs, of which 6,394 were opium shops where 360-540 grains could be purchased at one time. (4 grains are fatal to a person unused to opium). The per capita consumption with a population of 319 millions equalled 26 grains. Although the opium revenue in 1921 only equalled 3 per cent. of the total revenues, of this £3,728,000 went direct to the Central Government, and £10,162,000 to the Local Government. Of the latter sum an unspecified amount was deducted for the Central Government.

The British possessions of the unfederated Malay States (Johore, Kelantan, Trengganu, Perlis and Kedah) have a combined

area of 22,700 sq. miles, and a population of 1,203,000 of which 179,000 are Chinese. In Trengganu (1917), the revenue surplus over expenditure was 114,145 dollars. *The opium revenue for the same period was 117,145 dollars, which shows that the opium revenue was more than responsible for the entire surplus.* The official Blue Books for 1919 state that the increase in the opium revenue from 166,000 dollars in 1914 to 762,000 dollars in 1919, resulted from placing the traffic under Government control. In Kedah, the total revenue for the five years ending 1921 was 26 million dollars, of which 11 million dollars were from opium. The total expenditure in the same period was 20 millions. In Perlis, of a total revenue of 443,441 dollars, 171,554 was opium revenue; the total expenditure being 277,993 dollars.

The per capita consumption of opium in the unfederated States based on the Chinese population reaches the appalling figure of 17,480 grains—a fantastic result which utterly destroys the argument that the stuff is alone for the Chinese population. These figures not only demonstrate the swindle of Government control, but they also clearly show that the natives in the interest of financial surpluses are systematically poisoned, and that the means for a huge profitable illicit trade involving smuggling and price extortions, exists.

In these unfederated states, as in North Borneo (operated by a British Chartered Company), Brunei and Sarawak (totalling over 330,000 sq. miles with an approximate population of 900,000) the real reason for the opium traffic is strikingly identical. The natives in these areas are in many instances physically unable to undertake the heavy rigours connected with oil drilling, mining, rubber planting, etc. *Consequently "recreations"—officially so termed, involving State opium traffic, State gambling hells, and government controlled pawnbroking—are undertaken as a means to attract immigrant Chinese labour.*

The problem in Persia is quite otherwise. Here Britain holds the State opium revenues, among other things, as security for a debt totalling £92,000,000. It is an instructive sidelight on capitalist hypocrisy to recall that, at the moment Persia was signing the Conditions of the 1912 Hague Opium Conference, which she never ratified, *Britain was simultaneously loaning to her money on the strength of the opium revenues referred to.*

For the three years beginning 1919, Persia produced 162 tons, 149 tons and 162 tons (Persian opium contains 12 per cent. morphine as against 8 per cent. morphine in Indian opium), and in the same period Britain purchased 133 tons, 90 tons and 121 tons respectively. A striking commentary upon the extent of

Britain's drug industries. Russia's opium imports from Persia dropped from 300,872 lbs. in 1917, to 32,826 lbs. in 1921.

Since 1843, when Britain defeated China and compelled her at the point of the bayonet to throw her doors open to the import of Indian opium, the situation—excepting the noble effort of 1907-1917, has intensely become worse. Britain from Hong-Kong, Portugal from Macas (where the opium State rights (1920) were sold to a private company for an annual payment of 3,900,000 dollars), France from Indo-China, Japan and until recently America also, have and still continue to profitably debauch China and her people. As a result, China joins suicide with murder. The China Year Book (1924) estimates that China herself produces annually not less than 20 million lbs. of opium. Dr. Wu Lien (*Pekin Times*, 1920) gave publicity to the still more appalling statement that the imports of morphia increased from 5½ tons in 1911 to 22½ tons in 1918.

The United States, also, has a huge drug problem. The State Treasury estimates that there exists over one million drug addicts. Independent authorities, however, place the figure as high as four millions. Leading criminologists state that 60 per cent. to 100 per cent. of the inmates of reformatories and some prisons are drug addicts. Of these 90 per cent. are heroin addicts. This drug can be easily smuggled. The life of the heroin addict averages 22 years. One dose for six successive days makes an addict; one ounce is sufficient to make 2,000 such addicts within a week. It practically destroys all moral or social responsibility, and is responsible for a large part of America's annual 3,000 million dollar crime and prevention of crime costs. The United States (1910-15) consumed four times more drugs than the combined totals of Britain, France, Italy and Germany. This means for America's high capitalistic development a great danger.

The interests of America in the opium problem, however, is not fully explained by these important domestic difficulties. There are two reasons for its conflict with European nations over the Far East. First, the successful solution of the American drug problem is dependent upon the successful solution of the opium traffic in the Orient, and second, *China is the largest and best country wherein the United States can invest its surplus wealth and develop new markets.*

It is precisely at this point that English and American interests clash most. Each country represents a different level of development; each is historically compelled to employ different methods. Britain generations ago first penetrated the East in search of markets. Her wars with China were on behalf of the

Indian opium trade, and British shipping. She cannot without serious damage to herself, or ruin, follow new paths.

On the other hand, the roots of the American drug problem are in the East. Further, American capital means American methods. In the United States, the interest of American capital finds it necessary to heavily fence American labour with anti-drug laws. Much more so in China—American capital finds similar protection is necessary: though the successful enactment and operation of such protection will prove more difficult than in America. *Chinese Labour with American dollars to spend on European manufactured drugs would react too seriously against America's large-scale intentions in China, and would rapidly and ultimately destroy the living foundation of every investment.*

The means of warfare employed by the principal adversaries are also instructive. Britain democratically shelters behind the alleged self-government of India. The United States, through Rockefeller's supported church efforts and Morgan's subsidised Red Cross, works altruistically in the best Wilsonian spirit for the good of China alone. The truth is—each require China for their own special purposes. The destruction of the opium trade in the East means for England—a huge loss of revenue and Chinese labour with the probability of revolution in India. America demands an international guarantee that Chinese labour will not be doped and destroyed by Indian opium or French, British, German or Japanese manufactured morphine, heroin or cocaine. *Neither country is seriously interested in China for China's sake. In other words, the opium conflict over China is at this moment a beautiful illustration of the conflict between different levels of capitalist development.*

JACK, V. LECKIE.

The Employers' Offensive and How to Meet It

THE Labour unrest amongst the workers is undoubtedly growing and even the capitalist press is looking forward to the possibility of heavy struggles before the year is over. In some quarters of the Labour Movement the situation is being compared to that existing between the Armistice and Black Friday, when the organised workers were full of fight and pressing forward everywhere for increases in their wages. There is indeed a superficial resemblance between the present situation and that existing prior to Black Friday. Nevertheless, they are not altogether similar.

During the years between 1919-1921, the situation was on the whole favourable to the workers. Unemployment over most of this period was almost non-existent. Not only the workers but even the employers for a time had an exaggerated idea of the strength of the Labour Movement. The employers during this period were everywhere on the retreat being prepared to grant temporary concessions lest worse should befall them. That section of the Labour leadership which is most closely in touch with the employers, and which normally acts as a channel for the expression of the opinions of the employing class in the Labour Movement, devoted most of its strength to breaking the full force of the workers' drive by taking steps to discourage mass movements and by strongly urging the workers to participate in Joint Councils, etc., with the employers, and so raise their standard of life without indulging in mass struggle.

EMPLOYERS PREPARING ATTACK.

The situation to-day is somewhat different. There are still over a million unemployed, and the strength of the unions is not nearly so great as it was previous to Black Friday. Although the workers in the principal industries are demanding increases in wages, the employers are not prepared to give ground, even temporarily, as they were in the years immediately following the Armistice. So far from giving ground, the employers, under the pressure of foreign competition, are moving forward to attack the wages and conditions of the workers.

The metal workers' application for an increase in wages has been turned down, the National Wages Board will probably refuse

to consider the All-Grades Programme of the N.U.R. as a whole, while the mineowners at the present moment are openly scouting the possibility of any increase in wages to the miners.

In this situation the right-wing trade union leaders are working desperately to prevent the unity of the working class in the struggle. At every possible opportunity they are fulminating against the Minority Movement, and its efforts to secure unity. They are not acting as in 1919-20 to prevent the workers' full strength being exerted against the capitalists in retreat, but are endeavouring to demoralise the working class to such an extent that the capitalists will be able to get their blow in before the workers are ready and to gain a smashing victory.

NO LEFT LEAD.

In this situation no lead is coming to the workers from any trade union officials, with the possible exception of Mr. A. J. Cook. While the right wing have been vocal in their attacks on the Minority Movement, the trade union leaders of "Left" tendencies on the General Council and elsewhere have not given any lead to the workers as to what they should do in the impending struggles.

There is no doubt that the "left-wing" union leaders are working fairly hard in other directions. They are pushing forward the idea of international unity, they are endeavouring to bring about more union amalgamations, and to give the trades councils a more definite status in the Labour Movement. Left-wing leadership, however, cannot concern itself purely with question as to how the trade union movement should be organised to-morrow. It must face the struggle as it is developing to-day, and give the working class the lead in that struggle. It is a grave weakness for the left-wing to remain silent when issues of capital importance are before the working class.

It is true that, if any of the left-wing leaders, either through the General Council, or, as individuals, ventured to make any suggestions as to how to deal with the situation confronting the workers at the present time, their action would be widely resented by large numbers of trade union officials.

The tradition which exists among the trade union leadership that each official should look after his own union and leave the business of other unions to be conducted by the properly elected officials, is still very strong in the British Labour Movement. It is, nevertheless, an evil tradition and must be fought against. We have passed the stage when each union could consider its special problems in isolation from all others. We have reached the

stage when the situation demands that the position of the working class movement in relation to its struggle against capitalism should be considered as a whole, and it is, therefore, to be hoped that the silence of the left-wing as to what should be done in the impending struggles will soon be broken.

THE RANK AND FILE OUTLOOK.

Among the rank and file there is seething discontent. It is, however, unlike the discontent of 1919-20. The discontent of 1919-20 was a discontent mixed with hope; one might almost say with an exaggerated faith in the power of labour organisation to extract concessions from the employing class. The discontent existing at the present time is a discontent mixed with pessimism. The defeats following Black Friday have had their effect. However great the worker is in rebellion against existing conditions, he feels that his union and all the unions in his industry are much weaker than they were and the chance of gaining concessions by isolated action is almost nil.

The problem before those who desire to see effective struggle on the part of the working class is how to dispel the pessimism which exists among the discontented workers. We believe that it is possible to dispel this pessimism, if we can convince the workers that while they are weak acting in isolation they can be strong if they combine their movements against the capitalist class. In this connection the efforts of the Minority Movement to put before the discontented workers a practical method of struggle is of the very highest importance. Briefly, the principles of the Minority Movement are, that the large industries which are putting in a demand for higher wages should combine their forces and take strike action at the same time, giving each other a mutual guarantee that no section shall make an agreement until all have been satisfied. It would, of course, have been better from the theoretical point of view to have had the main industries striking together for the same common demand, and if we were facing a situation which had not yet been developed, and where we could influence the character of the demands as well as the character of the organisation to secure those demands, there would be good grounds for advocating a common wage claim as well as common action to secure the demands.

However, we have got to take the trade union machinery as it is, and as the demands have already been formulated and the likelihood of their being revised is remote, we have got to concentrate all our power upon securing common action on behalf of the demands already formulated.

THE MINORITY PLAN.

In pursuance of this plan, the Minority Movement has written to the General Council of the Trades Union Congress asking them to take steps to bring the mining, railway and metal unions together for a common struggle. It has also written the Executives of these Unions asking them to take similar steps. The Minority Movement realised, however, that its plan of campaign is unlikely to be realised unless great popular pressure can be exerted upon the officials. When aggressive action is in question, the average trade union official is a follower rather than a leader and will not take any steps off the beaten path unless he is convinced that there is an overwhelming weight of rank and file opinion in favour of those steps. The Minority Movement is, therefore, suggesting that the rank and file should get busy in the districts, form local solidarity committees of miners, railwaymen and metal workers, which shall popularise the idea of joint action. These local committees will endeavour particularly to interest the District Committees of the unions concerned.

WHAT TRADES COUNCILS CAN DO.

In past industrial crises it has been exceedingly difficult for the rank and file to exert their full weight in bringing pressure upon the officials. They have now, however, an opportunity which they never previously had. That opportunity is afforded by the Conferences of Trades Councils which are going to take place all over the country. These trades councils conferences have been called by the General Council to discuss the relations of the trades councils to the general Labour movement, and current trade union problems.

These Conferences must not, however, degenerate into conferences discussing purely organisational questions. The trades councils must use their influence to bring pressure upon the leaders to line the workers up for united action against the capitalist class. From their very structure, the trades councils representing, as they do, all sections of the working class are well qualified for this task.

It will be claimed, of course, that the question of mobilising the workers for the struggle does not come within the purview of the trades councils, but is purely a question for the individual trade unions. The trades councils delegates would, however, be well advised to treat this point of view as a sectional and departmentalist one which cannot be countenanced at the present stage when the whole working class is menaced by the power and

aggressiveness of the capitalist class. They must put in the forefront of their tasks the question of how united action can be secured and, secondly, the relations of the struggle going on at home to the struggles abroad.

The employing class have asserted that they are faced with intensified competition abroad, and that the only way out is to lower wages. No trade unionist will accept the employers' way out, but they will have to face the fact that the employers' statements about intensified competition is in the main correct, and if they reject the employers' way out they will have to find the working class way out. The working class way out is via international trade union unity, and the struggle against the Dawes Plan which is now having, as the Communist Party predicted months ago, detrimental effects on the working class standard of life. The work of preparing the workers for struggle through the unions, the local solidarity committees of the trades councils, is one which calls for better organisation among the active rank and file.

The Communist Party has very responsible work to accomplish in the present situation. Last autumn it predicted the development of heavy industrial trouble, and clearly outlined the steps that the workers should take to meet that trouble. It is our belief that the policy put forward by the Communist Party is the only policy which can meet the situation. That policy has to be driven home to the workers by every Party member. Where sympathisers are supporting the Party in the trade union branches and are not prepared to come into the Party as members, endeavours should be made to organise them in a minority group linked up with the National Minority Movement. The factory groups must be developed as speedily as possible because the Party message must be carried not merely to the active men in the trade union branches, but also to the masses in the workshops who never go near a trade union branch. In this connection the development of factory papers, the holding of factory gate meetings, has become a matter of immediate practical importance.

In a period of industrial struggle like this, the C.P. above all other parties, will be able by its leadership and the devotion of its members in the actual struggle to prove that it is the real Party of the working class capable of leading them to victory.

J. R. CAMPBELL.

Agricultural Problems in Russia

THE fortunes of the Russian Revolution are closely tied up with the solution of the fundamental questions of the Russian village. The October Revolution wiped out all the semi-feudal survivals, giving all the land to the toiling peasantry and abolishing the power of the landlords for ever.

But in a speech delivered on May 22, 1917, before the All-Russian Congress of peasants' deputies, Comrade Lenin said, among other things: "*It is impossible to eat the land. In order to cultivate the land, one must have the implements, cattle, appliances, and money. Without implements there can be no cultivation.*"

These terse and clear words define the whole content of the urgent questions of our village life. *The Soviet Government must solve the problem of supplying the necessary agricultural implements to the peasants who got the land from the landlords.*

Agriculture plays a very important part in the economy of the U.S.S.R.; more than one-half of the national income is derived from peasant agriculture.

Hence it stands to reason that the question of the reconstruction, consolidation and development of peasant agriculture should be tackled first of all, because on this development depends the development of industry, and the entire material and cultural power of the Soviet Union.

Hence the question arises, what do we observe just now in regard to the growth of the productive forces of the village?

We undoubtedly observe a *steady and invariable growth of these productive forces*: the area under cultivation is increased year by year, and in the last economic year of 1924 it reached 90 per cent. of the pre-war dimensions (about 80 million dessiatins).

Especially worthy of note is *the growth of the area under special cultivation*. We have here an increased area under hemp, sugar-beets, cotton, sunflower seeds, potatoes, etc.

The dynamics of this growth are illustrated in the following table:

Years	Sunflower dess.	Flax dess.	Hemp dess.	Cotton dess.	Sugar-Beets dess.
1913 ...	820,000	1,100,000	650,000	800,000	700,000
1922 ...	1,750,000	420,000	120,000	40,000	150,000
1923 ...	1,800,000	500,000	390,000	200,000	225,000
1924 ...	1,925,000	650,000	525,000	420,000	300,000

The growth of the area under cultivation year by year was accompanied by a *corresponding increase in the herds of cattle* which may be seen from the following table :

Years	Horses	Large cattle	Sheep & goats	pigs
1916	28,000,000	50,000,000	83,000,000	19,000,000
1923	19,000,000	38,000,000	56,000,000	9,000,000
1924	23,000,000	45,000,000	65,000,000	17,000,000

There is no doubt that agriculture is being restored at a rapid pace, and that in the next few years (if there is no complication in the international situation) it will surpass all pre-war standards.

What part will be played by this growth of peasant agriculture in the development of Russian industry ?

The growth of the economic power of the country, and the consequent rise in the purchasing power of the Russian village, will necessarily be accompanied by the growth of the *internal market*, which will present colossal demands for the products of the urban industries.

If in capitalist Russia the metallurgical industry worked on behalf of the army and navy for the strategic railways, *i.e.*, was fed chiefly by governmental orders, in Soviet Russia there is a total change in the situation. *Metallurgy is turning its face to the country* and is beginning to manufacture agricultural implements and machinery : ploughs, sowing drills, harvesters, and what is very important, *tractors*.

No article commands such interest in the country just now as the tractor. By November 1st, the People's Commissariat of Agriculture received upwards of 11,000 applications for tractors. The result of these applications was that the manufacture of tractors was put on the production plans of the Putilov, Obukhov, Kharkov, Kolomna and other machine construction works.

Comrade Lenin, in one of his speeches on questions of peasant agriculture, said : "*It must be shown to the peasants that the old method will not do.*" This clear and simple formula was accepted by the peasantry, and through the length and breadth of the Soviet Union a *re-organisation of peasant agriculture is in progress—the old village is dying, and in its place arises the new village, with its new forms of tillage on the basis of mechanisation.*

The agrarian world crisis has its effect also on the peasant agriculture in Russia : the surplus stocks of American grain, cheap grain, product of mechanical cultivation by the American farmers, constitute a serious menace also to the grain export trade of the Soviet Union.

The Russian peasantry must needs re-adjust itself. It must

mechanise its methods of cultivation. It must produce even cheaper, in order to stand the competition of mighty America.

How does the Russian peasantry solve the current problems of the re-organisation of its agriculture?

Apart from the above mentioned features—increase of area under cultivation and of stocks of cattle—we observe also the *mass adoption of rotation of crops, and of grass sowing*, communal forms of tillage, where they prove a hindrance to progressive measures in agriculture, and are dying out; large villages with thousands of population are being split up into compact hamlets; there is a steady liquidation of small and scattered strips of cultivated land, and the population is brought nearer to the land cultivated by them. In other sections of the country, the peasants are settling down and establishing homesteads, thus obviating the constant re-distributions of the land, which was so detrimental to peasant agriculture in the past. The death blow is being dealt to the three-field system.

Briefly, a technical revolution is in full progress in the Russian countryside.

What is *the correlation of class forces in the country?*

On this question we have the following data, communicated by Comrade Kamenev at the 13th Congress of the R.C.P. : 74 per cent. of the peasant farms are of small intensity : they raise 40 per cent. of crops, and 50 per cent. of working cattle; this group of peasant farms buys a half of the manufactured articles that are sent into the village.

The middle peasantry constitutes 18 per cent. of the total. The group holds 23 per cent. of the cultivated area and 25 per cent. of the working cattle; it buys 35 per cent. of the industrial products.

The wealthy group of peasants constitute 8 per cent. of all the farms. This small group holds 36 per cent. of all the crops and 25 per cent. of the working cattle. This group buys one-third of the production of the urban industries which is sent to the villages.

Thus we are witnessing a manifest differentiation of classes in the Russian village.

The question arises, what is the attitude taken by the Soviet Government to the future forces of capitalist relations in the Russian villages?

The workers' and peasants' government directs all the cultural and material forces, all its mighty Soviet apparatus, *to the support and invigoration of the poor and middle peasant agriculture.*

What material forms does this support assume?

The Central Agricultural Bank has been organised. The moment that a firm currency was established, there arose a wide possibility for the extension of cheap credits to peasant agriculture, and in the coming year the capital of the bank for credit purposes will be brought up to 175 million roubles.

Credits are granted for mortgage operations, for the purchase of cattle-fodder, seeds, working cattle, agricultural implements, mineral fertilisers, for the organisation of industrial treatment of agricultural produce, for the improvement of meadows, for irrigation and amelioration of the soil, and so on.

The organisation of machinery and credit societies grows year by year. The agricultural population becomes united in small co-operative societies.

At the same time the poor and middle peasantry, having finally broken with the old rural traditions, is organising its agriculture on collective lines. In the R.S.F.S.R. there are already 14,000 collective agricultural units in which about 60,000 people are enrolled, and what is highly important, *a considerable percentage of these collective estates has been mechanised.* There is a region where *one tractor is owned by every 10 of these collective units.*

The greatest development of collective farming occurred in the Ukraine, where there are about 6,000 collective units.

The growth of the collective movement gives rise to the need for the creation of a guiding organ. This question is being elaborated at present, and will be solved at the Federal Conference of Collective Farmers, which is to be held in February, 1925.

There is no doubt that by its intense activity among the poor and middle peasants *the Soviet Government creates a durable and strong Soviet peasantry, which obtained support from the working class and will always be ready to defend the Soviet Union.*

But, as we have already seen, there is yet in the country a group of *wealthy* peasants which is of fairly significant import in the economy of the U.S.S.R.

The question is, what is the attitude of the Soviet Government towards this group?

Those wealthy farms which accumulated material wealth by progressive methods of agriculture and by mechanisation, which are cultivated by the exertions of their owners and without the use of hired labour (except special cases mentioned in the Land Code), enjoy equally *the support of the Soviet Government.*

These farms will continue to develop. Their fortunes are tied up with those of Soviet rule.

There remain the farms owned by *wealthy kulaks.*

What sort of farms are these? They are farms which con-

stantly exploit hired labour, which resort to rapacious and wasteful methods of tillage, which indulge in usury, which grind the village poor by usurious prices for their horses, machinery, seeds, etc.

Very frequently the usurious farmer succeeds in getting into his hands the various local industries: water-mill, dairy plants, grist-mills, etc.

At the same time these farmers, taking advantage of the still weak condition of the co-operatives, buy up the raw products from the poor peasants, compelled to sell under distress. To this group belong also the professional traders, profiteers, clandestine whisky distillers, bar-keepers, etc.

With this category of peasants the Soviet Government is engaged in a tireless and relentless fight.

This fight is accompanied by vast politico-educational propaganda and Party work.

The organisation of the liquidation of illiteracy, of cottage libraries and peasants' homes is at present widely developed.

At the same time *the Communist Youth Movement grows in the village, and the ranks of the Communist Party are being filled with members of the poor and middle peasantry, and of those peasants who engage in progressive agriculture without the exploitation of hired labour.*

The "smytchka" (solidarity) between the city and village assumes more real and wide proportions day by day: *the village is interested in the growth of the factories and workshops of the towns, because the village will then be able to get cheap goods and to dispose of its surplus products among the workers of the towns.*

The city needs a wealthy countryside, because only such a country will represent a mighty and developed internal market, a capacious and solvent buyer which will easily absorb the output of the urban production.

This stubborn revolutionary fight for the strengthening of the "smytchka" is being waged to the utmost, and with very insignificant participation by the outside world.

Thus the Soviet Union proves once again that, in spite of all the difficulty of development under conditions of isolation, *it does not go under, but grows steadily, if slowly.*

But this growth of the productive forces of city and village would assume unparalleled proportions if the peoples of the West would gain the victory over the bourgeoisie.

The Russian worker and peasant are firmly convinced that this victory is close at hand, that it is bound to come; at the same time they do not keep idle, but march stoutly forward. Even now, when this victory has not yet come.

P. GU ROV.

Links of October*

EVEN in the darkest days of autocracy, when every sign of life seemed almost extinct, and prison authorities were doing their worst, women revolutionists did not desert their posts. They shared together with men the hardships of an underground existence, they went bravely into exile in far distant and unhealthy regions, and fearlessly went to the scaffold.

When the revolutionary movement emerged from its underground existence into the open and workers fought on the barricades, working women were also to the fore.

When the whole world seemed to be stifled in smoke and blood, when as if from one gigantic chest the cry echoed throughout the world to the heavens: "The fight to the finish!" working women were the first to declare "War against war!"

They, together with the men, repressed the hirelings of capitalism who came from all sides to join the attack against the young Soviet Republic.

Neither did they shrink from the sharp encounter with the capitalists on the economic front. They prevented many conspiracies of the latter and saved many factories from utter ruin.

In the fierce fight between capital and labour, working women were in the forefront. But the struggle was difficult and slow in its development; it was made up of a whole string of sacrifices and achievements which are the corollary to a victory such as the world has never seen.

We will but take from the stormy sea of past events some few drops, a few instances of how women participated in the great fight. These are:

1. LIFE IS A MISERY TO US.

It is always dark in the knitted goods factory of Mosekov Bros. on the Moika. A dirty brick wall is just in front of the windows, and a dim light is thrown on to the black row of knitting machines.

High up just under the ceiling, glimmered a few electrical lamps like stars, but they did not disperse the gloom.

* "Links of October" is suitable for reading aloud and for dramatic sketches.

Somewhere an unseen motor was rumbling and the belts were making a furtive noise. The whole workshop seemed to hum and tremble.

There was also burning indignation in the hearts of the working women. On that very morning the employer had again lowered the wages.

"It is impossible to live like this," complained the women.

"This is like penal servitude, and the only reward is a crust of bread."

Although they set to work as usual, they were all smarting under the sense of a terrible injustice.

Zena Kuzina was even more excited than the rest. The backache, which she had been suffering from since yesterday, had weakened her whole body. She noticed with profound alarm that her strength was giving way, but the old fear gained the upper hand.

"I only hope the employer will not notice in what state I am!" murmured her bluish lips. And her fingers flew again over the cold and shining needles.

Anna Evanovna, who was sitting behind her, watched her with apprehension. She was a general favourite for her ready sympathy with others; above the noise of the machines, she asked: "Do you feel bad, Zena?"

Deep blue eyes full of tears were turned towards Anna Evanovna.

"Ah—h."

The machines went on with their noise and above it one heard something between a sigh and suppressed crying.

Anna Evanovna seemed engrossed in her work as though she and her machine were one, but her thoughts were busy with other things.

"The war is going on, everything is getting dearer, and on the top of it this cut in wages. To-day will not pass off without a storm!"

And all of a sudden she remembered: "For some time there has been unrest in the other factories. Something will come of it!"

This thought seemed to make her easier in her mind. After a cursory glance at the working women she turned her eyes again towards Zena.

"Dear little Zena," thought Anna Evanovna, "it is now your turn to be ill. In another year your health will have broken down, just like that of most factory workers. And then the employer will throw you out and your place will be taken by someone else. And the life of the newcomer will be only a repetition of your life and mine, and that of many others."

Anna Evanovna shuddered.

"This must not be!" And she looked again at the working women. Over a whole row of heads, Lena Sibikova nodded to her in a friendly manner.

"This will not be . . ."

Joy was all of a sudden in the heart of Anna Evanovna.

She knew: one had only to call the working women and they would come. They would rise against the oppressors, against the employer who had sucked out Zena Kuznina's young blood in the dawn of her life.

Anna Evanovna whispered to Zena:

"We cannot stand this . . . We must go on strike."

"Yes, yes, yes," was the joyful and yet apprehensive response from all sides.

The noise of the dilapidated motor had ceased at last and the belts were running more slowly—the day of labour had come to an end. There was unusual excitement in the factory. Somebody, one could not say who, was heard to say:

"Meet near the backyard."

As usual, Anna Evanovna quietly approached the working women who were waiting for her. Scores of tired eyes seemed to ask: What will be her joyous news, what respite will she promise us?

But she only added to their chagrin, and put her fingers right into the festering wound.

"You dear women, we cannot live like this any longer. The war seems to be everlasting, people are making money out of it like our employer, by becoming government contractors, but we are deprived of most of even our miserable earnings."

It was as if the wind had brought the feather grass into motion. All of them talked together. . . "Life is terrible. We have nothing to eat and no clothes to put on."

Then Zena Kuznina came forward:

"I think that we must go on strike. We cannot consent to this new reduction. Even if I have to die I will not give in."

"What, go on strike, only to be dismissed from the factory? No, and a thousand times, no," cried one woman hysterically. "Hundreds of people live like we do and keep silent."

"We will go on strike, we will indeed. We will not make a present of a single penny which is our due to these monsters. Do you agree to a strike?" And scores of voices answered in unison: "Better die than live like this. Life is a misery to us."

The working women of the factory of Mosekov Bros. went on strike and a day later other factories followed suit. Working women were meeting in the outskirts of the town, and from there were marching in procession through the main streets.

A thick mist was hanging over the town, and a biting wind was blowing from the Neva, and was making people shiver with damp and cold. But the working women were full of jokes as if they were going to a jolly feast or to some carnival.

Anna Evanovna was keeping order among the demonstrators.

"The Cossacks will teach you a lesson," said the passers-by viciously.

"Perhaps we will teach them a lesson!" shouted a woman.

When the red banner was unfolded, all joking ceased. Zena Kuzina held up the banner and clung to it until her last breath.

"To the Nevsky Prospect, to the Nevsky Prospect," was the order.

The head column made a start, and the noise of hundreds of feet was heard on the dirty and melting snow.

From the back ranks there came the sound of "Boldly forward, comrades, and keep pace."

But no sooner had the song started, than it was drowned in the cries, "Give us back our husbands, we do not want war . . . Peace! peace!"

The procession turned a corner and was met by a black line of mounted police with rifles slung over their shoulders.

No one wavered, and those in the front ranks shouted:

"Shoot if you like, we are not afraid of death: It is life that we fear!"

Mounted police barred the way, but were pushed back by the strong pressure of the women demonstrators. Shaking their fists, women pushed forward.

And hundreds of women's voices made the cry resound throughout the town: "Down with the Tsar who started the war! Peace and bread!"

The procession wound on its way forward and the police were powerless.

All of a sudden something exploded in the air, and then again and again.

Groans were heard in the crowd.

"They are shooting . . ."

"The Cossacks, the Cossacks are coming!"

The ranks began to waver, and the column became thinner. Zen's hand was still clutching the banner. She was still steadily looking before her, but death had overtaken her.

"Comrades, the banner!" she cried and her body began to sway.

Anna Evanovna firmly gripped the banner. Zena was no more, but the banner was safe, the banner was safe.

2. DOWN WITH THE TEN CAPITALIST MINISTERS.

What Zena Kuzina had not time to accomplish, was accomplished by others. The Czarist throne was shaken and overthrown. The despot was no more. The wished-for freedom had become a reality. But it required a heroic fight to snatch this freedom from the strong and grasping hands of the bourgeoisie.

The working women at the bench already saw in the February revolution the embryo of the coming fight: a fight without a precedent between labour and capital.

And having overthrown the executioner, working women from factories and workshops came out for the first time freely into the streets on their international day, March the 8th.

They were celebrating the overthrow of autocracy, and at the same time they were reviewing their forces and strengthening their ranks for fresh, decisive battles with the bourgeoisie.

On March the 8th there re-sounded throughout the city the echo of hundreds of thousands of feet marching to the final deadly struggle with the class enemy.

Two months had passed since the death of Zena, the poor factory worker. It was the month of April and the weather was warm. A fresh smell came still from the far distant fields into the dark stone houses of the city, but during the day the air in the narrow streets was already polluted, and the hot asphalt pavement gave forth an overpowering smell.

Heavy motor lorries stirred the town with their noise, the warning signal of motor hooters was heard, and tramcars, loaded to their utmost capacity were to be seen everywhere.

There was a peculiar tension in this noisy flow of life. It seemed at times that the street traffic would come to a standstill all of a sudden, and that something dreadful would happen. All sorts of things were related in Shestoparlov's cotton mill where Shura Gorlikova was employed. Most of the talk was about the Bolsheviks. There was unrest in the factory, and people thought that something was bound to happen.

Although Shura Gorlikova was in the know, she did not divulge much. She only threw out hints such as: "Something is brewing girls; there will be an attack on the capitalists. You must listen to the Bolsheviks."

To-day Shura is like quicksilver. She paid no heed to the heavy loads of the finished work which she had to carry. Only towards the evening her friends noticed a change. Her eyes seemed to dilate and became like those of an angry animal. All of a sudden the girl left off working, and was plunged in deep thought, leaning on the pile of material. She did not even notice the employer. He was inspecting this department and stopped near her.

"Do you think this is an asylum for the old?" he shouted, foaming at the mouth, "Do you want to be dismissed?"

Shura started and a dangerous light came into her eyes, and she said abruptly:

"Do not shout at me, be a little more polite, please."

And then she turned towards the women who were crowding around her.

"Dear comrades," she said in a loud voice, "what did we make the revolution for? We have overthrown the Czar, but the parasitic bourgeoisie is sucking our life blood! Did our comrades lay down their lives for this? Remember the February days."

The employer's eyes rolled and rolled, and he screamed:

"What are you saying? Are you speaking against the government and against the revolution. Arrest this Bolshevik woman."

Then to his astonishment the crowd exclaimed!"

"It is you, the exploiter, who should be arrested!"

The manufacturer was beside himself with rage.

"Get out of here, go to your proper places or be dismissed!"

No one made a move. Only Shura Gorlikova said definitely :

"Listen to me! We want a second revolution. If we do not cut off the hands of the bourgeoisie we are lost! They have put in their own capitalist ministers, and yet they speak of "democracy." Comrades, it is time we kicked out this "democracy." If we had done it, war would have been at an end."

Shura had universal support :

"We can do without them. . . ."

"You there! When are you going to bring the war to an end?"

The manufacturer, Shestopolov, was beside himself, he was almost bursting with fury. He decided in his own mind to have the ringleaders arrested, and to reduce all the others to a lower category.

But things turned out differently.

Towards the morning, the town had a strange look. Factory workers were going somewhere hurriedly. The militia was here, there, and everywhere, and junkers were met singly and in groups. In the crowd there were also shopkeepers who were rubbing their fat hands.

In the Shestopolov factory the machinery is at a standstill and it is quiet there as in a grave. But the street outside the factory is full of people. The faces of the women are smiling and cries are heard :

"All the factories are at a standstill, workers want the Bolsheviks. Many of our people are in the streets!"

"It looks as if it is all up with the manufacturers!"

The only signs of the excitement of the crowd were the business-like roll-call and the hurried movements of those who had assembled.

"Comrades, form up your ranks!" Shura Gorlikova called out.

A red poster was carried aloft over the heads of the crowd :
The device is "Down with the Ten Capitalist Ministers!"

In a phalanx the workers poured into the streets. Shura Gorlikova raised still higher the red banner bearing the device :

"Down with the Ten Capitalist Ministers!"

Everyone can see and everyone is reading.

“ The Bolsheviks are on the march . . . Look! look!”

“ Against our enemies, against the rich!” Such were the cries which filled the streets and re-echoed from the grey stone walls.

The streets are full of people, but there are few factory workers among them. One sees mostly bowler hats and top coats, and the wearers of them say angrily :

“ Those damned Bolsheviks! . . .”

“ They should be strung up!”

This is met by :

“ Damn the bourgeoisie.”

All of a sudden there was a rattling noise, and a voice was heard saying :

“ Comrades, keep cool. We are in a trap. . . The infuriated bourgeoisie has assumed the offensive.”

Shura holds her banner still higher :

“ Down with the Ten Capitalist Ministers!”

A tall man wearing a cap with a blue band it at her side.

“ Madam, will you let me have this banner?” and he endeavours to tear it from her hands.

Shura bit with her teeth into his hand. He let go immediately and stepped back. The girl cries with joy :

“ Good, I have saved it! Long live the Soviets!”

From the pavement, a man in a grey military uniform, is aiming his rifle at Shura.

There is a rattling sound and a cry : many more such sounds echo through the streets.

When quiet was restored motor cars and cabs began to dash through the streets. They were occupied by people in festive dress. On passing each other they lifted their bowler hats and top hats and said :

“ Congratulations on the victory!”

“ The Bolsheviks are beaten for good and all! . . .”

“ What impudence to attack civilisation and culture . . .”

3. THERE ARE MANY OF THEM.

Shura Gorlikova sacrificed her life. Working men picked up her dead body from the cold pavement. But in the depths of Russia, on its far distant borders, on misty mountain tops, in the echoing steppes, in Ekaterinoslav, Odessa, Tiflis, Evanovo-Vosnisenk, Perm, Ekaterinburg, Chalabinsk, Omsk, Irkutsk,

Chita, and in the marshy Altai forests, in fact everywhere, thousands of others are ready to take the place of the fallen.

They were the bearers not of vengeance but of retaliation.

They marched against those to whom factories and workshops, safes and land, mines and railways belonged.

They wanted all this to become the property of the R.S.F.S.R.

"What, Sawa Morozov without his textile factories? Terishchenko without his sugar refineries? The Mine Owners' Federation without the Donetz Basin?"

"Let us destroy Bolshevik Russia with the help of British and French bayonets, machine guns, rifles and tanks. Let us conquer it by hunger. . . ."

And the answer to this was: Red banners over the Kremlin, red banners like poppies all over Russia, and radio messages sped throughout the world announcing the first victory over the capitalists and the fight which was to come.

The workers and peasants of Russia had risen at last; they took up scythes, pitchforks, clubs, bayonets, in fact anything they could lay hands on; trenches were dug everywhere.

And against all this there were German Zeppelins, British machine guns, French rifles and officers, officers of all nations—a regular international.

"We have culture, civilisation and technique on our side, and we will win the day."

"Do not boast before the battle . . ."

It was the season when the cranes were going southward. The last belated flock in looking down from the sky saw flames bursting out suddenly and sparks moving like birds among seedlings.

At that time a Red Army detachment was being landed on the Olkhovka Station.

The commander, Stepan Chashkin, is a handy man. He can mend a rifle, he can make cartridges and balls and he can hack to pieces White Guards—in fact, there is nothing he cannot do.

Olkhovka is an important station. It is on the way to our granary, and to the sheep ranches.

Sheepskins are now worth their weight in gold. The cranes have gone; this means that the cold weather is coming, and the body requires warmth.

"What are you crouching for, Tishkin?"

"I am cold, Comrade Chashkin. This is weather to lie on the stove."

He did not get any further, his tongue froze stiff under his bristling moustache. It was Stepan Chashkin who froze it stiff,

and yet he had done nothing but use very strong and expressive language.

Under the cold, turquoise blue sky the whole detachment heard Chashkin say: "You selfish brute!"

Suddenly there was a noise as if something very heavy was rolling over the far distant bridge.

This made the Red Army men sit up, and the whisper which was a half sigh went through their ranks:

"They have tanks for which going over precipices is child's play . . ."

There was a whistling sound which interrupted their conversation.

Towards the evening they got into the trenches which smelled of fresh earth. For supper they had "locusts and wild honey," bread, and water from the river.

In the evening a messenger came to Comrade Chashkin from the General Staff.

In the twilight things look different, and Chashkin thought for a moment that he saw a butterfly before him.

When he realised that it was a woman, he thought of the danger she was running, for the guns were firing continually.

"Comrade Chashkin," he heard a clear voice say, "I have been sent by the Party Committee."

(To be continued)

Trotsky and the Party

[For the benefit of those of our readers unfamiliar with the internal affairs of the Communist Party in Russia, and the Communist International, it should be explained that Comrade Trotsky, on the occasion of the Seventh Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, wrote a preface to a book on the Lessons of the October (1917) Revolution, which gave rise to considerable discussion upon many important phases of the October days. This preface, with the replies from responsible members of the Central Committee of the Party in Russia, it is proposed by the Communist Party in Great Britain to publish in book form for the benefit of the working class in this country.

The political line taken by Comrade Trotsky was roundly condemned by the Party in Russia as a whole, with the result that the Central Committee had to place the question on its agenda for special discussion. The following documents, which we reproduce here, are, (1) the letter of Comrade Trotsky to the Central Committee, and (2) the decision of the executive. From a perusal of these it will be seen that the Communist Party of Russia still remains a real Bolshevik Party, firm in its decisions, merciless in its discipline, and united to the core.—Editor.]

Trotsky's Letter and Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.)

Dear Comrades,

The first item on the agenda of the forthcoming Plenum of the Central Committee is the question of the resolutions from local organisations on Trotsky's "conduct." Owing to my state of health, I will not be able to take part in the work of the Plenum, but I think I can contribute towards the elucidation of this question, by making the following remarks:

1. I considered and consider now that I could, in the discussion, bring forward a sufficient number of weighty objections on principle and in fact against the charge brought against me, that I am aiming to "revise Leninism" or "minimise" the role of Lenin. I refrained, however, from doing so, not only because of the state of my health, but also because *in the atmosphere of the present discussion*, every statement I made on this question, irrespective of its content, character and tone, would but serve as an impetus to intensify the controversy, to turn it from a one-sided to a two-sided controversy, and give it a more acute character. Even now, weighing up the whole progress of the discussion, and in spite of the fact that throughout it, many untrue and even monstrous charges have been brought forward against me, I think that my silence was correct from the standpoint of the general interests of the Party.

2. However, under no circumstances can I admit the charge that I am advocating a special policy ("Trotskyism") and that I am striving to revise Leninism. The conviction that is ascribed to me, to the effect that it was not I who came to Bolshevism, but Bolshevism came to me, is simply monstrous. In my introduction to "Lessons of October," I frankly stated (page 62) that Bolshevism prepared for its role in the revolution by its irreconcilable struggle not only against the Narodniki and the Mensheviks, but also against the "reconcilers," i.e., to the tendency to which I belonged. Never at any time during the past eight years has it entered my head to regard any question from the point of view of "Trotskyism" which I have considered and consider now to have been politically liquidated long ago. Quite apart from whether I was right or wrong concerning any other questions that came before our Party, I always endeavoured to solve them in accordance with the general theoretical and practical experience of our Party. Throughout all this time, no one ever told me that any of my thoughts or proposals indicated a special tendency, i.e., "Trotskyism." Quite unexpectedly for me this expression came out during the course of the discussion of my book on "1917."

3. The question of the estimation of the peasantry in this connection is of the greatest political importance. I absolutely deny that the formula "permanent revolution," which applies wholly to the past, in any way caused me to adopt a careless attitude towards the peasantry in the conditions of the Soviet Revolution. If, at any time after October, I had occasion for private reasons to revert to the formula, "permanent revolution," it was only a reference to Party history, i.e., to the past, and had no reference to the question of present-day political tasks. To my mind, the attempt to construct an irreconcilable contradiction in this matter is not justified either by the eight years' experience of the revolution, through which we have gone together, or by the tasks of the future.

Equally I refute the statements and reference to my alleged "pessimistic" attitude towards the progress of our work of Socialist construction in the face of the retarded process of the revolution in the West. In spite of all the difficulties arising out of our capitalistic environment, the economic and political resources of the Soviet dictatorship are very great. I have repeatedly developed and argued this idea on the instructions of the Party, particularly at international congresses, and I consider that this idea preserves all its force for the present period of historical development.

4. I have not spoken once on the controversial questions settled by the Thirteenth Congress of the Party, either on the Central Committee or on the Council of Labour and Defence, and I certainly have not, outside of leading Party and Soviet institutions, ever made any proposal that would directly or indirectly raise questions that have already been decided. After the Thirteenth Congress, new problems arose, or to speak more clearly, defined themselves of an economic, soviet and international character. The solution of these problems represented an exceptional difficulty. The attempt to put forward any kind of "platform" as against the work of the Central Committee in solving these questions, was absolutely alien to my thoughts. For the comrades who were present at the meetings of the Polit-bureau, the Plenum of the Central Committee, of the Council of Labour and Defence or of the Revolutionary Council of the U.S.S.R., this assertion requires no proof. The controversial questions settled at the Thirteenth Congress were again raised in the course of the last discussion, not only in no connection with my work, but as far as I can judge at the moment, with no connection with the practical questions of Party policy.

5. In so far as my introduction to my book "1917" has served as the formal ground for the recent discussion, I consider it necessary first of all to repudiate the charge that I published my book, as it were, behind the back of the Central Committee. As a matter of fact, my book was published (while I was undergoing treatment in the Caucasus) on exactly the same terms and conditions that all other books, mine or of other members of the Central Committee, or of members of the Party generally are published. Of course, it is the business of the Central Committee to establish some form of control over Party publications, but I have in no way and not in the slightest degree violated the forms of control which have been established up till now, and, of course, I had no reason to violate them.

6. The introduction to "Lesson of October," represents a further development of the ideas which I have frequently expressed in the past and particularly during the past year. Here I enumerate only the following lectures and articles: "On the Road to European Revolution" (Tiflis, April 11th, 1924), "Prospects and Problems in the East" (April 21st), "The First of May in the West, and in the East" (April 29th), "A New Turning Point" (introduction to "Five Years of the Comintern,"), "Through What Stage are we Passing?" (June 21st), "Fundamental Questions of Civil War."

All the lectures enumerated above were prompted by the defeat of the German revolution in the autumn of 1923, and were printed in the *Pravda*, *Isvestia* and other publications. Not a single member of the Central Committee nor indeed of the Polit-bureau ever pointed out to me anything wrong in these lectures, nor did the editor of *Pravda* make any comment on these lectures or make any attempt to point out to me anything with which he did not agree in them. Of course, I never regarded my analysis of October in connection with the German events as a "platform," and never believed that anybody would regard it as a "platform" which it never was and never could be.

7. In view of the fact that in the charges brought against me are several of my books, including several of which have been published in several editions, I consider it necessary to state that, not only did not the Polit-bureau as a whole, nor any single member of the Central Committee ever indicate that any of my articles or books could be interpreted as "revision" of Leninism. Particularly does this apply to my "1905" which was published during the lifetime of Comrade Lenin, went through several editions, was warmly recommended by the Party press, was translated by the Comintern into foreign languages and is now being used as *the principal evidence in the charge of revising Leninism.*

8. The purpose I pursue in putting forward these views, as I stated in the beginning of this letter is but one, viz., to assist the Plenum to settle the question as the first item on the agenda.

With regard to the statement which has been repeated in the discussion to the effect that I am aiming to secure "a special position" in the Party, that I do not submit to discipline, that I refuse to perform work given me by the Central Committee, etc., etc., I categorically declare, without going into an investigation of the value of these statements, that I am ready to perform *any work* entrusted to me by the Central Committee in *any* post and *without any post*, and of course, under *any form* of Party control.

There is no necessity, therefore, particularly, to point out that after the recent discussion, the interests of our cause demands my speedy release from the duties of Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council.

In conclusion, I think it necessary to add that I will not leave Moscow prior to the Plenum so that if necessary, it will be possible for me to reply to any questions, or give any explanation that may be required.

(Signed) L. TROTSKY,

January 15th, 1925.
Kremlin.

Certified correct: Balashov.

Resolution on the action of Comrade Trotsky passed at the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (two against) and the Central Control Commission (one abstained from voting).

The fundamental basis of *all* the successes of the Bolshevik Party has always been the steel-like unity and iron discipline, genuine unanimity of views on the basis of Leninism. Comrade Trotsky's unceasing attacks against Bolshevism confronts the Party with the necessity *either* to abandon this fundamental condition *or* once and for all to put an end to these attacks.

On an international scale, Comrade Trotsky's attacks against the Party are regarded by the bourgeoisie and the Social-Democrats as a precursor of a split in the Russian Communist Party, and, therefore, of the collapse of the proletarian dictatorship generally. It is from this partly that international imperialism draws its practical conclusions with regard to the U.S.S.R. in spite of the fact that the objective position of the U.S.S.R. is stronger now than it has ever been before.

Within the country, Comrade Trotsky's opposition is regarded by all anti-Soviet and wavering elements as a *signal* to combine against the policy of the Party for the purpose of inclining the regime of the proletarian dictatorship towards making concessions to bourgeois democracy. The anti-proletarian elements in the State apparatus are striving to "emancipate" themselves from

Party guidance and see in Comrade Trotsky's fight against the Central Committee of the Party *their* hope. The dictatorship of the proletariat and particularly one of the most important teachings of Comrade Lenin concerning the necessity of transforming the whole of the State apparatus in the spirit of a workers' and peasants' government, is being subjected to enormous damage. In the Party and around the Party, Comrade Trotsky's opposition has made his name the banner around which are rallying all the non-bolshevist, non-communist, anti-proletarian deviations and groupings.

In the most general form Comrade Trotsky's actions against the Party as a whole can now be described as an attempt to convert the ideology of the Russian Communist Party into a sort of "modernised (by Comrade Trotsky) "Bolshevism" *without Leninism*. This is *not* Bolshevism. This is a *revision* of Bolshevism. This is *an attempt to substitute Leninism by Trotskyism, i.e.,* an attempt to substitute for the Leninist theory and tactics of international proletarian revolution that variegated Menshevism which the old Trotskyism represented, and which is represented to-day by the resurrected "modern" Trotskyism. Essentially, modern Trotskyism is a counterfeit of Communism approaching the "European" model of pseudo-Marxism, *i.e.,* in the last resort, to "European" social democracy.

FOUR HISTORIC DISCUSSIONS.

During the course of the few years that Comrade Trotsky has been in the Russian Communist Party, our Party has had to conduct against him four discussions on a national scale, not including less important controversies on extremely important questions.

The *first* discussion was that over the Brest Peace. Comrade Trotsky failed to understand that the *peasantry* did not wish to fight any more, and he conducted a policy which nearly cost the revolution its head. It required the threat on the part of Comrade Lenin to leave the Government, it required an intense struggle at the Seventh Congress of the Party to rectify the error and secure—although on worse terms—the Brest "respite."

The second discussion was on the *trade unions*. As a matter of fact, this was a discussion concerning the *attitude towards the peasantry* raised against war-Communism, concerning the attitude towards the non-party masses of the workers and generally concerning the Party's approach to the masses in the period when the civil war had come to an end. An acute controversy over the whole country, an intense campaign conducted by the whole nucleus of the Party, headed by Comrade Lenin against the

"feverish heights" of Trotskyism were required in order to save the Party from mistakes which threatened all the gains of the revolution.

The *third* discussion was over the "Party apparatus," "plan," over the alleged "inclination towards the peasantry," on the part of the Central Committee, over "the conflict between two generations," etc. As a matter of fact, this too was a question of the *economic* alliance between the proletariat and the *peasantry*; the question of the policy of prices, of currency reform, of the necessity for steering the policy of the Party by the *workers'* compass, of maintaining the leadership of the Party in the economic and *State* apparatus, concerning the fight against "freedom," to form fractions and groupings within the Party, the maintenance of the leadership in the hands of the Bolshevik cadres of the Party, in a word, of keeping to the Leninist policy of the Party in the period of N.E.P. In this discussion, Comrade Trotsky became the absolutely pronounced speaking-trumpet of petty bourgeois deviations. Again he urged the Party to adopt the policy which might have led to the doom of the revolution, for this policy would have crushed the economic successes of the Party in their embryo.

The petty bourgeois opposition, headed by Comrade Trotsky, forced themselves into a position, in which, refusing to admit their radical errors, they were compelled to adopt the attitude of "the worst—the better," i.e., to state their case on the *failure* of the Party and of the Soviet Government.

It was necessary to put up an intense fight to resist this petty bourgeois attack upon the fortress of Bolshevism. It is now clear to all that the Trotskyist talk of the "doom of the country" in the autumn of 1923, was merely an expression of petty bourgeois fear, of lack of confidence in the forces of our revolution, and complete failure to understand our economics. The reform of the currency, in opposition to which, Comrade Trotsky proposed his "plan" and the failure of which was prophesied, restored the economic position and proved a tremendous step forward on the road towards the economic revival of the country. Industry is reviving in spite of the bad harvest in 1924. The economic conditions of the workers are improving. The Party emerged from the trial, stronger than ever. The Lenin enrolment strengthened the Party by infusing fresh proletarian forces into it. But had not the Bolshevik Party so sharply and unanimously resisted the semi-Menshevist relapse of Comrade Trotsky, the genuine dangers for the country, for the working class, and for our Party would indeed be innumerable.

All the actions of Comrade Trotsky against the general Party policy from 1918 to 1924 in their last resort, had their source in the semi-Menshevist failure to understand the role of the proletariat in relation to the non-proletarian and semi-proletarian sections of the working class, in minimising the role of the Party in the revolution and in Socialist construction, and the failure to understand that the Bolshevist Party can fulfil its historic mission only, if it is really unanimous in opinions and monolithic in character.

The *fourth* and present discussion still more revealed the serious and all-embracing differences between Comrade Trotsky and the Bolshevist Party. The matter now stands clearly as two fundamentally opposite systems of politics and tactics. In the present discussion, Comrade Trotsky commenced a direct attack upon the basis of Bolshevist philosophy. Comrade Trotsky

(1) *Completely denies the doctrine of the driving forces of the Russian Revolution outlined by Comrade Lenin in 1904 and upon which has been based the tactics of Bolshevism in the course of three Russian Revolutions.*

(2) *Puts forward against the Bolshevist estimation of the driving forces of the Russian Revolution and against the Leninist doctrine of the world proletarian revolution his old "theory of permanent revolution," which was utterly discredited in three Russian Revolutions (and also in Poland and in Germany) and was described by Comrade Lenin more than once as an eclectic attempt to combine petty bourgeois Menshevist opportunism with "left" phrases, and as an attempt to leap across the peasantry.*

(3) *Tries to convince the Party that before Bolshevism adopted the path of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it was obliged "intellectually to re-arm itself," i.e., it was obliged to abandon Leninism and adopt Trotskyism.*

(4) *Advocates the theory of "bisecting" Bolshevism, viz., (a) Bolshevism prior to the October Revolution of 1917, which is alleged to be of secondary importance, and (b) Bolshevism, commencing from October, 1917, which it is alleged, had to grow into Trotskyism before it could fulfil its historic mission.*

(5) *"Interprets" the history of October in such a manner that the role of the Bolshevist Party disappears altogether and first place is taken by the personality of Comrade Trotsky himself, according to the formula of "the hero in the crowd," and his version of the "peaceful revolt" which is alleged to have taken place on the 10th of October, 1917, had nothing in common with the Bolshevist views concerning armed uprising.*

(6) *Describes the role of Comrade Lenin in the October Revolution very ambiguously. Lenin is made to appear as if advocating the seizure of power by conspirative methods behind the back of the Soviets, and that the practical proposals made by Comrade Lenin arose from his failure to understand the conditions prevailing.*

(7) *Radically distorts the relations between Comrade Lenin and the Central Committee of the Party and represents them as an unceasing war between two "powers." Comrade Trotsky endeavours to convince his readers of the truth of his "version" by publishing (without the consent of the Central Committee) extracts from certain documents presented in a false light and in a connection distorting the truth.*

(8) *Describes the role of the whole of the Central Committee which led the revolt in such a light as to sow the most profound distrust towards the fundamental nucleus of the present Party Staff.*

(9) *Distorts the most important episodes of the revolution in the period between February and October, 1917 (the April and June demonstrations, the July days, the preliminary parliament, etc.).*

(10) *Distorts the tactics of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, and endeavours to throw the responsibility for the failures in Germany, Bulgaria, etc., upon the fundamental nucleus of the E.C.C.I., thus sowing distrust towards the Central Committee of the R.C.P. and the E.C.C.I.*

Thus the differences that divide Comrade Trotsky from the Bolshevik Party from year to year, and lately, from month to month, increase. These differences concern not only questions of the past; the past is being "reviewed" in order to "prepare" a platform for the present real political difficulties. The retrospective exposure of the "Right-wing" in the old Bolshevik Party is necessary for Comrade Trotsky to use as a screen under cover of which to win for himself the right to form a genuine Right-wing in the Russian Communist Party *at the present time*—in the period of N.E.P., in the period of retarded world revolution, when the petty bourgeois dangers favourable for the formation of a right-wing in the Russian Communist Party and the Comintern are in evidence.

The "revision" of Leninism on the question of the driving forces of the revolution, *i.e.*, principally the question of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry is the "justification" of Comrade Trotsky's non-Bolshevik views concerning the *present* policy of the Party with regard to the peasantry. The incorrect anti-Leninist estimation of the *role of the peasantry* in the revolution made by Comrade Trotsky, is the subject to which the discussion between the Party and Comrade Trotsky brings us back again and again. Mistakes on *this* question become particularly dangerous at this time when the Party, carrying out the slogan of "face the village," is working intensely to strengthen the tide between the industry of the cities and peasant agriculture; to enlist the broad masses of the peasantry into the work of Soviet administration to liven up the Soviets, etc., and when the future success or failure of the revolution is being determined precisely by the correct or incorrect relations between the proletariat and the peasantry.

On fundamental questions of international politics (the role of fascism and social democracy, the role of America in Europe, the length and character of the democratic pacifist era, in the estimation of which his views in many ways coincide with the social-democratic "centre," etc.), Comrade Trotsky occupied a different position from that of the Russian Communist Party, and the whole of the Comintern without troubling first of all, to explain his point of view to the Central Committee, or to the E.C.C.I.

The delegation of the Russian Communist Party at the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, in complete agreement with the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party proposed to Comrade Trotsky that he explain his views on international questions to the Congress of the Communist International. Comrade Trotsky refused to do this at the Congress, but considered it expedient to do so a little while after at a gathering of veterinary surgeons over the heads of the Comintern and the R.C.P. In recent times, there has not been a single important question upon which Comrade Trotsky has acted with the Party, but more frequently has acted *against* the views of the Party.

The Party is confronted by a most important and immediate political task, viz., to take a determined course towards overcoming the elements dividing the town from the country, *i.e.*, to take up in its full scope the question of further lowering prices on manufactures, to create conditions for a real revival in agriculture (land re-distribution and land utility), to devote concentrated attention upon developing agricultural co-operation (genuine voluntary membership, election of officers, credit), bring up and solve the question of easing the burden of taxation for the peasantry and reforming the system of taxation, and also to exert all the efforts of the Party towards the solution of the question of improving political conditions in the villages (proper conduct of elections, enlisting non-party peasants, etc.).

This policy alone in the main outlined by Comrade Lenin, can lead to the real consolidation of State industry, secure further development and the growth and concentration of the social power of the industrial proletariat, *i.e.*, not in mere words, but in fact, to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in the conditions of N.E.P. The primary condition enabling this policy to be carried out is the absolute maintenance of the leading role of our Party in State and economic organs, and genuine unity of the Party on the basis of Leninism. It is precisely this decisive (in the present circumstances) relation between the Party, the working class and the peasantry that Comrade Trotsky fails to understand.

This situation inevitably led to all the non-Bolshevist and anti-Bolshevist elements in the country and outside of the country placing their *own* construction upon the position taken up by Comrade Trotsky and to their supporting Comrade Trotsky precisely because he was being condemned by the R.C.P. and the Comintern. A party leading the dictatorship of the proletariat in circumstances in which all anti-proletarian parties and groups

are deprived of "liberties" *must inevitably* make enemies. All these enemies, particularly the well-to-do petty bourgeois, desire to see in the present Comrade Trotsky the individual who could shake the iron dictatorship of the proletariat, split the Party and divert the Soviet Government to other lines.

All the leaders of the Second International, the most dangerous lackeys of the bourgeoisie, strive to utilise Comrade Trotsky's intellectual "revolt" against the basis of Leninism, in order to discredit Leninism, the Russian Revolution and the Comintern in the eyes of the masses of Europe, and in this way to bind the social-democratic workers to the chariot of capitalism. The renegade, Paul Levi, published Comrade Trotsky's "Lessons of October" in German, with his own introduction, and German social democracy has undertaken to spread this book broadcast. It is widely advertising as a book directed against Communism. Souvarine, who was expelled from the Comintern, is trying to cause a split in the French Communist Party by spreading counter-revolutionary lies about the Russian Communist Party. Balabanova, Hoeglund and other renegades from Communism act in a similar manner. The Italian social fascists of "Avanti," the hirelings of the German bourgeoisie from *Vorwaerts*, Renaudel and Grumbach of the *Quotidien*, etc., etc., all these elements endeavour to associate themselves with Comrade Trotsky, because of his opposition to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and the E.C.C.I.

The non-party workers, who should see in this prominent Party worker a model of solidarity for the whole Party, as a matter of fact, for the last few years, have seen Comrade Trotsky shaking the unity of the Party with impunity. Such a situation undermines elementary class discipline without which victorious proletarian dictatorship is impossible.

The peasantry should be able to see that on the question of unity between the working class and the peasantry, there is not the slightest hesitation in the Russian Communist Party, and that on this question the Party is more united than on any other. But the conduct of Comrade Trotsky causes the peasantry to believe the very opposite, and this important question becomes the subject of all kinds of legends. This represents extreme danger to the workers' and peasants' bloc. Our Party has to conduct the dictatorship of the proletariat in a *peasant country*. To carry out this dictatorship while Comrade Trotsky continues to *worry* the *peasantry* is impossible.

The youth, who formerly saw in Comrade Trotsky one of the

greatest leaders of the Party, now see that this leader is dragging the youth into "a war between generations" on anti-Leninist lines.

The Red Army and the Red Fleet, who should see in the leader of the army a model of Party discipline and of correct understanding of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry (our army in the main is a peasant army) is now presented with a spectacle of *the very opposite* in Comrade Trotsky. Such a situation is pregnant with enormous dangers for the internal state of the army.

The whole Party is convinced that in such a state of affairs, there could be no talk of preserving a genuine, Bolshevist, monolithic Russian Communist Party, and is coming to the conclusion that our Party would be faced by a tremendous intellectual and organisational danger if it permitted Comrade Trotsky to continue his fight against the Bolshevist Party. *The Lenin enrolment*, which is sincerely striving to introduce Trotskyism in the place of Leninism, and demand that the Party bring this to the light of day.

The whole Comintern observes how one of the most prominent members of the Russian Communist Party *hampers* the work of Bolshevising the sections of the Comintern and is in fact rendering intellectual political support to the enemies of Bolshevism in the camp of the Second International.

Under these circumstances the joint Plenum of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Committee is of the opinion that to leave things in a position, when the Party decides on one thing, and Comrade Trotsky continues to act against the Party, would mean the beginning of the abandonment of the Bolshevist character of the Party, and the beginning of its collapse. With the controversy over Trotskyism is closely connected the question as to what does the Russian Communist Party represent in 1925; —a Bolshevist Party hewn out of a single piece and standing on the lasting foundation of Leninism, or a Party in which semi-Menshevik views may become a "Legitimate shade of view."

Having read Comrade Trotsky's declaration to the Central Committee, dated the 15th of January, 1925, the Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee notes Comrade Trotsky's readiness to carry out any work entrusted to him by the Party, under the control of the Party and declares that Comrade Trotsky has not uttered a single word in his declaration indicating that he recognises his errors, but on the contrary, in fact strives to defend his anti-Bolshevist platform and limits himself merely to formal expressions of loyalty.

Following from what has been said above and particularly from the fact that in spite of the well known decisions of the Thirteenth Congress, Comrade Trotsky is again raising the question of the fundamental alteration of the leadership of the Party and is advocating views which have been categorically condemned by that Congress, the *Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee Resolves* :

1. *Most categorically to warn Comrade Trotsky that membership of a Bolshevik Party demands real and not mere verbal subordination to Party discipline, and complete and unreserved abandonment of opposition to Leninism in any form.*

2. *In view of the fact that leadership of the army is impossible unless this leadership is backed by the authority of the whole Party, that without this support, the danger of breaking the iron discipline in the army arises; in view of the fact that the conference of political workers and the fraction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the U.S.S.R. have already passed resolutions calling for the removal of Comrade Trotsky from army work, and in view of the fact that Comrade Trotsky himself in his declaration to the Central Committee dated 15th of January, 1925, admits that "the interests of the cause demands" his speedy release from the duties of the Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council—that Comrade Trotsky's continued work on the Revolutionary Military Council of the U.S.S.R. be deemed impossible.*

3. *That the question of Comrade Trotsky's work in the future be postponed to the next Party Congress, and that Comrade Trotsky be warned that in the event of any fresh attempt on his part to violate or refuse to carry out Party decisions, the Central Committee will be compelled, without waiting for the Congress to be convened, to deem it impossible for Comrade Trotsky to continue further on the Polit-bureau and will raise the question at the joint meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee of removing him from work in the Central Committee.*

4. *To regard the discussion as closed.*

5. *To continue and develop the work of the Party in explaining throughout all the ranks of the Party the anti-Bolshevik character of Trotskyism—from 1903 to "Lessons of October"—and instruct the Polit-bureau to convey to all the organs of propaganda (Party schools, etc.), proper instructions on this matter, and to include in the programme of political instruction an explanation of the petty bourgeois character of Trotskyism, etc.*

6. *Simultaneously with the explanatory propaganda conducted within the Party, and the Young Communist League, etc., it is necessary to explain in a popular manner to the non-Party masses of workers and peasants the meaning of the deviations of Trotskyism and reveal its false paths leading to the break-up of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry.*

Book Reviews

Capitalist Combination in the Coal Industry. By D. J. WILLIAMS. Price 6/-. Published by the Labour Publishing Company.

Beginning with an account of how the Tyne hostment, merchant exporters of coal, protected at so much per annum by a corrupt and dying feudal monarchy, combined over three hundred years ago in order to extract from the market as high a price as possible, the writer develops the story of the British coal industry, and shows how coal has founded the fortunes of many a privileged exploiter.

All that comes under the scope of the title, the linking together into combines of coal, iron and steel undertakings, the grouping of coal, iron-ore, limestone, iron works, and steel works, with their subsidiary industries under the control of one trust, is clearly and comprehensively dealt with. One is impressed by the exhaustive survey—of the industry covered by the author, but left at the same time with a sense of something lacking. It is shown that the early combines of owners and merchants felt the necessity to combine against their rebellious slaves as well as to rig the markets. But what of the lives and conditions of the miners themselves through these three centuries? Enslaved, brutalised, despised—a people apart, a brief accompanying story of their struggles would have vitalised the book, and toned down its tendency to statistical dryness.

To-day the miners of Great Britain, beaten down by the combined capitalists and their State are discussing ways and means of realising the much improved standard of life to which they are entitled, and which the industry undoubtedly can afford. This book should convey to them and all workers the lesson of combination—and its purpose how to secure the interests of a class.

One of the most striking chapters in the book is the one dealing with the period of post-war prosperity, in which portions of the huge profits made were distributed by the firms concerned in the form of "bonus

shares" to the shareholders. The consequences to the industry, as in the engineering industry and in textiles, were that the slump which followed found it burdened with a huge proportion of "water."

We find, for instance, that the capital invested in the industry increased from £135,000,000 in 1914 to £195,000,000 in 1923, an increase of nearly 50 per cent. It is known that the bulk of this added capital consists of "water."

The intricate conditions of the agreement of 1921, the sole achievement of Frank Hodges for the men he claimed to lead, recognises the claim to interest payments on this non-existent capital. Before wages can rise this agreement must be scrapped.

But to secure better conditions for the miners under a capitalistic system that is ever consolidating its strength, other workers, transport, engineering, etc., must aid in the common fight against the common enemy. That is the supreme lesson from the story of combination in the coal industry.

The capitalist leeches who are at present, as in the past, extracting wealth out of the sweat of the miner, must be eliminated entirely.

The alternative to the common ownership and control of the industry by the working class is the perpetuation of the present slave conditions now playing such deadly havoc amongst the miners. R.

"Creative Socialism," by E. TOWNSEND. Price 2/6. Published by J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.

The author of this book sets out to tell us what Syndicalism is, and tries to give one the impression that it is an indefinite set of ideas, "emotional in origin." Indeed, for this latter attribute he has a whole-hearted admiration and scorns the "materialist ideas of Karl Marx"!

How the aims put forward—the operation of industry by and for the workers engaged in it—are to be realised we are left in doubt. The necessity for “a change of heart” among striking workers is stressed; and the author tells us they must be persuaded to strike for control of industry instead of merely increased wages.

The opinions of the Guild Socialists, whom the writer confuses with the Syndicalists, are given, as well as those of Morris and others, but the case for Syndicalism is not a convincing one.

Force as a weapon in the struggle against capitalism is rejected. A whole jumble of confused ideas emerges as follows: “Labour and the ‘Consumer,’” “Productive indus-

tries have closed down (as a result of wage demands) though badly needed by the ‘Public,’” “A creative and not destructive revolution,” “Organise Labour to produce not to fight,”—as if capitalism has not done all the organising for production necessary to provide sufficient for all!

The Syndicalists of the author are merely reformists without even a definite reformist policy, with an aim which only a complete destruction of capitalism would make possible of realisation—but “Force is no remedy”—“Organise to produce, not to fight!”

This book will arouse no enthusiasm among the “Materialist British workers,” because there is nothing “creative” or “Socialist” in his thought. R.

YOUR CLASS AND PARTY NEED YOU.

There are some who, sympathising with, and appreciating the Communist position, will call themselves Communist without realising that the first duty of a Communist is to become a member of the Communist Party.

Therefore, DO YOUR DUTY,

JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY NOW

APPLICATION FORM.

I wish to be a member of the Communist Party. Please put me in touch with local membership.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Fill in this form and give it to the comrade who sold you this *Review*, or to Local Secretary

Or to Albert Inkpin, Secretary, Communist Party, 16, King Street, London, W.C.2.

C. R. A.