

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 33

22nd April 1926

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

CONTENTS

- Appeal of the E. C. C. I. for the First of May 1926.
- Politics.
- J.: Social Democracy and the Disarmament Manoeuvre of the League of Nations.
- The Labour Movement.
- A. Lozovsky: Fight or Submission.
International Aid for the English Miners.
- Union of Soviet Republics.
- A. Rykov: The Economic Situation and the Budget of the Soviet Union.
- In the Colonies.
- M. N. Roy: The Calcutta Riot.
- J. B.: The Disturbances in Transjordan.
- G. A. K. Luhani: Agricultural Policy of British Imperialism in India.
- In the International.
- Arvid Hansen: The Left Platform of Korsch & Co.

Appeal of the E. C. C. I. for the First of May 1926.

Working Men and Women!

The First of May 1926 occurs at a time of increasing acuteness of the economic situation in the most important countries of Europe, at a time of tremendous increase in unemployment, and of a brutal capitalist offensive against the working class in order to cut down wages and social insurance and to lengthen the working day.

In Great Britain the bourgeoisie is preparing a concentrated attack upon the miners — it is attempting to reduce still further their starvation wages and to throw thousands of miners on the street. It is realising with increasing anxiety the fact of the decline of the British world empire, and is attempting to hold up the inevitable by pauperising the English proletariat, by shattering the organisation of the advance troops of the British working class, the million miners.

In Germany the bourgeoisie is endeavouring to "rationalise" production by reducing wages, lengthening the working day and closing down factories.

In France the bourgeoisie, by means of inflation, is depressing the real wages of the workers and ruining millions of small investors.

In Italy the most elementary right of combination, the free trade union movement, has been destroyed by fascism.

In Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Norway, in Austria — everywhere we see hundreds of thousands of unemployed, everywhere we see the attempts of the bourgeoisie to depress the standard of living of the working class. The most terrible results of this capitalist offensive are specially felt by the young generation of the proletariat. The double pressure of high prices and unemployment is pressing with ever increasing weight on the working women and the housewives of the proletarian family.

In America the imperialist bourgeoisie is bribing the upper sections of the working class at the cost of the ruined farmers and the broad masses of the immigrant, unskilled proletarians, at the cost of the whole of the European working class and the peoples of Latin America.

But the bourgeoisie is not only plunging you, the workers, into ever deeper misery, in alliance with the big landowners it is plundering the peasantry, the allies of the proletariat, by means of increased taxation, by protective duties against the interests of the peasants, by depreciation of their small savings.

The 1st of May falls at a time of general intensification of class struggles. For the first time since the world war we are experiencing a simultaneous political and social crisis in the

three most important countries of Europe: in Great Britain, in Germany and in France. The white terror prevails in Italy, Spain, Hungary, in the Balkans, in Poland and in the Baltic Countries. It is already casting its shadow upon the countries of "Western Democracy", in which the class justice of the bourgeoisie is persecuting with ever increasing savagery the advance guard of the proletariat.

The 1st of May falls at a time of new war dangers, of imperialist conflicts, of the bankruptcy of the League of Nations' policy. The imperialist powers are themselves demonstrating that the illusion that a League of the capitalist nations for the maintenance of peace is possible, has completely collapsed. The 1st of May 1926 occurs at a time of preparation of a sham disarmament conference and of active struggle of imperialism against the peoples of China, Syria and Morocco. The four hundred million population of China is carrying on its world-historical struggle for freedom against the criminal forces of British and Japanese imperialism which do not shrink back from any abomination. The people's army in Northern China is not destroyed, in spite of all the lies of the capitalist world press; the peasants' and workers' government in Canton in South China remains firm and unshaken, in spite of all the counter-revolutionary intrigues. The proletariat of the whole world views with admiration the great Chinese revolution.

Working men and Women!

The 1st of May originated as a day of international solidarity of the workers, as a day of class struggle for the great aims of Socialism, as a day of fight against the dangers of imperialist wars. The war policy of social democracy destroyed international unity, the social democracy buried the May Day ideas of the class struggle in the trenches of the world war. Their coalition policy has not served to rally the proletariat for the struggle, but has fettered the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. If today the rule of the bourgeoisie remains unbroken, if the capitalist class society has not been destroyed, if the proletariat must still bear the yoke of suppression and exploitation, the social democracy and the social democracy alone is responsible for this.

Comrades!

Can we to-day, eight years after the war, tolerate that the proletariat, nationally as well as internationally, is split in its most widely embracing mass organisations, in the trade unions? Can we, after eight years of privations, tolerate, in view of the capitalist offensive, a continuation of the old coalition policy? Can we believe any longer the agents of the League of Nations and the so-called disarmament conference, when the imperialists are enslaving the German people numbering 60 millions, and are converting the small states of Europe into a pliant instrument against the vanquished peoples and the Soviet Union? Must not the proletarians in soldiers' uniforms become conscious of the growing danger of war, shall the spirit of the barracks and military drill tear them from the great army of the proletarians in the workshops?

No, and again no!

We are strong enough for the struggle. We possess the best weapons, before all the unity of the working class. On the 1st of May, on the day of international solidarity of the workers, the proletarians of all countries and all parties must join together, firmly and determinedly, under the slogan of the international united front, under the slogan of a united trade union international. The working class, on the 1st of May, must proclaim their will to fight for unity by giving earnest and unequivocal expression to their readiness to support the English miners who are confronted by a tremendous struggle. The working class must show their will to unity, they must see to it that the trade unions and the social democratic workers arrange with the communists joint May Day demonstrations and meetings.

The May Day slogans for the united front must be: Fight for the eight hour day and increase of wages; fight for adequate support for the unemployed; for the destruction of the fascist organisations; for the most elementary political liberties; for the release of the political prisoners; for preparing for the struggle against the danger of war; for supporting the national revolutionary movement of China.

At the same time the workers must always remember that the united front of all workers is, indeed, the way to victory, but not victory itself. The overcoming of the results of the decline of capitalism, the repelling of the attempts of the bourgeoisie to reconstruct its economy at the cost of the workers, the prevention of the Dawesation of the whole of Europe by American capital, the stopping of the expenditure of milliards on armaments — all these demands will only be realised by the proletariat by means of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship, only by setting up a workers' and peasants' government in every country and by bringing these governments together into the United States of socialist Europe which shall stretch out a brotherly hand to the Soviet Union, to the colonial peoples and to the proletariat of America.

From the eight years experiences of the Soviet Union, of the peoples of the one-time Tsarist Empire, the proletariat can see what the proletarian revolution is able to achieve. Nobody, except the most die-hard reactionary bourgeois and the most narrow social democratic and trade union bureaucrats can any longer deny the rapid political and economic advance of the Soviet Union, can dispute the existence of a real proletarian democracy and the setting up of socialism in the Soviet Union.

There is only one country that knows neither economic decline nor capitalist offensive; there is only one country in the world in which wages are increasing, the eight hour day exists and the land has been wrested from the big landowners and handed over to the peasants, where all nations possess equal rights and the full equality of both sexes is realised. There is only one country in which there are neither fascist organisations, nor white terror — this country is the Soviet Union.

Working men and Women!

On the 1st of May, which from the beginning has raised the banner of social revolution, unite into a determined army for capturing power.

On the 1st of May 1926, on the day of the fight for the united front of the working class, all proletarians must rally under the slogans:

Long live proletarian unity in the class struggle!

Long live the united Trade Union International!

Proletarian, show solidarity with the English miners!

Long live the fraternisation of the proletarians of the workshops and of the barracks!

Long live the fighting alliance of the workers and the peasants!

Hails off revolutionary China!

Our proletarian May greetings to the workers of the Soviet Union!

Down with the fascist organisations, down with the White Terror!

Down with the Imperialist League of Nations!

Long live the Workers' and Peasants' government!

Long live the United States of Socialist Europe!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

POLITICS

Social Democracy and the Disarmament Manoeuvre of the League of Nations.

By J.

The burdens of militarism are pressing with enormous weight upon the budgets of the victor States. Nevertheless none of them thinks of restricting this expenditure, still less of disarming. How could it be otherwise? Here it is a question of States which wish to secure, at least for the time being, the booty they have seized in the world war solely by maintaining uninterrupted land, sea and air armaments. In order, however, to throw sand in the eyes of the mass of the people who have to bear these enormous burdens, the League of Nations has initiated a so-called action for disarmament.

What was the attitude of social democracy to this diplomatic manoeuvre? Before the war the II. International correctly estimated the love for peace of the imperialist Powers. When Tsar Nicholas II. with hypocritical gesture, raised the question of a disarmament Conference, the result was to arouse scornful laughter in all the social democratic parties. The latter quite rightly warned the workers against this humbug. At the Stuttgart Congress of the II. International in 1907, the Hague Peace Court was characterised, amidst the general applause of the Congress, as a "thieves' kitchen". Bebel in his last speech before his death characterised the international situation not as "disarming" but as "arming". The year 1914 fully confirmed this former conception of social democracy. And all that occurred afterwards confirmed it still more. Thus Wilson's 14 points were nothing else than an introduction to the Versailles Treaty.

Present-day social democracy which has little in common with social democracy in 1914, has, it is true, repeatedly talked about "securing peace", but it has undertaken very little towards limiting military expenditure and cutting down armaments. At the last Congress of the II. International at Marseilles almost nothing was said regarding these matters.

What was and what is the attitude of social democracy to the so-called disarmament campaign of the League of Nations? One can say that in the victor States it has not been overzealous in this respect. The case was different, however, in the vanquished States. In the latter the desire for international disarmament represented to a certain extent the demand of the bourgeoisie. This does not mean that the latter was against militarism, but that as it had been forbidden to maintain its own army it would be glad if the victor States did not have too great military means at their disposal. Naturally the bourgeoisie in the victor States does not believe in disarmament. If however it discusses the question of limiting armaments, it is only in order to create difficulties.

The German social democracy has joined in the disarmament campaign, but, it is worth noting, right from the outset not with the intention of bringing about disarmament, but in order, once again, to deal a blow at the Soviet Union and to represent this, the only real opponent of militarism, as the scapegoat who is alone responsible for the fact that there has been no disarmament. The Central organ of German social democracy, the "Vorwärts", right from the commencement of the campaign has issued the catch word for the diplomats and called upon Switzerland not to comply with the justified demands of the Soviet Union. It surrounded Sir Austen Chamberlain, the most obstinate representative of imperialism, with the halo of an angel of peace, in order thereby to be able to paint in more terrible colours the red devil of "Soviet imperialism". After every note or utterance of Chamberlain "Vorwärts" made the stereotyped remark: "It is now for Russia to speak!" The Soviet government soon replied. The "Vorwärts" either refrained from publishing the replies at all, or reprinted them in a very mutilated form with comments which distorted their contents still more.

Comrade Chicherin has now, on the 7th April, sent a Note on behalf of the Soviet government to the General Secretary of the League of Nations, in which the disarmament manoeuvre is finally and completely exposed. The "Vorwärts" has continually published verbatim reports of Chamberlain's speeches on its front page. Of the Note of Chicherin, however, the "Vor-

wärts" only publishes a few passages, torn from their context and attempts to refute them by means of petty trickery and with the frequent use of "ifs" and "buts".

The "Vorwärts" remarks:

"If to-morrow the governments of England and of the United States were to convene an Anglo-American-Russian Conference in Geneva, with the agenda: full resumption of diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and granting of a credit of a milliard dollars to Soviet Russia, along with action in support of the shaky Chervonetz, ah!, how quickly a Soviet Russian delegation with M. Chicherin at the head, accompanied by an army of technical experts, would travel there at the shortest notice."

What sense is there in this "if"? One could just as well say: "If the German Nationalists were suddenly to become republicans, if the German People's Party came forward in support of the expropriation of the princes — what results would that have!" These are not questions which politicians put forward, this is merely a game intended to confuse the issue. One must deal with things as they are. The Soviet Union is a revolutionary workers' and peasants' State and the bourgeois powers of Great Britain and before all the United States of America, are endeavouring to fight the Soviet Union with every possible means. That is how the matter stands. If, however, we were to adopt the methods of the "Vorwärts" with its "ifs" and "buts", then nothing would be easier than to assert: if these governments suddenly decided to support the Soviet Union, would they not choose another town for their negotiation than that to which the Soviet government, for very compelling reasons, is unable to send its representatives.

The crux of the question is: Do they want to disarm or do they not? Of course they do not wish to disarm. And precisely because Chamberlain and Briand are not at all serious in their talk of disarmament, they insist upon convening the disarmament Conference in Geneva.

They only intend to mislead the masses and to find a scapegoat. Chicherin has thwarted this manoeuvre and the childish ifs and buts of German social democracy only testify to its good will to help imperialism out of a mess. But it will be a case of love's labour lost. The manoeuvre is completely exposed.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Fight or Submission.

(On the Mining Dispute in Great Britain).

By A. Lozovsky.

It is at present hard to say whether, on the 1st of May, there will break out the titanic struggle of the British coal miners against the mine owners. It is difficult to say because the reports which have arrived up till now are extremely contradictory, and also because, during the last two or three months, there has taken place a certain re-grouping of forces between the two opposing parties. On the one hand the entire English bourgeoisie, with Mr. Baldwin, "who stands outside of all parties" at the head, is conducting with a very clear and definite allocation of roles, a tenacious and bitter attack upon the working class, in which it is supported by a certain section of the leaders of the Labour Party and of the trade unions. On the other hand there is an insufficiently united labour movement, divided by craft unionism and political differences, the right leaders of which are pressing for an understanding at all costs.

One must do justice to the British bourgeoisie. Its plan of attack has been drawn up according to all the rules of the art. After Mr. Baldwin was compelled in July last year to beat a retreat, a Royal Commission was appointed in which the big bankers and industrialists predominated, and which in the course of many months studied and elaborated the question of how best to hoodwink the miners.

What was the question in dispute? The whole question has continually turned on the conclusion of a national wages agreement; but the proposal of the royal Commission provides for district agreements, whereby, in certain districts, wages are to be reduced by 20 and 30% and in other localities, on the other hand, even a increase can be allowed if the result is an average

reduction of 10%. The object of this plan is to drive a wedge into the ranks of the miners, to set one district against the other and thereby to break the backbone of the most important section of the British proletariat.

These plans of the Royal Commission, which have received the approval of the mine owners, would not be so terrible for the workers if the trade union movement in Great Britain were strongly welded together, and if at the head of the Labour Party there were not such friends of the "national interests" as Mac-Donald, Thomas, Clynes and Co. The first reports of the findings of the Commission had scarcely appeared when these agents of the bourgeoisie commenced to work in order to persuade the miners, who still stood firm, to give up resistance. Everything was set in motion, including open attacks as well as intriguing behind the scenes, and a number of special methods to which the degenerate parliamentarians of the British Labour Party are specially addicted.

This persistent work of the open and secret friends of the British mine owners brought hesitation, vacillation and uncertainty into the ranks of the leading organs of the British trade union movement. Instead of, in the last few months seeing to it that the entire proletariat of Great Britain was prepared for the conflict which will break out on the 1st of May, instead of centring the entire propagandist, agitational and organisational work upon this tremendous encounter between the classes, and to mobilise the whole labour movement of Great Britain, numbering many millions — instead of all this there took place unofficial conferences, and in secret sittings the proposals of the Right, not to fight but to capitulate, were discussed. All these meetings behind closed doors were, of course not kept secret from the British bourgeoisie, which has its agents everywhere. This encouraged the mine owners and they undertook a number of fresh attacks.

All the reports from Great Britain go to show that the greatest indignation prevails among the miners. The working masses will have nothing to do with talk of concessions. In these circumstances the fight between the miners and the mine owners is unavoidable. The situation in Great Britain at present is such that the miners alone would not secure a victory without serious support by the larger trade unions and by the Central Council of the British Trade Union Congress, for the forces are not equal: on the one side there stands the entire British bourgeoisie, the whole State apparatus, strike-breaking corps of all kinds etc. Will the railway workers, the transport workers and the General Council come to the aid of the miners? There exists a formal promise of support, but whether this support will be realised in practice, whether the transport workers, the railway workers (we must not forget that the General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen is the notorious J. H. Thomas) etc. will enter on a solidarity strike, is at present very difficult to say.

If the Right wing of the Labour Party and the Right wing of the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress had not carried on a disintegrating, demoralising and defeatist policy in the last two or three months, had these advocates of capitulation not everywhere called attention to the "unprejudiced attitude" of Mr. Baldwin, the acceptability of the proposals of the Royal Commission, the futility of fighting, the advantage of losing a little without a struggle instead of losing a great deal in a struggle, then the bourgeoisie of Great Britain would have learned a lesson on the 1st of May which it would not forget in a hurry. But now, when a new Black Friday is being prepared by the Right wing of the Labour Party and by the Right wing of the General Council, (they are one and the same elements), we are justified in regarding with anxiety the state of affairs in Great Britain, for the fate of the entire British proletariat is at stake.

We are following events in Great Britain with considerable uneasiness, for on this section of the British coal front the workers will again have to fight a battle against united capital, against the bourgeois State and the Right leaders of the British labour movement.

We know that the British miners, in their overwhelming majority, will not hear of submission, that they are ready for a struggle. They can be assured of the warmest sympathy and of the unreserved support of the revolutionary workers of the whole world — the Conference of Action of the Minority Movement has shown this in Great Britain itself —, for the victory of the British miners is our victory; their defeat, however, is our defeat. Therefore, every honest proletarian will be in favour of a fight to the end, until victory is attained.

International Aid for the English Miners.

R. I. L. U. Proposes Joint Action to the I. F. T. U.

Moscow, 18th of April 1926,

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions has sent to the International Federation of Trade Unions the following communication signed by Lozovsky:

"The approaching conflict in the English mining industry bears a decidedly international character; it demands that the working class in all countries and all the international organisations adopt an attentive and serious attitude towards it. We are all interested in seeing that the English miners beat back the attack on their wages and working conditions contemplated by the mine owners and by the Coal Commission. The defeat of the English miners would be the signal for reducing the standard of living not only of the English, but of the entire International proletariat. In these circumstances the organised united action of all sincere friends of the English proletariat is an absolute necessity.

In view of this the Executive Bureau of the R. I. L. U. proposes common action in order to help the English miners in their rightful struggle against the attack of capital, which is united and well organised. We express the conviction that the existing differences of opinion will not act as a hindrance to our common action for the defence of the interests of the English miners. In view of the urgency of the matter we request you to inform us by telegraph the time and place where the representatives of both Internationals can meet in order to decide upon the methods of support for the English miners."

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Economic Situation and the Budget of the Soviet Union.

The most important Features of the Economic Situation in the Soviet Union.

By A. Rykov.

(Extract from the Report at the Meeting of the Central Executive Council of the Soviet Union.)

When, under Lenin's leadership, we carried out the transition to the New Economic Policy, the extent of the decline of our country was characterised by the following figures: Industrial production amounted to 18-20% and agricultural production amounted to 49% of the pre-war production. By comparing these two figures one could, at the first glance, arrive at the conclusion that agriculture was in a better position than industry.

Such a conclusion, however, would be extremely superficial, as it would leave out of account the fact that the bulk of the agricultural products is consumed by the peasants themselves, while almost the whole of the industrial products is sent to the market. At the beginning of the New Economic Policy agriculture sent such an insignificant portion of its products to the market that we experienced at the time an exceedingly severe food crisis. The development of our entire economy, including the development of industry, encountered before all in this period the difficulty presented by the weakness of agriculture. The workers had to have bread, the town population had to be supplied with food, and industry with raw material. All this was only possible through the development of agriculture.

Hence, at that time agriculture was the weak point in our entire economy, the strengthening of which was the necessary pre-condition for the economic reconstruction and further development of the whole country.

The present economic situation differs greatly from the original stage of the New Economic Policy. Industry has now attained about 95% and agriculture 91% of the pre-war standard. At the commencement of the New Economic Policy there existed hunger and food crisis. To-day, there prevails hunger for industrial products. If one wished to express in a short formula the chief difference between the present economic situation and the situation at the beginning of the New Economic Policy, one could say: At that time agriculture was in a backward condition and as a result there prevailed throughout the whole country

a severe food crisis; to-day it is industry that is in a backward condition, and as a consequence we are in the second year of shortage of goods.

Thus the importance and the role of agriculture and industry in the whole life of our Union has changed, although at the same time industry has developed at an exceedingly rapid rate. Last year it increased its production by 64%, and in the present year it will increase it by about 35%. The yearly increase in industrial production considerably exceeds the growth of agricultural production, nevertheless there prevails a shortage of goods.

Simultaneously with the growth of industry and agriculture — and this is one of the symptoms of this general process of reconstruction — our budget has grown considerably, and this year attains a balance of over four milliard roubles as against 2,208,148,000 roubles in the year 1923/24 and 2,905,070,000 roubles in the year 1924/25.

It must be borne in mind that we have achieved these results without any help whatever from outside. I believe that our State is the only one that has succeeded in overcoming the enormous devastation without foreign loans. I believe that our State also occupies a unique position in that it has proved capable of achieving economic successes such as other States have not been able to obtain even with the aid of foreign loans and the support of other States. Our economic successes have — and everyone must realise this — a tremendous political importance, as they prove that, in spite of all the attempts of our opponents to prove the inability of the working class and of the peasantry to organise economy without the factory owners and landlords, that the workers and peasants know how to build up the economic life of the country and to organise it better than was ever the case under the rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords and under the capitalist Order.

These successes which we have attained not only compel quantitative respect, but they imply at the same time a gigantic moral victory, as they prove the superiority of our Order compared with the bourgeois-capitalist Order.

As I have already said, in spite of the fact that we have attained 95% of the pre-war production in our industry and 91% in agriculture, there prevails a shortage of goods. Wherein lies the cause of this? If the proportion between the quantity of goods produced by agriculture and the quantity produced by industry has remained about the same, and the rate of development of industry even exceeds the growth of agriculture, then the chief cause, apparently, must be sought in another sphere.

The chief cause of the shortage of goods is the forced growth of effective demand.

There has been a great change in the budget of the peasant as compared with pre-war times. The nationalisation of the land, the freeing of the peasants from the burdens of purchase of land from and payment of rent to the land-owners, hand in hand with the advance of agriculture, alone increase the purchasing capacity of the peasants. The freeing of the peasants from a number of other liabilities which were part and parcel of the landlord regime, increases at the same time the purchasing power of the village, and therefore the growth of agricultural production of the peasants involves a greater demand for industrial products. Thanks to the considerable reduction of the agricultural income tax and the increase in the price of corn, and thanks to the generous granting of credits to our organs responsible for collecting grain, the purchasing power of the village has greatly increased this year.

The rapid growth of effective demand in the towns is due to various causes: the level of income of the urban population and the wages of the workers and employees have increased; along with this there is to be observed in recent times a certain retardation in the increase of the productivity of labour. In the increased shortage of goods the rapid pace of the development of heavy industry and the inauguration of a comprehensive programme of new buildings plays a considerable role. It must be remembered that the investment of capital does not mean the immediate inflow of new goods on to the market; on the other hand the demand for finished products is increased by this. If a new factory is built or a new pit is opened in the Donetz basin, the work takes some years, and during this time the workers who are engaged in the new construction require bread and finished products. Therefore, the industrial investment of capital which finally leads to the abolition of the shortage of

goods, increase the demand so long as the new factory is not set going.

All these facts which I have mentioned have greatly increased the growth of the effective demand in town and country; and this demand our industry was unable to satisfy, in spite of the fact that it increased its production by 64% in the past year.

These are the causes of that shortage of goods which we feel so keenly in the present year and which existed in a weaker form in the past. I do not wish to create the illusion that this shortage of goods can be abolished in the near future. The elements of natural economy still play a very great role in the economic system of our country. Even today, a considerable portion of the peasant undertakings satisfy their own requirements. The element of natural economy is gradually decaying and will decay the more rapidly, the more speedily industry is restored, its products cheapened and its connection with agriculture consolidated. This decay of the elements of natural economy will still further increase the demand for industrial products.

That is not dangerous. The rapid pace of the transference of agriculture on to the basis of goods economy will stimulate the development of our industry, promote technical progress and improve its organisation. Only such an increase of the shortage of goods would be dangerous which constituted a hindrance to the development of economy itself.

The general economic difficulties, which are a result of the shortage of goods, have been rendered more acute by some "miscalculations" and by some mistakes in carrying out the most important economic plans.

As a result of these difficulties we had to adapt our export-and import plan, the plan of our capital investments etc. to the means at the disposal of our State. But even according to this reduced plan, industry will increase its production this year by 35 to 40%.

We must now devote our chief attention to that danger which threatens us from the side of a too great increase of retail prices. A number of supplementary measures are at present being worked out which are intended, in the course of the Summer, to increase the quantity of goods in circulation and to reduce prices. A further means towards the reduction of retail prices must be the improvement of the apparatus of our State and co-operative Trading and the reduction of their overhead charges.

Whither and how shall our economy further develop after the removal of these difficulties?

In discussing the budget question one often encounters the following view: our agricultural population is much larger than the industrial, and therefore the budget must provide more for agriculture. Such a way of putting the matter is incorrect. We must do everything possible in order to secure the growth of our entire national economy. At the beginning of our New Economic Policy agriculture was the weak point, and we did our utmost in order to raise it. At the present time the weak point is industry, as it not only cannot satisfy the personal, but also the productive requirements of the agricultural population. Therefore, the further development of agriculture depends, to a very great extent, upon industry.

Our most important task, therefore, is the industrialising of the country. Of course, that does not mean that only industry is to be developed and agriculture shall remain stationary. It must also develop, and we must provide it with considerable help in the near future. But in this joint advance of agriculture and industry the latter must develop at a pace which will secure the overcoming of the shortage of goods and create the basis for industrialising the country.

The greatest difficulty consists in the fact that the development of industry, which has almost completely worn out the plant and equipment left over from the old time, requires great investments of capital. From where are we to obtain these means? The general pre-requisites for accumulation have been created by the October Revolution, which did away with the landowners and capitalists, cancelled the debts and concentrated industry, transport, the banks etc. in the hands of the proletarian State. This renders possible an accumulation and a productive employment of our means.

In the expenditure of our accumulated means we must take into consideration two factors: first a strict, planned-economic discipline is necessary. Our practice hitherto in this respect

leaves very much to be desired. Secondly the greatest thrift must be observed from top to bottom.

These are, in main outline, the most important features of our economic situation, which must form the main point in the discussion of our Budget.

IN THE COLONIES

The Calcutta Riot.

By M. N. Roy.

The antagonism between the Hindus and the Moslems is an old phenomenon in the social life of India. This antagonism, which has its roots in the history of the country, has been fully exploited by British Imperialism. It has always provided the basis for imperialist policy of "divide and rule". During the last two decades the religious conflict broke out into bloody riots on several occasions. In each case the hidden hand of the government was to be noticed behind the scene. Provocation acts on the part of the police were the immediate cause of such bloody riots. The latest one in Calcutta has been of an unusually acute nature.

In spite of the fact that Hindu-Moslem unity was one of the planks of the nationalist programme, the bourgeois leaders have totally failed to solve the vexing problem. The reason of this deplorable failure is the inordinate importance given to religion in nationalist agitation. It is also due to the fact that the bourgeois nationalist leaders only searched for a basis of compromise.

Before the British conquered India in the middle of the eighteenth century, the country had been ruled by Moslem invaders for nearly five hundred years. Although the Moslem conquerors settled in India and practically severed all connection with their land of origin, they were always regarded more or less as aliens in the country. Religious antagonism and the consequent persecution was the order of the day in that period. A handful of British invaders were able so easily to conquer India, largely owing to the tacit connivance of the Hindu majority of the population. The memory of the three centuries of Moslem domination did not die easily among the Hindus. The bogey of a new Moslem invasion from the North-West was successfully held up by the British rulers to terrify the Hindus into subjugation. On the other hand, the Moslem minority was held in check by the fear that the disappearance of British protection would place the Moslems under the revengeful tyranny of the Hindu majority. The British rulers very successfully played upon the mutual fear and suspicion of the two communities. The policy would not have been so disastrously effective had these elements of fear and suspicion not had a traditional basis.

The Moslem community constitutes a minority of the population, being in round numbers, 70 millions as against 200 million Hindus. In its earlier stages (until the beginning of the World War) the nationalist movement was almost exclusively a Hindu movement. After having overthrown the decayed Moslem power with the help and connivance of the oppressed Hindu majority, the British conquerors changed their policy. They pretended to be the protector of the Moslem minority as against the possible dictatorship of the Hindu majority. This pretention was backed up by certain favouritism towards the Moslem intelligentsia who received preference over the Hindus as regards State employment. This policy of favouritism kept the advanced elements of the Moslem community away from the nationalist movement. Consequently, the latter became predominantly Hindu and came under the influence of Hindu religious ideology. This rendered the situation still worse. It enabled Imperialism to play more upon the fear and suspicion of the Moslems. It was pointed out by Imperialist writers that the programme of the Nationalist movement was to establish a Hindu kingdom in India, and that if that programme were realised the Moslems would find themselves in a precarious position: they would be subjected to a revengeful tyranny or even driven out of the country like the Moors from Spain. On the other hand, the government refused to pay any heed to the demands of the nationalist movement, on the pretext that it did not represent the view of the entire population. This state of affairs culminated in the organisation of the Indian Moslem League under official inspiration, as a standing challenge to the claims of the National Congress to speak on behalf of the entire nation.

The reactionary nature of Hindu nationalism greatly helped the divide and rule policy of imperialism. It strengthened the

religious pre-occupation of the Moslems who considered themselves Moslems first and Indians last. Whenever necessary the government, with the help of the Mullahs (Moslem priests), could stir up religious fanaticism among the lowest section of the proletariat and turn their fury against the Hindu nationalists. Moslem fanaticism, on its part, provoked the corresponding passion among the Hindus.

The acuteness of this unfortunate state of affairs was somewhat relieved by the rapid development of native capitalism during the years immediately preceding the World War. Economic interests enabled the bourgeoisie to overcome religious prejudice. Eventually, in 1916, nationalism found a common platform. Hindu and Moslem bourgeoisie united in their demand for self-government and fiscal autonomy. Imperialism answered with a very clever move. The very limited franchise (embracing less than two per cent of the population) granted by the Reforms Act of 1919 was based upon the principle of communal representation. In the beginning the evils of this system were not so clearly felt. They were temporarily drowned by the gigantic mass upheaval of the past war years. The inclusion of the redemption of the Islamic Khalifat in the Indian nationalist programme created an apparent unity among the Hindus and Moslems. But these tactics at the same time encouraged patriotism among the Moslems. The failure of the Khalifat movement has disturbed the apparent unity; but the results of religious fanaticism are playing havoc.

The religio-communal problem, dangerous as it is, does not however, affect all the social strata; only certain elements of the population are affected by it. A revolutionary outlook on the part of the nationalist leaders would render the solution of the problem much easier. But the nationalists are totally devoid of any understanding of the social basis of this problem. Besides, the leaders themselves are full of religious and communal prejudices, which actually frustrate all their frantic attempts at unity. The office-hunting intelligentsia are the spokesmen of communal interests, and the slum proletariat in the cities are the instrument with which the bloody conflicts are precipitated. There has hardly been any case of religious riot in the countryside, in spite of the ignorance and religious prejudice of the peasantry. These class conflicts cut across the artificially fermented religious fanaticism. The land-owning class, just as the peasantry, belong to both the religious communities. A Moslem landowner exploits his tenant irrespective of religion. So also does the Hindu landlord. Only in areas where the land-owners and peasants, as classes, belong to different religions does there exist a certain social basis for religious conflict. This was the case in the Moplah rebellion of 1920-21. The peasants were all Moslems and the landlords Hindus. Consequently, although possessed of a certain religious character, the Moplah revolt was an agrarian revolt.

Among the proletariat religious conflict has practically disappeared. For instance, the day after the bloody riots in Calcutta, 7,000 workers (Hindus and Moslems) employed in the jute mills 20 miles away came out on strike as a protest against the ill-treatment of a Moslem worker by an English engineer. The police were called in to suppress the strike. Blood was shed; but the cause on that occasion was just the contrary — it united the struggle of the working class irrespective of religion.

The Calcutta event has its special reasons. It is a part of a plan carefully laid down by the government to break up the Swaraj Party, which, in the province of Bengal, is under certain revolutionary influence. In Bengal the two communities are nearly balanced, the Moslems having a small majority. A pact between the Hindus and Moslems led to the return of a Swarajist majority in the last parliamentary elections. The next elections will take place at the end of the year. The plan of the government is to break up the Hindu-Moslem pact so that the Swarajist majority in the provincial Legislative Council will be eliminated. The bankruptcy of the Swaraj programme of parliamentary obstruction has disrupted the nationalist bloc. Now the government is endeavouring to win the Moslems to its side by promising the introduction of communal representation in all branches of the public services: in other words, by promising government jobs to the Moslem intelligentsia. In order to realise this sinister plan it must be demonstrated that the communities are in a perpetual state of warfare and fly at each others throats at every opportunity. The agitation for the organisation of a Moslem Party, obviously under official inspiration, strengthened the hands of the reactionary Hindu leaders, who are ever ready for an anti-Moslem campaign. There are a thousand and one pretences on which

the **sham proletariat** in large cities like Calcutta can be incited into a street brawl. A few bottles of alcohol and pieces of silver can always work miracles. That is how the bloody riot of Calcutta, the news of which has been flashed all over the world by Reuter as a proof of Indian's incapacity to govern herself, was engineered.

The growing importance of the proletariat and the rapid development of class consciousness amongst the poor peasantry render these artificially provoked religious riots of much less gravity than they appear. Nevertheless, the problem of a national minority is there. The bourgeois nationalism, under the ideological influence of the reactionary intelligentsia, has failed to tackle the problem. But approached from the angle of class interests and class struggle this problem becomes comparatively easy.

The Disturbances in Transjordania.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

Almost every month appear reports in the press regarding disturbances in Transjordania. At one time it is a case of excesses in various towns, at another time there is talk of insurrectionary movements of whole tribes. Nevertheless, the disturbances have not up till now assumed very large proportions.

In spite of this it can be said that Transjordania is the territory in which the clouds are most darkly looming over the head of the English Mandatory Power. The Bedouin tribes who constitute the majority of the population, are armed, as are also the Fellahien (peasant) population. The English dare not venture to carry out the disarming of the population as they have done in Palestine and Mesopotamia. In addition to this the population is very dissatisfied with the mandatory rule. Rikabi Pasha, who has been set up by the English and who is directly subordinate to the English authorities, has carried out the most monstrous and arbitrary attacks on the peasants. He has confiscated enormous areas of land and leased them to various members of his family, he is using the military in order to collect the debts of the peasants who are in arrear with their payments of interests to himself and his family, and he squanders in the most frivolous manner the taxes which have been squeezed out of the people, often applying them for his own private purposes.

Regardless of the numerous protests on the part of the Arabs against the scandalous rule of Rikabi Pasha, the English continue to support him; for the suppresses with an iron hand (as the gallows which are erected almost every day in Amman testify) every attempt at an insurrectionary movement against the mandatory power. He also understands, as none other, the art of skilful bribery, and where force is of no avail, the English pound sterling is used in order to conciliate recalcitrant Sheiks. Thus Rikabi Pasha with his English friend Peak Pasha, who is in command of the Transjordanian troops, have succeeded up to now in quelling the many attempts at revolt.

The situation now, however, has grown much more serious. After the victory of Ibn Saoud the Wahabites have advanced right to the frontier of Transjordania, and the Bedouin tribes of the border districts thus feel themselves strengthened in their efforts at revolt by the nearness of a well-armed freedom-loving and independent power (for in Arabia scarcely anyone takes the paper treaties of Ibn Saoud with the English seriously). The English feel how dangerous the situation is now becoming and have, as the first step towards securing their rule, ordered the disbanding of the Arab Battalions who had existed hitherto in Transjordania, and their replacement by Tcherkessish-English troops (the Tcherkess are playing a great role in the fight against the Syrian insurgents). The Transjordanian area is now placed under the direct military control of Lord Plumer, with the result that the office of Emir Abdallah is completely reduced to a mere shadow rule.

At the same time the English desire by means of certain administrative reforms, such as the removal of the universally hated Rikabi Pasha, to check the insurrectionary movement. It is, however, doubtful whether the military and political tricks will be successful. Transjordania, in spite of its economic and social backwardness, is today (like the neighbouring Djebel Drus and Hauran north and Hedjas South) drawn into the vortex of the national emancipation movement, and the brutally suppressed and exploited population will hardly shrink back from the final consequences of an armed revolt.

Agricultural Policy of British Imperialism in India.

By G. A. K. Luhan.

Recently, Lord Reading, the outgoing Viceroy of India, announced the appointment of a Commission to study the agricultural condition of the country. This comes after a series of official statements, both in India and England, that agriculture is the greatest problem confronting India today. The nomination of the next viceroy, who is to succeed Lord Reading, has also been meant as a sign that agriculture is to occupy official attention during the next few years to a considerably greater extent than before: Lord Irwin, the viceroy-designate, having been a minister of agriculture in a Conservative cabinet.

It is significant that this discovery of the importance of agriculture has been made now. Many of the Swarajist critics of the British government's new agricultural policy have, however, missed the significance. They have run away with the hasty assumption that it is meant to divert the "attention of the public from the political problems (namely agitation for autonomy etc.) which alone are important".

Now, the new agricultural policy of the British government is not designed to take attention away from the "political problems". That may or may be one of its effects in the sense of the Swarajist interpretation. On the other hand it is clear that it is designed as a further overhauling and modernisation of the mechanism of oppression.

The economic exploitation of the Indian population is done according to a certain system. The system changes with developing circumstances; simple robbery by force giving place to robbery by subtle methods of fraud on national scales in the history of colonial expropriations. Till the beginning of the last imperialist war, India was used by the British capitalists as a vast reservoir of raw materials, and in the second place as a dumping ground for the industrial products of England. There was undoubtedly here and there a considerable amount of British capital "working" on the spot in India, invested in the nascent industries. There was also developing an active participation of native capital in these industries.

But the economic characteristics of pre-war India remained, in spite of the commencing processes of industrialism, those of an industrially backward country. The proletariat consisted, for the most part, of the vast masses of the miserably-paid agricultural workers and the coolies on the plantations, with a fringe of industrial workers, properly so-called, in the large cities like Bombay, Cawnpore, Calcutta and Madras. The function of these labouring masses was to produce raw materials and to prepare them for export to England and in the second place to absorb, according to their buying capacity, the industrial imports from England. The surplus-value from this process had been shared between the foreign and the native bourgeoisie, the lion's share of course going to the former.

Already during the war, a start was made with a more extensive development of industries, for the immediate purpose of supplying the war needs of British imperialism in the Near and the Middle East. Since then, the industrialisation of India has become the accepted policy of British imperialism, as laid down by the Industrial Commission 1916—1917. There is now a constant flow of capital from London to various industrial areas in India, where, in collaboration with capital supplied by the native bourgeoisie, the foundations have been laid for what is practically an industrial revolution, after the model of that which happened in Europe generally in the 19th century in the period of transition from the economy of guild and Craft industries to the high economy of high scale industrialism.

As is well known, the industrialisation of a country must have in the beginning, as its basis, a "protected" home-market. This is the necessary condition of its growth. It means that the competition of foreign countries for the supply of goods to India must be regulated, controlled, and if necessary, made to cease. This is precisely what is being done in India now by a system of protective tariffs, "discriminate protection" and bounties. The large firm of steel manufacturers in India, namely Tata and Co. has received large bounties. Many other industries are "protected".

But the absence of foreign competition is only one of the factors in the creation of a home-market. Another and a more important factor is the buying-capacity of the population con-

cerned; because protected industries means higher prices. The second phase of the industrial policy of the British government is precisely to take measures to increase the buying capacity of the Indian peasants, who, as the overwhelming majority of the population, are responsible for the greatest consumption of goods.

The appointment of the agricultural commission is a step towards estimating the actual economic position of the Indian peasantry with a view to increase its power of absorbing the products of the new industrialism. In the imperialist press, the commission has been presented as a philanthropic gesture for the unique benefit of the peasants; it is of course nothing of the sort. It does not propose to consider the question of the relation of the peasants to the landlords, the question of ownership of land, the pivotal question in any scheme of peasant improvement. The labours of the commission will leave the Indian peasants, in the future as in the past, completely at the mercy of the landlords, the hierarchy of rent-collecting intermediaries, and the Sanukar (money-lender) to whom the indebtedness of the peasant has assumed colossal proportions.

Nor will there be any attempt to abolish the system of minute fragmentation of holdings which obtains in many parts of India. No measures are to be taken to improve the position of the small-holders. As a matter of fact, legislation is being proposed in some provinces to buy out the large number of small-holders with the double purpose of facilitating large capitalist farming and pauperising vast masses of the peasants for their eventual employment as necessary man-power in the new intensive industrialism.

The question of land-tenure is expressly left out of the agenda of the commission. It is quite evident that the commission has been called into being with the eminently capitalist object of making the Indian peasants work harder, so that the yield of his labour may be greater, and his exploitation, in the interests of the British capital invested in India, more intensive.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Left Platform of Korsch & Co.

By Arvid Hansen (Moscow).

In the following article, Comrade Hansen, who, at the last Conference of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. belonged to the group of the ultra-Left, now feels compelled to oppose sharply the consequences of the ultra-Left attitude, which find expression in the anti-Comintern and anti-Soviet Korsch group. It is to be hoped that Comrade Hansen, now that he has seen the mote in the eyes of others, will also see the beam in his own eye. Ed.

The fractional circular of the group of Korsch & Co., and the attempt to form a fraction not only on a national scale in Germany but even on an international scale, and particularly the political character of this attempt — all this, which the recent documents show clearly and unmistakably, has proved that the C. P. of Germany was perfectly right when it vehemently resisted such tendencies. Although it would be a great mistake to ignore the danger from the Right, it would undoubtedly be equally wrong to fail to recognise the extreme seriousness of the anti-Bolshevist ultra-Left advances in Germany.

What is the "Left" platform of the Korsch group? Every political word in this platform is wrong. In political and organisational questions, in the question of its relation to the Russian revolution, which is the centre-point of every political trend, and in the question of factory nuclei as a basis for the organisation of the Party — it is the same platform as that of Souvarine and the French Right. If there is any difference in the relation to Russia, it is that, politically, Korsch goes still further to the Right than Souvarine. If there is any difference at all, it is only that Korsch is still a member of a section of the Communist International.

What Korsch says with regard to the productivity of labour, sanitation in the factories etc. in Soviet Russia, is exactly according to the recipe of Amsterdam and the Reformist parajudgments in all countries. On what principles is the attitude of this group to the Soviet Power based? The following is a literal quotation from the circular before us by Korsch & Co.:

"As a matter of fact the Worker and Peasant Government has never and nowhere been a synonym for, i. e. meant the same as, a proletarian dictatorship; neither in Saxony and Thuringia in 1923 and still less in Russia in 1921—1926*). We understand that the Russian Worker and Peasant Government, the best that there has hitherto been, is, in the end, not a dictatorship of the proletariat, but on the contrary, a dictatorship against the proletariat, a dictatorship of the Kulaks*)."

And it is this that calls itself a "Left" platform! Is it Left? No, it is Right, it is the point of view of all renegades from the camp of the Communist International. Of what did Tranmael speak when he broke away from the Comintern? Of course of the "dictatorship against the proletariat" and of the "new revolution in Russia", which he longed for with all his heart. Of what have Höglund & Co. talked the whole time? What is the difference between the thesis of Korsch and that of Kautsky in his last calumnious brochure against Soviet Russia? There is no fundamental difference.

The Korsch platform is not only Right from Communism, it is Right from Otto Bauer, Right from all the Left and pseudo-Left Social Democrats, against whom he prattles from the "Left". What do the Norwegian Social Democratic leaders, who were in Russia say? They say:

"We need unity so that the working class in the capitalist States may be able to seize the power and to lay the foundations for economic and social liberation, in the same way as the worker and peasant class in Russia has done."

It is true, British Social Democrats, who make no pretensions to be Marxists, maintain in their ideological backwardness that:

"the present Communist system of complicated compromises has reached a stage which cannot be described as Communism but as a form of State Socialism or State Capitalism."

They nevertheless declare at the same time that the Soviet Government is a real worker and peasant Government and that the Soviet Power is a system of State in the interest of the working population. What is the case however with Korsch? He on the contrary, adopts the point of view of the Menshevist calumniators in all countries, and has moreover the effrontery to speak of a "Left platform" — even on an international scale.

After that, no one can be astonished that Korsch & Co. stigmatise the Comintern as a counter-revolutionary organisation which is carrying on a "false and counter-revolutionary policy." But who asks this company to belong to our organisation? It is perfectly possible to leave this "counter-revolutionary" organisation! Let Korsch join company with Souvarine! The agents of Tranmael & Co. are already in the game with him. Let him test his international fraction against Bolshevism in the political "chambres separees" in Paris and leave the honest proletarian members of the C. P. of Germany in peace. An end must be put to the "counter-revolutionary garbage" of such people. At the moment when the worst opponents in the ranks of international Social Democracy are compelled to make concessions to the sympathies of the exploited masses of Western Europe for Russia, the bourgeois elements in our own ranks try to undermine the sympathies for Soviet Russia by all kinds of calumnies, though they are unable to give any theoretical or practical reasons for their attitude. The activities of Korsch & Co. are a systematic attempt to poison the minds of the German workers. No sisters of Mercy are any help against this plague boil. Here one must use the lancet. As the representatives of the German Central declared at the Meeting of the Enlarged Executive, such tendencies must be combated by carrying on a campaign of annihilation with all the necessary ideological and organisational measures, whilst not forgetting that tendencies to anti-Bolshevism lurk in a more or less disguised form in the Right groups also. Anyone, however, who does not openly and categorically break with a "Left" like that of Korsch & Co. and carry on a decisive campaign against the spread of the ideological poison of that company, is lost for the cause of the working class.

*) Emphasised by me. A. H.